

**UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CONNECTOR**  
**FIRST STREET IMPROVEMENTS BETWEEN SUSSEX AVENUE AND**  
**WEST MARKET STREET**

**CITY OF NEWARK**  
**ESSEX COUNTY, NEW JERSEY**

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT/  
DRAFT SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration  
and  
New Jersey Department of Transportation

---

For N.J. Department of Transportation

Date

---

For Federal Highway Administration

Date

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

N.J. Department of Transportation  
Mr. Jack McQuillan  
Bureau of Environmental Services  
1035 Parkway Avenue  
PO Box 600  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625  
(609) 530-2824

Federal Highway Administration  
Mr. Randy Prescott  
Program Operations Director  
840 Bear Tavern Road  
Trenton, New Jersey 08628  
(609) 637-4235

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>I-1</b>
A. PURPOSE OF STUDY .....	I-1
B. PROJECT SETTING .....	I-2
<b>II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED PROJECT .....</b>	<b>II-1</b>
A. PROJECT HISTORY .....	II-1
B. PROJECT PURPOSE .....	II-3
C. PROJECT NEED .....	II-3
1. Operational Problems .....	II-6
2. Need for Physical Widening of the Corridor and Pedestrian Safety .....	II-8
<b>III. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>III-1</b>
A. INTRODUCTION.....	III-1
B. PROPOSED PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....	III-1
C. CONSIDERED AND REJECTED ALTERNATIVES .....	III-3
<b>IV. OTHER PROPOSED ACTIONS IN THE VICINITY OF THE UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CONNECTOR PROJECT .....</b>	<b>IV-1</b>
A. FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDED/SUPPORTED PROJECTS.....	IV-1
B. LOCAL/PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS .....	IV-3
<b>V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION .....</b>	<b>V-1</b>
A. SOCIOECONOMICS/LAND USE/AESTHETICS .....	V-1
1. Existing Conditions .....	V-1
1.1 Analysis Methodology .....	V-1
1.2 Social Characteristics .....	V-3
1.3 Economic Characteristics .....	V-8
1.4 Land Use .....	V-9
1.5 Aesthetics .....	V-15
2. Impacts .....	V-16
2.1 Socioeconomic Impacts.....	V-16
2.2 Business Establishments.....	V-18
2.3 Fiscal Impacts.....	V-20
2.4 Land Use .....	V-20
2.5 Aesthetics .....	V-23
3. Mitigation.....	V-24
3.1 Residential Acquisitions.....	V-24
3.2 Proximity Impacts .....	V-24
3.3 Business Establishments.....	V-24
3.4 Community Facilities .....	V-25
3.5 Land Use .....	V-25
3.6 Aesthetics .....	V-25
B. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	V-25
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-25
1.1 Identification of Minority and Low-Income Populations .....	V-26
2. Impacts .....	V-27
2.1 Determination of Disproportionate Impacts on Minority and Low-Income Populations .....	V-27
C. AIR QUALITY .....	V-28
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-28
1.1 Existing Air Quality .....	V-29

2. Impacts.....	V-31
2.1 Modeling Results.....	V-31
2.2 Construction Impacts.....	V-32
2.3 Conformity Determination .....	V-32
3. Mitigation.....	V-33
D. NOISE.....	V-33
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-33
1.1 Existing Sound Levels.....	V-35
2. Impacts .....	V-36
2.1 Methodology .....	V-36
2.2 No-Build Alternative.....	V-37
2.3 Build Alternative .....	V-37
2.4 Construction Noise.....	V-41
3. Mitigation.....	V-41
3.1 Traffic Management.....	V-42
3.2 Roadway Alignment Alterations .....	V-42
3.3 Property Acquisition .....	V-42
3.4 Noise Barriers.....	V-43
3.5 Sound Proofing.....	V-43
3.6 Construction Noise.....	V-43
E. ECOLOGY.....	V-44
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-44
1.1 Geology, Soils and Groundwater .....	V-44
1.2 Surface Water.....	V-46
1.3 Vegetation .....	V-46
1.4 Wildlife .....	V-47
2. Impacts .....	V-47
F. CULTURAL RESOURCES.....	V-48
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-48
1.1 Historic Architectural Resources.....	V-48
1.2 Archaeological Resources .....	V-49
2. Impacts .....	V-53
2.1 Historic Architecture .....	V-53
2.2 Archaeology .....	V-53
2.3 Section 106 Coordination.....	V-54
3. Mitigation.....	V-54
3.1 Historic Architectural Resources.....	V-54
3.2 Archaeological Resources .....	V-54
G. HAZARDOUS WASTE.....	V-55
1. Existing Conditions.....	V-55
2. Impacts .....	V-58
3. Mitigation.....	V-58
3.1 Geophysical survey .....	V-58
3.2 Historical Use Subsurface Investigation.....	V-58
3.3 Existing Underground Storage Tanks .....	V-58
3.4 Further Actions Regarding Soil and Groundwater Contamination.....	V-59
3.5 Issues Concerning Asbestos and Lead .....	V-59
H. MAJOR METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION INVESTMENT AND CONGESTION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS .....	V-59
I. ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS .....	V-59
<b>VI. SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>VI-1</b>
A. INTRODUCTION .....	VI-1
B. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT.....	VI-2
1. Project Location and Existing Conditions .....	VI-2
2. Proposed Project.....	VI-2

C. NEED FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT .....	VI-2
D. DESCRIPTION OF SECTION 4(F) RESOURCES.....	VI-2
1. 400-406 Central Avenue.....	VI-2
2. Other Resources.....	VI-3
E. EFFECTS ON SECTION 4(F) RESOURCES.....	VI-3
F. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED .....	VI-5
1. No Build Alternative .....	VI-7
2. Widen First Street Along the East Side of the Existing Right-of Way.....	VI-7
3. West-East Shift Alternative .....	VI-11
4. Reduced Cross-Section.....	VI-15
5. Reduced Cross-Section with TSM and Reversible Lane.....	VI-18
6. Limited Widening of the First Street Corridor and Enhanced Cross Streets.....	VI-21
7. One-Way Couplet (First and Second Street) .....	VI-24
8. One-Way Couplet (First and Morris Avenues).....	VI-27
9. Shift University Heights Connector to Second Street .....	VI-29
10. Shift University Heights Connector to Morris Avenue.....	VI-31
G. MEASURES TO MINIMIZE IMPACT .....	VI-33
H. SUMMARY OF PROJECT COORDINATION .....	VI-33
I. CONCLUSION .....	VI-33
<b>VII. COMMENT AND COORDINATION.....</b>	<b>VII-1</b>
A. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....	VII-1
B. AGENCY INPUT .....	VII-2
C. MUNICIPAL INPUT.....	VII-2
<b>VIII. LIST OF TECHNICAL STUDIES AND REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>VIII-1</b>
A. LIST OF TECHNICAL STUDIES AND REFERENCES.....	VIII-1
B. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS.....	VIII-2
C. PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS .....	VIII-2
<b>IX. LIST OF PREPARERS.....</b>	<b>IX-1</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table II-1	First Street Corridor – Accident Rate Data	II-7
Table II-2	First Street Intersections – Intersection Accident Rate Data	II-7
Table V-1	Demographic Characteristics	V-4
Table V-2	Total Acreage by Land Use	V-9
Table V-3	Summary of Project Impacts	V-27
Table V-4	New Jersey and National Ambient Air Quality Standards	V-29
Table V-5	Peak One-hour and Eight-hour Design Year CO Concentrations	V-30
Table V-6	Examples of Common Sounds	V-33
Table V-7	Threshold for Noise Interference and Noise Abatement Criteria	V-37
Table V-8	Summary of Impacts 2025 Design Year	V-39
Table V-9	Existing, No-Build, and Design Year Noise Level Comparison	V-40
Table V-10	Comparison of Impacts 2025 Design Year	V-40
Table V-11	Results of Phase IB Archaeological Survey	V-49
Table V-12	Potentially Contaminated Sites in Project Area	V-55
Table V-13	Potentially Contaminated Sites within 250 feet of Project Corridor	V-56
Table VI-1	Comparison of Alternatives For University Heights Connector	VI-6

## LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit VI-1	400-406 Central Avenue	VI-4
--------------	------------------------	------

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I-1	Project Vicinity Map	I-3
Figure II-1	Existing Conditions	II-5
Figure III-1	Preferred Alternative	III-2
Figure V-1	Study Area Boundaries Map	V-2
Figure V-2	Community Facilities Map	V-6
Figure V-3	Existing Land Use Map	V-10
Figure V-4	Zoning Districts Map	V-14
Figure V-5	2025 Design Year 66 dBA Noise Contour	V-38
Figure V-6	Archaeological Resources Map	V-51
Figure VI-1	Alternative 2 - East Side Widening	VI-8
Figure VI-2	Typical Sections Alt. 2 – East Side Widening	VI-9
Figure VI-3	Alternative 3 – West/East Shift Route	VI-12
Figure VI-4	Typical Sections Alt. 3 – West/East Shift Alternative	VI-13
Figure VI-5	Typical Section Alternative 4	VI-16
Figure VI-6	Typical Section Alternative 5	VI-19
Figure VI-7	Alternative 6	VI-22
Figure VI-8	Alternative 7	VI-25
Figure VI-9	Alternative 8	VI-28
Figure VI-10	Alternative 9	VI-30
Figure VI-11	Alternative 10	VI-32

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	Agency Correspondence
Appendix B	Distribution List of Agencies and Groups for Environmental Assessment
Appendix C	Public Notices
Appendix D	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority Coordination
Appendix E	Local Letters of Support/Municipal Resolutions
Appendix F	Notice of Planned Action Correspondence
Appendix G	Section 106 Coordination



# **SUMMARY**



## **SUMMARY**

The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) is planning improvements to First Street in the Central Ward of the City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, in order to provide a more efficient movement of traffic, reduce congestion, enhance safe travel within the project area, and remove through traffic from residential streets. The proposed project involves the widening of First Street between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street and related intersection improvements, and is known as the University Heights Connector.

Because of its proximity to Route I-280, First Street is an important gateway into the City of Newark. The city has recognized that the attractive appearance of its gateways is a significant factor in improving Newark's overall economic health. Accordingly, the proposed project has been designed to implement this important objective.

The proposed project consists of a boulevard with the following elements:

- One 13-foot curb lane in each direction.
- One 12 to 13-foot interior through lane in each direction, adjacent to a raised, planted median.
- One 22-foot raised, planted median, sufficiently wide to provide for a 13-foot turning lane, adjacent to the interior through lane.
- Reconstructed sidewalks.
- Class 1 bikeway, coordinated with requirements of the Newark Greenway Plan, along the west side of the widened corridor.
- New street trees, street lighting fixtures, and street furniture.

Implementation of the proposed project will serve to alleviate the following problems and project corridor deficiencies:

- Traffic congestion during peak travel periods;
- High accident rate;
- Increasing traffic volumes and traffic speed along residential streets; and
- Pedestrian safety issues resulting from close proximity of travel lanes to existing sidewalks.

Further information regarding project purpose and need is provided in Section II of this EA.

Our assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed project is summarized below:

- The proposed project will improve traffic circulation and safety while imposing minimal adverse effects on noise, air quality, ecology, hazardous waste sites, socioeconomics and land use. Implementation of the proposed project is not expected to result in any significant impacts to these resources. The proposed project will not result in any direct impacts to any parks.
- The proposed project requires the acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue; a property the State Historic Preservation Office has determined as being eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed demolition of this building would be a direct adverse effect on this eligible property. An Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation has been prepared as part of this EA. The results of the Section 4(f) Evaluation demonstrate that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives that would avoid the acquisition and demolition of this historic architectural resource. It is proposed that mitigation will consist of a narrative and photographic recordation of the property.
- Archaeological resources eligible for the National Register under Criterion D were found on seven lots. A program of data recovery is proposed to recover any archaeological features found within the project corridor. Additional Phase 1B and Phase 2 testing is recommended for lots that were not accessible or inadequately tested due to access restrictions.
- The proposed project will not result in any adverse impacts to any publicly-owned recreational resources.
- The proposed project will require the total or partial acquisition of 23 properties containing residential, religious, and business uses. These acquisitions will result in the displacement of the tenants and occupants of the properties. Any loss in tax revenues to the City of Newark as a result of this acquisition will be insignificant, while the loss of employment in the immediate project area is not expected to have an adverse effect on the local economy or labor market. All displaced businesses, houses of worship, and residents will be relocated to other properties of equal value within the city. Considering the urban character of the project area, these acquisitions are not considered to be significant.
- The proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts to the existing development pattern or proposed development within the study area. In addition, the proposed project is consistent with local and regional plans pertaining to the project corridor.
- The proposed project is not expected to result in any significant adverse impacts that will disproportionately affect low-income or minority population groups who reside or work in the project area.

- The proposed project includes a substantial landscape and streetscape amenity, which will significantly enhance the aesthetics of the project corridor. The proposed project is intended, in part, to create an attractive gateway to the city from the Route I-280 corridor.
- The proposed project will not result in any exceedances to local air quality standards.
- The proposed project will not result in any significant adverse noise impacts.
- The proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts to the ecology of the study area. The study area consists of urban land with a long history of disturbance, and the project corridor does not contain any significant natural resources.
- The proposed project is not expected to result in any cumulative impacts with other federal, state, local and private development projects that would require further environmental and regulatory review or mitigation.
- The preliminary assessment of hazardous materials prepared for this project identified ten sites within the proposed street right-of-way that may have environmental concerns, may contain contaminated soil, and warrant further investigation. An additional 18 properties located within 250 feet of the project corridor were identified as having the potential to impact the project corridor as a result of contaminant migration. Where acquisition of contaminated properties is deemed necessary, appropriate mitigation will be implemented prior to any disturbance or demolition of these properties.

The proposed project is the subject of this EA/Section 4(f) Evaluation. Modified as recommended herein, it best satisfies the project purpose and need while minimizing environmental and socioeconomic impacts. As shown in the Section 4(f) Evaluation, there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue. While there are no significant adverse environmental impacts anticipated from implementation of the proposed project, the beneficial impacts from reduced traffic congestion and improved travel safety make the project both necessary and desirable.

# **I. INTRODUCTION**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Purpose of Study**

This Environmental Assessment/Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation (EA) has been prepared to identify and evaluate the potential social, economic, and environmental impacts of the proposed University Heights Connector Project in the City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey. This EA has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as implemented by the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1500 et seq.) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Procedures (23 CFR 771) and pursuant to 42 USC 4332(2)(c), 16 USC470(f) of the Department of Transportation Act (49 USC 303 and 23 USC 138).

This EA is supported by technical studies for air quality, socioeconomics and land use, hazardous waste, archaeology, and historic architecture, all of which have been prepared separate from this document during the early environmental screening process.

The proposed University Heights Connector Project (Proposed Project) is classified as a Class III action pursuant to 23 CFR 771.117, for which the level of significance of environmental impacts has not been determined, and for which further study is required.

The purpose of this EA is as follows:

- To identify and resolve any uncertainty as to whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be required for the proposed project (40 CFR 1508.9(a)(1), and determine the applicability of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) (23 CFR 771.119) (23 CFR 771.121);
- To provide sufficient information to serve as a record for environmental approvals and consultations as required by law;
- To identify the potential for environmental impacts to the natural and built environment as a result of the construction and operation of the proposed project; and
- To present these findings for public input.

## **B. Project Setting**

The proposed project is located in the central part of the City of Newark, and provides access from the regional highway system to the city's Central Ward, including University Heights and Science Park neighborhoods (see Figure I-1). The project corridor provides direct access to the University Heights area and the Roseville neighborhood, and indirect access to the Central Business District (CBD) and other portions of the City from Route I-280. Considered part of the Roseville neighborhood in Newark's Central Ward, the project area contains a mix of low to medium density residential properties comprised mostly of two to four unit structures, as well as service and retail commercial, institutional, and light industrial properties. Several multifamily structures are located throughout the project area, including two high-rise structures on the south side of West Market Street. A significant number of the residential structures are old and in need of repair, and many lots have been cleared. In addition, several dilapidated and abandoned residential structures are scattered throughout the project area. There are plans to construct low-density residences within the project area by the private sector. The University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey is located to the southeast of the project corridor.

The project area is served by the Sussex Avenue Elementary School, the Newark Christian Academy, the Bethany Christian Academy, and the Saint Vincent Academy; all located near the project corridor.

Central Avenue and West Market Street, which cross the project corridor, provide a mix of retail commercial services to the community as well as access to the Newark CBD and neighborhoods to the west of the project area.



## **II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED PROJECT**



## II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED PROJECT

### A. Project History

The University Heights Connector project includes key elements of previous transportation programs proposed for the study area: the First Street Beautification Program; the Newark Route I-280 / Downtown Connector Study; and, the Newark Land Use and Economic Development Study.

The First Street Corridor Beautification proposal of 1991 called for a six-lane boulevard widened along the west side of First Street between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street. The project was viewed as both a short-term enhancement of connections between Route I-280 and the key arterials leading to the CBD (i.e., Central Avenue and West Market Street), and a long-term enhancement of the neighborhood entry and access to UMDNJ. Where appropriate, property acquisition would serve both short-term corridor and long-term Downtown Connector goals.

To address the need for improved accessibility and reduced diversions through residential neighborhoods, the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) initiated a re-examination of the Route I-280 / Downtown Connector concepts approximately ten years ago. This study included a comprehensive review of land use, traffic, environmental concerns and the impacts associated with the development of a series of improvement measures to improve access to the Newark CBD and other corridors. A three-phased program of staged improvement measures was proposed upon the conclusion of this Concept Development Study:

- Phase 1 proposed the widening and reconfiguration of the abandoned Route I-280 and Route 75 interchange intersection at First Street. Morning peak hour congestion along the First Street intersections with Sussex Avenue and Orange Street would be eased by providing a bypass connection directly from the Route I-280 interchange to Sussex Avenue east of First Street. Evening peak operations would be enhanced by allowing direct access from First Street to Route I-280 westbound without requiring use of the existing Orange Street connection (which would remain in a reduced capacity). Phase I was constructed in 1997-98. Six vacant lots, that formerly included four residential structures at the southwest corner of Sussex Avenue and First Street, were acquired by NJDOT for the street widening to allow the improvements north of Sussex Avenue to operate effectively and are currently publicly owned.
- Phase 2 proposed the widening of the section of First Street extending south of Sussex Avenue to the intersection of West Market / Hartford / Bergen Streets. Utilizing information derived from the Route I-280 Downtown Connector Report, the NJDOT advanced a Feasibility Assessment Report (October 1998) for the First Street Widening Project. This Final Scope Development effort and the preparation of the accompanying Environmental Assessment Document represent a continuation of that Feasibility Assessment process. Further discussion of the Feasibility Assessment process, and how it was affected by other ongoing programs to result in an initial improvement recommendation, is provided below.

- Phase 3 recognizes that the Newark Central Business District will require long-term connections between Route I-280 and key north-south CBD corridors (i.e., Route 21/McCarter Highway, Broad Street, and/or University Avenue/Washington Street) or east-west corridors (Raymond Boulevard, West Market Street, Central Avenue and Orange Street). Phase 3 is outside the scope of this project.

Simultaneously, the City of Newark began a program of mobility planning and engineering aimed at improving the economic vitality and quality of life of the entire city, which culminated in the Draft Node Development and Transportation Plan. The study recognized the importance of the First Street widening project as an important component of this effort.

Two development proposals along the First Street corridor reflect the City of Newark's view that the project should proceed based on widening the west side of First Street rather than the east side before the improvement connects to Bergen Street, located south of the project corridor:

- Checkers Restaurant. Plans for the redevelopment of the east side of First Street between New Street and Hartford Street date to early 1994, when Burger Boys, Inc. prepared the first site plan for a new Checkers Restaurant. The initial site layout, dated May 27, 1994, included a new building oriented on an east-west axis, perpendicular to First Street. According to city records, this concept was altered to a north-south alignment in response to the city's intent to widen First Street.
- Roseville Resurrection Project. In the 1995-1996 period, city-owned abandoned property on Block 1846 (west side of First Street between Dickerson Street and Central Avenue) was sold to the Metropolitan Ecumenical Ministry Community Development Corporation for a nominal price. The corporation promised to develop the site as the first phase of the "Roseville Resurrection" residential project. In return, the City of Newark would be granted a 131-foot ROW along the west side of First Street between Dickerson Street and Central Avenue for the proposed widening of First Street and as a buffer or recreation zone for the ongoing townhouse construction.

The City of Newark's support for the west side widening is also documented in a December 1999 meeting attended by the State, City traffic engineers and consultant representatives for the University Heights Connector and the Newark Greenway Project discussed the status and location of a proposed Greenway segment within the First Avenue corridor between Sussex Avenue and New Street. Original proposals for the bikeway had intended its location to be along the east side of the First Street corridor, as its origin and destination points (Sussex Avenue and New Street, respectively) would be on the east side as well. At this meeting, recommendations for corridor widening focused upon the west side of the corridor since the remainders of acquired parcels could be developed for recreational uses, or allow for a curvilinear bikeway design. It was also noted that the west side of First Street abutted residential areas of the Roseville

neighborhood, while the east side areas were generally industrial in nature. On the basis of these considerations, it was agreed to develop a Class 1 Bikeway along the west side of First Street between Sussex Avenue and New Street.

## **B. Project Purpose**

The University Heights Connector project, which proposes the development of a widened boulevard within an enhanced First Street roadway between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street, seeks to improve Central Ward mobility and safety. The proposed project will improve access to University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey and enhance the connection between Route I-280 and two key CBD-bound arterials, West Market Street and Central Avenue.

## **C. Project Need**

The need for improved connections between the Route I-280 corridor and the Newark CBD, as well as improved vehicular mobility in Newark's Central Ward, has been recognized since the 1950's. The lack of suitable vehicular access to the CBD is evidenced by the overall decline in employment that has occurred in the CBD since the 1960's, and by the continuing congestion that affects the Garden State Parkway and the city's arterial system immediately beyond the limits of the CBD.

Support for improved operations and safety in the corridor, and reduced diversions into residential areas, has been sought by the City of Newark since the early 1990's. A City Council resolution adopted on August 6, 1997 supports this project and related acquisitions. The University of Medicine and Dentistry, University Hospital, the Metropolitan Ecumenical Ministry Community Development Corporation, and other local groups have expressed additional support for the project.

