

6. Consistency with Local Plans

6.1. Chapter Overview

6.1.1. Introduction

This section presents the goals, objectives and policies of municipal, county and state planning entities, as well as known development/redevelopment activities planned within the study area. Legislation pertaining to the implementation of public policy within the state is summarized below.

The State of New Jersey has passed enabling legislation which provides counties and municipalities with planning and regulatory authority. Statewide policy objectives articulated in the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan (NJSDRP), the state's land use plan, also facilitates land use policy decisions at the regional and local level. As a result, an inventory of applicable public policy initiatives is provided at the state, regional, county and municipal level. This section also addresses the compatibility of the proposed project with surrounding uses and its compliance with, or variance from, public policy under the respective Build Alternatives.

6.1.2. Summary of Findings

No conflicts with existing state and regional plans are anticipated as a result of the implementation of either Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) or Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 as these plans are generally supportive of the reintroduction of passenger rail transit to the Northern Branch Corridor. Consistency of the Build Alternatives with adopted public plans varies at the municipal level. These differences are briefly described below.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)

- Light rail transit as a vehicle mode is supported by the local plans adopted by Ridgefield, Leonia, Tenafly, and Englewood.
- Tenafly's Master Plan supports rail service to and through Tenafly; however there is opposition to a terminal station within the municipality.

Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

- Light rail transit as a vehicle mode is supported by the local plans adopted by Ridgefield, Leonia, Tenafly, and Englewood.
- This Build Alternative terminates at Englewood Route 4 Station and would not provide service to Englewood Hospital or Englewood Town Center.
- This alternative would avoid a terminal station in Tenafly but is inconsistent with Tenafly's Master Plan in terms of service, as that plan supports rail service to and through Tenafly.

6.2. Methodology

The New Jersey State Planning Act (NJSA 52:18A-196 et seq.) requires the preparation and updating of a state land use plan (the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan) to articulate statewide planning objectives. The County Planning Act (NJSA 40:27-1 et seq.) passes some of the State's land use regulatory authority to counties. Counties with planning boards are required to make and adopt a county master plan to assess development of the county. Similarly, the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) of 1975 (NJSA 40:55D-1 et seq.), as amended, passes much of the planning and regulatory authority to municipalities. The MLUL requires that municipalities reexamine their Master Plan every six years and where necessary update the goals, objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards upon which

the community's comprehensive Master Plan for the physical, economic and social development of the community is based.

Additionally, the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission (NJMC) is legislatively empowered to regulate and guide development within the 30.4-square-mile Meadowlands District, a portion of which lies within the project area in North Bergen and Ridgefield. NJMC authority includes the establishment of a master plan component, as well as zoning and land use regulations.

The State of New Jersey has also enacted a statewide land use plan. The NJSDRP is a non-regulatory guidance document issued by the State of New Jersey to help inform local land use policy decisions with a regional perspective.

6.3. Environmental Review

The following section summarizes public plans on a statewide and county level that are applicable to the project corridor. In addition, municipal plans specific to project elements within the study area that relate to development, open space, community consistency, and transportation policy are then described by municipality.

6.3.1. Statewide and Regional Plans

6.3.1.1. Existing Conditions

New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan

The NJSDRP identifies both statewide policy objectives and specific regional policy goals. The NJSDRP is currently being updated. According to the Draft Final Plan (May 2009) the entire project corridor falls within a large region encompassing most of northeastern New Jersey designated as a Policy Area One: Metropolitan Planning Area. Relevant policy goals enumerated in the NJSDRP specific to Metropolitan Planning Area regions include the revitalization of cities and towns, the promotion of mixed-use development and the promotion of growth in compact forms. Statewide policy objectives as applied to Metropolitan Planning Areas include the promotion of multi-modal transportation alternatives and transit-oriented development, the promotion of infill development and brownfield redevelopment, and the creation of a wide range of residential housing opportunities.

New Jersey Meadowlands Plans

New Jersey Meadowlands Commission Master Plan

In early 2004 the NJMC adopted the NJMC Master Plan, which is the primary planning document for the District. The plan aims to balance environmental and economic development needs in the District through a series of measures including wetlands protection, preservation and enhancement, as well as redevelopment and new development on upland locations. Unlike the 1970's original Plan which identified 2,000 acres of wetland infill, the new plan calls for the protection, preservation, and enhancement of the remaining 8,400 acres of wetlands. Development pressures would be satisfied through the planned redevelopment of parcels including "brownfields" and upland sites. This would work in conjunction with cultivating a suitable, efficient and environmentally conscious use of land. The integration of a multi-modal transportation network in the District and encouraging communication and coordination is also a major vision guiding the NJMC.

