23. Historic Properties and Resources

23.1. Chapter Overview

23.1.1. Introduction

This section identifies resources in the Northern Branch Corridor project area that are National Historic Sites or Landmarks, listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places, have been determined eligible by the Keeper of the National Register of Historic Places, or have State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) opinions of eligibility. This analysis was prepared in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and Chapter 268 of the New Jersey State Register Law of 1970. This section is a summary of the findings made in the following reports and letters. The reports are available upon request; the relevant correspondence has been included in Appendix C.

- Northern Branch Rail Corridor DEIS Historic Architectural Resources Background Study Volumes I and II, May 2008; and Volumes III and IV, September 2009.
- Supplement to the Northern Branch Rail Corridor DEIS Historic Architectural Resources Background Study Volumes I and II, September 2009.
- Daniel D. Saunders, Deputy SHPO, to Dara Callender, NJ TRANSIT, March 3, 2009
- Daniel D. Saunders, Deputy SHPO, to Dara Callender, NJ TRANSIT, July 28, 2009
- Daniel D. Saunders, Deputy SHPO, to Dara Callender, NJ TRANSIT, January 20, 2010
- David R. Wall, Chair, Tenafly Historic Preservation Commission, to Daniel D. Saunders, Deputy SHPO, April 12, 2010
- Daniel D. Saunders, Deputy SHPO, to David R. Wall, Chair, Tenafly Historic Preservation Commission, April 21, 2010

Historic resources are protected under federal law through Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; Section 101(b)(4) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Historic and Archaeological Data Protection Act of 1974; Executive Orders 11593 and 12372; 23 CFR 771, as amended, October 30, 1980; 36 DVR 66; the guidelines developed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation published November 26, 1980; and the amended procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties as set forth in 36 CFR 800. Applicable State of New Jersey legislation governing the protection of these resources includes Chapter 268 of the New Jersey State Register Law of 1970 and Executive Order 215.

The regulations developed under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act require that prior to approval of federal funding, agencies should consider a project's impacts on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included on, or eligible for inclusion on, the National Register of Historic Places (National Register), and give the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on an undertaking. The Historic and Archaeological Data Preservation Act directs federal agencies to preserve historic and archaeological data that would otherwise be lost as a result of a federal action. A project is considered to have an adverse effect on such sensitive resources if it changes the quality or cultural characteristics that render them eligible for listing on the National Register.

23.1.2. Summary of Findings

An Area of Potential Effect (APE) was established for each area of proposed construction activity within the Northern Branch Corridor, such as stations, the VBF, viaducts, and bridges. For the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way, a general APE was developed to identify potential impacts associated with the proposed catenary. Historic resources within view of the proposed catenary were considered to be within the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way (ROW) APE. Within the site specific APEs and the ROW
APE 195 historic architectural resources, including 26 bridges, were identified and evaluated to determine their potential for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Of these 195 resources, only five were found to be listed on or eligible for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. The locations of these resources are identified in Table 23-1.

### Table 23-1: Historic Resources Within the Areas of Potential Effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Applicable Build Alternative</th>
<th>APE</th>
<th>Designation of Resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood</td>
<td>1040 Edgewater Avenue, Ridgefield, Bergen County</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>State and National Register Listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Route 46 Corridor Between George Washington Bridge and Grand Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>U.S. Route 46 and Grand Avenue, Ridgefield/Palisades Park, Bergen County</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>SHPO Opinion of Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrett’s, Palmer &amp; Heal Dyeing &amp; Cleansing Establishment</td>
<td>60 Cedar Lane, Englewood, Bergen County</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood</td>
<td>CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook APE</td>
<td>SHPO Opinion of Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building</td>
<td>21 Park Place, Englewood, Bergen County</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>SHPO Opinion of Eligibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenafly Railroad Station</td>
<td>1 Piermont Road, Tenafly, Bergen County</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Tenafly Town Center APE</td>
<td>State and National Register Listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) serves a greater distance, it has the potential to affect two more resources than does Light Rail to Englewood Route 4. Specific findings are as follows:

- Both Build Alternatives present the potential for impacts associated with construction noise and vibration; however, with mitigation measures, impacts to historic resources are not anticipated.
  - Mitigation measures for construction activities are aimed at buffering historic resources from noise, vibration, and dust, and include relatively simple measures such as establishing staging areas away from the resources and establishing truck routes that do not pass by the resources.
- All resources except the U.S. Route 46 Corridor are potentially affected by the proposed overhead catenary wires. Construction of the catenary may change the visual context of the resources; however, these impacts can be mitigated.
  - Catenary impacts can be mitigated through the application of context-sensitive design elements that respect the local development patterns and historic resources in the area.
- With mitigation in place, there is no appreciable difference in impacts between the two Build Alternatives.

### 23.2. Methodology

#### 23.2.1. Data Resources

The analysis was conducted in accordance with National Park Service professional qualification standards for historic preservation consultants as specified in the Federal Register (36 CFR 61, Section 61.5).
The Northern Branch Historic Architectural Resources Background Study (HARBS) was prepared in order to:

- Identify all resources in the APE that are National Historic Sites or Landmarks, listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places, have been determined eligible by the Keeper of the National Register, or have SHPO opinions of eligibility;
- Locate and identify all previously recorded and unrecorded structures over 50 years of age;
- Evaluate the potential eligibility of these resources for listing on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places.