According to traffic engineering analyses performed in the mid-1990s, there are two key physical alterations to the project corridor that would be necessary to provide the capacity to alleviate the current bottlenecks in the project corridor. These include:

- Two through travel lanes in each direction along First Street
- Provision of a protected left turning lane, with storage lane and approach tapers (based upon a 60 km/hr design speed) sufficiently long to fully store the queues of left-turning vehicles, at Central Avenue (both directions) and West Market Street (southbound).

Quantitative verification through the acquisition of new traffic data and analysis indicate that these needs remain.

The Department's Route I-280 Downtown Connector Study included an origin-destination study of vehicles departing the Route I-280 corridor at the First Street exit. This study determined that approximately 40 percent of the ramp traffic turned onto southbound First Street for access to institutions located outside of the Central Business

district, including UMDNJ and its surrounding neighborhood. An additional 40 percent sought destinations within the CBD, but utilized First Street as a matter of convenience until the point at which their trip was adversely affected by corridor congestion. At that point, drivers would make left turns and travel through the residential neighborhoods along Sussex, Dickerson or New Streets for access to the northern portions of the Newark CBD. Recent improvements at the Route I-280 Connector / First Street intersection (Phase 1 - Sussex Avenue Connector) have provided short term, limited relief to the vicinity of the First Street corridor by directing CBD-bound traffic eastward onto Sussex Avenue, a residential collector street improperly serving CBD-bound traffic. However, the bottleneck of the narrow First Street section between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street leaves little choice to area commuters. In recognition of these remaining concerns, and the importance of addressing the concerns, the North Jersey Transportation Planning Association issued a Type 3 Waiver (Alleviation of a Bottleneck) of a Congestion Management System (CMS) study to this project in Spring 1999.

At present, First Street is intended to function with a single travel lane in each direction. The existing configuration of the project corridor is shown in Figure II-1. Between Sussex Avenue and New Street, left turn bays are not provided despite large turning movements at Central Avenue. Though striped for a single lane operation (12-foot travel lane with an 8-foot parking lane implied) in each direction, the prohibition of peak period curbside parking (southbound in AM, northbound in PM) often results in two-lane operation in the peak direction on two narrow (10-foot) lanes. This operation often allows through traffic to bypass turning vehicles, with operations effectively reverting to a single lane operation, especially southbound in the AM peak. (Note: Signal plans obtained from the Essex County Department of Engineering indicate that striping for full-time four-lane operation (two 10-foot lanes each direction) was once intended). The resulting narrow lanes and frequent illegal curbside parking make it imprudent to rely upon the two lane peak direction operation as a permanent means of increased capacity, and make the corridor highly dependent upon traffic enforcement. As a result, congestion persists even during periods of two-lane peak period operation in the peak direction.

Existing land use is decidedly different on either side of the First Street corridor. Land use on the east side of the existing corridor predominantly consists of commercial and industrial businesses occupying large lots. The west side is characterized by residential land use, although a majority of the former residential lots are now vacant.

**INSERT FIGURE II-1**

7

The proposed project will satisfy the following needs:

- Alleviate the current First Street bottlenecks and reduce commuter diversions onto adjacent residential streets by improving access to the CBD by way of the Market Street and the reversible Warren Street / Raymond Boulevard corridors.
- Provide a north-south boulevard through the Central Ward, comprised of the widened sections of First and Bergen Streets to improve local peak period traffic and emergency access.
- Reduce turning movement conflicts by providing turning lanes and storage capacity.
- Enhance pedestrian safety by providing wider sidewalks free of encroachments.
- Within the framework of bottleneck relief and enhanced safety, create a beautified First Street to provide a visual gateway to the Roseville area of the Central Ward and to routes leading to the CBD. Use of urban design treatments to enhance the appearance of the corridor is considered important to help spur economic and residential redevelopment of the Roseville area.

### **1. Operational Problems**

Traffic counts conducted during May 2000, indicated that during the AM Peak Hour (7:45 AM – 8:45 AM), when southbound operations are constrained, southbound left turn volumes onto Dickerson Street were nearly one-third higher (275 vph vs. 210 vph) than southbound turns onto Central Avenue, one of the principal arterial routes into the CBD. Most turning vehicles were observed to make secondary turns southward for access to Central Avenue beyond the point of congestion at First Street / Central Avenue. Based upon traffic counts acquired during other periods of the day when less constrained operations occur, we estimate that approximately 200 vph of the turning volume at Dickerson Street actually desires access to Central Avenue, but bypasses corridor congestion. To a lesser degree, southbound diversions from West Market Street have also been noted on New Street, one – two blocks north. Additionally, new residential, commercial and institutional development within the Central Ward and along the West Market Street corridor, including the expansion of UMDNJ and Essex County College, have increased vehicular demands over the past 20 years to points west of the CBD during peak commuter periods.

Capacity analyses conducted for this project based upon Spring 2000 traffic volumes, two years after the opening of the Sussex Avenue Connector, indicate unsatisfactory corridor traffic operations during peak periods. These findings are corroborated by recent field observations of congestion and delays persisting along First Street at the intersections of Central Avenue and West Market Street. Recent observations and data collection and analysis indicate that the Phase 1 improvements employed between Orange Street and Sussex Avenue, including construction of the Sussex Avenue Connector, have improved conditions at Sussex Avenue and points to the north. However, congestion and safety concerns persist along First Street to the south.

In addition to existing capacity concerns, there are several safety concerns apparent in the project corridor. To examine these issues, the accident history along the First Street corridor has been analyzed for the years 1998-2000. Results of this corridor-wide analysis are summarized in Table II-1.

**Table II-1  
First Street Corridor – Accident Rate Data**

<b>Roadway</b>	<b>Years</b>	<b>Limits</b>	<b>Cross Section</b>	<b>Accident Rate Per MVMs</b>	<b>NJ Statewide Accident Rate (Accidents/MVM) 3 Year Average</b>
First Street	1998-2000	Sussex Avenue – West Market Street	Two lanes without shoulders	8.46*	4.40

Source: Statewide Accident Rates for Interstate, U.S., and New Jersey Numbered Highways under NJDOT jurisdiction, NJDOT website.

Notes: MVM = million vehicle miles.

\* 1998-2000 accident summaries show 66 accidents occurred between West Market Street and Sussex Street.

A second measure of safety, related specifically to accidents at intersections, compares the number of intersection accidents to the number of vehicles entering the intersection. This rate of accidents per million entering vehicles (MEV) is distinguished on the basis of roadway geometry, traffic control, area population, and land use. NJDOT does not currently maintain statewide accident rates based on intersection MEV. However, the NYSDOT does maintain these values, and they are generally consistent with Institute of Traffic Engineers values for similar conditions. Table II-2 compares the associated accident rates per MEV for the corridor to NYSDOT statistics for urban state highways.

Traffic accident summary reports that NJDOT provided in January 2002 indicate that the intersections in the northern section of the corridor operate more safely than do those in the southern section. This finding appears related to the opening of the Sussex Avenue Connector in 1998. This connector has eased congestion and safety concerns at the Sussex Avenue and Dickerson Street intersections.

**Table II-2  
First Street Intersections – Intersection Accident Rate Data  
1998-2000**

<b>First Street Intersection</b>	<b>Traffic Control</b>	<b>Number of Accidents</b>	<b>Actual Accident Rate – Accidents per MEV</b>	<b>NYSDOT Accident Rate per MEV</b>
West Market Street	Signal	82	1.81	0.60
New Street	Stop Sign	25	1.10	0.35
Central Avenue	Signal	76	1.87	0.74
Dickerson Street	Stop Sign	7	0.24	0.35
Sussex Avenue	Signal	11	0.35	0.74

Source: Average Intersection Accident Rates for State Highways by Intersection Type (1/97-12/98), dated 2/00, NYSDOT.

At the other intersections along the First Street corridor, accident history is consistent with the physical and operational inadequacies of the corridor. These specifically include:

- Central Avenue has rear end and turning vehicle accident concerns that will be addressed by proposed turning bays and improved signalization. Existing county-owned signals are undersized and antiquated, and should be replaced.
- At New Street, inadequate intersection sight distance appears to contribute to the high incidence of right angle accidents in the corridor. Intersection sight distance is adversely affected by the abrupt curvature in the First Street alignment west of New Street, by buildings along the property line of First Street, and most particularly by congestion and queued vehicles. The Preferred Alternative will ameliorate these conditions. Signalization would lessen the likelihood of right angle accidents, but the addition of a signalized intersection within 300 feet of the signalized West Market Street intersection is not considered to be operationally beneficial.
- The West Market Street intersection has a predominance of turn-related accidents. Proposed measures to widen and realign the First Street approach with the Bergen Street approach to the south would provide some benefit, and the closure of the fifth approach leg (to Hartford Street in the NE quadrant) would also ease intersection and corridor operations.

## **2. Need for Physical Widening of the Corridor and Pedestrian Safety**

The need for sufficient length of left turn bay and tapers in advance of the Central Avenue and West Market Street intersections will necessitate widening up to one block in advance. Thus, the minimum limits of First Street widening necessitated by constrained left turn capacity would extend at a minimum from one-half block north of Dickerson Street south to West Market Street.

This requirement is the basis for evaluating whether the minimum roadway cross section necessary to accommodate the required five lanes plus sidewalks can be accommodated so as to alleviate the current bottleneck within the existing 66-foot right-of-way.

Recent observations and analysis indicate that a minimally acceptable connector cross section based upon Table 2-2 of the NJDOT Roadway Design Manual, with engineering judgment applied to relate these criteria to an undivided urban street, the absolute minimum cross sectional width (curb-to-curb) of First Street should be 58 feet.

This configuration would result in unsafe four-foot maximum sidewalk widths available within the existing foot right-of-way. As the existing building line along either side of First Street is coincident with, or in some cases extends beyond, the existing right-of-way line, building acquisition of some form is unavoidable. On this basis, it was determined that any meaningful improvement to the First Street corridor would require acquisition of a property frontage strip to accommodate the required First Street improvements.

In 1997, citing City goals and UMDNJ efforts to beautify the corridor, the concept of a 74-foot wide section with decorative plantings and sidewalk treatments was advocated, provided that it would not result in additional displacements of residents and businesses. As per the December 1999 meeting noted earlier, the improvement also includes the development of a Class I bikeway further necessitating the widening of the First Street corridor.



### **III. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

### **III. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

#### **A. Introduction**

During project development, various alternatives including the Preferred Alternative (Figure III-1) and the No-Build Alternative were considered. After assessment of these alternatives, the Preferred Alternative was developed to be advanced through final design and the environmental review process. The alternative described below has been selected as the Preferred Alternative and is the subject of this EA.

#### **B. Proposed Project Description**

The proposed project involves the widening and reconstruction of First Street between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street in Newark's Central Ward. The length of the project is 523.4 meters. The approximate cost of the proposed action is estimated at \$9,400,000, including right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, and construction costs.

The proposed project consists of the following elements:

1. Widen First Street from Sussex Avenue to West Market Street, to consist of two 12-foot to 13-foot wide through lanes in each direction.
2. The design of the West Market Street intersection will include dual left-turning lanes with protected signal phasing in the northbound and southbound directions, a northwest corner curb realignment to improve pedestrian safety, a free southbound right turn lane and refuge island to improve operations and pedestrian safety, and the closure of the approach to Hartford Street.
3. Full time parking prohibitions (rather than peak period only) along Central Avenue approaches within one block of the University Heights Connector to allow two cross street approach lanes in each direction during all periods.
4. Addition of a traffic signal and a southbound left-turn bay at the Dickerson Street intersection to enhance traffic safety and operations.
5. A 22-foot wide landscaped and brick paved median narrowed to provide turning at key intersections. Mountable curbing is proposed to facilitate access for emergency vehicles under extreme conditions in the traffic corridor.
6. Eliminate parking and shoulders within the project corridor.
7. New curbing along the east and west sides of the proposed street.

Insert Figure III-1

8. Widen the sidewalk along the east side of the right-of-way by three feet to provide a nine-foot sidewalk with a four-foot clearance strip. A ten-foot wide sidewalk and clearance strip are proposed for the west side of the right-of-way.
9. A ten-foot wide Class 1 bikeway along the west side of the University Heights Connector. This improvement conforms with the City's Newark Greenway Plan.
10. Traffic signals along the University Heights Connector will be included in Newark's UTCS program.
11. New street lighting, street trees, and street furniture (including benches and trash receptacles) along First Street.

### **C. Considered And Rejected Alternatives**

To address the traffic circulation and safety problems and deficiencies documented in Section II of this EA, eleven alternatives, a No-Build Alternative and ten build alternatives, were considered. The ten build alternatives are all based on the project needs set forth in Section II of this EA.

#### **No-Build Alternative**

Under the No-Build Alternative, there would be no widening of the existing roadway within the First Street corridor, and only routine or emergency maintenance and repair would be performed. The No-Build Alternative does not meet the purpose and need of the proposed project because it would not correct existing substandard traffic and safety conditions. The No-Build Alternative would maintain the existing street system and community elements. Although the No-Build Alternative does not involve any property acquisition, it does negatively impact residences and businesses located on and near First Street. Under the No-Build Alternative, chronic traffic congestion would persist during both peak periods along First Street, and continue to result in commuter diversions through adjacent residential neighborhoods. Emergency access and other trips to the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey would be curtailed. Pedestrian safety will not be improved, and the city's bikeway project will be incomplete. The No-Build Alternative does not satisfy the purpose and need for the proposed project, nor does it address the objectives of the State of New Jersey or the City of Newark for improved access to the city's Central Ward.

#### **Build Alternatives**

As the First Street corridor must be widened to properly serve the immediate and long-term traffic needs of the City, the following nine build alternatives that would avoid the acquisition and demolition of 400-406, a historic architectural resource, were considered and rejected:

1. Widen First Street along the east side of the existing right-of-way;
2. West-East shift;
3. Widen roadway within the existing First Street right-of-way;

4. Widen First Street within the existing right-of-way with TSM and reversible lanes;
5. Limited widening of First Street and enhancing cross streets;
6. One-way couplet (First and Second Street);
7. One-way couplet (First Street and Morris Avenue);
8. Shift University Heights Connector to Second Street;
9. Shift University Heights Connector to Morris Avenue.

These alternatives are described in detail in Section VI of this EA. As demonstrated in the evaluation in Section VI, no feasible and prudent alternatives to the proposed project were identified.

In addition, an alternative that would entail a partial widening on both sides of First Street was considered and rejected. This alternative would require the acquisition of building frontage on both sides of the street at most locations. Existing building facades are generally located along the existing right-of-way with stoop and cellar encroachments into the right-of-way at several locations. As a result, the partial widening alternative would have a large cumulative effect upon property acquisition, with adverse impacts to both sides of First Street. This alternative would require the acquisition of all buildings to be acquired under the proposed project plus those that would be acquired under the east side alternative. This alternative would provide no benefit that would not also be provided by the proposed project, and would still require the acquisition of 400-406 Central Avenue. The partial widening alternative is not considered viable

### **Intersection Improvement Measures Dropped From Consideration**

Traffic analyses performed for the Design Year 2025 indicate that Levels of Service worse than 'D' (i.e., LOS 'E' or 'F') will continue to occur throughout the improved corridor. This condition was known to the Department and the City of Newark prior to the initiation of the Final Scope Development and Environmental Assessment effort. The project advanced on the basis of the Preferred Alternative because the benefits provided to the community and the general public, in terms of safety, operations, access, pedestrian and bicycle amenities and aesthetics, remain considerable in comparison to the "No-Build" alternative. There are corrective measures that theoretically could be employed to improve these conditions to a Level of Service 'D' or better. However, the remedies to the Level of Service generally have adverse impacts that would prove either unacceptable, or at least greater than their benefits. These possible remedies and their disadvantages include:

- **Third Through Lane in Each Direction along First Street.** The cross section of the recently improved section of First Street at the northern project limits is restricted by the presence of two culturally significant buildings. Any further widening would result in an adverse impact to one or both of these buildings. Secondly, additional through lanes at the southern project limits would not eliminate the need for additional left turn lane capacity (see West Market Street intersection discussion, below), and, therefore, require further widening and property acquisition at the West Market Street intersection. Widening would require that either or both the Wendy's (northwest corner) and Checkers

(northeast corner) Restaurants to be acquired, and parking at the McDonald's (southwest corner) would be adversely affected. Finally, further corridor widening would lessen the redevelopment potential of remainder areas along the west side of First Street (should the NJDOT decide to resell these areas) and create a wider-than-desired corridor adjacent to the residential areas to the west.

- **Widening of Key Cross Streets (West Market Street, Central Avenue).** Benefits to through traffic along both streets would occur if each roadway is widened by a total of twelve feet to facilitate a left turn lane for east-west traffic. In both cases, queued left turn volumes have a significant impact upon the through traffic using the shared lane, in some cases converting the shared lane into a *de facto* turn lane. In these cases, property acquisition or sidewalk narrowing impacts would likely extend up to 400 feet beyond the First Street intersection. These widenings are deemed beyond the scope of the University Heights Connector project.
- **Signalization at New Street.** Despite the LOS 'F' related to current and long term operations, signal warrants based on traffic would not be met for this intersection. Review of 1998-2000 accident history indicates the signals could be warranted based on the number of right angle and turning accidents. However, this intersection is within 300 feet of the signal at West Market Street, and could actually confuse operations at the location due to the close proximity. Alignment benefits and coordination of signalization gaps at adjoining intersections will improve operations and intersection sight distance, and likely address right angle accident concerns. At this time, it is recommended that the New Street median opening remain operative, based on the following consideration;
  - a. Improvements within the Preferred Alternative will ease and control the queuing that currently restricts sight distance.
  - b. Closure of Hartford Street reinforces the use of New Street for emergency vehicles.
  - c. Proposed right-of-way acquisition will eliminate existing physical sight obstructions, improving sight distance.
  - d. The 22-foot wide median can provide a refuge area for drivers unsure of their safety as cross traffic.
- **Closure or Re-direction of New Street.** Prohibiting through traffic along New Street, projected to operate at LOS 'F', is feasible, but undesirable. Median closure would require local traffic to divert to either Central Avenue or West Market Street for left or U-turns to driveways. Emergency vehicle access would be lessened, and off-peak operations that may otherwise be satisfactory would be curtailed. Instead, the benefits noted above will improve operations at the intersection.

**IV. OTHER PROPOSED ACTIONS  
IN THE VICINITY OF THE  
UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS  
CONNECTOR**

#### **IV. OTHER PROPOSED ACTIONS IN THE VICINITY OF THE UNIVERSITY HEIGHTS CONNECTOR PROJECT**

##### **A. Federal and State Funded/Supported Projects**

###### **Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Waterfront Park and Historic Area**

The Passaic River waterfront in the Newark CBD is proposed for revitalization as a waterfront urban park by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE) under the Streambank Restoration legislation authorized by the U.S. Congress in 1992.

Referred to as the Joseph G. Minish Passaic River Waterfront Park and Historic Area, the project is located in the lower valley of the Passaic River, in the City of Newark. The project encompasses approximately two miles of the west bank and extends along the eastside of Route 21 between Bridge and Brill Streets. The project will provide environmental and aesthetic improvements to the surrounding area, and will protect the western streambank of the Passaic River from tidal storms and erosion. The project involves the provision of recreational facilities and landscaping, which will include a pedestrian promenade along the waterfront with a median planting strip and a bicycle path.

Four major entry points to the park are planned. The first entrance is located at the north end of the project at Bridge Street, and will include a planting area with a kiosk. The second entrance, at Center Street, will include seating, a fountain plaza, a boat entrance, and a pedestrian bridge to a Newark – Elizabeth Rail Link station and the New Jersey Performing Arts Center. The third entrance, located at the site of the existing fire training center on Raymond Boulevard, will feature a plaza, concession stands, open lawn areas, and historical features. The south end of the park will serve as the fourth entrance, with an open recreational area, ball fields, and educational center with information on shore protection and tidal wetlands.

No cumulative environmental impacts are anticipated between this project and the University Heights Connector project that would require further regulatory review or mitigation.

###### **Reconstruction of Six NJ Transit Morris and Essex Line Bridges**

This NJDOT sponsored project includes six crossings of the Morris and Essex Line. The project entails removing or replacing these crossings. Final scope development for this effort is to begin mid/late 2002. The issuance of a Categorical Exclusion Document for the project is expected in early 2004, and construction would begin in late 2005. The six crossings, all located between Orange Street and Seventh Avenue, are all located within a half-mile of the University Heights Connector. A seventh crossing replacement, where First Street runs over the Morris and Essex Line, is under design within the NJDOT.



## **Route 21 Roadway and Intersection Improvements Project**

This project is located in the City of Newark, and extends through the city's CBD between Green Street on the south and Passaic Street on the north.

The project consists of intersection improvements, resurfacing, roadway realignment, road widening, and signing and traffic safety improvements. The design of the 2.1-mile section of Route 21 is classified as a Transportation System Management project.

The addition of one lane in each direction at individual intersections is intended to improve intersection operations and reduce delays. Because of the short distance between intersections, the extra lanes will be continuous and will function as an auxiliary lane to prevent mid-block congestion that would be created if the lanes were eliminated between intersections. Traffic signals will be removed from four of the existing 16 signalized intersections, since they are not needed and result in congestion. Most of the proposed roadway construction will occur within the existing highway right-of-way. However, due to the roadway realignment and widening, additional right-of-way and easements will be required.

In general, the following roadway and intersection improvements are proposed:

- Three through lanes are proposed on both sides of Route 21 from north of Green Street to Passaic Street. A 12-foot side shoulder will be provided along Route 21 northbound from north of Cherry Street to Bridge Street. The northbound left turn lane at Clay Street will be relocated via Clark and Passaic Streets. The southbound left turn lane at Clay Street will be replaced with a new ramp at Spring Street.
- To accommodate the proposed widening and realignment of Route 21 at milepost 3.3, the NJ Transit Bridge will be reconstructed to accommodate the proposed six lanes for Route 21 and the Route I-280 exit ramp. The existing bridge span will be lengthened with new abutments and superstructure. The increased lateral clearance for the bridge over Route 21 will also provide for an acceleration lane for the Route I-280 exit ramp to Route 21 southbound.
- To facilitate vehicular flow along Route 21, several changes to local side street travel directions are proposed.