Meadowlands District Transportation Plan 2007

The Meadowlands District Transportation Plan 2007 supersedes the NJMC Master Plan-Meadowlands Mobility 2030 Technical Study dated January 2004 which was an addendum to the NJMC Master Plan described above. The Transportation Plan identifies existing and future transportation needs and

recommends improvements for the Meadowlands Transportation District which was established by the Hackensack Meadowlands Transportation Planning Act on June 24, 2005.

The Plan identifies goals, policies, needs and improvement priorities relating to the transportation network including public transit, roadways and pedestrian and bicycle access within the Meadowlands District. The proposed project is noted in the plan as an opportunity to improve existing public transit service to the Meadowlands District.

North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) Plans

NJTPA Plan 2035: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) for Northern New Jersey

The NJTPA's Plan 2035 was approved in August 2009. This plan updates and expands upon the provisions of the previous long-range plan, Access & Mobility 2030, adopted in 2005. The plan developed an extensive framework for transportation planning including improving access and mobility, enhancing public transit, and Smart Growth compatibility. The plan recognizes and supports the Northern Branch project as a strategic passenger rail project in the region.

NJTPA Transportation Improvement Plan Fiscal Years 2010-2013

Projects are reviewed every year for inclusion in the NJTPA Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and New Jersey's State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP), which assesses transportation designs and right-of-way constructions and acquisitions. The STIP identifies projects in need of funding and provides a schedule of federal funding allotted for each project on a yearly basis. The TIP and STIP are updated on a yearly basis; the most recent update was released on October 1, 2009. The TIP covers the 2010-2013 fiscal years and the STIP covers the 2010-2019 fiscal years. The Northern Branch project, although mentioned, was not independently listed as its own project, but included under the collection of Transit Rail Initiatives. No other specific information was provided regarding the Northern Branch project in the latest reports.

NJ TRANSIT / NJDOT Plans

New Jersey Long Range Transportation Plan - Transportation Choices 2030

This plan is updated every five years and sets forth the goals and visions of NJ TRANSIT and NJDOT regarding transportation strategies, financial resources, operations and policies that direct ongoing and future projects. The plan was last updated in 2007. It offers a 25-year forecast of future transportation options and evaluates transport alternatives in five, ten and 25-year increments. New Jersey Transportation Choices supports increased regional passenger rail connectivity as long as it is pursuant to NJDOT and NJ TRANSIT initiatives.

Transit Village Initiative

This initiative is a multi-agency Smart Growth partnership led by NJ TRANSIT and NJDOT. The Transit Village Initiative incentivizes municipalities to develop and revitalize areas around transit stations using transit-oriented development (TOD) design standards. This initiative also focuses on reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality by increasing transit ridership. An additional goal of this program is to attract residential and commercial uses to neighborhoods around transit stations. Currently, there are 20 municipalities within the state that have been designated as transit villages by the multi-agency Transit Village Task Force. Designated communities have met the requirements of the Transit Village criteria and have demonstrated a commitment to redeveloping communities around transit stations into compact, mixed-use neighborhoods. None of the designated municipalities are located within the project study area.

6.3.1.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in statewide or regional public policy are contemplated. The current focus on commercial and retail development patterns within main arterials in the municipalities is consistent with the NJSDRP. This alternative would also be expected to have no effect on wetlands preservation or redevelopment goals enumerated in the NJMC Master Plan, since the No Build Alternative proposes no facilities on or adjacent to NJMC-zoned land in North Bergen or Ridgefield.

The NJSDRP identifies the need for improved transportation circulation, better connectivity and public transportation connections to outlying residential neighborhoods. However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly reduce overreliance on the private automobile as called for in the NJSDRP. The No Build Alternative would also not be expected to serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the NJSDRP and of the master plans of the municipalities in the project corridor. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

There is no notable difference between the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 as they relate to statewide and regional public policy initiatives. As a result, the following narrative applies to both alternatives.

Impacts – All state and regional plans identified above are generally supportive of the reintroduction of passenger rail transit to the Northern Branch Corridor. The consistency of the Build Alternatives with state and regional plans is described below.