The task of identifying historic resources in the project area began with a review of existing studies and findings that have been conducted regarding historic resources in the project area. This included the review of the findings of the following documents:

- *Bergen County Historic Sites Survey.* Bergen County Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Cultural and Historic Affairs 1981-82;
- *Bergen County Historic Site Survey Revisions and Update.* Bergen County Department of Parks and Recreation, Division of Cultural and Historic Affairs, 2006.

Background research on the history of the Northern Branch and the municipalities in the project area was conducted to provide an overview of the developmental history and a context for the discussion of historic resources. Research was conducted at the New Jersey Historic Preservation Office to review existing documentation, National Register files, determinations of eligibility, SHPO opinions, existing surveys, case reports, environmental impact statements, National Register files, and maps. Research was also conducted at the Bergen County Office of Cultural and Heritage Affairs in Hackensack, the Bergen County Historical Society in River Edge, and the Leonia Historical Society in Leonia, as well as at public libraries in Hudson County in North Bergen and Bergen County in Ridgefield, Palisades Park, Leonia, Englewood, and Tenafly. Research was also conducted at the New Jersey State Library in Trenton and the Newark Public Library in Newark. Title research was conducted at the Bergen County Recorder of Deeds in Hackensack and the Hudson County Recorder of Deeds in Jersey City. This was followed by verification in the field.

### 23.2.2. Definition of the Area of Potential Effect

#### 23.2.2.1. Areas of Potential Effect, Generally

The APE is defined as the area in which the proposed project is most likely to have impacts on cultural resources. The APE includes the area that may be affected by direct physical impacts, such as demolition or alteration of a resource, or by indirect contextual impacts such as changes in the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood or in the view from a resource. The potential effects of temporary project actions (i.e.; construction noise, dust and vibration) are also considered in determining the APE.

In consultation with the SHPO, APEs have been developed for each area of construction activity including each proposed station site and yard. APEs were also developed for areas where viaducts would be constructed in North Bergen to connect the terminus of the HBLR to the light rail alternatives and to cross over the NYS&W. These APEs are mapped on Figures 23-1 through 23-14. Only those resources that are listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places or have a SHPO opinion of eligibility are discussed in this chapter and included on the APE maps. A discussion of all historic architectural resources examined as part of this study can be found in the Northern Branch HARBS, Volumes I and II, May 2008 and the Northern Branch Supplemental HARBS, September, 2009.
APEs have also been developed for bridges along the rail corridor that would need construction. These bridges are described and evaluated in the Northern Branch HARBS Volume II, May 2008. One resource, Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment which is adjacent to the CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook, has a SHPO opinion of eligibility. This resource and the potential effects of the project are discussed in this chapter.

### 23.2.2.2. Area of Potential Effect for Northern Branch Corridor Right-of-Way

An APE for the Northern Branch Corridor Right-of-Way was conceptually developed to identify potential impacts associated with the proposed catenary. Due to the length of the project, the APE was not mapped, but was interpreted as the area within which the overhead catenary along the alignment could be seen, generally within one to two rows of buildings from the right-of-way. For the analysis of the historic architectural resources that may be affected by the catenary, the SHPO agreed that due to the large amount of relatively insignificant resources that bordered the Northern Branch right-of-way (i.e. primarily post-World War II housing, etc.), no intensive level research, survey forms, or mapping of these resources would be required. SHPO requested general photographic representation of these areas with a list of the non-eligible resources arranged by municipality with street addresses and brief descriptions provided. However, the SHPO requested that if general research of existing documentation, historic maps or field surveys determined that any of the structures within close proximity to the right-of-way (one block or within a close clear view) may have the potential for historic or architectural significance, intensive level research would be conducted and a survey form prepared. These resources are described, evaluated, and included on maps in the HARBS Volumes I and II, May 2008. Only those resources that are in close proximity to the Northern Branch right-of-way and that are listed on the State or National Register of Historic Places or have a SHPO opinion of eligibility are discussed in this section and included on the mapping/figures presented in this chapter. A discussion of all historic resources examined can be found in the HARBS Volumes I and II, May 2008 and the Supplemental HARBS, September 2009.

### 23.2.3. Inventory and Identification of Resources Within the Project Area

The National Park Service, which administers the National Register, has established criteria for the evaluation of the significance of potential historic/archaeological properties (i.e.; evaluating their eligibility for listing in the National Register). As set forth in the guidelines (36 CFR 60.4):

"The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture that is present in districts, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and:

a. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history;

b. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past;

c. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; and,

d. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history."

Historic properties of national, state and local significance may be nominated to the National Register of Historic Places and the New Jersey Register of Historic Places (New Jersey Register) following evaluation in accordance with an established set of criteria. The evaluation process is conducted at the state level by the Historic Preservation Office and at the federal level by the National Register staff of the Department of the Interior. Listing in the New Jersey Register requires the approval of the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). Listing in the National Register requires the approval of both the SHPO and the Secretary of the Interior. The SHPO, acting on behalf of the Advisory Council on
Historic Preservation (ACHP), is responsible for historic reviews under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and other relevant federal legislation.