The Route 21 and University Heights Connector projects are not anticipated to result in any cumulative environmental impacts that would require further environmental regulatory review or mitigation. The two projects can be constructed independently, with little, if any, construction coordination.

## **B. Local/Private Development Projects**

Several major projects are proposed or recently completed in Newark. The most significant of these is a multiple use sports-oriented development within the CBD. The proposal includes an indoor arena, a stadium, office buildings, a television studio, a hotel, and stores and restaurants. The facility is expected to be the new home of the New Jersey Nets, as well as other sports activities and franchise teams. The facility is expected to be completed in 2003.

The recent completion of the New Jersey Performing Arts Center and the Riverfront Stadium indicate that there is a positive attitude toward new construction in Newark. If the proposed sports arena were built, additional office, hotel, and entertainment development would likely follow.

In addition, the following projects are either planned or proposed in the City of Newark outside of the University Heights Connector project area:

**Newark City Subway Modernization Project.** NJ Transit is planning to replace the existing subway fleet and to rehabilitate other elements of the system. Likely project components include upgrading of electrification, rehabilitation of some stations to improve accessibility, ventilation improvements, and replacement of the light rail vehicle maintenance facility.

**Public Service Electric and Gas (PSE&G).** PSE&G proposes to construct 750,000 square feet of office space between Center Street and City Dock Street, east of the Legal Center.

**Linpro/Mack Development.** Linpro/Mack Development proposes to construct 675,000 square feet of office space at the northeast corner of Route 21 and Raymond Boulevard.

**Rutgers University Law School Expansion.** Plans call for the expansion of the Rutgers Law School in the area between Washington Street and New Street.

The development projects described above are either planned or proposed independently of the University Heights Connector project, and are not anticipated to be directly impacted by the proposed project, nor are these projects anticipated to impact the proposed project. The transportation projects are being implemented to remedy existing facility design deficiencies, reduce existing local traffic congestion, accommodate future traffic, and to improve overall traffic safety. As a result, no cumulative impacts are anticipated that would require further environmental and regulatory review or mitigation.

# **V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

## **V. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

### **A. Socioeconomics/Land Use/Aesthetics**

#### **1. Existing Conditions**

##### **1.1 Analysis Methodology**

The study area to assess potential impacts to socioeconomics, land use, and aesthetics is defined as the area of the Central Ward of Newark, bordered by Fifth Street and Littleton Avenue to the west, Route I-280 to the north, Hudson Street to the east, and Twelfth Avenue to the south (see Figure V-1).

The primary impact area includes properties within and abutting the affected right-of-way, between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street. The secondary impact area extends approximately 1,000 feet from the project corridor. The northern boundary of the study area was terminated at the Route I-280 right-of-way, since the highway right-of-way will not be directly affected by the proposed project and Route I-280 effectively separates the area to the north from the project area.

A two-phase analysis was conducted to identify and assess potential socioeconomic and land use impacts resulting from the proposed University Heights Connector project. The first phase consisted of documenting the existing character and significant features of the study area, reviewing pertinent planning and zoning documents, and identifying development proposals within the study area.

Field surveys were conducted to determine existing land use, and the status of current development proposals. Interviews with representatives of the City of Newark, the Newark school district, and affected property owners and business operators were conducted to obtain information characterizing community facilities and businesses within the study area.

A photographic inventory of the project corridor was compiled to document the existing visual character of the study area.

The second phase of the study consisted of an assessment of the proposed project's impacts. The socioeconomic impact analysis considered residential, business, and community facility displacements, community cohesion and stability, as well as the project's fiscal impact. The land use impact analysis considered the project's consistency with local and regional plans, its effects on current development proposals within the study area, its consistency with the study area's existing land use pattern, and potential changes to development opportunities within the study area. The visual impact analysis reviewed effects of the proposed street improvements on the aesthetic character of the project corridor.

Insert Figure V-1

## 1.2 Social Characteristics

### 1.2.1 Neighborhoods

The study area includes four distinct neighborhoods, including a residential neighborhood to the west of First Street, an industrial neighborhood to the east of First Street, a residential neighborhood in the northeast corner of the study area, and an institutional neighborhood to the south. These neighborhoods are characterized as follows:

- The area to the west of First Street, commonly referred to as Roseville, consists of a mostly residential neighborhood with some scattered neighborhood commercial establishments. Residential uses consist of one to four-family residential structures, with a few larger apartment buildings. Ten houses of worship, a public elementary school, a private elementary school, and the Roseville Branch of the city's library system are located in the neighborhood. This area is also characterized by a significant number of vacant properties and buildings, many owned by the City. Noteworthy is a development of attached single-family residences located at the intersection of Dickerson and Second Streets. Commonly referred to as the Roseville Resurrection development, the development consists of attached single family residences that were recently constructed at the four corners of this intersection. In addition, Rosa Realty recently completed a development consisting of two-family residences at the southeast corner of Dickerson and Third Streets. Finally, Sylvan Summer Homes is rehabilitating nine row houses located at the northwest corner of Dickerson and Third Streets. The Central Avenue commercial corridor runs through the southern portion of this neighborhood, and consists of various retail shops, personal services, restaurants, and bars.
- A predominantly industrial neighborhood is located to the east of First Street. This neighborhood is characterized by industrial and commercial establishments, although many of the industrial buildings are vacant. Residential uses are scattered throughout this area. Boys Park, an undeveloped Green Acres site, is located in its north central area. Vacant land and buildings occupy a significant part of the neighborhood, constituting over a third of the neighborhood. Community facilities in this neighborhood include the Essex County Juvenile Detention Center, the Bethany Baptist Church, and the Bethany Christian Academy.
- The area to the south of the First Street corridor largely consists of the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ) campus. This area also contains two-low-rise garden apartment developments, two 18-story multifamily buildings, and a pocket of commercial development along the south side of West Market Street. Engine 7 of the Newark Fire Department is located at the intersection of West Market Street and Warren Street, while the Saint Vincent Academy is located just west of the fire station.

- The northeast corner of the study area contains a distinct residential neighborhood that continues eastward to Martin Luther King Boulevard. This area consists of detached one- to four-family residences with some mixed commercial and residential uses along Sussex Avenue. This neighborhood is characterized by smaller lots and less vacant land, as compared to the Roseville neighborhood.

### 1.2.2 Population and Housing

Data on the demographic characteristics of residents within the study area were obtained from the 1990 and 2000 Censuses. Information pertaining to the number of residents and households in the study area, their race, sex, and age was available from the 2000 Census, while data concerning median household income, persons below poverty level, tenure, and median value of housing units was only available from the 1990 Census. In addition, a residential contact survey conducted by NJDOT in March and April of 2000 provides more specific data regarding the residences located along First Street.

The study area falls within Census Tracts 10, 11, 13, 15, and 82. Table V-1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of residents within the study area. It is noted that the boundaries of the census tracts do not coincide with the boundaries of the study area.

The census data reveal the five census tracts had a population of 12,546 persons in the year 2000, or 4.6 percent of the city's total population. Most the area's residents were non-white (86.8). The census data also show that in 1990, 27 percent of the study area population had a household income below the poverty line. These percentages exceeded those exhibited by the city as a whole, (73.5 and 25.7 percent respectively).

**Table V-1  
Demographic Characteristics**

<b>Demographic Characteristic</b>	<b>Census Tract 10</b>	<b>Census Tract 11</b>	<b>Census Tract 13</b>	<b>Census Tract 15</b>	<b>Census Tract 82</b>	<b>All Census Tracts</b>	<b>City of Newark</b>
Population (2000)	4,542	2,550	1,410	1,673	2,308	12,483	273,546
Non-White (%) (2000)	82.8	77.6	96.7	95.6	92.5	86.8	73.5
Hispanic Origin <sup>(1)</sup> (%) (2000)	32.2	15.1	8.5	14.0	4.8	18.5	29.5
Median Age (2000)	30.8	23.2	28.8	25.9	31.3	28.5	30.8
Over 65 (%) (2000)	14.2	3.0	9.4	7.2	13.0	10.2	9.3
Households (2000)	1,255	554	429	558	821	2,417	91,382
Median Household Income (1990)	\$18,750	\$29,000	\$23,681	\$18,792	\$10,327	NA	\$21,650
Persons Below Poverty Level (%) (1990)	25.3	32.3	15.0	35.0	33.5	27.3	25.7

<sup>(1)</sup> Includes persons classified as both white and non-white.

NA = Not available.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990 and 2000.

### 1.2.3 Community Facilities

Community facilities in the study area include a number of churches, schools, and public facilities as shown on Figure V-2. Notable community facilities located within the study area include the following:

- **Sussex Avenue School.** The Sussex Avenue School, with an enrollment of approximately 400 students, occupies the entire block of Sussex Avenue between Second and Third Streets. Although not within the project corridor, this facility to some degree influences pedestrian and vehicular travel patterns in the surrounding area. The school provides elementary education (Grades K-8) to Central Ward neighborhoods.
- **Newark Christian School.** This is a private elementary school located at the northwest corner of the intersection of First Street and Sussex Avenue. This school provides elementary education for grades K-8, with a staff of 12 teachers, administrators, and support personnel. Its enrollment for the 1999-2000 school year was 78. The school borders First Street and the project corridor to the south and east, a residential area to the west, and Route I-280 to the north.
- **Saint Vincent Academy.** This private secondary school is located on West Market Street at its intersection with Warren Street. The school enrolls approximately 300 female students in Grades 9-12. The school has a staff of 40 personnel, including teachers, administrators, and support staff. The school is planning to construct a new building at the site to expand its facilities, but will not increase its enrollment.
- **Bethany Christian Academy.** This private school is associated with the Bethany Baptist Church, and is located on West Market Street, north of its intersection with Hudson Street. The school, which was constructed within the past five years, has an enrollment of 50 students in Grades pre-K-3. The staff consist of 9 persons, including teachers, administrators, and support staff. The school plans to expand its education program to include Grades 4-6. The property borders a declining industrial neighborhood to the north and east, an automotive establishment to its north, and St. Vincent's Academy and Engine Company #7 to the south.
- **Engine Company 7.** This fire station house is located at the intersection of West Market, Hudson, and Warren Streets. The site includes one pumper (Engine 7) and the battalion chief for Battalion 1. The site is currently staffed by seven firefighters per shift. A rescue squad may be relocated to the existing building in the near future, which will increase the number of staff to 12.
- **Liberty Park.** Located at the intersection of West Market Street and Central Avenue in the western section of the study area, this park provides a passive open space which includes park benches and shade trees.



Insert Figure V-2

- **Boys Park.** This site is located at the intersection of Sussex Avenue and Duryea Street. The property was acquired by the City through the Green Acres program, but has not been developed into a recreational facility.
- **Essex Residential Group Center.** This facility is a group home for juvenile delinquents (14 to 18 years old). It is operated by the state, and has a capacity for 35 residents. The facility has 25 employees, and provides shelter, food, counseling, educational, and medical services for the juveniles placed there.
- **Essex County Juvenile Detention Center.** Operated by Essex County, this secured detention facility is located to the east of the project corridor, on the south side of Sussex Avenue between Duryea and Hecker Streets. The facility was built in 1997, with a capacity for 206 incarcerants. The site already exceeds its design capacity. The site is staffed by approximately 210 personnel, including juvenile detention officers, administrators, and support staff. The facility provides inmates with medical, educational, recreational, and counseling services.
- **University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey.** The university is located to the south of the project corridor, and consists of offices, classrooms, and University Hospital. A prior traffic study indicates that approximately 40 percent of the traffic within the First Street corridor is headed to the university and its hospital.
- **Haitian Baptist Church at the Crossroads.** This religious facility is located at the northwest corner of First Street and Central Avenue. The property contains one building. The church also owns a property along the north side of Central Avenue that it uses for parking.
- **Supernatural Deliverance Tabernacle Church.** This church facility is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of First and Dickerson Streets, and has approximately 100 members. The property contains one building with no off-street parking facilities.
- **Phillips Metropolitan Christian Methodist Episcopal Church.** This church facility is located at the southwest corner of Morris Avenue and Dickerson Street, and fronts Morris Avenue. The property extends along the entire frontage of Dickerson Street between Morris Avenue and First Street, and has 50 feet of frontage on First Street. The property contains one building, as well as off-street parking facilities.

Churches located within the secondary study area include the Iglesia Pentecostal Church, the Kingdom Hall of Jehovah's Witnesses, the Union Baptist Church, the Faith Temple Center, the Grace Bible Tabernacle, the Bethany Baptist Church, and the Williams Temple.

### 1.3. Economic Characteristics

#### 1.3.1 Local Business Activity

Employment information is not maintained at any level more specific than the municipal level by the New Jersey Department of Labor. As a result, businesses were directly contacted to determine the number of employees at each establishment along First Street. The following businesses are potentially affected by the proposed project:

- **Wendy's:** This fast-food restaurant, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of First Street and West Market Avenue, employs twenty-one black, one white, and two Hispanic employees, and draws its business from college students and local workers. Much of its business is conducted at the drive-through window. One employee drives to work, six take a bus, and 17 live within walking distance. The restaurant has 23 off-street parking spaces.
- **Garden State Check Cashing:** This business, located at the southwest corner of the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue, employs one full-time employee and two part-time employees; all black. The business provides check-cashing services for neighborhood residents. Two employees commute by bus, and one employee commutes to work by car. The business occupies a floor area of approximately 500 square feet. A key factor for this business is access to a bus line near a residential neighborhood. Off-street parking is not available at the site.
- **Nubian's Grocery and Deli:** This business is located at the southwest corner of the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue on the ground floor of an unoccupied four-story apartment building. Operated by a sole proprietor, it consists of a grocery store that also prepares fast food for lunch. The grocery store has been in operation since 1996, and employs four black persons who reside in the City. The employees all commute to work by bus. The business occupies an area of approximately 500 to 600 square feet. Off-street parking is not available at the site.
- **Defense Sports Wear:** Located in the same building as the grocery store, this business is also operated by a sole proprietor. The store sells clothing. The store employs three black employees who commute to work by car. All employees are members of the owner's family, and work at the store on a part-time basis. The business, which occupies a floor area of 300 square feet, has been in operation for approximately one year. Off-street parking is not available at the site.
- **Checkers Restaurant:** This fast food restaurant is located at the northeast corner of the intersection of First Street and West Market Street. The owner provided the following information regarding this business. The restaurant employs 43 persons, all black, of which 35 reside in Newark. The remainder of the employees live in Irvington, Orange, East Orange, and Jersey City. Ten of the employees participate in State-sponsored programs, seven are in halfway houses, and three are welfare recipients. One of the halfway house residents has been promoted as a manager. All workers commute to work by bus or live within

walking distance. The restaurant is part of a franchise (Metro Burger, LLC) that owns seven other Checkers restaurants, which are located in East Orange, Passaic, Paterson (2), Jersey City, Toms River, and Sayreville. The franchise employs 300 entry-level team members and 25 managers. The First Street restaurant benefits from the high visibility of the site and the adjacent traffic flow. As a result, it is one of the top 25 Checkers restaurants in the country. The Newark location paid \$307,700 in wages to its employees in 2001, and collected \$88,200 in State sales tax. In addition, the Newark restaurant serves as the training center for the franchise. Nine current managers got their start in Newark. The loss of the Newark location could jeopardize the entire franchise.

### 1.3.2 Fiscal Resources

According to the 2000 municipal tax records, the city's tax base was \$825,889,225, and the total tax levy for municipal purposes was \$78,111,499.

## 1.4 Land Use

### 1.4.1 Existing Land Use

The study area is typified by a variety of land uses, including public/quasi-public institutions, commercial, office, light industrial, automotive-related activities, and a variety of residential uses. A noteworthy feature of the study area is the presence of a large number of vacant properties and buildings. Significantly, the First Avenue corridor functions as a transitional area, separating two areas with distinctly different land uses. The area to the west of First Street is largely residentially developed while the area to the east is largely developed with industrial and commercial uses. The existing development pattern of the study area is summarized in Table V-2 and shown on Figure V-3.

**Table V-2**  
**Total Acreage by Land Use**  
**University Heights Connector Study Area**

Land Use	Land Area (acres)	Percentage
Public/Quasi-public	39.2	36.2
Residential	32.2	29.7
Industrial	10.3	9.5
Commercial	4.6	4.2
Automotive	2.2	2.0
Restaurant/Bar	1.9	1.8
Office	1.3	1.2
Vacant	16.7	15.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>108.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: Land use survey and city tax records.

Insert Figure V-3

The land use of properties required for the proposed project consists of residential uses, two houses of worship, vacant land, and a commercial building.

The development pattern along the west side of First Street is varied and intermittent. Development is concentrated in two parts of the street frontage, with vacant land interspersed. Specifically, the area between Sussex Avenue and New Street consists of 30 properties of which ten properties are residentially developed and sixteen are vacant.

The remaining properties include two churches, a commercial property developed with a three-story building with street level storefronts and vacant upper floor apartments, and an industrial property containing a vacant industrial building. The residential structures have been rehabilitated for occupancy within the past ten years. Tenants at the residential properties use the adjoining vacant lots as unimproved parking lots. The continuity of development in this area is interrupted by vacant lots, which together with the presence of a vacant industrial building detract from the overall aesthetics of this area. The area would benefit from the development or redevelopment of the vacant properties.

Properties situated on the west side of First Street, between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street, occupy an area of 9.4 acres. The area's development pattern is described below:

The percentage of vacant land is higher within the project corridor than the overall study area. Vacant land constitutes 2.0 acres, or 20.2 percent of land within the project corridor. Most of this land is situated on the west side of First Street.

- Residential uses along the project corridor are primarily located on the west side of right-of-way, with the exception of a four-family residence at the southeast corner of First Street and New Street. Residential uses fronting on First Street occupy an area of 1.0 acre, or 8.4 percent of the project corridor.
- Two churches are located in the project area. The Haitian Baptist Church at the Crossroads and the Supernatural Deliverance Revival Tabernacle Church are situated on the west side of First Street, while the rear of the Phillips Metropolitan Christian Methodist Episcopal Church abuts the east side. Overall, churches occupy an area of 1.4 acres, or 14.9 percent of the land within the study area.
- Non-residential development within the project corridor, including industrial, retail, office, and restaurant uses, is concentrated on the east side of First Street. Such uses occupy an area of 5.0 acres on the east side of First Street, but only 0.5 acre on the west side of the street, including a vacant industrial building. Land uses on the east side of the street include the Tuck-It-Away warehouse and the former N.S. Clothing building (closed for business as of January 2002) located between Sussex Avenue and Dickerson Street, an office building at the northeast corner of the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue, the C. Patti Electroplating company at the northeast corner of First and New Streets, and the

Checkers fast-food restaurant at the intersection of First and West Market Streets. Commercial uses on the west side of First Street include a fast-food restaurant at the intersection of First and West Market Streets, and a building containing five storefronts on the south side of intersection of First Street and Central Avenue.

#### 1.4.2 Newark Master Plan

The proposed project is consistent with and implements the city's master plan, as summarized below:

- The proposed street improvement project is consistent with the goals, objectives, and principles advanced in the city's master plan. Specifically, this includes plan goals to enhance transportation routes within the City and provide additional recreational facilities for city residents.
- The proposed project positively addresses several problems identified in the city's master plan and reexamination report. First, the 1990 Master Plan found there were inadequate connections between the local street system and regional highways. The 1999 reexamination report found access from city streets to the regional highway system still poses a problem. The proposed action will serve to reduce this problem within the study area.
- The proposed project includes the construction of one link in the Newark Greenway Network, which is designed to enhance pedestrian and bicycle accessibility in the city. When completed, the 18.5-mile Greenway Network will provide connections between Newark's recreational, cultural, and educational resources, and its residential neighborhoods. Within the project corridor, the New Jersey Department of Transportation will construct a Class 1 bikeway as part of the proposed First Street right-of-way improvements.
- The proposed project also furthers a 1990 master plan objective to promote pedestrian and bicycle routes as a means to reduce vehicular trips in the City. The reexamination report notes there have not been any major improvements in the pedestrian and bicycling environment since 1990.
- The reexamination report notes that Newark accounted for 15 percent of all statewide traffic accidents involving pedestrians between 1991 and 1995. The proposed street widening and associated pedestrian circulation improvements will serve to enhance pedestrian safety along this street segment. The proposed action will advance these principles by reconstructing the right-of-way improvements in an attractive manner, and will include provision for safe pedestrian and bicycle circulation through the project area.

The proposed project is also consistent with the circulation objectives of the Newark 1990 Master Plan, which calls for "improved street and intersection capacity in areas of heavy traffic demand."

Additionally, the proposed project is consistent with the City's Draft Node Development and Transportation Plan, dated March 2000, which identifies the University Heights Connector project as a means to enhance traffic circulation along the First Street corridor.

### 1.4.3 Zoning

Zoning within the project area falls under the jurisdiction of the City of Newark. Zoning patterns within the area consist of districts that allow for a wide range of residential, commercial, industrial, and institutional uses. Newark representatives have indicated that the city's zoning map is not consistent with its land use plan and the existing development pattern, and that a comprehensive update is currently being conducted to provide the basis for a new zoning ordinance.

The following zoning districts are located in the study area:

*Residential 3 (R-3)* – This district permits one to four family residences, attached units, as well as all uses permitted in the R-1 and R-2 districts.

*Business 2 (B-2)* – This district permits various intensive commercial uses including laundries, pool and billiard halls, storage warehouses, drive-in restaurants, arcades, as well as rooming and boarding houses.

*Business 4 (B-4)* – This district permits intensive commercial and industrial businesses such as drive-in restaurants, building material storage, machine shops, cement block manufacture, gasoline filling station, etc.

*Industrial 1 (I-1) and Industrial 2 (I-2)* – These districts permit light industrial uses that do not produce excessive noise, smoke, odors, etc.

Figure V-4 illustrates the boundaries of the zoning districts within the study area. The figure shows that properties to be acquired on the west side of First Street are zoned I-1 or B-2, whereas properties to be acquired on the east side are zoned I-2 or B-2.

