

# Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation

BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON  
SUPERCONDUCTING MAGLEV PROJECT

January 2021



U.S. Department of Transportation  
**Federal Railroad Administration**

**M2OT**  
MARYLAND DEPARTMENT  
OF TRANSPORTATION.

---

**Baltimore-Washington  
Superconducting MAGLEV Project**

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement and  
Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation**

*Prepared by:*

**US Department of Transportation –  
Federal Railroad Administration  
and  
Maryland Department of Transportation**

*With Cooperating Agencies:*

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)  
Federal Transit Administration (FTA)  
National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC)  
U.S. Department of Interior (USDOL)-National Park Service (NPS)  
Surface Transportation Board (STB)  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)  
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)–Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC)  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center (NASA/GSFC)  
National Security Agency (NSA)  
U.S. Department of Interior (USDOL)-U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

**Submitted Pursuant To:**

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) and the Council on Environmental Quality Implementing Regulations for NEPA (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508);  
Federal Railroad Administration Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 FR 28545, May 26, 1999, as updated by 78 FR 2713, January 14, 2013);  
Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decision making (23 U.S.C. § 139);  
Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S.C. § 303);  
Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 (54 U.S.C. § 306101);  
the Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 7401 et seq.);  
the Clean Water Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. § 1251-1387); and the  
Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. § 1531-1544).



---

Paul Nissenbaum  
Associate Administrator for Railroad Policy and Development  
Federal Railroad Administration

January 13, 2021  
Date of Approval

---

---

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

Brandon Bratcher  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
USDOT Federal Railroad Administration  
RPD-13: Environment and Corridor Planning Division  
1200 New Jersey Ave SE  
West Building, Mail Stop 20  
Washington, DC 20590  
[brandon.bratcher@dot.gov](mailto:brandon.bratcher@dot.gov)

Jacqueline Thorne  
Project Manager Priority Projects  
The Secretary's Office  
Office of Freight and Multimodalism  
Maryland Department of Transportation  
7201 Corporate Center Drive  
Hanover, MD 21076  
[jthorne@mdot.maryland.gov](mailto:jthorne@mdot.maryland.gov)

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) have prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) to document the evaluation of the potential beneficial and adverse environmental impacts of the Superconducting Magnetic Levitation (SCMAGLEV) Project. The Project Sponsor, Baltimore Washington Rapid Rail, LLC proposes to construct and operate an SCMAGLEV system between Baltimore, MD and Washington, D.C. The SCMAGLEV Project is a high-speed rail technology that runs on a grade-separated, fixed guideway powered by magnetic forces at speeds of over 300 miles per hour. This system does not operate on standard steel wheel railroad tracks and therefore requires a dedicated grade-separated guideway.

The SCMAGLEV Project includes two terminal stations (Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, MD) and one intermediate station at the Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI Marshall Airport Station). The system requires additional facilities to operate including one trainset maintenance facility (TMF), two maintenance of way (MOW) facilities, and various smaller ancillary facilities. The ancillary facilities include fresh air and emergency egress (FA/EE) facilities, substations, SCMAGLEV wayside system facilities and stormwater management. The system proposes to operate on both underground (deep tunnel) and an elevated guideway (viaduct). Stations and ancillary facilities are generally above, below, or adjacent to the guideway and would provide for access to passenger and employee parking as applicable.

The purpose of the SCMAGLEV Project is to evaluate, and ultimately construct and operate, a safe, revenue-producing, high-speed ground transportation system that achieves the optimum operating speed of the SCMAGLEV technology to significantly reduce travel time to meet the capacity and ridership needs of the Baltimore-Washington region.

---

---

FRA may provide Federal funding for construction of the SCMAGLEV Project or take regulatory action, including issuing a Rule of Particular Applicability, to ensure the proposed system is operated safely. Either of these actions (funding or regulatory) constitutes a major federal action and triggers environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

This DEIS documents the evaluation of the reasonably foreseeable potential beneficial and adverse environmental impacts of implementing the proposed SCMAGLEV system, including a No Build Alternative and twelve Build Alternatives between Washington D.C., and Baltimore, MD. Measures being considered by FRA and MDOT to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the potential adverse impacts of the twelve Build Alternatives are described. This document provides a comparative analysis between the No Build Alternative and the Build Alternatives. The Preferred Alternative will be identified in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. FRA has also prepared a Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation for the SCMAGLEV Project in compliance with Section 4(f) of the United States Department of Transportation Act of 1966, and a Draft Programmatic Agreement in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

FRA is seeking input from the public on the DEIS, Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, and Draft Programmatic Agreement, which are being made available to the public in accordance with NEPA and NHPA, and are available at the Project website:

<https://www.bwmaglev.info/index.php>.