23.2.3.1. Eligibility of the Northern Branch Corridor

The Northern Railroad of New Jersey, now known as the Northern Branch, is not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places due to a loss of historic architectural integrity, as determined by the SHPO. Only four of the original 15 stations on the Northern Railroad in New Jersey remain intact, one of which, Englewood Station, has been extensively modified for use as a recording studio and has lost its historic architectural integrity. In the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE, the only architecturally-intact railroad station is the State and National Register-listed Tenafly Railroad Station. Of the 22 bridges located on the Northern Railroad of New Jersey in the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE, none date back to the original 1859 construction of the railroad and only three bridges date from the nineteenth century. All of the bridges on the Northern Branch are common examples of highway, railroad or pedestrian bridges, and none are individually eligible, nor are they eligible as a whole.

23.2.4. Preliminary Determination of Effect

The ACHP has developed criteria to determine whether a proposed project would have an effect on a property listed on, or eligible for listing on, the National Register. The ACHP guidelines define effect and adverse effect in 36 CFR 800.5, Subsection (a)(1), as follows:

(1) Criteria of adverse effect. An adverse effect is found when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics of a historic property that qualify the property for inclusion in the National Register in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Consideration shall be given to all qualifying characteristics of a historic property, including those that may have been identified subsequent to the original evaluation of the property's eligibility for the National Register. Adverse effects may include reasonably foreseeable effects caused by the undertaking that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance or be cumulative.

Adverse effects on historic properties include, but are not limited to:

(i) Physical destruction of, or damage to, all or part of the property;
(ii) Alteration of a property, including restoration, rehabilitation, repair, maintenance, stabilization, hazardous material remediation, and provision of handicapped access, that is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (36 CFR part 68) and applicable guidelines;
(iii) Removal of the property from its historic location;
(iv) Change of the character of the property's use or of physical features within the property's setting that contribute to its historic significance;
(v) Introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the property's significant historic features;
(vi) Neglect of a property which causes its deterioration, except where such neglect and deterioration are recognized qualities of a property of religious and cultural significance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization; and,
(vii) Transfer, lease, or sale of property out of Federal ownership or control without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions to ensure long-term preservation of the property's historic significance.
In their July 28, 2009 letter, the SHPO determined that the project would “conditionally have no adverse effect on historic resources provided that the SHPO reviews and comments on final plans and specifications prior to bidding to confirm that that proposed project design and materials conform to the recommendations found in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties (Standards).”

The completion of the legal and regulatory requirements for the protection of historic resources are ongoing and the final determination of effect for the two Build Alternatives will be made by the SHPO during the FEIS phase of the project when, as necessary, all the requirements mandated by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act would be agreed upon by the FTA, NJ TRANSIT, and SHPO in a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). A draft version of this MOA is included in Appendix H.

23.2.5. Mitigation Methods

Accepted best management practices and protocols are typically implemented as mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate the potential for impact to historic resources. The mitigation measures are referenced in the environmental review section that follows (Section 23.3 – Environmental Review). An explanation of accepted practices for mitigation is as follows:

*Construction Noise*
Specific guidance and contract specifications would be developed prior to project implementation to address construction actions. If necessary, special construction methods would be specified as part of the construction contract documents. A basic set of construction noise abatement measures would be included in the construction specifications. Specific measures to protect sensitive historic sites would be developed through consultation with the SHPO. All equipment would have sound control devices and would comply with pertinent equipment noise standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

*Noise During Operation of the Passenger Rail Service*
Standard design features to reduce noise during operation of the rail service will be provided in the system design under the Build Alternatives. These features include continuous welded rail, resilient rail fastenings, resilient chassis mounting on the vehicles and the use of rail grinding for maintaining the rails and wheels in smooth condition. Mitigation measures for noise are more thoroughly addressed in Chapter 12: Noise.

*Construction Vibration*
Compliance with industry practices and FTA guidelines for historic structures should provide adequate protection to buildings in the corridor and their occupants from vibration effects. Vibration mitigation could include the use of pre-auguring and pre-cutting pavement prior to pile driving, alternate pile driving methods including hydraulic insertion, use of dampeners on machinery that typically vibrates, and field monitoring of vibration levels during construction near vibration sensitive buildings.

*Construction Air Quality and Dust*
A number of mitigation measures would be utilized to minimize or eliminate temporary air quality impacts created during the construction phase of the proposed project. The application of various control measures during construction activities would be employed to minimize the amount of construction dust generated, such as applying water or other soluble moisture-retaining agents to dirt areas, cleaning construction equipment and adjacent paved areas that may be covered with dirt or dust, covering haul trucks carrying loose materials to and from construction sites and treating materials likely to become airborne and contribute to air pollution if left untreated.
Construction Staging Areas
Locations of construction staging areas will be reviewed and approved by NJ TRANSIT; construction staging areas within a 150-foot radius or that would have a clear view of significant historic resources will also be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

General Project Review and Coordination
Continued coordination with the SHPO would be conducted during Final Design and Engineering to minimize the potential effects of new construction on the historic resources that are located near the rail corridor. All design drawings prepared for new construction in the Northern Branch Corridor, that would be located near significant historic architectural resources, will be reviewed and approved by SHPO. New construction would include, but not be limited to, proposed new rail stations and parking areas, new grade crossing equipment, new traffic signals and new signal equipment and signal bungalows. All plans and specifications for new construction that is to be conducted near significant historic resources would be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

Any changes to the locations of proposed station or yard sites and any other new areas of construction activity that were not disclosed or evaluated in the Northern Branch HARBS Volumes I and II, May 2008 and the Northern Branch Supplemental HARBS, September 2009, will require Section 106 review to identify if any historic architectural resources of significance are located in the Area of Potential Effect.