As noted, the City of Newark is in the process of revising its zoning plan. It is the City's intention to modify the zoning plan to more closely follow the existing pattern of development throughout the city. These changes would not conflict with or limit the design or construction of the proposed project.

### 1.4.4 New Jersey Development and Redevelopment Plan

The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP), which designates Newark as a Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1). SDRP goals with respect to PA1 include revitalizing cities and towns and redeveloping urban areas. The proposed project advances these goals. In addition, the project is consistent with the following SDRP policies:





- Revitalize the State’s cities and towns.
- Provide adequate public facilities and services at a reasonable cost.
- Preserve and enhance areas of historic, cultural, scenic, open space, and recreational value.
- Ensure sound and integrated planning and implementation statewide.

#### 1.4.5 Proposed Development

Three proposed development projects have been identified in the immediate vicinity of the project area, and are described below:

- *Sylvan Summer Homes, LLC*, is currently rehabilitating the existing vacant row houses at 34-50 Third Street. It is anticipated that the dwelling units will be ready for occupancy in late 2002.
- *New Builders, Inc. – First Street*. New Builders, Inc., has plans to construct three two-family residences on the east side of First Street, just south of Dickerson Street. Two of the structures have been constructed to date.
- *Greenstar Construction – First Street*. Greenstar Construction proposes to construct a two-family residence at Block 1840, Lot 11, which is located on the west side of First Street, just south of Central Avenue. According to an agent of Greenstar Construction, the developer has submitted an application for construction permits, and seeks to start construction upon issuance of the requisite permits. The proposed project requires the acquisition of this property. Greenstar’s agent, Lucky Realty Associates, has been advised of the proposed project, and was requested to have a representative of Greenstar Construction contact the project team. Greenstar’s representative (Corrado Minervini) spoke with the project team on October 1, 2002, to review project status and schedule, and has been added to the list of stakeholders.

### 1.5 Aesthetics

The northern section of the study area is characterized by its old urban development pattern on lots ranging in size from 2,500 to 10,000 square feet. The area consists of commercial development along the thoroughfares, two- and three-story detached dwellings throughout its residential neighborhoods, scattered multifamily residences, a light industrial area comprised of many vacant or poorly maintained structures, and extensive areas of vacant lots. There is a new residential townhouse development at the intersection of Dickerson and Second Streets, and two developments of two-family residences are planned within this area. Route I-280 blocks views of the area located farther to the north, including any view of Branch Brook Park.

The area to the south of West Market Street is characterized by recent institutional, residential, and commercial development on relatively large development tracts. Lots in this section of the study area range in size from one to three acres. Views into this area from the project corridor are limited to the properties along the east and west sides of Bergen Street, and extend only partly to the south.

There are no significant distant views within the study area, though some locations in the southern portion of the study area offer views of Newark’s central business district.

## **2. Impacts**

The proposed project is located in the central portion of the study area, and runs between a predominantly residential neighborhood to the west and a predominantly industrial/commercial neighborhood to the east. The proposed project entails the acquisition of privately owned properties located along the right-of-way, and the relocation of residents and businesses at these properties.

### **2.1 Socioeconomic Impacts**

#### **2.1.1 Direct Impacts**

The proposed project will result in the acquisition of 26 dwelling units with approximately 73 occupants in 11 residential structures on First Street. This includes all 22 dwelling units on the west side of the street and a four-family residence on the east side at the southeast corner of First and New Streets. The affected properties are located at the east end of the Roseville neighborhood, and the proposed project will not adversely affect the remaining portions of this neighborhood located further to the west. In fact, residents attending the Public Information Center held on June 29, 2000, expressed concerns about pedestrian safety and traffic volumes along First Street, as well as a desire to move from the First Street Corridor. As a result, the impact of these property acquisitions is considered to be minor and not expected to adversely impact any of the study area neighborhoods or disrupt existing neighborhood cohesion.

The proposed project also includes the acquisition of two community facilities; the Haitian Baptist Church at the Crossroads and the Supernatural Deliverance Revival Tabernacle Church. The Supernatural Deliverance Revival Tabernacle provides community services including a food bank for nearby residents. A representative of the church indicated that although parishioners reside over a wide area generally spanning several miles, with some church attendees residing as far away as Brooklyn, NY, or Philadelphia, PA, the church would prefer to remain within the immediate neighborhood. The presence of a large number of vacant properties and buildings in the area suggests the church would be able to find a suitable new location. A representative of the Haitian Baptist Church has indicated the church would be amenable to relocation, especially to a site where off-street parking could be provided. The church is currently seeking relocation to a multi-story building located at 168 Clinton Street in East Orange, about two miles west of its current location. They have formally approached the NJDOT Office of Community Relations seeking early compensation for relocation costs to help offset the purchase cost of the new building. Both of these community facilities would be relocated in accordance with federal and state requirements. In view of the vacant land available for relocation in the study area for these facilities, this adverse impact will not be significant.

### 2.1.2 Proximity Impacts

As a result of the acquisition and removal of an existing residence at the southeasterly corner of First and New Streets, the adjoining residence on New Street will border the proposed First Street right-of-way. The proposed improvements will include a 20-foot wide open space that will act to buffer this property from traffic along First Street. In addition, the proposed project will not significantly change the proximity of the First Street right-of-way to properties located along Second Street, as these properties will be located at least 60 feet from the proposed right-of-way boundary and are buffered on their easterly boundaries by mature trees and shrubs. The remaining portions of the properties acquired to enable the project will likely be redeveloped for compatible land uses following the construction of the proposed street improvements, with a greenway consisting of pedestrian and bicycle paths that will buffer the properties located to the west. As a result, the project will not result in any significant adverse proximity impacts to adjacent residential properties.

Current access to Hartford Street from First Street is proposed to be eliminated for traffic safety purposes. The proposed impact of this change to the local traffic circulation pattern is not anticipated to result in any adverse impacts. Currently, Hartford Street is one-way eastbound between First Street and Morris Avenue. Under the proposed project, this segment of Hartford Street will be open to two-way traffic, and access between Hartford Street and First Street will be available from Morris Avenue. While this change may result in slight inconvenience for traffic from the west, the change will make travel from the east more convenient.

### 2.1.3 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project is being constructed to address an existing traffic bottleneck. Stimulation of new development is not a goal of this project, although the proposed project is envisioned as supporting planned development and redevelopment of the city's Central Ward neighborhoods.

Cumulative impacts include the effects of other proposed projects in combination with the proposed University Heights Connector improvements. Other transportation projects planned or under construction in the general vicinity of the project corridor include the Route 21 Roadway and Intersection Improvements project, the Newark-Elizabeth Rail Link, the Route 21 Viaduct and Interchange Improvements, and the Route I-78 West Peddie Street Ramps Realignment. Planned local non-transportation projects include housing construction in the project vicinity. These projects will serve to complement the proposed University Heights Connector project in improving the community.

Because of the local nature of the proposed University Heights Connector, the proposed project is not expected to contribute significantly to new development in combination with other planned improvements in the vicinity. It is possible that significant development in Newark's Central Ward and Central Business District (CBD) may in the long term add traffic to the project corridor, since the ramps provide some degree of access to downtown Newark.

However, planned transportation improvements in and around the Newark CBD are being designed specifically to handle projected downtown traffic. Also, the Newark-Elizabeth Rail Link project is expected to reduce the growth of vehicular traffic in Newark.

The improved First Street corridor is not expected to contribute to traffic flow capacity to the downtown area because it is not being designed to accommodate increased growth and traffic volumes. Hence, the proposed corridor improvements are not considered as a significant factor in stimulating or inducing new development in the project area or elsewhere in Newark.

## **2.2 Business Establishments**

### **2.2.1 Business Displacements**

The proposed project will result in the acquisition of three active businesses in the project area. These acquisitions will result in the displacement of the business operations and the tenant/owners located on one property (Block 1840 Lot 8) at the southwesterly corner of the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue. The property contains a delicatessen, a clothing store, and a check-cashing establishment.

The proposed project will require frontage and minor property acquisitions from commercial properties located at Block 1838 Lots 1 and 8, and Block 1840 Lot 16. The acquisition of frontage from these properties is not expected to result in any adverse impacts to access or usage of these properties by the tenant/owner operators.

The businesses to be displaced are not labor-intensive employers. In addition, these businesses do not have special site location needs, and do not require that they be adjacent or in close proximity to their present locations. The proposed project is not expected to result in any significant or adverse proximity impacts to project area businesses.

### **2.2.2 Proximity Impacts**

The proposed project is not expected to significantly alter local or regional circulation patterns. Existing traffic will be maintained through the project corridor during the construction period. In addition, the construction of proposed project will be staged in order to maintain adequate and safe travel. The proposed project is not expected to result in any significant or adverse proximity impacts to project area businesses.

Current access to Hartford Street from First Street is proposed to be eliminated for traffic safety purposes. The proposed impact of this change to the local vehicular circulation pattern is not anticipated to result in any adverse impacts. Currently, Hartford Street is one-way eastbound between First Street and Morris Avenue. Under the proposed project, this segment of Hartford Street will be open to two-way traffic, and access between Hartford Street and First Street will be available from Morris Avenue. While this change may result

in slight inconvenience for traffic from the west, the change will make travel from the east more convenient.

## 2.3 Fiscal Impacts

The proposed project is expected to result in only a minor impact to Newark's ratable base by the acquisition of taxable property. The extent of the property tax loss was determined by calculating the direct dollar loss in taxes collected annually, as well as the percentage of total tax ratables the affected parcels represent to Newark.

The direct dollar loss was calculated by first determining the assessed valuation of the properties to be acquired for the proposed project. The estimated percentages of the city's ratable base and revenue loss were also calculated by dividing the losses in assessment and tax revenue by the ratable base and total tax levy, respectively.

The following is the tax loss calculation used for this analysis:

### Taxable Rate Loss Calculation:

Total Assessed Net Valuation for City of Newark	\$825,889,225
Total Assessed Valuation of Acquired Properties	\$188,100
2000 Tax Rate for Municipal Purposes	\$9.45 per \$100
Tax Loss	\$17,775

Based on the above analysis, the estimated assessed valuation of all property to be acquired by the proposed project is \$188,100, which is less than 0.02 percent of the city's total ratable base. The estimated tax loss to Newark (\$17,775) represents less than 0.02 percent of the city's total 2000 tax levy. The impact to the City of Newark's tax base is considered negligible. Similarly, the fiscal impact on Essex County and the Newark School District would also be negligible.

## 2.4 Land Use

### 2.4.1 Existing Land Use

The proposed project will require the use of 23 properties within the project corridor, and the demolition of any existing structures on these properties. These include ten residential properties on the west side of First Street, one residential property on the east side of the street, one commercial property on the west side of the street, two churches located on the west side of First Street, and five vacant privately-owned lots on the west side of the street. In addition, the project includes a partial taking of the Checkers site, the Wendy's site and the adjoining lot to the north, and the Koeller industrial site. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts to existing land use based on the following:

- The properties to be acquired are sufficiently deep to allow their redevelopment subsequent to the construction of the proposed street improvements. It is anticipated that a strip of land up to 44 feet in width will be utilized for the widening of the First Street right-of-way. The remaining portions of acquired lots will be available for redevelopment for residential, commercial, community, or recreation use. The redevelopment of the remaining properties should minimize the number of vehicular access points along First Street. This will serve to reinforce the intended purpose of the proposed street improvement to eliminate a traffic bottleneck within the project corridor. The redevelopment will be consistent and compatible with surrounding development pattern. The adverse land use effects of eliminating the existing uses would, therefore, be relatively short-lived. In the long term, the project corridor will benefit from the future redevelopment of these properties, which include a consistent development pattern along a significant gateway into the city and substantial improvements to the aesthetics of the corridor.
- The project entails acquiring a narrow strip of land along the frontage of an industrial property located on the west side of First Street about 150 feet south of Sussex Avenue (Koeller property). This property currently contains an unoccupied industrial building, although much of the equipment and machinery formerly used at the site is still stored in the building. The potential continued use of this property for industrial purposes will not be adversely affected by the road widening since the building will remain approximately 100 feet from the proposed boundary of the right-of-way and access to and from First Street will remain. In addition, the property could become a significant part of any future redevelopment of the properties located on First Street between Sussex Avenue and Dickerson Street.
- The proposed project will result in modifications to the existing access and layout of the Checkers fast-food restaurant at the northeast corner of the intersection of First, Hartford, and West Market Streets. The proposed street improvements include the acquisition of the entire street frontage, and much of the existing internal circulation drives within this property, thereby eliminating its access to and from First Street. Discussions have been conducted between the operators of the Checkers franchise, the NJDOT (including the Bureau of Right-of-Way) and the Newark Department of Engineering (Traffic Operations) to review possible site modifications. The current design proposes to maintain the existing use of the site by changing the existing building and parking layout. Those modifications are expected to maintain access to and from northbound First Street and New Street. The NJDOT has indicated its willingness to acquire a property abutting the north boundary of the site (408 New Street) for construction staging purposes; this site may then be transferred to the Checkers operators as partial mitigation for site impacts. On their own initiative, the Checkers franchise has discussed their own acquisition of additional adjoining properties (to the east) to consider further betterments to the site, once modification is made necessary by this project.



- The proposed street improvements will have no effect on the use of properties fronting on adjacent streets. This is due to the continued use of the First Street right-of-way as a transportation corridor, the orientation of the properties away from First Street, and the presence of a sufficient buffer by virtue of their distance from the right-of-way.
- The proposed changes to the right-of-way width and design will not adversely affect the continued use of the remaining properties on First Street, but will rather enhance access to these properties by eliminating the existing traffic bottleneck.
- The depth of the properties adjoining the immediate project corridor is sufficient to buffer existing neighboring development from activities along the First Street corridor. The use of residential properties situated along Second Street will thus not be affected by the proposed street improvements or any subsequent redevelopment of the remainders of the properties acquired for the proposed road-widening project.

#### 2.4.2 Newark Master Plan

The proposed project is not expected to result in any impacts to the city's master plan. The proposed project is compatible with the land use designations for the project area.

#### 2.4.3 Zoning

The proposed project is not expected to result in any impacts to existing zoning patterns. The proposed project is compatible with the city's zoning ordinance.

#### 2.4.4 State Development and Redevelopment Plan

The proposed project is consistent with the strategies, policies, and goals of the SDRP, which seeks reinvestment in the state's urban areas, enhancement of existing transportation facilities, and provision of recreational facilities.

#### 2.4.5 Proposed Development

The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant adverse impacts to proposed development projects in the study area, except for the Green Star construction project. The acquisition of the Green Star property for the proposed project is not significant since new development will likely occur on the remainders of acquired properties after completion of the proposed project.

## **2.5 Aesthetics**

The proposed project is not expected to affect any uniquely constructed or naturally occurring views within the project area. The proposed project will not introduce any significant structures or appurtenances that would intrude into the area's visual character. Rather, the proposed project will enhance the aesthetic character of the First Street corridor. The proposed widening of First Street will include new shade tree planting strips along both sides of the right-of-way, as well as in the proposed median strip. In addition, the project includes a bikeway on the west side of the right-of-way and new pedestrian sidewalks on both sides of the street. Proposed streetscape improvements will include street lighting, aesthetic pavement treatments for the roadway and sidewalks, and sitting benches with tables. Properties that are acquired as a result of the project will likely be redeveloped for recreational, community, residential, or commercial uses. The visual impact of the proposed project will not extend into the secondary areas. The proposed project will substantially improve the aesthetics of the First Street corridor, providing an attractive gateway to City from Route I-280.

### **3. Mitigation**

#### **3.1 Residential Acquisitions**

All residential relocations will be conducted pursuant to the Federally Assisted Programs act of 1970, as amended in the Federal Uniform Act Amendment, effective March 2, 1989 (Chapter 50 NJ Public Laws of 1989). This law is designed to ensure the prompt and equitable relocation of persons displaced as a result of federally funded projects. The services and payments provided include the following:

- Assistance in finding replacement dwellings;
- Moving expense reimbursement;
- Payment of replacement housing supplements, mortgage interest rate differentials, and closing costs to assist in the purchase of a new home;
- Payment of rent supplements that may be converted to a down payment, enabling a tenant to become a homeowner;
- Last resort housing, if needed; and
- Provision of related support services and assistance.

Suitable housing is available within the City to relocate the affected residents over the course of twelve to eighteen months according to area realtors.

#### **3.2 Proximity Impacts**

In order to mitigate potential proximity impacts stemming from construction activities near existing residential structures, specifications for all contracts will be drafted to require contractors to comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and orders to reduce these impacts. Such impacts can be adequately mitigated by confining hours of construction to the daytime, and by using appropriate mufflers and vibration dampers designed for the equipment used at the site. As a result, adverse impacts of construction activities to residents proximate to the project area will not be significant.

#### **3.3 Business Establishments**

The NJDOT Right-of-Way Unit foresees no difficulties in the relocation of the six displaced businesses. All project-related relocation payments and services will be provided pursuant to the Federal Uniform Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs Act of 1970, as amended in the Federal Uniform Act Amendment, effective March 2, 1989 (Chapter 50, New Jersey Public Law of 1989). This law is designed to ensure the prompt and equitable relocation and reestablishment of businesses displaced as a result of federally funded projects. Based on this law, the NJDOT Right-of-Way Unit offers a Relocation Assistance Program with the following services:

- Assistance in finding business locations;
- Moving expense reimbursement; and
- Allowance to business in lieu of moving reimbursement.

### **3.4 Community Facilities**

The NJDOT Right-of-Way Unit would also administer the relocation of two churches within the project corridor. Project-related relocation payments and services would be provided pursuant to the Federal Uniform Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs Act of 1970, as amended in the Federal Uniform Act Amendment, effective March 2, 1989 (Chapter 50, New Jersey Public Law of 1989).

### **3.5 Land Use**

The proposed project is not anticipated to have any significant adverse impacts to existing land use, local or regional land use plans, local zoning regulations, or proposed development within the study area. Therefore, no mitigating measures are necessary or proposed.

### **3.6 Aesthetics**

The proposed project will not result in any adverse impacts of the aesthetics of the project area. Therefore, no mitigation is necessary or proposed.

## **B. Environmental Justice**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* signed by President Clinton on February 11, 1994, requires federal agencies to take appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal projects on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent practicable and permitted by law. The goal of Executive Order 12898 is as follows:

...each federal agency shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States...

The purpose of the environmental justice review is to determine whether a disproportionate share of the proposed project's adverse impacts are borne by minority and low-income populations.

### **1.1 Identification of Minority and Low-Income Populations**

The criteria for designating minority and low-income populations were based on Executive Order 12898 and subsequent guidance as follows: USDOT Order 6640.23 (December 2, 1998) *FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*; and, *Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analyses*, USEPA, December 1997. As set forth in USDOT Order 6640.23, "Minority Population means any readily identifiable group of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, and if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans)... Low-Income Population means any readily identifiable group of low-income persons who live in geographic proximity, and, if circumstances warrant, geographically dispersed/transient persons (such as migrant workers or Native Americans)..."

To determine the potential for impacts to low-income and minority populations, it is necessary to take into account the context of the affected neighborhoods. For the proposed project, the project area neighborhoods consist of those areas in the project area within Census Tracts 10, 11, 13, 15 and 82, as defined by the 2000 US Census. All of these Census Tracts are located within the City of Newark. Therefore, the project neighborhoods (based on US Census Tract data) have been analyzed in comparison to the City of Newark. Section 1.2 of this report describes the character of the project study area, including discussion of residential neighborhoods, study area demographics, and community facilities present in the local community, while Section 2.1 discusses potential project-related impacts to the local community. Section 1.3 of this report discusses local business activity, and Section 2.2 outlines potential impacts to project area businesses. Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 identify mitigating measures that would be implemented to address potential impacts to the project area community.

To identify minority and low-income populations, data concerning race were obtained from the 2000 U.S. Census SF-1 files, while data concerning household income were obtained from the 1990 U.S. Census STF-3 files. The data were organized by census tract and were also used to characterize the City of Newark as a whole. These data are presented in Table V-1.

The project area census tracts can be characterized as having minority and low-income populations. All of the census tracts have non-white populations that exceed the percentage of the non-white population for the City of Newark. In addition, the census tracts exceed the percentage of persons of Hispanic origin for the City of Newark. On average, the project area census tracts, as compared to the City of Newark, have a higher percentage of persons with incomes below the poverty level. The Newark Housing Authority has indicated that none of the residents potentially displaced by the proposed project receive housing assistance. Further, conversations with residents attending the Public Information Center did not reveal a lack of mobility or need to remain close to

support services or places of employment within the project study area. On the contrary, residents living in the project corridor expressed a desire to relocate in view of perceived dangerous pedestrian traffic conditions along First Street.

Persons and businesses potentially affected by the proposed project were contacted and provided the opportunity to comment, as described in Section VI of this document.

## **2. Impacts**

### **2.1 Determination of Disproportionate Impacts on Minority and Low-Income Populations**

The proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts to minority or low-income residents or businesses within the project study area. Specifically, although the proposed project will require the acquisition of eleven occupied residential properties and one commercial property with three businesses, these acquisitions are not considered to be a significant adverse impact to the local community. Affected residents can be readily relocated within the City of Newark, likely within the immediately surrounding neighborhoods. In fact, residents along First Street indicated during the Public Information Center (PIC) that current traffic conditions contribute to a reduction in their quality of life. A summary of the comments received at the PIC is provided in Appendix C. Specifically, the factors that were noted were high traffic volumes throughout the day, speeding vehicles, and concerns about pedestrian safety. The businesses to be acquired and displaced are not large employers and their functions and services can be readily relocated to other parts of the project area in adjacent neighborhoods. Three of the business owners present at the PIC have since closed their operations. Project-related impacts to community facilities (two churches) are also not considered to be significant. The Haitian Baptist Church has already identified a new location in East Orange, and is seeking assistance from the NJDOT in their relocation effort. The Supernatural Deliverance Tabernacle Church has previously indicated a preference to remain within the Roseville community in view of their continuing community programs. The proposed project is also not expected to result in any significant adverse noise or air quality impacts within the limits of the project area or nearby neighborhoods.