For the most up to date information visit [www.bwmaglev.info](http://www.bwmaglev.info). If additional assistance is required to review the DEIS, please send an email to [info@bwmaglev.info](mailto:info@bwmaglev.info).

The 90-day comment period for the DEIS starts on **January 22, 2021**. Comments on the DEIS can be submitted by email to [info@bwmaglev.info](mailto:info@bwmaglev.info), or through the online comment form at [www.bwmaglev.info](http://www.bwmaglev.info). Comments must be sent no later than **April 22, 2021**. FRA strongly encourages the submission of comments via email or through the online comment form and will consider all comments received during the comment period. For the most up to date information, sign up to join the project mailing list and visit [www.bwmaglev.info](http://www.bwmaglev.info).

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
<b>ES.1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
ES.1.1 Agency Roles and Responsibilities .....	ES-2
ES.1.2 Description of the Project .....	ES-3
ES.1.3 Project Study Area .....	ES-4
ES.1.4 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) .....	ES-4
<b>ES.2 Project Purpose and Need .....</b>	<b>ES-6</b>
<b>ES.3 Alternatives Development .....</b>	<b>ES-7</b>
ES.3.1 SCMAGLEV Technology .....	ES-7
ES.3.2 Alternatives Development Process .....	ES-9
<b>ES.4 Environmental Resources and Consequences .....</b>	<b>ES-12</b>
ES.4.1 Methodology .....	ES-12
ES.4.2 No Build Alternative .....	ES-13
ES.4.3 Build Alternatives .....	ES-13
ES.4.4 Mitigation Strategies .....	ES-24
<b>ES.5 Permits, Approvals and Authorizations .....</b>	<b>ES-24</b>
<b>ES.6 Public and Agency Outreach .....</b>	<b>ES-25</b>
<b>ES.7 Preferred Alternative .....</b>	<b>ES-25</b>
<b>ES.8 Next Steps .....</b>	<b>ES-26</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
<b>1.1 Project Description .....</b>	<b>1-2</b>
1.1.1 Proposed Action .....	1-2
1.1.2 Project Study Area .....	1-2
<b>1.2 Planning Context .....</b>	<b>1-4</b>
1.2.1 Previous Maglev Studies .....	1-4
1.2.2 Northeast Corridor (NEC) FUTURE Program .....	1-4
1.2.3 NEPA Process .....	1-5
<b>1.3 Scope of this Document .....</b>	<b>1-7</b>

<b>Chapter 2 Purpose and Need</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.1 Project Purpose</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
<b>2.2 Project Need</b> .....	<b>2-2</b>
2.2.1 Increasing Population and Employment .....	2-3
2.2.2 Growing Demand on the Existing Transportation Network.....	2-6
2.2.3 Inadequate Capacity of the Existing Transportation Network.....	2-12
2.2.4 Increasing Travel Time .....	2-13
<b>2.3 Decreasing Mobility</b> .....	<b>2-14</b>
<b>2.4 Maintaining Economic Viability</b> .....	<b>2-15</b>

<b>Chapter 3 Alternatives Considered</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
<b>3.1 SCMAGLEV Technology</b> .....	<b>3-1</b>
3.1.1 Dedicated Guideway .....	3-2
3.1.2 Ancillary Facilities .....	3-4
<b>3.2 Alternatives Development Process</b> .....	<b>3-5</b>
3.2.1 Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report .....	3-6
3.2.2 Alternatives Report.....	3-6
3.2.3 Alternatives Refinements .....	3-7
<b>3.3 Description of Alternatives</b> .....	<b>3-7</b>
3.3.1 No Build Alternative.....	3-7
3.3.2 Build Alternatives .....	3-11
<b>3.4 Project Sponsor Preferred Configuration</b> .....	<b>3-40</b>