23.3. Environmental Review

23.3.1. North Bergen

23.3.1.1. Existing Conditions
As illustrated by Figures 23-1 through 23-5, there are no eligible historic resources within the APEs of the proposed Northern Branch improvements in North Bergen, and no resources are within the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE.

23.3.1.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative
Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4
Both Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 are identical in their potential impacts and mitigation through North Bergen. Consequently, the discussion below applies to both Build Alternatives.

Impacts – As there are no eligible historic resources within the APEs of the proposed Northern Branch improvements, including catenary, no impacts to historic resources would result.

Mitigation – None required.
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23.3.2. Fairview

23.3.2.1. Existing Conditions

There are no planned improvements other than catenary in Fairview. No resources are within visual distance of the proposed catenary.

23.3.2.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

**No Build Alternative**

Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

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

Both Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 are identical in their potential impacts and mitigation through Fairview. Consequently, the discussion below applies to both Build Alternatives.

**Impacts** – As there are no eligible historic resources within the APEs of the proposed Northern Branch improvements, including catenary, no impacts to historic resources would result.

**Mitigation** – None required.

23.3.3. Ridgefield

23.3.3.1. Existing Conditions

No resources are within the APE for the station site, as illustrated in Figure 23-6. However, one eligible historic resource is located within the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE, the Dutch Reformed Church, which is also shown on Figure 23-6.

**Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood, 1040 Edgewater Avenue, Ridgefield**  
(*SR: 11/27/78*) (*NR: 01/25/79*) (Figure 23-6). The Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood is one of eight stone churches in Bergen County associated with the Dutch Reformed religion. As with the other churches built between 1791 and 1819, this church is an outstanding example of a vernacular interpretation of a church type established by British architects Sir Christopher Wren and James Gibbs. All these churches illustrate the merging of the stone building methods of the Dutch culture with English architectural layout and forms.

The Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood, also known as the English Neighborhood Reformed Church of Ridgefield, was built in 1793. The church property consists of the entire block bordered by Edgewater Avenue on the north, Hendricks Causeway on the south, Church Street on the east, and Fulton Street on the west (Block 2907, Lot 1), which consists of a total of 5.8 acres. The church is a rectangular, one-story sandstone building with a balcony. The style is Vernacular Wren-Gibbs with Gothic Revival elements. A cemetery surrounds the church on all sides. An Education Building/Fellowship Hall, erected in 1912, is adjacent to the church on the eastern boundary of the property; both the Fellowship Hall and the cemetery are part of the National Register-listed complex.
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23.3.3.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

**No Build Alternative**
Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

**Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4**
Both Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 are identical in their potential impacts and mitigation through Ridgefield. Consequently, the discussion below applies to both Build Alternatives.

**Impacts** – The potential for impact to the Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood is assessed in terms of the duration of the impact, long-term or construction/short-term, as follows:

**Long-Term Impacts.** The church, at its closest point, is located approximately 180 feet from the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way and would be too distant to be affected by noise and vibration during the operation of the railroad. However, due to its elevated position, the proposed catenary would be visible from the church and the church would be visible from the vicinity of the rail alignment.

**Construction Impacts.** The church is too distant to be affected during the construction of the Ridgefield Station and its parking area. However, the church may be affected by noise and vibration during the installation of the second track and catenary along the right-of-way due to the potential use of loud machinery, such as pile drivers, to install the catenary. The church could also be affected by staging areas and truck traffic during the construction of the station.

**Mitigation** – The potential adverse visual effects of the catenary poles and the overhead power system would be mitigated through the selection of appropriate poles, traffic control signals, or signs that are compatible with the historic character of the Dutch Reformed Church. Spacing, height, size, location, design, profile, finish and color of poles or frames will mitigate the impacts to views from historic resources. The design, color and placement of the catenary at or near these significant historic architectural resources will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

Staging areas and traffic routes for trucks during construction would be carefully located so as not to affect the church property; the location of construction staging areas would be reviewed and approved by the SHPO. Also, any changes to traffic patterns; i.e., rerouting of traffic and new signaling systems to serve the new station, would consider the potential impacts to the church. Therefore, with appropriate measures to minimize the effects of the project during construction, the Build Alternatives would have no adverse effect on the Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood.

**23.3.4. Palisades Park**

**23.3.4.1. Existing Conditions**

No resources are located within the APE for the station site, as illustrated in Figure 23-7. However, one eligible historic resource is located within the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE, the U.S. Route 46 Corridor, which is also shown on Figure 23-7.
U.S. Route 46 Corridor Between George Washington Bridge, Fort Lee to Grand Avenue Interchange, Palisades Park (SHPO Opinion: 02/21/97). U.S. Route 46 was originally constructed as New Jersey Route 6. Route 6 was planned in 1927 to provide an east-west route between the Delaware River and the George Washington Bridge. The bridge over the railroad was built in 1930. In 1934 the entire route between the Delaware River and the George Washington Bridge was completed and officially opened as Route 6. In 1953 the highway was renamed US Route 46. The section from the George Washington Bridge to the interchange with Grand Avenue in Palisades Park (approximately one mile) is eligible as a single linear historic district. This section contains the most intensive civil engineering; this portion of Route 46 was designed and built with a single approach to separate Route 46 traffic from local streets, and is significant as an excellent and relatively intact highway system which displays bridge technology and highway designs representative of the period prior to World War II.

