



Colts Neck Township Municipal Building

Cedar Drive, Colts Neck, New Jersey

124 Cedar Drive  
Colts Neck, New Jersey 07722  
Web: [www.colts-neck.nj.us](http://www.colts-neck.nj.us)  
E-mail: [twpcn@optonline.net](mailto:twpcn@optonline.net)

Phone: (732) 462-5470  
Fax: (732) 431-3173  
TDD-TYY: (732) 462-6090

January 14, 2009

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Atlantic  
Attn: Code EV21 Laurelwood Housing PM  
6506 Hampton Blvd., LRA Building A  
Norfolk, VA 23508

To Whom It May Concern:

Please find enclosed a paper copy of the comments made by Colts Neck Mayor Thomas E. Hennessy, Jr. at the December 16, 2008 Public Hearing held at Monmouth Regional High School, Tinton Falls, New Jersey, pertaining to the Laurelwood housing situation at Naval Weapons Station Earle.

Very truly yours,

Robert Bowden  
Township Administrator

Enclosure

**PRELIMINARY COMMENTS, CONCERNS & QUESTIONS OF  
THOMAS E. HENNESSY, JR. MAYOR  
TOWNSHIP OF COLTS NECK**

This hearing should have been postponed to give adequate time for all concerned to review a 400 plus page document. Despite requests from Federal, State and Local Officials, the Navy refused to postpone the hearing.

At the very least, a second hearing should be scheduled, perhaps in late January or early February. In general, very little information on time lines or cost/benefit analysis was performed throughout the EIS.

More specifically, however:

1. Why does the Navy refuse to see the obvious security risks of allowing the privatization of these homes? The Navy should abandon their plans for this reason alone.
2. How long will it take for the Navy to acquire various permits to enter Route 34? What if they are denied? Has this process been started?
3. Wetland disturbance was given very little serious attention. What is the mitigation plan and what if these permits are denied? Similar questions could be asked about clean water, floodplains, endangered species, wildlife and the fact that Earle is a superfund clean-up site. How long will it take to acquire these permits and has the process been started?
4. Though the developer is required to build the road, no construction cost estimates were provided. What is the cost estimate for each? Also, will there be cost sharing with Navy? Will the developer be responsible for the fencing, bridge improvements and traffic improvements on Route 34, and along each alternative?
5. Why does the Navy refuse to do a thorough analysis of the "buy-out" alternative with the developer? It is unclear if the Navy has even initiated discussions with the developer in this regard.
6. Why was there no thorough analysis of the cost and effect of public services to surrounding communities such as Colts Neck, Tinton Falls or the entire region?
7. The Executive Summary of the EIS listed the central concerns raised at the scoping meeting held at Brookdale College last November, yet few of these concerns were addressed in the EIS. Why not?
8. Little more than "lip service" was included for the "No Action" alternative. This section would have provided the best place to do a cost analysis of all alternatives and the possible buy-out of the developer. Is the Navy concerned that the "No Action" alternative may indeed be the best alternative?

This is just a sampling of the questions and concerns that local officials and residents have about the Navy's plans. Many more issues could be raised if given adequate time to prepare. Once again, this hearing should have been postponed, but at the very least, a second hearing scheduled and the comment period should remain open for a much longer period of time.