## **Chapter 4 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation**

<b>4.1 Introduction</b> .....	<b>4.1-1</b>
4.1.1 Geographic Context.....	4.1-1
4.1.2 Approach to Resource Analysis .....	4.1-2
4.1.3 Chapter 4 Organization.....	4.1-9
<b>4.2 Transportation</b> .....	<b>4.2-1</b>
4.2.1 Introduction.....	4.2-1

4.2.2	Regulatory Context and methodology .....	4.2-1
4.2.3	SCMAGLEV Service and Operations .....	4.2-5
4.2.4	Commuter Rail Network .....	4.2-9
4.2.5	Intercity Passenger Rail (Amtrak) .....	4.2-11
4.2.6	Local Transit Systems .....	4.2-13
4.2.7	Regional Roadway Network .....	4.2-18
4.2.8	Station Area and Train Maintenance Facility Street Network Impacts .....	4.2-20
4.2.9	Station Area Street Network – Baltimore Cherry Hill Station Alternative .....	4.2-21
4.2.10	Station Area Street Network – Washington, D.C. Mount Vernon East Station .....	4.2-24
4.2.11	Road Network Around Train Maintenance Facility Alternatives .....	4.2-26
4.2.12	Roadway Realignments (Horizontal and Vertical) Resulting from .....	4.2-28
4.2.13	BWI Marshall Airport Access .....	4.2-29
4.2.14	SCMAGLEV Project Station Area Parking .....	4.2-32
4.2.15	Station Area Urban Sidewalk and Pedestrian Networks .....	4.2-34
4.2.16	Passenger Pickup and Drop-Off Operations at SCMAGLEV Project Stations .....	4.2-36
4.2.17	Transportation Network Impacts Related to Truck and Auto Arrivals at .....	4.2-38
4.2.18	Transit Service Impacts During Construction .....	4.2-40
4.2.19	General Traffic Operations Impacted by Street Closures and Modifications .....	4.2-42
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Land Use .....</b>	<b>4.3-1</b>
4.3.1	Introduction .....	4.3-1
4.3.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.3-1
4.3.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.3-4
4.3.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.3-8
4.3.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.3-15
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Neighborhoods and Community Facilities .....</b>	<b>4.4-1</b>
4.4.1	Introduction .....	4.4-1
4.4.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.4-1
4.4.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.4-3
4.4.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.4-4
4.4.5	Mitigation Strategies .....	4.4-20

<b>4.5</b>	<b>Environmental Justice</b> .....	<b>4.5-1</b>
4.5.1	Introduction.....	4.5-1
4.5.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.5-1
4.5.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.5-5
4.5.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.5-8
4.5.5	Environmental Justice Outreach .....	4.5-21
4.5.6	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	4.5-25
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Economic Resources</b> .....	<b>4.6-1</b>
4.6.1	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.6-1
4.6.2	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.6-3
4.6.3	Environmental Consequences .....	4.6-8
4.6.4	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	4.6-21
<b>4.7</b>	<b>Recreational Facilities and Parklands</b> .....	<b>4.7-3</b>
4.7.1	Introduction.....	4.7-3
4.7.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.7-3
4.7.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.7-5
4.7.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.7-7
4.7.5	Short-term Construction Effects .....	4.7-21
4.7.6	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.7-24
<b>4.8</b>	<b>Cultural Resources</b> .....	<b>4.8-1</b>
4.8.1	Introduction.....	4.8-1
4.8.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.8-1
4.8.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.8-9
4.8.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.8-17
4.8.5	Potential minimization and mitigation strategies.....	4.8-44
<b>4.9</b>	<b>Aesthetics, Visual Quality, and Light Emissions</b> .....	<b>4.9-1</b>
4.9.1	Introduction.....	4.9-1
4.9.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.9-1
4.9.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.9-4
4.9.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.9-4
<b>4.10</b>	<b>Water Resources</b> .....	<b>4.10-1</b>
4.10.1	Introduction.....	4.10-1
4.10.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.10-2