23.3.4.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative
Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4
Both Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 are identical in their potential impacts and mitigation through Palisades Park. Consequently, the discussion below applies to both Build Alternatives.

Impacts – The potential for impact to the U.S. Route 46 Corridor section is assessed in terms of the duration of the impact, long-term or construction/short-term, as follows:

Long-Term Impacts. U.S. Route 46, at its closest point to the project at the Grand Avenue Interchange, crosses over the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way on an elevated bridge and, in this area, bisects the Boroughs of Ridgefield and Palisades Park. The historic U.S. Route 46 Corridor is located 900 feet south of the proposed Palisades Park Station and 700 feet south of its proposed parking area and would not be affected by the Palisades Park Station which is too distant. Because it is a busy federal highway, U.S. Route 46 produces noise and vibration well above the level anticipated by the operation of the proposed project.

Construction Impacts. Although construction may require the use of loud machinery, such as pile drivers; U.S. Route 46 is a busy U.S. highway and produces noise and vibration well above the level anticipated by the construction of the proposed project. Therefore, the U.S. Route 46 Corridor would not be affected by the reinstallation of a second track or catenary and the Build Alternatives would have no adverse effect on U.S. Route 46.

Mitigation – As there would be no effect, mitigation is not required.

23.3.5. Leonia

23.3.5.1. Existing Conditions

As illustrated by Figure 23-8, there are no historic resources within the APE for the proposed Leonia Station, and no resources are within the APE for the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way.
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23.3.5.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative
Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4
Both Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 are identical in their potential impacts and mitigation through Leonia. Consequently, the discussion below applies to both Build Alternatives.

Impacts – As there are no eligible historic resources within the APEs of the proposed Northern Branch improvements, including catenary, no impacts to historic resources would result.

Mitigation – None required.

23.3.6. Englewood

23.3.6.1. Existing Conditions

Figures 23-9 to 23-12 illustrate the APEs of the proposed Northern Branch improvements in Englewood. Two eligible historic resources are located within Englewood; one within the APE of the proposed improvements to an existing railroad bridge (Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment) and one within the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE (Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building).

Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment, 60 Cedar Lane, Englewood (SHPO Opinion: 07/28/09) (Refer to Figure 23-10). Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment, established in 1876, became the Bergen Silk Dyeing Company in 1926, and from 1935-39 was known as Uman’s Bleachery. The factory is significant for its associations with the fabric dyeing, cleansing, and finishing industry, and as an example of an early industrial site; and as one of the only sites in Englewood where industry continued at what was formerly a water-powered mill site. Barretts, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment is also eligible for National Register listing as an early and relatively intact example of a late nineteenth century factory complex.

Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment consists of a complex of buildings of varying construction dates that range from 1876 to 1979. The complex is primarily constructed of red brick. Roofs are primarily gabled and many windows are the original wood with multiple lights. Monitor roofs remain on some of the buildings in the complex, however they have been covered. The complex includes additions that were built over time as the industry changed, illustrating the growth and evolution of the fabric dyeing, cleansing, and finishing industry through the first half of the twentieth century. The oldest buildings in the complex are the Finishing and Shipping Building and the Office Building, both constructed between 1876 and 1890.

Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building (Bank of America), 21 Park Place, Englewood (SHPO Opinion: 07/28/09) (Refer to Figure 23-11). The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building is significant as an excellent example of an early twentieth century commercial building designed in the Tudor Revival style by prominent architect Aymar Embury II with a period of significance of 1906-1929.

The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building, built in 1906 with additions that date from 1908-1915; 1922-1929; and 1980, is a two-story limestone-clad Norman Tudor building with a gabled roof covered with red clay tile with cast iron snow guards. Large multi-pane windows are of leaded glass. Although the interior has been modified, the bank retains its original walls and ceilings of stucco with half timbers and a large leaded glass skylight.
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The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building was designed by prominent architect Aymar Embury II (1880-1966). Embury, who lived in Englewood for a time, specialized in the design of suburban country houses and estates and was the chief architect of many of Robert Moses’s public works projects including the Tri-borough, Henry Hudson and Whitestone Bridges as well as the Wollman Skating Rink in Central Park.

The building is currently is utilized as a commercial use and occupied by Bank of America.

23.3.6.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

No Build Alternative
Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)
Impacts – Both historic resources in Englewood are potentially affected by Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative). The potential for impact is assessed in terms of the duration of the impact, long-term or construction/short-term for each resource, as follows:

Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment, 60 Cedar Lane, Englewood (SHPO Opinion of Eligibility)

Long-Term Impacts. The Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment abuts the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way on its eastern boundary at Cedar Lane; the CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook is directly adjacent to the historic factory complex and the grade crossing improvements proposed for Cedar Lane are also immediately adjacent to the northeast of the factory. The proposed Englewood Route 4 Station would be located approximately 1,430 feet from the Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment; the proposed parking area for the Englewood Route 4 station would be located approximately 1,200 feet from the factory, both at a distance that would not impact the resource.