The proposed project will result in beneficial impacts to minority and low-income population groups in the project area. The project will provide improved transportation facilities through the widening of the First Street corridor, the provision of improved pedestrian and bikeway facilities and services, and an enhancement of streetscape aesthetics within the project corridor, all of which serve the low-income and minority populations that reside or work in the project area and adjacent neighborhoods. The principal intent of the project is to eliminate the existing traffic congestion conditions experienced within the project corridor, especially during the peak travel hours, and to eliminate unsafe traffic conditions.

Further, two other alternatives that meet the project needs would result in greater impacts to minority and low-income populations within the project study area. For instance, if First Street were to be widened along the east side of the right-of-way, at least seven

businesses employing about 170 employees would be displaced. Most of the employees at these businesses reside in Newark or adjacent communities. The other alternative (the “West-East Shift Alternative” - see Section VI, F.3) would displace three businesses with 53 employees. Either an east side widening or the east-west shift alignment would displace the Newark Checkers Restaurant. This restaurant bolsters the entire New Jersey Metro Burger franchise of Checkers, and its loss would place an additional 282 jobs throughout the State at risk. Some of the alternatives (see Table VI-1) would result in severe impacts to community cohesion.

In conclusion, the proposed project will not result in any significant adverse impacts that will disproportionately affect low-income or minority populations. A summary of project impacts related to minority and low-income populations is presented in Table V-3.

**Table V-3  
Summary of Project Impacts  
University Heights Connector**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Proposed Action</b>	<b>Result/Comments</b>
Properties acquired	23	48 percent of lots are publicly-owned.
Dwelling units displaced	26	Ten structures.
Residents displaced	73	Residents can be relocated within the area.
Community facilities displaced	2	Both churches are willing to relocate.
Businesses displaced	3	Three sole proprietors.
Employment displaced	8	Minimal loss of local employment..
Assessed valuation of acquired properties	\$188,100	Low acquisition cost.
Municipal tax Revenue loss	\$17,775	Small loss of municipal tax revenues.
Ability to relocate businesses	Feasible	Per local realtors.
Ability to relocate residents	Feasible	Per local realtors.
Demolition impacts and cost	Smaller frame buildings	Low site preparation cost.

## **C. Air Quality**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

In order to obtain federal funding for a highway project, it must be demonstrated that the project conforms to an approved Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The purpose of the STIP is to provide a plan for the attainment, maintenance, and enforcement of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for each state. The air quality analysis performed for this project provides validation of STIP conformity and adheres to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Carbon monoxide (CO) by volume is the most prominent mobile-source pollutant. When assessing the impact of a particular transportation-related project, a CO analysis is the best indicator. The focus of this air quality assessment is micro-scale impacts, i.e., impacts to localized areas immediately adjacent to the roadway.

The microscale analysis centered on a review of signalized intersections that will experience changes in traffic volume and alignment due to the project. An intersection analysis approach was used since ambient levels of CO are prone to be highest near locations where vehicles tend to accumulate, slow down, and idle for a period of time.

The following are the scenarios and years evaluated in the air quality analysis:

- 2025 “No-Build” conditions; and
- 2025 “Design Year” conditions.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) MOB5a\_h emissions model, as enhanced by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), and the USEPA approved CAL3QHC air dispersal model were used to perform the air quality analysis. Coordination and consultation with federal and state agencies is an essential part of the air quality evaluation process.

### **1.1 Existing Air Quality**

The USEPA defines ambient air in CFR 40, Part 50, as “that portion of the atmosphere, external to buildings, to which the general public has access.” In compliance with the Clean Air Act (CAA) and the Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990, the USEPA has promulgated ambient air quality standards and regulations. The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) were enacted for the protection of the public health and welfare. To date, the USEPA has issued NAAQS for pollutants that include: carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), particulates with a diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb). Areas that do not meet NAAQS are called non-attainment areas.

There are two types of NAAQS: primary and secondary. Primary standards are designed to protect the public health with an adequate margin of safety. Secondary standards are designed to protect public welfare from any known or anticipated adverse effects of a pollutant, e.g., soiling, vegetation damage, or material corrosion.

Under the CAA and the CAAA, state and local air pollution control agencies have the authority to adopt and enforce ambient air quality standards (AAQS) more stringent than the NAAQS. In addition to the NAAQS, the State of New Jersey has adopted AAQS that specify maximum permissible short-term and long-term concentrations of various contaminants (New Jersey Administrative Code Title 7, Chapter 27, Subchapter 13 – Ambient Air Quality Standards). These standards are generally the same as the NAAQS for criteria pollutants. However, while the national standard for total suspended



particulates (TSP) has been replaced by standards for particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) and particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), New Jersey retains its standards for TSP. The New Jersey and National standards for air quality are presented in Table V-4.

Although the USEPA has the ultimate responsibility for protecting ambient air quality, state and local governments have primary responsibility for air pollution prevention and control. The CAAA require states to submit a STIP describing how they will attain and maintain air quality standards in non-attainment areas. The STIP must be approved by USEPA for each non-attainment criteria pollutant. The NJDEP is responsible for implementing New Jersey's STIP. In order for projects to comply with the CAA and the CAAA, they must conform to the attainment plans documented in the STIP.

The proposed project is located in Essex County, New Jersey, which is classified by the USEPA (40 CFR, Part 81) as a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide and for ozone.

**Table V-4  
New Jersey and National Ambient Air Quality Standards**

<b>Pollutant</b>	<b>Averaging Period</b>	<b>New Jersey Primary</b>	<b>New Jersey Secondary</b>	<b>National Primary</b>	<b>National Secondary</b>
Carbon Monoxide	8-hour	10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (9.0 ppm)	10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (9.0 ppm)	10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (9.0 ppm)	10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (9.0 ppm)
	1-hour	40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (35.0 ppm)	40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (35.0 ppm)	40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (35.0 ppm)	40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> (35.0 ppm)
Ozone	8 hour	0.12 ppm	0.08 ppm	0.12 ppm	0.12 ppm
	1 hour	-	-	0.08 ppm	0.08 ppm
Nitrogen Dioxide	1 year	0.05 ppm (100.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.05 ppm (100.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.053 ppm (100.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.053 ppm (100.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )
Lead	3 months	1.5 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	1.5 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	1.5 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	1.5 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )
Sulfur Dioxide	1-year	0.03 ppm (80.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.02 ppm (60.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.03 ppm (80.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	-
	24 hour	0.14 ppm (365.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.10 ppm (260.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	0.14 ppm (365.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	-
	3 hour	-	0.50 ppm (1300 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	-	0.50 ppm (1300 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )
Total Suspended Particulates	1 year	75.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	60.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	-	-
	24 hour	260.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	150.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	-	-
Inhalable Particulates (PM-10)	1 year	-	-	50.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	50.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>
	24 hour	-	-	150.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	150.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>
Inhalable Particulates (PM-2.5)	1 year	-	-	15.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	15.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>
	24 hour	-	-	65.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>	65.0 ug/m <sup>3</sup>

Source: New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, 2000

## 2. Impacts

### 2.1 Modeling Results

The proposed improvements to First Street, which include widening, signalization, and signal enhancements, were assumed and have been incorporated into the air quality modeling analysis. Modeling techniques were performed to generate carbon monoxide concentrations at critical intersections, which are comprised of intersections projected to possess a Level of Service (LOS) D, E or F in the design year. Due to the predicted 2025 “Design Year” LOS, computer modeling was required at the First Street intersections with West Market Street, Central Avenue, and Dickerson Street. Table V-5 lists the peak concentration at each critical intersection, the peak traffic period, and the location of the receptor.

**Table V-5  
Peak One-hour and Eight-hour “Design Year” CO Concentrations (ppm)**

<b>Intersection (Receptor Location)</b>	<b>Peak Concentration (one-hour/eight-hour)</b>	<b>Peak Period</b>
First and West Market Streets (southbound approach leg)	11.0 / 7.7	AM
First Street and Central Avenue (northbound approach leg)	10.2 / 7.1	PM
First and Dickerson Streets (northbound approach leg)	9.5 / 6.7	PM

Source: Air Quality Technical Environmental Study, Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc., Dec. 2001.

One-hour standard = 35ppm

Eight-hour standard = 9 ppm

The carbon monoxide modeling analysis for the intersection of First and Market Streets, documented the highest AM concentration of 11.0 ppm (one-hour) and 7.7 ppm (eight-hour) at the southbound approach. The concentration at this sidewalk receptor is predicted to be a result of the roadway network and the adjacent approach leg LOS “E”.

Carbon monoxide concentrations are predicted to peak during PM traffic periods at First Street and Central Avenue. The highest concentration documented at this intersection occurred at the receptor located adjacent to the northbound approach leg. Peak carbon monoxide concentrations of 10.2 ppm (one-hour) and 7.1 ppm (eight-hour) were predicted.

Improvements proposed to the intersection of First and Dickerson Streets include a new signal. The highest concentration at this intersection is predicted along the northbound approach. The overall LOS during PM traffic periods is listed as “E”, although the northbound approach is proposed to operate at a LOS “F.” A peak one-hour concentration of 9.5 ppm and a peak eight-hour concentration of 6.7 ppm were predicted.

All one-hour concentrations were predicted to be below the 35 ppm standard. In addition, all eight-hour concentrations were predicted to be below the 9 ppm standard. As a result, the proposed project does not cause or contribute any new violation of any

standard, does not increase the frequency or severity of any existing violation of any standard, and does not delay the timely attainment of any standard or any required interim emission reductions or other milestones. Therefore, the proposed project conforms to the governing STIP and in turn conforms to the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

## **2.2 Construction Impacts**

Demolition/construction-related activities can result in short-term impacts to ambient air quality. These impacts are typically related to fugitive dust emissions in and around the site as a result of demolition/construction operations. Other potential air quality impacts from these activities are usually insignificant when equipment is well maintained and operated in well-ventilated areas. The potential for impacts will be short-term, occurring only while demolition or construction work is in progress and local conditions are appropriate.

Fugitive dust emissions typically occur during building demolition, ground-clearing, site preparation, grading, stockpiling of materials, on-site movement of equipment, and material transportation. Fugitive dust emissions are greatest during dry periods, during periods of intense construction activity, and under high wind conditions.

Impacts resulting from traffic disruptions during this period (i.e., decreased roadway capacity) could degrade air quality in the surrounding environs. Traffic disruptions would be greatest at intersections, leading to increased queuing and air quality emissions.

## **2.3 Conformity Determination**

The USEPA promulgated the Transportation Conformity Rules (TCR) under the Clean Air Act Amendments, effective on December 27, 1993. The TCR provides criteria for determining conformity to the STIP of transportation plans, programs, and projects that are developed, funded, or approved under Title 23 USC of the Federal Transit Act. The proposed project is located in an ozone non-attainment area; therefore, a conformity determination is required. The conformity requirements are as follows:

- The project must originate from a conforming transportation program (TIP);
- A transportation project that is not from a conforming TIP must contribute to emissions reductions in ozone and CO non-attainment areas; and
- In CO non-attainment areas, the project must eliminate or reduce the severity and number of violations of the NAAQS for CO.

Transportation projects that originate from a Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) are considered to conform to the rule. The University Heights Connector project is listed on page 8 in Section II of the FY 2002-2004 STIP and on page 3 (DBNUM 824A) of the Northern New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority's Transportation Improvement Plan for FY 2001-2003.

The results of CO analysis suggest that CO levels will be below the one-hour (35 ppm) and eight-hour (9 ppm) NAAQS. Therefore, the proposed project conforms to the goals set forth in the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 and the Final Conformity Rule.

### **3. Mitigation**

Mitigation measures to limit particulate emissions during demolition and construction activities include the following:

- Use, where possible, of water or chemicals for dust control in demolition of existing buildings or structures, construction operations, grading of roads, or clearing of land;
- Application of asphalt, oil, water, or suitable chemicals on dirt roads, materials, stockpiles and other surfaces that can give rise to airborne dust;
- Covering, at all times when in motion, open-bodied trucks transporting materials likely to give rise to airborne dust; and
- The prompt removal of earth or other natural materials from paved streets onto which earth or other materials have been deposited.

The potential for fugitive dust emissions from these activities would cease once barren earth is restored by landscaping. Mitigation measures to minimize traffic disruptions during construction will consist primarily of reducing construction traffic during peak-hour periods. This would minimize pollutant emissions during high congestion periods, hence lowering the risk of potential impacts.

## **D. Noise**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

Noise is basically defined as unwanted sound. It is emitted from many sources including airplanes, factories, railroads, power generation plants, and highway vehicles. Highway noise, or traffic noise, is usually a composite of noises from engine exhaust and tire-roadway interaction.

The magnitude of noise is usually described in terms of sound pressure. Since the range of sound pressure varies greatly, a logarithmic scale is used to relate sound pressure to some common reference level, usually the decibel (dB). Sound pressures described in decibels are called sound pressure levels, and are commonly defined in terms of frequency-weighted scales (A or C).

The A-weighted decibel scale is used almost exclusively in vehicle noise measurements because it reflects the frequency range to which the human ear is most sensitive (1,000 to 6,000 Hertz). Sound levels measured using an A-weighted decibel scale are generally expressed as dBA. Throughout this discussion, all noise levels are expressed in dBAs. Several examples of noise pressure levels in dBA are listed in Table V-6.

**Table V-6**  
**Examples of Common Sounds**  
**A-weighted Sound Level in Decibels (dBA)**

EXAMPLES	dBA	SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS
Near jet engine	140	Deafening
Threshold of pain	130	
Threshold of feeling	120	
Accelerating motorcycle a few feet away	110	
Loud auto horn at 10 feet	100	Very Loud
Noisy urban street	90	
School cafeteria full of students	80	
Near freeway auto traffic	70	Loud
Average conversation	60	
Average office	50	Moderate
Soft radio music in apartment	40	
Average residential home	30	Faint
Average whisper	20	
Rustle of leaves in wind	10	Very faint
Threshold of Audibility	0	

Source: Concepts of Architectural Acoustics, David Egan, McGraw Hill, 1972.

Table V-6 indicates that most individuals in urbanized areas are exposed to fairly high noise levels from many sources as they go about their daily activities. The degree of disturbance or annoyance of unwanted sound depends essentially on three factors:

- The amount and nature of the intruding noise;
- The relationship between background noise and the intruding noise; and
- The type of activity occurring where the noise is heard.

In considering the first of these factors, i.e., amount and nature of the intruding noise, it is important to note that individuals have different sensitivity to noise. Loud noises bother some more than others and some patterns of noise also enter into an individual's judgment of whether or not a noise is offensive. For example, noises occurring during sleeping hours are usually considered to be more of a nuisance than the same noises in the daytime.

With regard to the second factor, i.e., the relationship between background noise and the intruding noise, individuals tend to judge the annoyance of an unwanted noise in terms of its relationship to noise from other sources (background noise). For instance, the blowing of a car horn at night when background noise levels are typically about 45 dBA would generally be more objectionable than the blowing of a car horn in the afternoon when background noises are likely to be 60 dBA or higher.

The third factor, i.e., the type of activity occurring where the noise is heard, is related to the interference of noises with activities of individuals. In a 60 dBA environment, normal work activities requiring high levels of concentration may be interrupted by loud noises, while activities requiring manual effort may not be interrupted to the same degree.

Since sound is described in logarithmic scale, i.e., dB, sound levels cannot be added by ordinary arithmetic means. In fact, a doubling of the noise source produces only a 3 dB increase in the sound pressure (noise) level. Studies have shown that this increase is barely perceptible to the human ear, whereas a change of 5dB is readily perceptible. As a general rule, an increase or decrease of 10dB in noise level is perceived by an observer to be a doubling of halving of the sound, respectively.

Attempts have been made to regulate many of these types of noises including airplane noise, factory noise, railroad noise, and highway traffic noise. In relation to highway traffic noise, methods of analysis and control have been developed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and adapted by the New Jersey Department of Transportation, which are described below.

### **1.1 Existing Sound Levels**

Existing noise levels were monitored in May 2000, utilizing several noise level meters at five exterior locations within the project study area. Noise monitoring occurred during peak AM and PM noise periods. Noise monitoring locations were focused on First Street with one location on Hartford Street. As part of the proposed project, Hartford Street will be closed at the First/West Market/Bergen intersection. Therefore, to document any change in noise levels this closure may produce, noise monitoring was necessary.

After validation of the noise level prediction model, additional receptors representing sensitive land use within the project study area were modeled. Each leg of the roadway network was field verified for identification of sensitive receptors. The majority of the project study area consists of single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings. There are many commercial/light industrial establishments, a few with residences on the upper floors. Existing traffic volumes for each peak hour were input to the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) version 1.0b.

It is important to note that existing noise levels peak in correlation to the traffic peak in the AM. However, in the PM, peak noise was documented from 3:00-4:00, almost one hour prior to the afternoon traffic peak (4:00-5:00 PM). Preliminary twenty-four (24) noise monitoring indicates that noise levels decrease after 4:00 PM. This reduction is due to traffic congestion, forced lower speeds, and thus lower noise levels throughout First Street. Noise modeling for future conditions focused on these peak noise hours.

Two new dwellings have been constructed along northbound First Street, between Central Avenue and Dickerson Street, and building permits have been filed for one additional residence at this location.

The FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria are defined in Table V-7. Fifteen residential dwellings (single, two and multi-family units) and two churches are predicted to possess 2000 existing noise levels that approach or exceed the Category B Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) of 67 dBA. Ten commercial/light industrial establishments are predicted to possess noise levels that approach or exceed the Category C Noise Abatement Criteria of 72 dBA. The modeling analysis also indicates there are two buildings with upper floor apartments that approach or exceed the Category B NAC.

The northern project limit begins at Sussex Avenue. The Newark Christian School, located just north of Sussex Avenue and outside the project limits, has existing interior noise levels that approach the Category E NAC of 52 dBA.

## **2. Impacts**

### **2.1 Methodology**

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has established noise abatement criteria based on noise sensitivity of various land uses for motor vehicle noise on roadways constructed with federal funds. The FHWA indicates that noise impacts occur when sound levels approach or exceed the noise abatement criteria, or when there is a substantial increase in sound levels over existing conditions. The FHWA noise abatement criterion for Category B land uses, including residences, is 67 dBA. Noise levels that approach that criterion are defined by FHWA and adopted by the NJDOT as occurring at one (1) dBA less than the criteria levels, or 66 dBA for Category B uses. Substantial increase refers to the net increase in sound levels from existing conditions to that predicted for the design year at the same location and is defined by the NJDOT to be ten (10) decibels or higher.

Information utilized for noise level prediction for the University Heights Connector project study area includes:

- Design plans, profiles and topographic maps;
- Projected traffic volumes, vehicular classification percentages, directional distributions and speeds;
- Information on land use obtained from scale plans, tax maps and on-site observations; and
- Noise measurement study and modeling analysis to describe existing noise levels.

Federal regulations (23 CFR 772) specify that  $L_{Aeq}$  or  $L_{10}$  noise levels are to be calculated for developed land uses and proposed land use developments that are planned, designed and programmed. These calculations were performed using the Traffic Noise Model (TNM) Version 1.0b, which is capable of predicting noise levels due to stop-and-go and cruise-speed vehicles. In conjunction with these methodologies, the FHWA Noise Barrier Cost Reduction procedure (BCR) was applied. The 2025 “Design Year” noise levels were compared to existing (pre-construction) noise levels and overall NAC levels to determine the project-related impacts.

## **2.2 No-Build Alternative**

2025 “No-Build” conditions, during AM and PM peak periods, were modeled utilizing traffic projections reflected in the “Traffic Operations Report for the University Heights Connector” prepared by Parsons Transportation Group, dated January 2001. The analysis indicates twenty residential structures (single, two and multi-family units) and two churches are predicted to approach or exceed the Category B NAC. Under 2025 “No-Build” conditions, fourteen commercial/light industrial establishments are estimated to approach or exceed the Category C NAC. In addition, upper floor apartments located over commercial establishments exceed the Category B NAC at two locations.

All noise monitoring locations, during 2025 “No-Build” conditions were predicted to increase noise levels by one dBA over existing conditions. One exception was receptor location # 5 (Hartford Street). This receptor was located more than a block east of First Street, across from the Bethany Christian School. Noise levels increased from 61 (Existing) to 63 dBA  $L_{Aeq}$  in the 2025 “No-Build” condition.

## **2.3 Build Alternative**

There are two ways of assessing the noise impact of a proposed project. The first is to identify all receptor locations possessing “Design Year” noise levels that approach or exceed the NAC (see Table V-7). The term “approach” is defined as one (1) dBA less than the NAC. The second impact criterion includes an assessment of changes in existing noise levels over future “Design Year” levels. Changes of 10 dBA or greater, even though the impact criteria level is not reached, are considered significant impacts.

The alignment of First Street is proposed to shift predominately to the west. A total of eleven residential acquisitions are proposed. Ten residential acquisitions are proposed along the west and one to the east. Two churches and one commercial property will also be acquired. Computer modeling was performed to represent 2025 “Design Year” conditions. Traffic volumes representative of 2025 “Build” conditions were obtained from the “Traffic Operations Report” prepared by Parsons Transportation Group. The 2025 “Design” 66-dBA noise contour is displayed on Figure V-5.



Insert Table V-7

Insert Figure V-5

Seven residential dwellings (single, two and multi-family units) are predicted to possess future “Design Year” noise levels that approach or exceed the Category B NAC. Six of the seven impacted residential dwellings were built in 2000 and 2001. Thirteen commercial/light industrial establishments approach or exceed the Category C NAC within the project study area. Two buildings that include ground-level commercial establishments but upper level apartments possess noise levels that exceed the Category B NAC. These apartments exceeded the NAC under existing and 2025 “No-Build” conditions as well. Table V-8 summarizes the 2025 “Design Year” impacts.

**Table V-8  
Summary of Impacts  
2025 “Design Year”**

Land Use Descriptions	Number of Impacts
Residential Structures	7
Commercial/Light Industrial	13
Upper Floor Apartments	2

Source: Noise Technical Environmental Study, Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc., December 2001.

Hartford Street will be closed at the First/West Market Street intersection. Therefore, some through traffic will be eliminated on Hartford Street. Receptor location #5, which is directly across from the Bethany Christian School, is predicted to possess peak 2025 “Build” noise levels of 62 dBA ( $L_{Aeq}$ ). This is a decrease of one dBA from 2025 “No-Build” conditions and an increase of one dBA from 2000 existing conditions.