Policy objectives listed within the NJSDRP encourage transit use and call for a reduction in auto dependency. Another objective of the NJSDRP is to improve travel among major population and employment centers as well as transportation terminals. The proposed project itself, regardless of the Build Alternative selected, would be in substantial compliance with the NJSDRP. In addition, the NJMC Master Plan lists as a key vision the integration of a multi-modal transportation system within the District. In addition, the New Jersey Long Range Transportation Plan 2030 and the NJTPA's Plan 2035 strongly encourage passenger rail service to improve mobility and promote extensions and infill of existing centers and overall commercial growth.

None of the communities within the Northern Branch Corridor are designated as Transit Villages. However, these municipalities, which have historically developed along the existing rail right-of-way, typify a number of TOD characteristics such as compact buildings, traditional site design, and transit-supportive uses in downtown areas. In addition, the Tenafly Master Plan specifically references the potential introduction of transit village development associated with the proposed project. As such, both the proposed project and applicable local plans would be consistent with goals of the Transit Village Initiative.

Implementation of the proposed project would aid in achieving the goals and objectives discussed in the above-mentioned plans. As such, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse public policy impacts with respect to applicable state and regional plans.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.2. County Plans

6.3.2.1. Existing Conditions

Public plans for Hudson County and Bergen County that are applicable to the project corridor are discussed below. Public policy initiatives and their potential project-related impacts are discussed by county.

Hudson County

Hudson County Master Plan

The Hudson County Master Plan was last examined and updated in 2008. The Hudson County Reexamination of the Master Plan 2008 report addresses changes to the original Master Plan goals and objectives based on changes in demographics, employment and transportation patterns since 2002. Economic revitalization of the commercial and industrial base while preserving the residential neighborhood character continues to be a focal point in the plan. The report addresses climate change impacts on the Hudson County communities and the importance of an integrated approach to improving the local environment. The Northern Branch project is identified as a future transit improvement and the report identifies the existing Hudson-Bergen Light Rail as a critical element of the County's transportation system.

Hudson County Cross-Acceptance Report

The Hudson County Cross-Acceptance Final Report was updated in 2007. Although its goals are taken from the Hudson County Master Plan and Strategic Revitalization Plan, the purpose is to promote integration, coordination, and reconciliation throughout all governmental levels in order to attain consistency among state, municipal and county planning. The goal of the Hudson Cross-Acceptance Report is to provide a model for municipalities to follow in order for them to align their objectives with those of regional planning objectives.

Hudson County Open Space and Recreation Plan

The Hudson County Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP), dated December 2004, is a program designed to identify, prioritize, enhance and preserve open space resources within the County. The OSRP also maintains Hudson County's eligibility to receive grant funding from the Green Acres Program. The OSRP discusses development trends, the various types of open space, and their functions in Hudson County. A main goal of the Hudson County OSRP is to improve quality of life and to make recreational opportunities more accessible to all residents.

Bergen County

Bergen County Cross-Acceptance Report

The follow-up of the Bergen County Cross-Acceptance Plan concluded in May 2007. The Bergen County Cross-Acceptance Plan acts as a liaison for changes to the State Plan and serves to examine and consider the inconsistencies between municipal planning and the overarching State Plan relating to policy objectives and goals. The Bergen County Cross-Acceptance plan lists major transportation, development, and planning initiatives within the county that align with the State Plan. The Northern Branch project is identified in both the Northern Valley and Southeast municipalities of the county as a common resource that crosses municipal boundaries.

Bergen County Open Space and Recreation Plan

The Bergen County Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP), dated August 2004, provides a strategic plan and guidelines for future parkland acquisition, development and preservation throughout Bergen County. The OSRP also maintains Bergen County's eligibility to receive grant funding from the Green Acres Program. The Bergen County OSRP stresses the importance of providing facilities regional in nature that are capable of serving the entire county.

6.3.2.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The proposed project would not be constructed. Since the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in Hudson and Bergen public policy documents. The alternative would also not be expected to serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity within the project corridor is a central element of many of the county initiatives referenced above including the Hudson County Master Plan. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion within both counties are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Hudson County

Impacts – The Hudson County public policy initiatives identified above are generally supportive of the reintroduction of passenger rail transit to the Northern Branch Corridor. While the proposed project is not specifically referenced in the Hudson County Cross-Acceptance Report, the Build Alternatives would be consistent with the report’s circulation goals of promoting transit and using alternate modes of transportation as well as reducing congestion on local roadways and highways.

The Hudson County OSRP does not specifically reference transit plans. However, a main goal of the Hudson County OSRP is to improve quality of life and to make recreational opportunities more accessible to all residents. The proposed project would improve accessibility to open space resources proximate to the alignment within Hudson County. As a result, the proposed project would be consistent with aspects of the Hudson County OSRP that pertain to improving user accessibility to recreational resources within the corridor. No significant adverse public policy impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation – None is required.