However, due to the proximity of the CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment may be affected by the reinstallation of a second track bay and catenary on the bridge. The Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment may also be affected by the grade crossing improvements on Cedar Lane, which would be immediately adjacent to the factory to the northeast. While the grade crossing improvements may visually change the view from the dye factory, the building complex would not be affected by the warning whistles that would be sounded as the trains approach the grade crossing because the historic building complex, currently used as a factory, is already exposed to background sound levels associated with the existing freight traffic, I-80/95 vehicular traffic and truck traffic in the surrounding industrial area. Also, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, historically significant sites are treated as noise-sensitive depending on the current land use of the historic site. Sites that are currently used for interpretive activities, residences, or museums would be noise-sensitive. Sites that are used for commercial or industrial purposes would not be noise-sensitive. Therefore, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment, an industrial site, is not considered to be a noise-sensitive receptor.

Construction Impacts. During construction, staging areas will be sited to avoid the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment. The noise, vibration and air quality for the installation of the second track, catenary and the grade crossing improvements may affect the Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment for the short term. However, as discussed above, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment is not considered to be a sensitive noise receptor and also, presently experiences background noise from an elevated portion of I-80/95, which it abuts.
Mitigation – The potential adverse visual effects of the catenary poles and the overhead power system would be mitigated through the selection of appropriate poles, traffic control signals, or signs that are compatible with the historic character of the dying facility. Spacing, height, size, location, design, profile, finish and color of poles or frames will mitigate the impacts to views from historic resources. The design, color and placement of the catenary at or near these significant historic architectural resources will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

The grade crossing improvements would consider any potential impacts to the facility. Staging areas for the construction of the second track and the grade crossing improvements will avoid close proximity to the facility and will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO. Therefore, with appropriate measures to minimize the effects of the project, the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) would have no adverse effect on the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment.

The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building (Bank of America), 21 Park Place, Englewood (SHPO Opinion of Eligibility))

Long-Term Impacts. The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building, located approximately 1,160 feet northeast of the proposed Englewood Town Center Station, is too distant to be visually affected by the new station. The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building is located approximately 375 feet southeast from the grade crossing improvements at West Demarest Avenue. The bank would be too far from the grade crossing to be impacted by any views of the grade crossing improvements and the bank building would not be adversely affected by the warning whistles that would be sounded as the trains approach the grade crossing because the bank building is a commercial use and as per FTA’s criteria for assessment of impacts, is not a noise-sensitive receptor.

At its closest point, the bank building is 250 feet east of the Northern Branch right-of-way and has a clear view of the railroad due to the flat, grassy landscaped park and parking area that is located between the bank and the railroad. The catenary proposed under the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) would be visible to and from the bank building.

The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building would not be affected by the noise and vibration during the operation of the railroad as it is located in a busy downtown area and sufficiently distant from the railroad right-of-way.

Construction Impacts. During construction, staging will be sited to avoid impact to the Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building. The noise, vibration and air quality for the installation of the grade crossing improvements may affect the bank for the short term, and the resource may also be affected by the noise and vibration caused by the installation of the catenary due to the potential use of loud machinery, such as pile drivers. However, as discussed above, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, a commercial use is not considered to be a noise-sensitive receptor.

Mitigation – The potential adverse visual effects of the catenary poles and the overhead power system would be mitigated through the selection of appropriate poles, traffic control signals, or signs that are compatible with the historic character of the bank building. Spacing, height, size, location, design, profile, finish and color of poles or frames will mitigate the impacts to views from historic resources. The design, color and placement of the catenary at or near these significant historic architectural resources will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

Staging areas and traffic routes for trucks during construction would be carefully located so as not to affect the property; the location of construction staging areas would be reviewed and approved by the SHPO. Also, any changes to traffic patterns would consider the potential impacts to the property. Therefore, with appropriate measures to minimize the effects of the project during construction, the Build Alternatives would have no adverse effect on the Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building.
Light Rail to Englewood Route 4

Impacts – One of the two historic resources in Englewood may be affected by Light Rail to Englewood Route 4. The Palisades Trust and Guaranty Building is located north of the proposed Englewood Route 4 Station so it would not be affected, but the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment is located south of the Englewood Route 4 Station. Following is the discussion of long term and construction impacts for this resource.

Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment, 60 Cedar Lane, Englewood (SHPO Opinion of Eligibility)

Long-Term Impacts. The Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment abuts the Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way on its eastern boundary at Cedar Lane; the CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook is directly adjacent to the historic factory complex and the grade crossing improvements proposed for Cedar Lane are also immediately adjacent to the northeast of the factory. The proposed Englewood Route 4 Station would be located 1,430 feet from the Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment; the proposed parking area for the Englewood Route 4 station would be located about 1,200 feet from the factory, both at a distance that would not impact the resource.