There are no receptor sites within the project limits that are predicted to result in a substantial increase (10 dBA) over existing sound levels. The predicted noise level increase at each of the monitoring locations is shown in Table V-9.

The noise levels obtained at the Newark Christian School, located just outside the northern project limits documented existing noise levels that approach the Category E NAC. The building is currently not air-conditioned and has single-pane windows.

Table V-10 presents a comparison of the number of receptors with noise impacts for the 2000 existing, 2025 No-Build, and 2025 Design Year scenarios.

**Table V-9**  
**Existing, “No-Build” and “Design Year” Noise Level Comparison**  
**(dBA L<sub>Aeq</sub>)**

<b>Receptor Location</b>	<b>2000 Existing</b>	<b>2025 “No-Build”</b>	<b>2025 “Design Year”</b>	<b>Existing to “Design Year” Change in Noise Levels</b>
#1 – Southbound First Street (between Sussex & Dickerson)	67	68	69	+2.0
#2 – Southbound First Street (between Dickerson & Central)	63	64	65	+2.0
#3 – Northbound First Street (between New & Central)	75	76	73	-2.0
#4 – Southbound First Street (between New & W. Market)	66	67	68	+2.0
#5 – Westbound Hartford Street (between Morris & Hudson)	61	63	62	+1.0

Source: Noise Technical Environmental Study, Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc., December 2001.

**Table V-10**  
**Comparison of Impacts**  
**2025 “Design Year”**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Impacts 2000 Existing</b>	<b>Number of Impacts 2025 “No-Build”</b>	<b>Number of Impacts 2025 “Design Year”</b>
Residential Structures	15	20	7
Churches	2	2	0
Commercial/Light Industrial	10	14	13
Upper Floor Apartments	2	2	2

Source: Noise Technical Environmental Study, Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc., December 2001.

## **2.4 Construction Noise**

Under the Build Alternative, temporary increases in noise levels will occur during construction. Noise levels due to construction, although temporary, may impact areas adjacent to the project. Overall, construction activities along the project corridor should have a short-term noise impact on sensitive receptors in the immediate vicinity of the construction site. The extent of the construction-associated noise impact depends on the nature of the roadway segment, the construction schedule, and noise characteristics of the construction equipment. These impacts are not expected to be significant and would be limited to areas in close proximity to the construction area.

## **3. Mitigation**

Noise abatement strategies are designed to provide substantial sound level reductions. Such mitigation provides no guarantee that traffic noise levels will not exceed FHWA noise criteria at certain times, under certain circumstances; nor does the proposed

mitigation protect a receptor from noise disturbances originating from other ambient noise sources such as overhead aircraft and local street traffic.

The FHWA recognizes five methods of noise mitigating treatments for reduction of highway traffic noise at an impacted receptor. The following is a list of possible abatement strategies for mitigating traffic noise impacts:

- Traffic management;
- Roadway alignment alterations;
- Property acquisition to create a buffer zone between source and receptor;
- Installation of noise barriers within the right-of-way; and
- Noise insulation of public use buildings.

The above treatments are evaluated using a number of criteria including public input, safety, and aesthetics, as well as noise abatement potential, implementation cost, and logistical factors.

### **3.1 Traffic Management**

Alternate traffic routing schemes and prohibiting specific types of vehicles from using First Street would be considered a traffic management strategy. First Street, via Route I-280, is a necessary route for vehicles to Newark. Applying restrictions would be contradictory to the purpose of the proposed project.

### **3.2 Roadway Alignment Alterations**

A number of structure acquisitions have been proposed as part of this project. Due to the chosen alignment, remaining structures to the west of the proposed project are predicted to yield higher noise levels. Designing the roadway so that there is a greater buffer zone between the roadway and receptor may yield lower noise levels. However, this method of noise mitigation is not considered feasible due to the urban character of the area in which the proposed project is located, the location of sensitive receptors on both sides of the streets, and the number of acquisitions that have been proposed.

### **3.3 Property Acquisition**

As part of this project, First Street will be widened from its original geometry. In doing so, thirteen structures along the west, and one structure along the east will be acquired. The remainder of the project study area is developed and obtaining additional buffer zones would be impractical.

### **3.4 Noise Barriers**

Noise barriers are an effective means of mitigating noise impacts adjacent to roadways. In this instance, a series of breaks in a noise wall would be necessary for access to local streets and driveways. As a result, noise barriers would not be a practical means of noise mitigation for this project.

### **3.5 Sound Proofing**

Specific public use facilities and buildings can be insulated to mitigate noise impacts. No such buildings occur within the project limits.

All of the above potential noise mitigation measures were deemed ineffective in reducing noise levels within the project corridor.

### **3.6 Construction Noise**

The standards noise specifications (Standard Specifications for Construction Noise Mitigation) as contained in Section 107.28(b) of the 1989 NJDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction will be incorporated into the project's construction documents. These include:

- All construction equipment powered by an internal combustion engine shall be equipped with a properly maintained muffler.
- Air compressors shall meet current USEPA noise emission exhaust standards.
- Air powered equipment shall be fitted with pneumatic exhaust silencers.
- Stationary equipment powered by an internal combustion engine shall not be operated within 150 feet of noise sensitive areas without portable noise barriers placed between the equipment and noise sensitive sites. Noise sensitive sites shall include: residential buildings, schools, and churches. Portable noise barriers shall be constructed of plywood or tongue-and-groove boards with a noise absorbent treatment on the interior surface (facing the equipment).
- Powered construction equipment shall not be operated before 8:00 am or after 8:00 pm within 150 feet of a noise sensitive site.

## **E. Ecology**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

#### **1.1 Geology, Soils and Groundwater**

##### **1.1.1 Geology**

The proposed project lies within the Piedmont physiographic province. The bedrock geology of Piedmont deposits in New Jersey is related to sedimentation in the Newark Basin, a northeast-trending structural trough that was created by crustal deformation associated with the opening of the Atlantic Ocean Basin.

The bedrock underlying the proposed project alignment consists of Upper Triassic and Lower Jurassic rocks of the Passaic Formation, the oldest unit of the Brunswick Group. This formation was formerly considered part of the Brunswick Formation, a rock unit term no longer used. Regionally, it consists of sandstones, siltstones, shales, and conglomerates deposited by stream and lake processes within the Newark Basin. These rocks were subsequently folded, fractured, jointed, intruded and tilted, and overlain with lava flows and post-Jurassic sediment.

Bedrock in the project area is the reddish-brown to brownish-red, massive silty to sandy mudstone and siltstone unit of the Passaic Formation (Parker, 1993; Drake and others, 1996). Bedrock is overlain with continuous and unconsolidated Late Wisconsin glacial and modern fill (Stanford, 1988b; Stanford et. al., 1990). The thickness of this overburden of glacial and modern fill decreases to the west.

There are no geologic resources in the project corridor (e.g., minerals) that will be impacted. A constraint placed upon the project throughout the project area due to geologic properties is the ability of the underlying substrate to provide pavement support.

The geologic parameters of the disturbed and underlying units relevant to structure and pavement support will be examined during the development of design and construction plans to ensure that structural integrity of the completed roadway is not compromised. There are no potential impacts that require mitigation measures.

##### **1.1.2 Soils**

Ground and soil cover in the project area is urban land consisting of fill material and impervious surfaces. Natural soils underlying the project area consist of gravelly loams derived from the glacial overburden. Surface soils are mapped as Urban Land-Boonton Wethersfield Association (USDA-SCS, 1993). Urban Land, areas where more than 80 of the ground cover is impervious, occurs most frequently. This association consists of well drained and moderately well drained, very deep and deep gravelly loams. These soils are non-hydric and belong to hydrologic group C (slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted and slow rate of water transmission).

U.S. Department of Agriculture has no soil survey for Essex County that would provide detailed data (e.g., depth to seasonal high water table and acid properties) or note soil conditions requiring special erosion and sedimentation control measures. Site-specific investigations are necessary to obtain these data. The Engineering Soil Survey for Essex County states that soils within the project area are fair to good for pavement support.

Soils exposed to erosion during construction activities, or fill materials exposed during fill placement, may be eroded and potentially transported to nearby waterways by storm sewers. The construction-period soils erosion/sedimentation and stormwater management plans developed for the proposed project will include measures designed to prevent erosion and sedimentation to these waters.

### 1.1.3 Groundwater

Groundwater occurs in both fractures bedrock and in the unconsolidated overburden. The fractured Passaic Formation is the major source of groundwater in Essex County. The Passaic Formation is characterized by very low primary porosity and permeability, and thus, has limited flow and storage capacity except for discrete water bearing zones of connected features. However, secondary porosity and permeability have developed through fracturing.

In Essex County, the highest yielding wells tapping water-bearing zones within fractured bedrock are generally between 300 and 400 feet deep. There are no potable wells in the vicinity of Newark. All drinking water comes from Passaic County reservoirs.

Groundwater in the overburden of glacial and modern fill is recharged by direct precipitation and from nearby bedrock aquifers. Coarse-grained overburden has a greater capacity to store and transmit groundwater than fractured bedrock. Bedrock wells in area overlain with several feet of unconsolidated sand and gravel tend to have greater yields due to greater infiltration, less surface runoff, and thus, greater recharge.

Groundwater in the Passaic Formation and overburden is Class II-A, with the primary designated water use of providing potable water supply with conventional treatment at its current water quality (New Jersey Groundwater Standards, N.J.A.C. 7:9-6; revised February 1993). Secondary designated uses are agricultural and industrial water. The project corridor does not lie within a USEPA designated Sole Source Aquifer. Groundwater quality in the Newark area is poor due to anthropogenic contaminants.

There will be no adverse impacts to groundwater resources and wells from the infiltration of highway stormwater runoff because changes to the area of impervious surfaces will be too small to affect the quality of runoff, as discussed below. The area of pervious surfaces that may be replaced with impervious surfaces will be small. Any loss in recharge area at the project site will have little impact to the overall recharge to the Passaic Formation aquifer system that extends over a wide region encompassed by numerous counties.



## **1.2 Surface Water**

### **1.2.1 Surface Water Quality**

Federal Highway Administration research on pollution from highway stormwater runoff shows that pollutant loadings are not dependent on average daily traffic (ADT) (FHWA, 1990). It was concluded that ADT should only be used to distinguish between urban and rural highways. The key factor in highway runoff pollutant loadings is impervious surface area.

Changes in impervious surface areas as a result of the proposed improvements will be too small to affect the content of pollutants in stormwater runoff from the build-up of pollutants or deicing chemicals on the roadway surface. Thus, the proposed improvements will not affect the water quality of nearby waterways to which stormwater runoff is conveyed and discharged by storm sewers.

No mitigation measures to address stormwater runoff after completion of the project other than connecting to the existing stormwater sewer system will be necessary. In addition, the soil and sediment control plans developed for this project will minimize sedimentation to nearby waterways and prevent water quality impacts during construction.

### **1.2.2 Hydrology and Floodplains**

The nearest surface water body, Branch Brook Park Lake, is located outside of the project area. Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) maps show there are no 100-year or 500-year floodplains in the project area. The proposed project will not impact surface water hydrology and will not encroach onto floodplains. Mitigation measures will not be needed.

## **1.3 Vegetation**

### **1.3.1 Uplands**

Vegetation within the project area is typical of an urban area, primarily consisting of mowed turf and shade trees. Shade trees are present along several streets in the project area. The predominant species is London Plane Tree (*Platanus*) although other species such as Silver Maple (*Acer saccharium*), Norway Maple (*Acer platanoides*), and Elm (*Ulmus*) are present.

Clearing of upland vegetation during construction will result in impacts that occur by cut and fill for the road, including removal and trampling of vegetation, creation of ruts, sedimentation, and the depositing of construction debris. These impacts will be mitigated through cleanup and surface grading to re-establish vegetation as part of the landscaping plan. All street trees removed during construction will be replanted and the proposed project provides for a significant increase in landscaped areas.

### 1.3.2 Wetlands

The U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map and the NJDEP – Freshwater Wetlands Quarterquad Map of the project area indicate there are no wetlands present within the project study corridor. The absence of wetlands was confirmed by a field reconnaissance of the project area. As a result, the proposed project will not result in impacts to wetlands.

## 1.4 Wildlife

### 1.4.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Species

Disturbed and developed areas dominate the project area. Upland vegetation is limited to landscape and opportunistic species capable of adapting to disturbed environments. These vegetative communities most likely support populations of small mammals. Songbirds, such as sparrows and blackbirds, may also forage the area.

Potential impacts to wildlife as a result of the proposed project may be attributed to the alteration or elimination of habitat. The project may displace some species into adjacent habitat, but there are enough suitable adjacent habitats to absorb the displaced species.

There are no aquatic habitats in the project area, therefore, no aquatic species will be impacted at the project site. As previously discussed, the proposed improvements will not affect the quality of nearby waterways to which stormwater runoff is conveyed and discharged by storm sewers. Thus, the proposed project will not impact aquatic habitats or species within or outside the immediate construction site.

### 1.4.2 Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), except for an occasional transient bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) or peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), no federally listed or proposed endangered, threatened floral or faunal species are known to occur in the project area. According to the NJDEP, Division of Parks and Forestry, Office of Land Management, New Jersey Natural Heritage Program, there are no records of rare plants, animals or natural communities in the project area. The proposed project will not impact any rare, threatened, or endangered species.

## 2. Impacts

The proposed project will not have any significant adverse impacts to any ecological resources found within the project area.

## **F. Cultural Resources**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

Research was conducted to identify known historic and prehistoric archaeological sites in the project area, to determine the potential for archaeological remains to persist in the area of potential effect, to evaluate archaeological remains in the project area in terms of National Register of Historic Places eligibility, and to identify historic archaeological properties that might be affected by the project. Activities included background research, archaeological testing and property-specific documentary research, and an assessment of historic architectural resources in the project area. Detailed results in this research are presented in the technical studies prepared for archaeological and historic architectural resources that have been prepared separate to this Environmental Assessment. These technical studies are identified in Section VIII.

All work for this project was conducted in accordance with the instructions and intent of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended; Procedures for the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties (36 CFR 800); Guidelines for Archaeological Investigation” established by the Office of New Jersey Heritage; and, New Jersey Department of Transportation Scopes of Work for archaeological and historic architectural resources.

#### **1.1 Historic Architectural Resources**

The historic architectural evaluation conducted for the proposed project in August 2000 identified a total of 106 resources within the project’s area of potential effect. The project area is characterized as a mixed-use urban neighborhood comprised of late nineteenth and early twentieth century dwellings, stores, and industrial warehouses. Of the total 106 historic resources identified, approximately 66 are residential, 24 commercial, 8 are institutional, and the remaining 8 are industrial or former industrial resources. The residential resources are primarily two or three story frame dwellings, either single-family residences, multifamily flats, or apartments. In general, the historic resources in the project area are in fair condition, but exhibit a low degree of architectural integrity. Of the total number of historic architectural resources within the study area, 101 are deemed not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as they are neither historically or architecturally significant. In addition, there is a widespread loss of architectural integrity.

Five of the 106 resources evaluated meet the criteria for listing in the National Register: Tuck-It-Away Storage (former Whitehead and Hoag Factory at Block 1880, Lot 20); the Newark Christian School (Seymour/Essex County Vocational School at Block 1883 Lot 40), 34-50 Third Street; 394 New Street; and, 400-406 Central Avenue.

## **1.2 Archaeological Resources**

Based on the background research conducted for the project, 19 locations within the project area were considered to have potential for the persistence of archaeological resources (see Table V-11 and Figure V-6). These resources were considered to be most likely associated with domestic occupation and activities prior to inception of city water and sewer services and therefore, have the potential to include features such as privies and/or cisterns that, once they went out of use, were often the repositories for household refuse. After inspection, four of these properties were considered unlikely to have archaeological resources present based on observation of physical conditions that exist. Testing was not performed at four properties due to access limitations.

A follow-up program of Phase IB and Phase 2 archaeological testing, along with associated documentary research, was conducted during November-December 2000 and April-July 2001 to determine whether archaeological resources are present within the proposed improvements corridor.

Ten lots within the project corridor were tested during the Phase IB field program. Only eight of the ten lots that were targeted during the Phase 1B testing were accessible for Phase 2 testing. Seven of these were found to contain archaeological resources eligible for the National Register under Criterion D.

Seven lots still require either Phase 1B testing or completion of Phase 2 testing.

Insert Table V-11 PG 1

Insert Table V-11 PG 2

Insert Figure V-6

The archaeological features found during the Phase 2 testing potentially can yield data relating to a number of important issues. They can shed light on the culture(s) of a working class community in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century through the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and, within that context, on issues such as medicine, health and hygiene, ethnicity and national origin, social class, and the urban African-American experience. The material remains speak to these issues by addressing 1) household consumption, as reflected in the food remains and manufactured goods found in the deposits, and 2) house-lot infrastructure and its relationship to the provision of urban services such as water, sewerage, and garbage disposal. The significance of deposits within individual lots is substantially enhanced by the cumulative data the neighborhood as a whole can yield.

## **2. Impacts**

### **2.1 Historic Architecture**

Five of the 106 resources evaluated meet the criteria for listing in the National Register: Tuck-It-Away Storage (former Whitehead and Hoag Factory at Block 1880, Lot 20); the Newark Christian School (Seymour/Essex County Vocational School at Block 1883 Lot 40), 34-50 Third Street; 394 New Street; and, 400-406 Central Avenue. These resources were evaluated in light of the proposed improvements to First Street, and it was determined that the proposed project will have no effect on the Newark Christian School, 34-50 Third Street, and 394 New Street, and no adverse effect on Tuck-It-Away Storage. The Newark Christian School is located north of Sussex Avenue and far enough from the area of improvements that they would have no impact on this resource. Similarly, 34-50 Third Street, located two blocks west of the area of improvements and 394 New Street, located approximately one-half block east of the area of improvements, are sufficiently distant from the proposed project and will not be affected. Tuck-it-Away Storage is located adjacent to the area of improvements and would be visually impacted, but not to a degree that would be considered adverse. 400-406 Central Avenue will be acquired and demolished by the proposed project and, therefore, adversely affected. An Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation prepared for this historic architectural resource is provided in Section VI of this EA.

### **2.2 Archaeology**

Seven of the properties within the project corridor were found to contain archaeological resources eligible for the National Register under Criterion D. The properties found to contain eligible archaeological resources include the following:

- Block 1840, Lots 11 and 12;
- Block 1846, Lots 15 and 16; and
- Block 1879, Lots 1, 2 and 3.



The lots containing eligible resources are subject to project effects through the widening of First Street, with associated demolition and sidewalk and curb construction. The truncated properties will be leveled and may subsequently be made available for redevelopment. The archaeological resources would then be vulnerable to disturbance or destruction.

### **2.3 Section 106 Coordination**

Section 106 coordination with the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office has determined that there is one historic building within the project's area of potential effect that would be adversely affected by the proposed project (see Appendix G.)

## **3. Mitigation**

### **3.1 Historic Architectural Resources**

A narrative and photographic recordation process is recommended to mitigate the proposed demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue. The details of this mitigation measure will be described in a Memorandum of Agreement.

### **3.2 Archaeological Resources**

In order to mitigate potential adverse effects of the proposed project, a program of data recovery will be implemented in the rear yard areas of all lots within the project corridor that are found to contain archaeological resources meeting National Register (NR) evaluation criterion D. Although the widening of First Street itself will disturb only the front of each lot, subsequent sale and redevelopment of the lot remainders may lead to disturbances or destruction of the archaeological resources at the rear.

The scope of work for data recovery should also include additional documentary research to further identify the occupants by the remains and to better contextualize the households in time and place, as well as comparative research utilizing the results of analysis of other archaeological sites.

Further, the following properties, which were either not tested or inadequately tested due to access difficulties, should be addressed during later stages of the proposed project. A Memorandum of Agreement will be adopted that stipulates the scope of archaeological testing and the properties at which testing will be performed.

- Block 1840, Lots 13, 14 and 15;
- Block 1840, Lot 16 (Vreeland House);
- Block 1846, Lot 6 (pending hazardous materials assessment);
- Block 1879, Lot 8 (Hawley/Belluno House Site);
- Block 1879, Lot 5 (Redman/Wardell House Site); and
- Block 1879, Lot 6 (Overton/Van Houten House Site).

## **G. Hazardous Waste**

### **1. Existing Conditions**

A Preliminary Assessment (PA) report was prepared as a supporting document to this Environmental Assessment. The objective of the PA was to identify environmentally sensitive parcels within approximately 250 feet of the project corridor. The PA was performed in accordance with the latest NJDOT Procedures Manual guidelines.

The PA included a visual reconnaissance of the study area; a review of readily available Federal, State, and local regulatory records, an examination of historical information, and an evaluation of current and past operations and activities within the study area. The following sources of information were reviewed as part of the PA:

- Sanborn Fire Insurance Rate maps;
- City directories;
- Aerial photographs; and
- State and federal environmental databases, including the NJDEP State Hazardous Waste Program Site Listing, NJDEP Solid Waste Facility Directory, the NJDEP Bureau of Underground Storage Tank Listing, the NJDEP/BUST Enforcement Listing, National Priority List, CERCLIS Listing, RCRA Notifier's Listing, Orphan Sites,

Regulatory agencies directly contacted include the US EPA Region II, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), Essex County Health Department, Newark Health Department, Newark Construction Official's Office, and the Newark Fire Department.

Table V-12 lists eleven sites within the study area proposed for acquisition that were found to have the potential to be contaminated based on their historical and current use. An additional 18 properties located within the study area are not proposed for acquisition, but have the potential to impact the proposed project as a result of contaminant migration. Information regarding these properties is summarized in Table V-13.

Insert Table V-12

Insert Table V-13

## **2. Impacts**

There are eleven potentially contaminated properties within the proposed project right-of-way and eighteen nearby properties that are potentially contaminated and could impact the right-of-way. It is necessary to conduct further investigations to determine how to address these potentially contaminated properties.

## **3. Mitigation**

Based on the findings of the preliminary assessment, the following actions are recommended prior to the acquisition of properties necessary to implement the proposed project, or prior to construction, as noted below:

### **3.1 Geophysical survey**

Geophysical surveys are recommended prior to any construction or remedial activities in the area of sidewalks, parking lots, and open areas of properties to be acquired by NJDOT to determine the location of any subsurface anomalies, which may include underground storage tanks, septic tanks, and utilities.