Bergen County

Impacts – Plans related to Bergen County and identified above are generally supportive of the reintroduction of passenger rail transit to the Northern Branch Corridor, and the Northern Branch project is identified in the Bergen County Cross-Acceptance Plan.

Like Hudson County, transit plans are not specifically referenced in the Bergen County OSRP. However, the Bergen County OSRP stresses the importance of providing facilities regional in nature that are capable of serving the entire county. The proposed project would improve accessibility to open space resources proximate to the alignment within Bergen County. In addition, it is anticipated that Overpeck County Park would attract additional park patrons from Bergen County and beyond due to its proximity to Leonia Station. As a result, the proposed project would be consistent with the aspects of the Bergen County OSRP that pertain to improving user accessibility to recreational resources within the corridor. No significant adverse public policy impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.3. North Bergen

6.3.3.1. Existing Conditions

North Bergen Master Plan

The North Bergen Master Plan was last examined and updated in 2003. The 2003 strategy was to rectify the 1994 Plan's concern of this rapidly developing municipality. The current plan aims to promote economic commercial and residential development, undertake a complete upgrade of the sewer system, and make traffic and circulation improvements in conjunction with the New Jersey Department of Transportation.

6.3.3.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The current focus on the preservation of residential neighborhoods and continued commercial and retail development patterns along main arterials within the municipality is consistent with the North Bergen Master Plan.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in the North Bergen Master Plan. The alternative would also not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the North Bergen Master Plan. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – The proposed project, regardless of Build Alternative selected, would be consistent with the North Bergen Master Plan. The implementation of the proposed project would support the economic and residential development goals and traffic improvement goals articulated in the plan. As such, no significant inconsistencies or adverse public policy impacts at the municipal level are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.4. Ridgefield

6.3.4.1. Existing Conditions

Ridgefield Master Plan

The Ridgefield Master Plan was last reexamined in 2005. The plan aims to limit and channel commercial development to existing commercial areas and to upgrade facilities within the manufacturing districts abutting the right-of-way. Ridgefield also developed the Overpeck Creek Redevelopment Plan. This plan identifies the area west of the Northern Branch right-of-way to Overpeck Creek, north to Route 46 and south to Bell Drive as an area in need of redevelopment. This area is planned to be a mixed-use development and is aligned with the objectives of the surrounding area. The Overpeck Creek Redevelopment Plan proposes connectivity to the proposed Northern Branch passenger rail that would run adjacent to the development and encourages the use of public transportation as it incorporates a transit village and station within its plan.

6.3.4.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The current focus on the preservation of residential neighborhoods and continued commercial and retail development patterns along main arterials within the municipality is consistent with the Ridgefield Master Plan.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not significantly decrease traffic congestion within the municipality. This alternative would not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the Ridgefield Master Plan. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – The proposed project, regardless of Build Alternative selected, would be consistent with the Ridgefield Master Plan. Light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternatives, is specifically supported by Ridgefield in terms of vehicle mode. As such, no significant inconsistencies or adverse public policy impacts at the municipal level are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.5. Palisades Park

6.3.5.1. Existing Conditions

Palisades Park Master Plan

The Palisades Park Master Plan was last revisited in 2000. The plan lists a number of general development guiding objectives including the encouragement of appropriate locations and designs of transportation routes which would promote the free flow of traffic in the Borough. In addition, the plan lists specific goals and policies calling for a uniform land use arrangement to maintain and enhance existing areas of stability in the community; and assurance that future development and/or redevelopment is responsive to the Borough's environmental features and can be accommodated by the community's infrastructure development.

6.3.5.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes to public policy are anticipated to result. The proposed project would not occur. The Palisades Park Master Plan, which promotes public transportation connections to outlying residential neighborhoods, identifies the need to improve transportation circulation and connectivity within the municipality.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in the Palisades Park Master Plan. The alternative would also not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the Palisades Park Master Plan referenced above. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – The proposed project, regardless of Build Alternative selected, would be generally consistent with the Palisades Park Master Plan. The proposed project has the potential to reduce the overall VMT within the corridor and would be consistent with the transportation objectives identified in the municipal plan. As such, no significant inconsistencies or adverse public policy impacts at the municipal level are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.6. Leonia*6.3.6.1. Existing Conditions**Leonia Master Plan*

Leonia updated its Master Plan in 2002. The plan notes the reinforcement in uniform development to single and two-family residential neighborhoods. The plan promotes the reintroduction of passenger rail services as a long-term goal, but continues to be cautionary about potential impacts to Overpeck County Park and the immediate vicinity.