However, due to the proximity of the CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment may be affected by the reinstallation of a second track and catenary on the bridge. The Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment may also be affected by the grade crossing improvements on Cedar Lane, which would be immediately adjacent to the factory to the northeast. While the grade crossing improvements may visually change the view from the dye factory, the building complex would not be affected by the warning whistles that would be sounded as the trains approach the grade crossing because the historic building complex, currently used as a factory, is already exposed to background sound levels associated with the railroad, I-80/95 vehicular traffic and truck traffic in the surrounding industrial area. Also, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, historically significant sites are treated as noise-sensitive depending on the current land use of the historic site. Sites that are currently used for interpretive activities, residences, or museums would be noise-sensitive. Sites that are used for commercial or industrial purposes would not be noise-sensitive. Therefore, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment, an industrial site, is not considered to be a noise-sensitive receptor.

Construction Impacts. During construction, staging areas will be sited to avoid the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment. The noise, vibration and air quality for the installation of the second track and the grade crossing improvements may affect the Dyeing and Cleansing Establishment for the short term. However, as discussed above, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment is not considered to be a sensitive noise receptor and also, presently experiences background noise from an elevated portion of I-80/95, which it abuts.

Mitigation – The potential adverse visual effects of the catenary poles and the overhead power system would be mitigated through the selection of appropriate poles, traffic control signals, or signs that are compatible with the historic character of the dyeing facility. Spacing, height, size, location, design, profile, finish and color of poles or frames will mitigate the impacts to views from historic resources. The design, color and placement of the catenary at or near these significant historic architectural resources will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO.

The grade crossing improvements would consider any potential impacts to the facility. Staging areas for the construction of the second track and the grade crossing improvements will avoid close proximity to the facility and will be reviewed and approved by the SHPO. Therefore, with appropriate measures to
minimize the effects of the project, the Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 would have no adverse effect on the Barrett’s, Palmer & Heal Dyeing & Cleansing Establishment.

23.3.7. Tenafly

23.3.7.1. Existing Conditions

Figures 23-13 and 23-14 illustrate the APEs for the proposed Northern Branch improvements in Tenafly. One eligible historic resource is located within the APE for the proposed Tenafly Town Center Station:

**Tenafly Railroad Station, 1 Piermont Road, Tenafly** (SR: 11/27/78) (NR: 01/25/79) (Refer to Figure 23-13). The Tenafly Railroad Station, built in 1872-74, is an excellent representative of a suburban railroad station built during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. It is also one of the foremost examples of the Victorian Gothic style in the State. It is one of two stations on the Northern Railroad that was constructed of native sandstone. Tenafly Railroad Station was designed by Daniel Topping Atwood (1836-1919), an important suburban New York architect who practiced during the last half of the 19th century. The construction of the station was jointly funded by the Northern Railroad and the Tenafly community; local resident George Huyler donated the land for the station site and provided one-third of the construction cost. Other Tenafly residents paid one-third and the Northern Railroad of New Jersey, the remainder. The Borough of Tenafly purchased the station from Conrail in 1963; passenger service ended in 1966. The current tenant is a restaurant.

23.3.7.2. Potential Impacts and Mitigation

**No Build Alternative**

Under the No Build Alternative, the Northern Branch project would not be constructed; consequently, no impacts to historic resources in the APE would occur. It is assumed that historic resources within and adjacent to the right-of-way would remain the same as for the existing conditions.

**Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)**

*Impacts* – The potential for impact to the Tenafly Railroad Station is assessed in terms of the duration of the impact, long-term or construction/short-term, as follows:

**Tenafly Railroad Station, 1 Piermont Road, Tenafly (Listed on the State and National Registers)**

*Long-Term Impacts.* The Northern Branch Corridor right-of-way is located directly adjacent to the historic rail station. The historic Tenafly Railroad Station is located approximately 370 feet north of the Tenafly Town Center Station and 350 feet north of the drop-off-pick-up point of the station. The proposed Tenafly Town Center Station would be too distant to visually affect the Tenafly Railroad Station. The historic station would also not be affected by noise during the operation of the railroad as the building, currently used as a café, is already exposed to background sound levels associated with the busy downtown area and the warning whistles of the existing trains as they approaches the grade crossings of West Clinton Avenue and Washington Street. The historic station would also not be affected by vibration as the speed of the trains that would pass by the Tenafly Railroad Station would be less than 25 miles per hour, thereby limiting any potential effects from train vibrations (further discussed in Chapter 13: Vibration). Although the project would increase the frequency of rail traffic, the Tenafly Railroad Station would not be impacted by this increase due to the fact that, as per FTA’s Traffic Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidance, historical transportation structures, such as railroad stations, are not considered noise-sensitive land uses. Historically significant sites are treated as noise-sensitive depending on the current land use of the historic site.
HISTORIC RESOURCES

TENAFLY TOWN CENTER STATION

Northern Branch Corridor
Figure 23-13

Source: Field Inspection

Legend:
- Green: Area of Potential Effect (APE) within Station Area
- Green with green border: Historic Resource within APE of Station Area
- Gray: Project Feature