### **3.2 Historical Use Subsurface Investigation**

Borings or test pits should be advanced on properties to be acquired by NJDOT that are listed above as having the potential to be contaminated based on historical or current industrial use. Samples should be collected and submitted for laboratory analysis. All sampling should be conducted in accordance with NJDEP Technical Requirements for Site Remediation (TRSR).

Sampling is not recommended for potentially contaminated properties within the project corridor that will not be acquired by NJDOT. However, sampling within the right-of-way adjacent to these properties should be conducted to determine whether historical activities have impacted the properties to be acquired or the proposed street right-of-way.

If laboratory analyses indicate the presence of subsurface soil contamination, groundwater sampling may be required pursuant to the TRSR.

### **3.3 Existing Underground Storage Tanks**

Borings should be conducted on properties to be acquired by NJDOT that are suspected to have an underground storage tank. Samples should be collected and submitted for laboratory analysis. All underground storage tanks should be closed in accordance with NJDEP and local regulations.

### **3.4 Further Actions Regarding Soil and Groundwater Contamination**

Based upon the findings of the Preliminary Assessment Report, and any additional information obtained from the recommended activities described above, remedial investigations, consisting of soil and groundwater sampling may be needed. Construction specifications and a remedial action workplan should be prepared to address any remedial activities that may be necessary. If necessary and appropriate, a soil reuse plan will be prepared for reuse of contaminated soil within the project right-of-way. Property Acquisition Environmental Cost Estimates should then be prepared for all properties to be acquired that exhibit environmental concerns. Once all remedial activities have been completed, a Remedial Action Report should be prepared.

### **3.5 Issues Concerning Asbestos and Lead**

Based on age, the existing structures to be acquired are likely to contain asbestos containing materials (ACM) and lead-based paint (LBP). These buildings should be inspected for ACM and LBP prior to demolition, and demolition should occur in accordance with federal and state laws.

## **H. Major Metropolitan Transportation Investment and Congestion Management System Requirements**

Under ISTEA, as defined in 450:320(b), of the Metropolitan Planning Regulations published in the Federal Register on October 28, 1993, federal funds may be programmed for the addition of general purpose lanes and capacity for single occupant vehicles in ozone and/or carbon monoxide non-attainment areas if the “project results from a Congestion Management System (CMS) meeting the requirements of 23 CFR 500, Subpart E.” While many mandatory aspects of the management systems have been removed by recent federal legislation, the congestion management requirements for projects that significantly enhance single occupancy vehicle capacity in air quality non-attainment areas have been left untouched.

On September 27,1999, the New Jersey Transportation Planning Agency (NJTPA) determined the proposed University Heights Connector project is a spot improvement of a classic bottleneck, and is therefore excluded from further study under the CMS requirements. Correspondence regarding this determination is provided in Appendix D.

## **I. Environmental Permits**

The proposed project will require the following environmental permits:

- Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Approval
- NJDEP and/or municipal underground storage tank closure permits or approvals.

## **VI. SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

## **VI. SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION**

### **A. Introduction**

A Section 4(f) Statement is prepared when a federally-funded or federally-administered transportation project proposes using land from a publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or historic site of national, state or local significance.

This Section 4(f) Statement has been prepared for the historic resource that would be directly impacted by the project proposed by the New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT) in Newark along First Street between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street, namely 400-406 Central Avenue, which has been deemed by the New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (United States Code, Title 49, Section 307), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and NJDOT may not approve the use of land from a publicly-owned park, recreation area or wildlife/waterfowl refuge, or any historic site, unless a determination is made that:

- There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the land from the property; and
- The proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use (23 CFR 771.135)

The word “use,” as is stated in this analysis occurs when:

- Land from a Section 4(f) property is acquired for a transportation project, referred to a “direct taking;” or
- The proximity impacts of the transportation project on the Section 4(f) site, without acquisition of land, are so great that the purposes for which the Section 4(f) site exists are substantially impaired, known as “constructive use.”

The following sections, drawn from earlier chapters of the Draft Environmental Assessment, describe the proposed project location; the Section 4(f) resources; the feasibility and prudence of alternatives that would avoid Section 4(f) resources; and describe the planning efforts to minimize any potential impacts on Section 4(f) resources.



## **B. Description of the Proposed Project**

### **1. Project Location and Existing Conditions**

The proposed project is located in the central part of the City of Newark, and provides access from the regional highway system to the city's Central Ward, including the University Heights and Science Park neighborhoods. The project corridor provides direct access to the Roseville neighborhood, and indirect access to the Central Business District (CBD) and other portions of the City from Route I-280. Considered part of the Roseville neighborhood in Newark's Central Ward, the project area contains a mix of low to medium density residential properties comprised mostly of two to four unit structures, as well as service and retail commercial, institutional, and light industrial properties. Several multifamily structures are located throughout the project area, including two high-rise structures on the south side of West Market Street. A significant number of the residential structures are old and in need of repair, and many lots have been cleared. In addition, several dilapidated and abandoned residential structures are scattered throughout the project area. The community has promoted plans to construct low-density residences within the project area by the private sector. Recently, new housing has been constructed particularly along Second Street and along the east side of First Street. The University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey is located to the southeast of the project corridor.

Central Avenue and West Market Street, which cross the project corridor, provide a mix of retail commercial services to the community as well as access to the Newark CBD and neighborhoods to the west of the project area.

### **2. Proposed Project**

A detailed description of the project is provided in Section III.B of this Environmental Assessment.

## **C. Need for the Proposed Project**

Detailed information about the project purpose and need is provided in Section II.B of this Environmental Assessment.

## **D. Description of Section 4(f) Resources**

The proposed project would have an adverse effect on one Section 4(f) resource: 400-406 Central Avenue, which the SHPO has deemed eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

### **1. 400-406 Central Avenue**

The proposed University Heights Connector would require the acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue. The property consists of a four-story, masonry building constructed between 1908 and 1911. The building exhibits the Renaissance Revival style, and is an example of early twentieth century, urban commercial development in Newark. Although a sign awning and modern plate glass windows currently dominate

the first floor façade, the SHPO determined that the building retains sufficient elements of its original design to be deemed eligible for listing in the National Register. These building elements include stone, ionic pilasters, window lintels, trim, and decorative stone keystones. Not all of these building elements are intact. The building also retains a simple metal cornice between the second and third floors, and an elaborate cornice with lintels and brackets along the roofline, with decorative, vertical projections along the roofline above this cornice (See Exhibit VI-1). The first floor of the building is occupied by several small businesses, while the upper floors are vacant due to their inhabitable condition.

## **2. Other Resources**

In addition, it was determined by the SHPO that the proposed project would have *no effect* on three other resources and *no adverse effect* on one other resource found within the project area. The three resources on which the project would have *no effect* include the Newark Christian School (former Seymour/Essex County Vocational School), 34-50 Third Street, and 394 New Street. It was deemed that the proposed project would have *no adverse effect* on Tuck-it-Away Storage (former Whitehead and Hoag Factory). The Newark Christian School and Tuck-It-Away Storage were found to be eligible for listing in the National Register by a study prepared in 1995 for a roadway improvement project located immediately north of the current project along First Street. The resources at 34-50 Third Street and 394 New Street were found to be eligible in the study completed for the current project.

Additional information about these historic resources is contained in *Survey of Historic Architectural Resources – First Street/University Heights Connector, Volumes I and II*, both prepared by Kise Straw and Kolodner for this project in 2000/2001.

The proposed project may also indirectly impact archeological resources. However, Section 4(f) does not apply to these resources, as they are important chiefly because of what can be learned through data recovery (see Section V.F of this Environmental Assessment).

### **E. Effects on Section 4(f) Resources**

The proposed project includes the widening of the existing right-of-way by approximately 42.5 feet to the west. This would require the acquisition and demolition of buildings along the west side of First Street between Sussex Avenue and New Street, and would, therefore, result in the acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue.

Insert Exhibit VI-1

## **F. Alternatives Considered**

During the course of the project study, ten alternatives were considered, all of which would avoid impacts to 400-406 Central Avenue. The alternatives that were considered include the No Build Alternative, widening First Street along the east side of the existing right-of-way, widening First Street along both sides of the existing right-of-way, improving First Street within the existing right-of-way, and relocating portions or all of the through traffic along First Street to either Second Street or Morris Avenue. See Table VI-1 for a comparison of alternatives for the proposed University Heights Connector.

Insert Table VI-1

## **1. No Build Alternative**

The No Build Alternative would require no changes to the current roadway configuration. However, this alternative is not prudent, as it does not meet the demonstrated need for the project.

The No Build Alternative would not address the traffic bottleneck that currently exists along First Street. Under the No Build Alternative, no pedestrian safety improvements would be made to the First Street corridor, and the existing hazardous traffic conditions would remain.

Also, the No Build Alternative would not provide improvements to the local circulation network. As described in this Environmental Assessment Section II.B, Project Need, the First Street corridor provides important access to the University Heights neighborhood, the CBD, and other parts of Newark, and it is, therefore, necessary to eliminate the existing substandard traffic conditions. This is not a prudent and feasible alternative.

## **2. Widen First Street Along the East Side of the Existing Right-of Way**

Widening First Street to the east would provide a similar cross-section, operational and geometric configuration as that provided by the Preferred Alternative. This alignment is shown in Figure VI-1, and a typical section of the alternative is shown in Figure VI-2. Widening First Street along the east side of the right-of-way would provide a Level of Service, corridor operations, and traffic safety similar to the Preferred Alternative, given its similar geometric and operational design. Pedestrian operations would be similar to the preferred alternative as well. In addition, a portion of the proposed Newark Greenway Bikeway Project would be shifted to the east side of First Street.

This alternative would have the following impacts:

- Nearly 40 percent of the frontage along the west side of the existing corridor is owned by, or soon to be dedicated to, public entities (either the State of New Jersey or the City of Newark). In contrast, only one property on the east side of First Street, with about 25 feet of frontage, is currently owned by the City of Newark, according to latest available property ownership records.
- The easterly widening would require the acquisition and demolition of two newly constructed (circa 2001 – 2002) two-family buildings (with a third building proposed) south of Dickerson Street.
- This alternative would require the acquisition of the recently rehabilitated (circa 1997) Modern Sanitation Systems Building located at 393 Central Avenue. This office building is occupied by several businesses providing a significant employment opportunity in this economically distressed area. Approximately 90 people are employed by businesses located in this building.

**Insert Figure VI-1**

**Insert Figure VI-2**



- This alternative would require the acquisition of the C. Patti Metal Finishing Plant (27 First Street), with 8 employees, which is suspected to contain hazardous materials requiring special treatment. Actions necessary to address the hazardous materials issues at this site would likely complicate the property acquisition and construction processes, thereby increasing the cost of the project and extending the time for its implementation.
- This alternative would require the acquisition of the Checkers Restaurant site at First and Hartford Streets. This business has 43 employees, of which 35 reside in Newark; many within the surrounding residential neighborhoods. According to statements made by representatives of Checkers Restaurant, this restaurant is the most profitable operation of a group of restaurants, and its loss could put the company's full staff of 325 employees in jeopardy of losing their jobs.
- NS Stores, a variety store that reopened in April 2002 under new management, would be displaced entirely under this alternative. The business employs 20 persons.
- The alignment for this alternative would require the acquisition of a portion of the Tuck-It-Away Storage Property. Figure VI-1 shows that the roadway alignment could be designed to avoid impacts to the actual building on the site, but doing so would affect the residential properties along the west side of First Street between Dickerson Street and Sussex Avenue, as well as the Supernatural Deliverance Revival Tabernacle Church. The alignment would reduce the depth of the property along the west side of the Tuck-It-Away building, thereby adversely impacting this site, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

In summary, this alternative would involve the displacement of 10 dwelling units and 7 businesses with about 170 employees. Relocation of the businesses displaced by a east side widening of the existing widening (C. Patti, Checkers, Modern Sanitation, NS Stores) would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve within the immediate neighborhood. The displacement or relocation of jobs from this neighborhood would pose a hardship to employment in the local community. Many of the displaced jobs are at the entry level, unskilled, or semi-skilled positions, which are important to the economic well being of the community. The community disruption caused to minority and low-income employees found within the project area would be quite severe. On this basis, this alternative is considered not feasible and prudent.

### 3. West-East Shift Alternative

The West-East Shift Alternative would provide a narrowed cross section through the intersection of First Street with Central Avenue by rotating the alignment about 15° counter-clockwise from the existing First Street alignment. This rotation allows a five-lane cross section to pass between the Modern Sanitation Systems Building and the Section 4(f) resource (400-406 Central Avenue) without requiring acquisition of either building. This alignment rotation requires shifting the connector alignment from the west side of the corridor north of Central Avenue to the east side of the corridor south of Central Avenue. This alignment is shown in Figure VI-3, and a typical section of the alternative is shown in Figure VI-4.

However, this alternative does not meet the project needs in the following respects:

- Lacks a raised median at Central Avenue to separate opposing traffic along turning lanes.
- Provides a narrower median width throughout the project area.
- Reduces stopping sight distance at the approaches to Central Avenue.
- Narrows sidewalk widths at the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue.
- Lacks or provides a narrower refuge area for vehicles turning at the intersection of First Street and Central Avenue.
- No provision for a separate continuous bikeway.

The reduced median width will lessen the size of the mid-intersection refuge area within which cars await to turn, and the narrowed corner sidewalks, lack of medians and shared bike/pedestrian use at Central Avenue will significantly reduce the size and safety of crosswalk refuge areas. With the constraints at the Central Avenue intersection, a section of the proposed Newark Greenway Bikeway Project between Central Avenue and New Street would be relocated along the east side of the corridor. Bicyclists would cross both Central Avenue and the University Heights Connector at this intersection, requiring the use of narrowed corner refuge areas (southwest or northeast corners) between crossings.

This alternative would have the following impacts.

- Impaired pedestrian and bicycle safety resulting from reduced width of sidewalks at the busy Central Avenue intersection.
- Impaired vehicular safety resulting from the loss of physical separation between opposing movements, and the reduced size of the mid-intersection refuge area, at the Central Avenue intersection.
- Compromises the “Gateway” aspect of the corridor, which is seen by city representatives as an important streetscape amenity for suburbanites seeking access to city arts, business, sports, recreational, educational, and health care institutions.

Insert Figure VI-3

Insert Figure VI-4

- Displaces the C. Patti Metal Finishing Plant. This site is suspected of having hazardous materials issues requiring special treatment, which in turn could complicate acquisition and construction processes, thereby slowing implementation.
- Requires the acquisition of the Checkers Restaurant site. This business employs 43 people, many of whom reside within the surrounding residential neighborhoods. Indirectly, the loss of this location could place the jobs of all 325 employees of the New Jersey Metro Burger franchise in jeopardy.

In summary, the West-East Shift Alternative would result in the displacement of 21 dwelling units and 3 businesses with 53 employees. Relocation of the displaced businesses would be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve within the immediate neighborhood. The displacement or relocation of jobs from this neighborhood would pose a hardship to local employment. Many of the displaced jobs are at the entry level or are unskilled or semi-skilled positions especially important to the economic well being of this community. Further, the Newark Checkers restaurant bolsters the entire Metro Burger franchise, and its loss would place an additional 282 jobs at risk. As a result, it is not considered a prudent and feasible alternative.

#### **4. Reduced Cross-Section**

This alternative consists of a reduced roadway cross-section (four lanes). It would widen the existing roadway within the existing 66-foot right-of-way, thereby eliminating the need for new right-of-way acquisitions north of New Street. A typical section of the alternative is shown in Figure VI-5.

The existing roadway would be widened to 46 feet between curbs, allowing for two travel lanes in each direction. This configuration would not allow for designated left turn lanes to separate turning vehicles from through traffic, except at West Market Street where additional widening and right-of-way acquisition could accommodate a single southbound left turn lane. Left turning vehicles would be accommodated either through the provision of lead/lag green phases to peak movements, or with turn prohibitions to maximize through lane capacity. This alternative would reduce sidewalks from a nominal 13-foot width to 10 feet. A raised median, sidewalk improvements, street trees, and the Class 1 Bikeway, all elements of the Preferred Alternative that seek to improve corridor safety and create a “visual gateway” to the city, would be eliminated. New signalization would be provided at West Market Street, Central Avenue, Dickerson Street and Sussex Avenue, with interconnection to optimize peak direction operation.

Even with the slight widening and improved signal coordination measures, Level of Service and corridor operations and safety would remain similar to the existing conditions, which are considered unacceptable by city and State representatives. The lack of separate southbound left turn lanes at Dickerson Street and Central Avenue will create blockages of southbound through traffic lanes by turning vehicles unable to proceed due to opposing traffic. Devoting greater time to a protected phase for peak direction flow would worsen cross street or still-sizable reverse peak (northbound AM, southbound PM) traffic operations. This assessment assumes that the curb lane would remain unimpeded by parked cars during peak periods. However, due to the limited availability of off-street parking along First Street, the presence of illegally parked, standing or stopped vehicles along the curbs during peak periods would further constrain capacity. The lack of turning lanes also eliminates any refuge that turning vehicles would require to enhance corridor safety. In summary, the most onerous aspects of existing vehicular operations (congestion, delay, illegal curbside parking, diversions into residential areas, accident rates well in excess of State averages for similar facilities) would remain.

This alternative would reduce the usable width of sidewalks to seven feet, due to the presence of building features that intrude into the existing right-of-way. Pedestrian operations and safety would thus become worse than the existing conditions.

Without the acquisition of property along First Street, it would not be possible to develop a continuous Class I Bikeway along the corridor between Sussex Avenue and New Street as per the plans for the Newark Greenway project. Bicycle use would be relegated to the less safe Class III status, i.e., shared use of curb lanes.

This alternative fails to meet any of the project needs. Specifically, this alternative:

Insert Figure VI-5

- Would not alleviate the current First Street bottlenecks or reduce commuter diversions onto adjacent residential streets.
- Would not provide a north/south boulevard corridor through the Central Ward to improve peak period traffic and emergency access.
- Would not reduce turning movement conflicts.
- Would not enhance pedestrian safety.
- Would not beautify the First Street corridor to provide a visual gateway to the city.

As it does not meet any project needs, this is not a prudent and feasible alternative.



## 5. Reduced Cross-Section with TSM and Reversible Lane

This alternative would develop the same geometric cross-section as the Reduced Cross Section Alternative. However, it would attempt to overcome the operational concerns of the Reduced Cross Section Alternative through the use of Transportation Systems Management (TSM) or Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) strategies. Specifically, the corridor would utilize overhead lane control signals and variable message signing to operate the University Heights Connector corridor with three travel lanes in the peak direction (southbound in the AM Peak, northbound in the PM Peak). A typical section is shown in Figure VI-6.

During peak periods, one of the travel lanes would be converted into a left turn lane to provide a storage and/or refuge area for turning vehicles. This would be especially important in the southbound direction during the AM peak period, where considerable left turning volumes are noted at Dickerson Street and Central Avenue. Left turns at these locations total about 500 vehicles per hour during the morning peak, and are opposed by 500-600 vehicles in the non-peak direction. This combination of high turning volume opposed by moderately high through traffic volumes requires the provision of a separate left turn storage lane to avoid blocking peak direction through traffic. During the PM peak period, northbound left turning volumes are lower; however opposing through volumes are considerably higher than the opposing volumes during the AM peak. The net result is that a lane reversal for PM peak operations is also warranted. Left turning vehicles would be accommodated through the provision of lead/lag green phases to peak movements. At West Market Street, additional widening and right-of-way acquisition could be necessary to provide left turn lanes. New signalization would be provided at West Market Street, Central Avenue, Dickerson Street and Sussex Avenue, with interconnection to optimize peak direction operation. Overhead lane use control signals and variable message signing would be employed in the corridor.

The provision of the third lane during peak periods would improve peak direction operations. However, reverse direction operations (northbound AM, southbound PM) would be limited to a single travel lane adjacent to a curb, and would deteriorate to levels at or below existing conditions as turning and driver behavior adjacent to the curb would become more difficult. This assessment assumes that the curb lane would remain unimpeded by parked cars during peak periods. The lack of off-street parking would likely result in the presence of illegally parked, standing or stopped vehicles along the curbs during peak periods, further constraining capacity. Devoting greater time to the single off-peak lane would worsen cross street or left-turning volumes. Cross street turns into the single lane off-peak approach would become more difficult, especially for right turns in an urban street grid system with tight curb radii. The net result would be a slight improvement in overall traffic operations and safety as compared to existing conditions, but these improvements would not remedy diversions into the surrounding neighborhoods. This modest level of improvement, when compared to the labor and enforcement-intensive efforts associated with the lane use control signals and the variable message signing, would likely be considered unacceptable by city and State representatives.

Insert Figure VI-6

Widening the roadway within the existing right-of-way would reduce sidewalk widths, resulting in a narrowing of the usable width of sidewalk due to the presence of building features that intrude into the existing right-of-way. Overhead signals and variable message signing associated with this alternative would also impede sidewalk/pedestrian operations. Pedestrian operations would thus be worse than existing conditions.

Without the acquisition of property along the First Street Corridor, a continuous Class I Bikeway could not be developed between Sussex Avenue and New Street. Bicycle use associated with the Newark Greenway would be relegated to the less safe Class III status. During peak periods, bicycles would have to share a single lane with vehicular traffic.

This alternative fails to meet four of the five project needs. Specifically:

- This alternative would not substantially alleviate existing north/south bottlenecks.
- This alternative would not provide a north/south boulevard corridor through the Central Ward, to improve peak period traffic and emergency access.
- This alternative would worsen pedestrian safety along First Street, as it would narrow existing sidewalks while retaining existing encroachments.
- This alternative would not provide a visual gateway to the city along First Street. Rather, widening the roadway and narrowing the sidewalks within the existing right-of-way would further reduce streetscape aesthetics along First Street.

Due to its failure to meet four of the five project needs, this is not a prudent and feasible alternative.

## **6. Limited Widening of the First Street Corridor and Enhanced Cross Streets**

This alternative maintains the existing 66-foot right-of-way of First Street, but widens the cross street approaches to reduce the amount of green time devoted to the cross street movements. By doing this, the amount of green time provided to First Street can be maximized, allowing for additional improvements to the operations of the north-south corridor (see Figure VI-7).