Leonia is currently reexamining its master plan. The draft Master Plan Reexamination Report, dated September 25, 2009, states that Borough officials have held meetings with NJ TRANSIT to explore the most advantageous integration of the proposed passenger rail station and station parking facilities for the Borough.

Draft 2009 Leonia Economic Plan

This draft economic development plan evaluates steps the municipality can take to improve economic conditions without impacting areas that are attractive to residents of Leonia. This document, dated December 10, 2009, focuses on the expansion of Leonia's downtown and commercial core, while retaining its residential character. The proposed project is identified as a potential public transit option within Leonia.¹ The plan also promotes the economic development opportunities for Leonia that are associated with the reintroduction of passenger rail service along the Northern Branch Corridor. Land use and smart growth objectives of the plan relative to the proposed project include the development of commercial and retail opportunities as well as public parking adjacent to the proposed station.²

*6.3.6.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation***No Build Alternative**

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The preservation of residential neighborhoods and continued development is consistent with the guidelines identified in the Leonia Master Plan. The current focus on commercial and retail development patterns within the municipality's downtown also complies with the Draft 2009 Leonia Economic Plan. In addition, transportation circulation and better connectivity is mentioned in the Leonia Master Plan which promotes the reintroduction of passenger rail along the Northern Branch Corridor.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in the Leonia Master Plan. The alternative would also not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of

¹ Borough of Leonia. *2009 Economic Plan*. December 10, 2009. p.29.

² Ibid. p. 33.

centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the public policy documents referenced above. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – The Draft 2009 Leonia Economic Plan identifies the proposed Leonia station site as a realistic economic development and public benefit opportunity for Leonia. The proposed project would provide an alternative method of transportation to residents who commute to Hudson County and New York City, reduce overall congestion within Leonia and throughout the project corridor, and potentially attract businesses to Leonia which are consistent with opportunities identified within this plan.

Light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternatives, is specifically supported by Leonia in terms of vehicle mode. Implementation of the proposed project would also facilitate the realization of potential economic development opportunities referenced above and described in the Draft 2009 Leonia Economic Plan. As such, no significant inconsistencies or adverse public policy impacts at the municipal level are anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed project would aid in achieving the goals and objectives discussed in the above-mentioned plans. Therefore, no significant inconsistencies as a result of the proposed project are expected.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.7. Englewood

6.3.7.1. Existing Conditions

Englewood Master Plan

The Englewood Master Plan was previously reexamined in 2003. The plan identifies its goals based on land use and urban design principles. The plan encourages both the preservation and development of residential neighborhoods and the connectivity to downtown Englewood and the Central Business District (CBD). Mixed-use development is targeted in office and industrial zones on underused land, specifically the enterprise zone along South Dean Street and Route 4. The promotion and maintenance of a pedestrian-oriented CBD and the need to upgrade the Service Business Districts creating new Neighborhood Service Districts is also part of the Englewood development strategy. The plan encourages the use of public transportation to provide connectivity from outlying areas to the CBD.

The City of Englewood is in the process of updating its master plan. A draft master plan, dated September 2009, provides a future vision of Englewood with respect to land use control and urban design principles. A main goal of the plan is to promote public transportation, including light rail and/or DMUs and trolleys, to reduce traffic congestion, encourage use of peripheral parking lots and provide access to the CBD from outlying areas.

6.3.7.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The current focus on the preservation of residential neighborhoods and continued commercial and retail development patterns within the municipality's downtown is consistent with the Englewood Master Plan. In addition, the master plan identifies the need for improved transportation circulation and better connectivity within the municipality.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not be expected to significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in the Englewood Master Plan. The No Build Alternative would also not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the public policy document referenced above. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)

Impacts – The implementation of Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) would be consistent with the Englewood Master Plan as this adopted plan encourages both the reintroduction of passenger rail service along the corridor as well as the use of mass transit. Light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternative, is specifically supported by Englewood in terms of vehicle mode. This alternative will also provide service to all of Englewood, particularly the CBD in the vicinity of the Englewood Town Center station. No adverse public policy impacts are anticipated as a result of the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative).

Mitigation – None is required.

Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – Light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternative, is specifically supported by Englewood in terms of vehicle mode. However, as this Build Alternative terminates at Englewood Route 4 Station, it will not provide service to all of Englewood, particularly the CBD in the vicinity of Englewood Town Center. The implementation of Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 would be consistent with the adopted municipal plan as it encourages both the reintroduction of passenger rail service along the rail right-of-way. However, the Build Alternative would be inconsistent with the adopted Englewood Master Plan in terms of service since only a portion of Englewood would be served by the Light Rail to Englewood Route 4.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.3.8. Tenafly

6.3.8.1. Existing Conditions

Tenafly Master Plan

The Tenafly Master Plan was last reexamined in 2005, with an updated Housing Element and Fair Share Plan amended to the plan in November of 2008. Among the goals highlighted in the plan are the continued concentration of retail and commercial uses in the CBD and the amelioration of traffic problems. The plan supports the reintroduction of rail passenger service along the Northern Branch right-of-way in the long-term; however, the policy statement regarding the Northern Branch service requires that service on the line minimize negative impacts regarding pollution and noise, and parking and traffic issues should be carefully considered. Additionally, the Tenafly Master Plan states the municipality's opposition to having rail transit terminate within the municipality for fear of potential traffic it may generate.

Although not included in the Tenafly Master Plan, Tenafly passed a resolution opposing the Northern Branch rail service in Tenafly.

6.3.8.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative

Under the No Build Alternative, no major changes in public policy are contemplated. The current focus on the preservation of residential neighborhoods and continued commercial and retail development patterns within the municipality's downtown is consistent with the Tenafly Master Plan. In addition, the master plan identifies the need for improved transportation circulation and better connectivity within the municipality.

However, because the No Build Alternative primarily assumes a continuation of existing transit service, it would not significantly decrease traffic congestion, a goal enumerated in the Tenafly Master Plan. The alternative would also not serve as a centralizing influence or be a magnet for development in the same way a rail-transit line within the study area would. The encouragement of centralized development and better connectivity is a fundamental element of the public policy document referenced above. Under the No Build Alternative, roadway traffic circulation and congestion are expected to worsen as a result of residential and economic background growth.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)

Impacts – The implementation of the proposed project would be consistent with the Tenafly Master Plan as this adopted plan encourages both the reintroduction of passenger rail service along the corridor as well as the use of mass transit. In addition, light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternative, is preferred by Tenafly in terms of vehicle mode. However, the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) is inconsistent with the Tenafly Master Plan's opposition to a terminal station in Tenafly.

Mitigation – None is required.

Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – Light rail transit, which would be implemented under the Build Alternative, is specifically supported by Tenafly in terms of vehicle mode. Although the adopted local plan opposes a terminal station in Tenafly, the plan supports rail service to and through Tenafly. As such, this alternative, which terminates at Englewood Route 4, is not consistent with the Tenafly Master Plan in terms of service.

Mitigation – None is required.

6.4. Summary of Local Plan Impacts

As described above, all Build Alternatives are generally supported by state and regional plans. The issue of compliance is a matter of local master plan support, as summarized below and in Table 6-1.

Light rail transit is specifically supported by the master plans adopted by Ridgefield, Leonia, Tenafly, and Englewood.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) is inconsistent with Tenafly's Master Plan, which is opposed to a terminal station in Tenafly.

Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 is not consistent with the local plans as adopted by Englewood and Tenafly in terms of service. This alternative will not provide service to Englewood Town Center or Englewood Hospital. Additionally, although Tenafly's Master Plan opposes a terminal station in their municipality, the plan supports rail service to and through Tenafly.

Project impacts north of Tenaflly will be confined to changes to the freight service schedule, with freight trains operating at night. Passenger service will not extend past the proposed Tenaflly North Station; consequently, no conflicts with existing local plans are anticipated.

Table 6-1: Summary of Compliance with Local Plans

Alternatives	Endorsed by Local Plan	Description of Support or Opposition
No Build	Not Supported	All local plans state the need for improved mobility, decreased congestion, and increased transit service.
Light Rail to Tenaflly (Preferred Alternative)	Specifically supported by Ridgefield, Leonia, Tenaflly, and Englewood in terms of vehicle mode.	Tenaflly opposes terminal station within Tenaflly. Although not included in the plan, Tenaflly passed a resolution opposing the rail service in Tenaflly.
Light Rail to Englewood Route 4	Specifically supported by Ridgefield, Leonia, Tenaflly, and Englewood in terms of vehicle mode.	Does not comply with Tenaflly Master Plan objective for transit service. Serves only part of Englewood.