Not to Scale
Northern Branch Corridor
Figure 23-14

Proposed Tenafly North Station
Area of Potential Effect
Tenafly North Station

Source: Field Inspection

HISTORIC RESOURCES
TENAFLY NORTH STATION

Bergen County
Hudson County
Manhattan
New Jersey
New York

Not to Scale

Area of Potential Effect (APE) within Station Area
Project Feature
While the proposed Tenafly Town Center Station would be too distant to visually affect the Tenafly Railroad Station, the proposed catenary would affect views to and from the historic station. The historic station would be visually affected by catenary poles and wires that would add a new element adjacent to the historic station and would also affect view corridors to and from the historic station. However, historically a trolley line terminated at the Tenafly Railroad Station and tall, wooden poles were located in the vicinity of the historic station to support the overhead contact wires of the trolley system. Historic postcards of Tenafly indicate that tall, wooden poles with several crossbars and at least two wires (believed to be railroad signal poles) were formerly located along the railroad right-of-way on West Railroad Avenue, adjacent to the historic station. Therefore, the new catenary poles and wires would not be out of context with the historic setting of the Tenafly Railroad Station.

Construction Impacts. The noise, vibration and air quality during the construction of the reinstated passenger rail service may affect the station for the short term due to the potential use of loud machinery, such as pile drivers. The Tenafly Railroad Station may also be affected by truck traffic and staging areas during construction.

Mitigation - Measures will be taken to minimize the effects of vibration and air quality during the construction of the rail project. Staging areas and traffic routes for trucks during construction would be carefully located so as not to affect the historic Tenafly Railroad Station and would be reviewed and approved by the SHPO. Also, any changes to traffic patterns, i.e., rerouting of traffic and new signaling systems to serve the new Tenafly Town Center Station would consider the potential impacts to the historic Tenafly Station.

The design, color, and locations of the catenary will be carefully evaluated in coordination with the SHPO so as to minimize any impacts on the view corridors to the historic station. This design review process is described in the Draft Programmatic Agreement (Refer to Appendix K). Measures will also be taken to minimize the effects of vibration and air quality during the construction of the rail project, and especially during the installation of the catenary. As the historic station was built by and for the Northern Railroad, the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) would have no adverse effect on the character-defining features that qualify this resource for listing on the State and National Registers of Historic Places. Therefore, with appropriate measures to minimize the effects of the project, the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) would have no adverse effect on the Tenafly Railroad Station.

**Light Rail to Englewood Route 4**

Impact - The Tenafly Railroad Station is located north of the proposed Englewood Route 4 Station. This Build Alternative terminates at the proposed Englewood Route 4 Station; consequently, resources located north of the proposed station site will not be affected by this Build Alternative.

Mitigation – Not required.

**23.4. Summary of Potential Environmental Effects**

As summarized in Table 23-2, five historic resources were identified in the Northern Branch study area. Three of the five are in the Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE, since they are within visual distance of the proposed overhead catenary. The remaining two are in the APEs of proposed construction activity associated with station and bridge improvements proposed for the Northern Branch project.
### Table 23-2: Summary of Potential Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Associated Build Alternative</th>
<th>APE</th>
<th>Findings After Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Bergen</td>
<td>No historic resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>No historic resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>Dutch Reformed Church in the English Neighborhood</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palisades Park</td>
<td>U.S. Route 46 Corridor Between George Washington Bridge and Grand Avenue Interchange</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonia</td>
<td>No historic resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>Barrett’s, Palmer &amp; Heal Dyeing &amp; Cleansing Establishment</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) and Light Rail to Englewood Route 4</td>
<td>CSX Northern Branch Bridge over Flat Rock Brook APE</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Northern Branch Corridor ROW APE</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenafly</td>
<td>Tenafly Railroad Station</td>
<td>Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative)</td>
<td>Tenafy Town Center APE</td>
<td>No Adverse Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential impacts to historic resources are related to the potential for noise and vibration impacts during the construction phase and incongruities in the visual landscape presented by the installation of catenary wires and poles. Construction impacts can be mitigated with careful planning that considers the sensitivity of nearby historic resources. Visual impacts resulting from the catenary can be mitigated through context-sensitive design elements that harmonize the catenary with the surrounding development patterns and styles, paying particular attention to the character of nearby historic resources. These elements will be reviewed by the SHPO through a design review process, as documented in the Draft Programmatic Agreement. A copy of the Draft Programmatic Agreement that would be reviewed/revised and then signed by the SHPO, FTA and NJ TRANSIT can be found in Appendix K. Prior to the issuance of a Record of Decision, the SHPO, FTA and NJ TRANSIT would agree upon the stipulations and mitigation measures required to maintain no adverse effect on any listed historic resources.

As Table 23-2 indicates, Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) results in the potential for impacts to two more resources than does Light Rail to Englewood Route 4. This is the result of the difference in service areas proposed for the two Build Alternatives. The Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) uses the existing rail right-of-way to extend passenger rail service to Tenafly. In doing so, improvements will extend through Englewood and Tenafly. Light Rail to Englewood Route 4 terminates at Englewood Route 4 Station and serves a smaller service area, but in doing so avoids the Palisades Trust and Guaranty Company Building and the Tenafy Railroad Station. However, potential impacts to these resources resulting from the Light Rail to Tenafly (Preferred Alternative) can be mitigated such that any impacts are negligible. In that the long-term impacts are minor, and in the case of the Tenafly Railroad Station, in keeping with the historic character of the resource (an historic railroad station), the two Build Alternatives are essentially identical in their potential for resulting in adverse effects to historic resources.