For the purposes of this evaluation, it is assumed that the First Street cross-section for this alternative would replicate the geometrics assumed for the Reduced Cross-Section Alternative.

Widening the roadway within the existing right-of-way would reduce the existing sidewalk width, resulting in a narrowing of the usable width of sidewalk. Pedestrian operations would thus be worse than existing conditions.

Without the acquisition of property along the First Street Corridor, it would not be possible to develop a continuous Class I Bikeway along the corridor between Sussex Avenue and New Street. Bicycle use associated with the Newark Greenway would be relegated to the less safe Class III status.

Traffic studies conducted for the Preferred Alternative indicate that the capacity-constrained intersections along the corridor include the intersections of First Street with Central Avenue and West Market Street. In both cases, parking would be prohibited during peak periods on Central Avenue and West Market Street to maximize approach capacity. Further reductions to green time on Central Avenue and West Market Street needed to increase First Street green time would considerably worsen operations along these two key east-west routes by limiting corridor-wide progression and by requiring their widening to offset these losses in capacity. Green time reductions on Central Avenue and West Market Street are limited by the time necessary for pedestrians to cross First Street and the demands of signal coordination with adjacent signals.

Improving intersection and corridor operations while avoiding corridor-wide property acquisition including 400-406 Central Avenue, would require other property acquisition, especially along one side of Central Avenue and West Market Street. Acquisitions must be of sufficient length to allow the addition of lanes to accommodate queues and tapers at both ends of the added lane. Widening Central Avenue along the north side of its corridor would require the acquisition of most buildings between Second Street and Morris Avenue, including the Modern Sanitation Systems building. Widening West Market Street along its south side would adversely affect existing parking and storefront access for the McDonald's (southwest corner) and the strip mall immediately to the west (a north side widening would have even greater adverse impact). This alternative would result in the displacement of nine businesses, including an office building with approximately 100 employees, and four residential properties.

Insert Figure VI-7

This alternative fails to meet any of the project needs, as follows:

- It would not alleviate current First Street bottlenecks or reduce commuter diversions onto adjacent residential streets since access to the CBD by way of the West Market Street and the Warren Street / Raymond Boulevard corridors would be impaired.
- It would not significantly improve peak period traffic and emergency access due to the lack of right-of-way widening.
- It would not reduce turning movement conflicts because it would not provide turning lanes and storage capacity.
- It would worsen pedestrian safety because it would narrow existing sidewalks and retain existing sidewalk encroachments.
- It would not provide a visual gateway to the city along First Street.

Since it does not meet any of the project needs and results in substantial impacts to minority and low-income employees, it is not a feasible and prudent alternative.

## **7. One-Way Couplet (First and Second Street)**

This alternative would retain the existing First Street right-of-way, but splits existing corridor traffic between First Street and Second Street. Under this scenario, First Street would carry northbound traffic, while Second Street would carry southbound traffic. It is assumed the existing roadway widths would be retained, with curbside parking prohibited along one side during peak use. Left turns would be accommodated through parking prohibitions along the left curb in the direction facing traffic. As shown on Figure VI-8, a possible scenario for connecting southbound traffic with the Second Street corridor would include: 1) cutting through state-owned properties along the west side of First Street just south of Sussex Avenue; and, 2) use of the existing West Market Street grid system at the south end. The establishment of a one-way couplet would require additional signalization at the Second Street intersections with Dickerson Street, Central Avenue and West Market Street, and would include improved channelization for the eastbound to southbound right turn at West Market/Bergen Streets.

Existing land use along Second Street is decidedly different than along First Street. Second Street is a residential street with single-family and multi-family housing along both sides, particularly north of Central Avenue. Current traffic demand along Second Street is under 100 vph during the peak periods, whereas bi-directional peak period demands in the First Street corridor approach 1500 vph.

From an operational aspect, the one-way couplet proposal could be developed to provide operations at a level that satisfies this project need. The split alignment of the couplet would allow for unopposed southbound left turns onto Dickerson Street, Central Avenue and West Market Street, the most critical of all movements during either peak period. At West Market Street, signalization could be simplified to two-phased operation (from the three-phase operation of the Preferred Alternative) or the third phase could be assigned to left turns from Market Street rather than from First and Bergen Streets; either modification would benefit intersection operations.

Pedestrian use of the existing sidewalk areas would be enhanced by the use of brick pavers, crosswalk delineation, decorative lighting and other context-sensitive design elements. However, bicycle operations associated with the Newark Greenway Project would be split by direction to both corridors of the one-way couplet. This would lengthen the southbound bikeway route between Sussex Avenue and New Street by two blocks, relegate bicycle use in the area to Class II (separate striping within the roadway) or Class III (shared vehicular / bicycle use of the curb lane) status, and could lead to “wrong-way” use of the northbound First Street corridor by southbound bicyclists seeking to avoid the additional length.

This alternative does not meet four of the project needs, as follows:

- It would shift the large (currently over 1000 vph) southbound AM peak period movement from the First Street to Second Street, significantly increasing the effects of peak hour traffic upon adjacent residential areas. This is in direct contrast to the first project need, which seeks to “reduce commuter diversions onto adjacent residential streets.”

Insert VI-8



- It would worsen peak and off-peak period emergency access. The one-way couplet would lengthen the trip from the I-280 Connector, just north of the project site, to the State Trauma Center at University Hospital by reducing the directness of the route followed by ambulances and increasing the number of turns necessary to reach the hospital.
- It would introduce high volumes of traffic to a residential street increasing the risk of pedestrian accidents.
- It would not beautify First Street to provide a visual gateway to the city. While brick pavers, decorative lighting, signing and additional street trees could be employed, the gateway concept is based upon a wide landscaped boulevard that would open up to the arterial system serving the Central Ward, particularly Central Avenue, West Market Street and Bergen Street.

This alternative would severely disrupt cohesion of the Roseville neighborhood by the dislocation of 21 residential dwelling units and isolating the dwelling units along First Street between Sussex and Dickerson Streets. If proposed, it would likely result in vehement community opposition to the proposed project. For these reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent.

## **8. One-Way Couplet (First and Morris Avenues)**

This alternative would retain the existing width of First Street, but would split existing corridor traffic between First Street and Morris Avenue. First Street would carry southbound traffic, while Morris Avenue would carry northbound traffic. It is assumed the existing roadway widths would be retained, with curbside parking prohibited along one side during peak use. Left turns would be accommodated by localized parking prohibitions employed along the left curb in the direction facing traffic. As shown on Figure VI-9, the most realistic scenario for connecting northbound traffic from West Market and Bergen Streets to Morris Avenue would require the acquisition of the Newark Car Care Center on the triangular shaped block formed by Hartford Street, West Market Street and the extension of Morris Avenue. The roadbed and right-of-way of Morris Avenue extended between Hartford Street and West Market Street until the mid-1990's, when the street was de-mapped and the property was divided and transferred to the adjoining Newark Car Care Center and the Bethany Baptist Church sites by the city. The re-connection to the First Street corridor would be by way of Dickerson Street. The establishment of a one-way couplet would require additional signalization along the Morris Avenue, including the intersections at Dickerson Street, Central Avenue, and possibly New Street. It would also include improved channelization for the turns at the following intersections: West Market and Bergen Streets; Dickerson and Morris Avenues; and, Dickerson and First Streets.

There are several disadvantages associated with this alternative, as follows:

- It requires right-of-way acquisition of active businesses in the vicinity of West Market Street, including the Newark Car Care Center.
- It would enlarge the First / Bergen Street intersection with West Market / Hartford Streets, worsening pedestrian and turning operations.
- It would bring large northbound corridor volumes into conflict with school-related drop-off and pick-up activities near the Bethany Baptist Church.
- Service and delivery vehicles to existing businesses along Morris Avenue would periodically block through traffic along Morris Avenue.
- Northbound widening would be necessary along First Street between Dickerson Street and Sussex Avenue, as the couplet cannot otherwise be extended to Sussex Avenue, requiring acquisition of the multi-family homes along the west side of First Street between Sussex Avenue and Dickerson Street.
- The northerly terminus of this alternative would likely impact upon the frontage to the historically-eligible Tuck It Away Storage property.

This alternative does not meet the project need for a visual gateway to the community, and provides a low level of operational efficiency due to a further enlargement of the already complex intersection at West Market Street. Traffic flow along Morris Avenue will likely be disrupted periodically by service and delivery vehicles. It would also have a direct visual impact on Tuck-It-Away Storage, a historic structure. On this basis, this alternative is not feasible and prudent.

**Insert Figure VI-9**

## **9. Shift University Heights Connector to Second Street**

This alternative would relocate the University Heights Connector to Second Street. It would maintain the connector termini at the intersections of First Street and Sussex Avenue and First Street with Bergen, West Market, and Hartford Streets; the key intersections most convenient to I-280 Connector located at the north end of the University Heights Connector; and, the Bergen Street/UMDNJ area to the south. The concept is shown in Figure VI-10. This concept would widen Second Street through property acquisitions along the west side of the corridor in order to avoid the acquisition and demolition of newly constructed houses on the east side of Second Street between Dickerson Street and Central Avenue, and the industrial building located on the east side of Second Street between Central Avenue and New Street. Further, a west side widening of Second Street provides a better geometric design than an east side widening.

Shifting the project's right-of-way and traffic impacts to the more-residential Second Street would have a substantial adverse impact on the Roseville neighborhood, including an increased risk of pedestrian accidents. Generally, homes in good condition would be demolished. Properties located between First and Second Street including Wendy's Restaurant (near West Market Street) and multi-family homes along the west side of Second Street north of Dickerson Street, would also be acquired to connect the relocated boulevard to its proposed termini, resulting in further impacts. Finally, this alternative does not take full advantage of the properties along First Street already owned by the city and State.

This alternative would result in the displacement of 48 dwelling units (the most of any of the alternatives considered) and 2 businesses, one of them a large industrial property. This alternative would severely impact the community cohesion of the Roseville neighborhood. If proposed, this alternative would likely be vehemently opposed by the community. For these reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent.

Insert Figure VI-10

## **10. Shift University Heights Connector to Morris Avenue**

This alternative would relocate the University Heights Connector to the Morris Avenue corridor, about 500 feet east of First Street. It would maintain the proposed connector termini at the intersections of First Street and Sussex Avenue and First Street with Bergen/West Market/Hartford Streets, the key intersections most convenient to the I-280 Connector at the north end and with the Bergen Street/ UMDNJ area to the south.

The concept is illustrated on Figure VI-11. It is assumed this concept would widen the Morris Avenue corridor through property acquisitions along the west side of the corridor. The west side of the Morris Avenue corridor was selected due to the perceived presence of greater areas of open space along the west side of Morris Avenue. The alignment also seeks to lessen impacts to the Bethany Baptist Church and to avoid demolition of several large industrial sites, though other industrial buildings and the Phillips Metropolitan Christian Methodist Episcopal Church appear to be in its path.

Shifting the project's right-of-way and traffic impacts to the Morris Avenue corridor would have the following impacts:

- The loss of several businesses, including the Newark Car Care Center, Hayes Bus, and NS Stores, would constitute a significant economic loss to this neighborhood. These businesses would be difficult, if not impossible, to relocate within the immediately surrounding neighborhood.
- The acquisition and demolition of the Phillips Metropolitan Christian Methodist Episcopal Church would have significant adverse social impacts.
- Service/delivery vehicles would periodically block traffic along Morris Avenue.
- The relocated boulevard would not take full advantage of the properties along First Street already owned by State or local agencies.
- Northbound widening would still to be necessary along First Street between Dickerson Street and Sussex Avenue, as the couplet cannot otherwise be extended to Sussex Avenue. This would require the acquisition and demolition of the residences located along the west side of First Street between Sussex Avenue and Dickerson Street.
- The northerly terminus of this alternative would impact the Tuck-It-Away Storage building, which is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Property acquisition required under this alternative would result in adverse impacts to access, parking, and site operations.

This alternative would result in the displacement of eight businesses with significant employment and eight residential dwelling units. For these reasons, this alternative is not feasible and prudent.

Insert Figure VI-11

In addition, in view of the required acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue, the partial acquisition on both sides of the street alternative it is not considered here.

### **G. Measures to Minimize Impact**

Since the acquisition of 400-406 Central Avenue cannot be avoided by the implementation of any of the considered alternatives, it is recommended that this adverse effect be mitigated through the completion of an appropriate program of recordation. Historic American Building Survey (HABS) guidelines for written reports and photographic documentation will be utilized in defining the appropriate program of recordation.

### **H. Summary of Project Coordination**

Coordination and on-going discussions between the NJDOT and SHPO have occurred during the course of the project. That coordination will continue as the proposed project is advanced through the environmental review process. This coordination will ensure that all practical measures to accommodate the proposed project with the minimum impact to the Section 4(f) historic resources will occur, and that all available opportunities and mitigation measures will be considered.

Coordination between the above agencies has served to ensure that all reasonable planning has been accomplished to minimize adverse impacts to these Section 4(f) resources.

Direct consultation and coordination between the FHWA, the NJDOT, and the NJHPO will identify appropriate mitigation measures to address the adverse effect resulting from the proposed project. Mitigation measures agreed upon by FHWA, NJDOT and the NJHPO will be set forth in a Memorandum of Agreement and may consist of documentation to the standards of the Historic American Buildings Survey.

### **I. Conclusion**

There are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the acquisition and demolition of 400-406 Central Avenue. The proposed project includes all possible planning to mitigate the adverse impact to 400-406 Central Avenue



## **VII. COMMENT AND COORDINATION**

## **VII. COMMENT AND COORDINATION**

### **A. Public Involvement**

Public involvement was developed and implemented by the NJDOT for this project. The intent of the public involvement was to optimize the level of communication with the general public, appropriate governmental agencies and officials, and team members, and to coordinate the public awareness activities with the entire process. Information pertaining to the project has been shared, presented, and made available for review and comments. Ideas, concerns, and recommendations from the public were considered and addressed appropriately.

The development of alternatives for the proposed design included ongoing coordination with local public officials. Letters, fact sheets, and flyers were used to announce the proposed project as it developed, including a presentation before the City Council and a Public Information Center. In accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulation (CEQR), requests were made for information and responses were solicited from relevant agencies regarding particular environmental issues of concern.

The urban conditions and demographic characteristics of the residents in the project area require that a meaningful communication process be undertaken in order to involve those residents considered to be members of special population groups, i.e., minority and low-income.

Based on the demographic characteristics of the local population, a public involvement and public notification plan was developed by the New Jersey Department of Transportation, Office of Community Relations, to ensure that appropriate local public input and participation take place in the review of the Draft Environmental Assessment. The public involvement program and public notification plan was developed to ensure compliance with the intent and objectives of Executive Order No. 12858, Environmental Justice, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

On June 23, 2000, a Public Information Center (PIC) was held at the World Impact building. Prior to this meeting, NJDOT send announcements to residents and businesses located within the project corridor, city officials (see Appendix C). A total of 46 people attended the PIC. During the PIC, attendees had the opportunity to review the proposed project design and to ask questions of NJDOT officials and project consultants that were present. Residents attending the PIC primarily inquired about the anticipated impact of the project on their places of residence or business, the project schedule, and relocation benefits. Residents indicated that high traffic volume and speeding vehicles adversely affect the quality of life along First Street, especially with regard to pedestrian safety. Residents attending the PIC also indicated a desire to move away from the busy traffic corridor.

The project mailing list has been continually updated as the project team has been apprised of new stakeholders, including property owners, residents, business operators, and other interested parties.

A bi-lingual newsletter was circulated in the Winter of 2002 to keep stakeholders apprised of the activities since the PIC. The newsletter included an overview of the project, project needs, and maps of existing conditions and the Recommended Alternative. In addition, a summary of major project activities and a schedule for completion of the project were provided.

A public hearing will be held following the release of this Environmental Assessment. The hearing will be announced in a timely manner upon document approval. The hearing will be transcribed, and verbal and written statements from the public and governmental entities during and after the comment period will be appropriately addressed and summarized. The early coordination, public involvement, and project development will be conducted in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, 40 CFR 1502.20 and FHWA 23 CFR 771.111, and the latest NJDOT procedures and regulations.

## **B. Agency Input**

Agency coordination was accomplished through a widely distributed request for input that was mailed to potentially affected public agencies and organizations. Mailings were sent to request information about the affected environment and to invite comments on potential social, economic, or environmental impacts of the proposed project on resources and issues of concern. All responses were considered and incorporated, to the extent possible, in the preparation of this EA.

Early coordination with appropriate agencies was initiated to solicit their views and to assure adequate environmental analysis/documentation and related environmental requirements. Requests for information were solicited from agencies according to the agency mailing list (see Appendix B). Notice of Planned Action (NOPA) letters were distributed to the appropriate agencies on May 23, 2000. Agency coordination will continue through formal and informal contact during project development. Coordination will also continue as the project is further advanced. All agency responses are discussed within the document in their appropriate sections, and are provided in Appendices A, F, and G.

## **C. Municipal Input**

The NJDOT held several meetings with officials of the City of Newark. Newark officials gave their full support to the proposed project with a few minor revisions. To address the issues raised by Newark officials, the NJDOT has made minor modifications to the project's design. Newark officials also made assurances to expedite the process where possible. A copy of the City of Newark resolution is provided in Appendix E.

A meeting was held in the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority (NJTPA) offices in February 1999. The proposed project design and the environmental review process for the project were presented and discussed. The proposed project was deemed an existing bottleneck, and therefore, exempt from the requirements for a Congestion Management Systems study.

## **VIII. LIST OF TECHNICAL STUDIES AND REFERENCES**

## **VIII. LIST OF TECHNICAL STUDIES AND REFERENCES**

### **A. List of Technical Studies and References**

The following reports and technical documents were prepared as part of the initial design, environmental review, and screening process, and as supporting technical studies to this Environmental Assessment. These studies form the basis for most of the information and data provided in this Environmental Assessment.

Air Technical Environmental Study. University Heights Connector Study. City of Newark, Essex County. Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc. 2001.

Conceptual Stage Relocation Study. 1<sup>st</sup> Street Improvements, New Jersey Department of Transportation, May 2000.

Draft Interim Memorandum on Environmental Justice for the University Heights Connector Project. Dresdner Robin. 2000.

Phase 1B/2 Archaeological Survey, First Street/University Heights I-280 Connector. The RBA Group, November 2001.

Letter Report, First Street University Heights Connector, Phase IB Archaeology. RBA Group. June 28, 2001.

Noise Technical Environmental Study, University Heights Connector Study, City of Newark, Essex County. Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc. 2001.

Phase 1 Archaeological Survey of the First Street/University Height Connector Improvements Corridor, Sussex Avenue to West Market Street, Newark, New Jersey. Kise, Straw and Kolodner. 2000.

Preliminary Assessment for the University Heights Connector, First Street from Sussex Avenue to West Market Street, Newark, Essex County, New Jersey. Dresdner Robin. 2000.

Preliminary Geotechnical Information and Assessment, University Heights Connector, First Street Between Sussex Avenue and West Market Street, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey. 2000.

Socioeconomic and Land Use Technical Environmental Study. University Heights Connector. Dresdner Robin. 2000.

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources. First Avenue/University Heights Connector, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, Volume I. Kise, Straw and Kolodner. 2000.

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources. First Avenue/University Heights Connector, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, Volume II – Survey Forms. Kise, Straw and Kolodner. 2000.

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources. First Avenue/University Heights Connector, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, Volume I. Kise, Straw and Kolodner. 2001.

Survey of Historic Architectural Resources. First Avenue/University Heights Connector, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, Volume II – Survey Forms. Kise, Straw and Kolodner. 2001.

## **B. Reference Documents and Materials**

City of Newark, Department of Engineering. Draft Transportation and Development Node Plan. 2000

Drake, Jr., A.A., et al., Bedrock Geologic Map of Northern New Jersey. U.S. Geologic Survey Miscellaneous Investigations Series Map I-2540-A.

Federal Emergency Management Administration. Flood Rate Insurance Map, City of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey. Community Panel Number 340189 0005A. Effective Date: March 28, 1980.

Rogers, F.C., et al., 1951. Engineering Soil Survey of New Jersey, Report Number 2, Essex County. Engineering Research Bulletin Number 16, Rutgers University - College of Engineering, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

United States Department of Agriculture – Soil Conservation Service. General Soils Map, Essex and Hudson Counties, New Jersey. 1993.

University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey – Office of Urban Planning and Community Relations. First Street Beautification Program. 1991.

## **C. Personal Communications**

Thomas Breden  
New Jersey Natural Heritage Program  
Division of Parks and Forestry, Office of Natural Lands Management  
CN 404  
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Linda LaSut  
Northern New Jersey Transportation Planning Authority, Inc.  
One Newark Center, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Fernando Rubio  
Newark Department of Engineering  
255 Central Avenue  
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Beth Tanzosh  
Newark Department of Engineering  
255 Central Avenue  
Newark, New Jersey 07102





## **IX. LIST OF PREPARERS**

## **IX. LIST OF PREPARERS**

The following individuals had primary responsibility for the preparation and review of the Environmental Assessment for the University Heights Connector Project.

### **A. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration**

Randy Prescott, Program Operations Director  
George Hoops, Area Engineer  
Amy Fox, Environmental Coordinator

### **B. New Jersey Department of Transportation, Division of Project Management**

Steven Hochman, A.I.C.P., P.P.  
Audrey Anderson  
Ihor Sypko  
Edward Tomaszewski

### **C. Dresdner Robin**

Edward Robin  
Victor Furmanec, P.P.  
Lawrence Smith  
Damiano Albanese

### **D. Parsons Transportation Group**

Andre Luboff, P.E.

### **E. Paul Carpenter Associates, Inc.**

Sharon Paul Carpenter

### **F. Kise Straw and Kolodner**

Glen Ceponis  
Ted Wells  
Martin Abbott  
Thomas Crist, Ph.D.  
Elizabeth Amisson  
Sara A. Paul

### **G. RBA Group, Inc.**

Jean Howson  
Richard L. Porter  
Leonard G. Bianchi

### **H. Converse Consultants**

Issa S. Oweis, Ph.D., P.E., President  
Prabhakar Casuba, Senior Geotechnical Engineer