4.10.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.10-3
4.10.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.10-12
4.10.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.10-29
<b>4.11</b>	<b>Wetlands and Waterways .....</b>	<b>4.11-1</b>
4.11.1	Introduction .....	4.11-1
4.11.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.11-1
4.11.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.11-3
4.11.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.11-7
4.11.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.11-18
<b>4.12</b>	<b>Ecological Resources .....</b>	<b>4.12-1</b>
4.12.1	Introduction .....	4.12-1
4.12.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.12-1
4.12.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.12-3
4.12.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.12-11
4.12.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.12-21
<b>4.13</b>	<b>Topography and Geology .....</b>	<b>4.13-1</b>
4.13.1	Introduction .....	4.13-1
4.13.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.13-1
4.13.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.13-3
4.13.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.13-6
4.13.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.13-8
<b>4.14</b>	<b>Soils and Farmlands .....</b>	<b>4.14-1</b>
4.14.1	Introduction .....	4.14-1
4.14.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.14-1
4.14.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.14-2
4.14.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.14-3
4.14.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.14-7
<b>4.15</b>	<b>Hazardous Material Sites and Solid Waste .....</b>	<b>4.15-1</b>
4.15.1	Introduction .....	4.15-1
4.15.2	Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.15-1
4.15.3	SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.15-4
4.15.4	Environmental Consequences .....	4.15-7
4.15.5	Potential Minimization and Mitigation Strategies .....	4.15-10

<b>4.16 Air Quality .....</b>	<b>4.16-1</b>
4.16.1 Introduction.....	4.16-1
4.16.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.16-1
4.16.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.16-6
4.16.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.16-7
4.16.5 Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	4.16-13
<b>4.17 Noise and Vibration .....</b>	<b>4.17-1</b>
4.17.1 Introduction.....	4.17-1
4.17.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.17-1
4.17.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.17-9
4.17.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.17-10
4.17.5 Short-term Construction Effects .....	4.17-14
4.17.6 Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	4.17-18
<b>4.18 Electromagnetic Fields and Electromagnetic Interference (EMF/EMI).....</b>	<b>4.18-1</b>
4.18.1 Introduction.....	4.18-1
4.18.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.18-1
4.18.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.18-2
4.18.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.18-3
<b>4.19 Energy .....</b>	<b>4.19-1</b>
4.19.1 Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.19-1
4.19.2 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.19-3
4.19.3 Environmental Consequences .....	4.19-6
4.19.4 Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	4.19-15
<b>4.20 Utilities.....</b>	<b>4.20-1</b>
4.20.1 Introduction.....	4.20-1
4.20.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology .....	4.20-1
4.20.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.20-1
4.20.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.20-2
4.20.5 Potential Mitigation Measures .....	4.20-4
<b>4.21 Public Health and Safety .....</b>	<b>4.21-1</b>
4.21.1 Introduction .....	4.21-1
4.21.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology.....	4.21-1
4.21.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.21-2

4.21.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.21-2
4.21.5 Potential Mitigation Strategies .....	4.21-6
<b>4.22 System Safety and Security .....</b>	<b>4.22-1</b>
4.22.1 Introduction .....	4.22-1
4.22.2 Regulatory Context .....	4.22-1
4.22.3 SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.22-6
4.22.4 Environmental Consequences .....	4.22-11
4.22.5 Safety and Security Compliance Measures and Mitigation .....	4.22-19
<b>4.23 Indirect and Cumulative Effects .....</b>	<b>4.23-1</b>
4.23.1 Introduction .....	4.23-1
4.23.2 Regulatory Context and Methodology.....	4.23-1
4.23.3 Indirect Effects Assessment .....	4.23-7
4.23.4 Cumulative Effects Assessment .....	4.23-9
<b>4.24 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources .....</b>	<b>4.24-1</b>
4.24.1 Commitment of Resources.....	4.24-1
4.24.1.1 Natural Resources .....	4.24-1
4.24.1.2 Cultural Resources .....	4.24-2
4.24.1.3 Energy .....	4.24-3
4.24.1.4 Mitigation .....	4.24-3

## **Chapter 5 Public Involvement and Agency Coordination .... 5-1**

<b>5.1 Notice of Intent .....</b>	<b>5-2</b>
<b>5.2 Public Communication .....</b>	<b>5-3</b>
5.2.1 Public Involvement Activities .....	5-3
5.2.2 Communicating with the Public .....	5-3
<b>5.3 Public Outreach .....</b>	<b>5-8</b>
5.3.1 Public Scoping Process, Meetings and Comments – December 2016 .....	5-8
5.3.2 Scoping Public Open House Meetings – December 2016 .....	5-11
5.3.3 Purpose and Need and Initial Alternatives Public Open House Meetings – April 2017 .....	5-12
5.3.4 Preliminary Alternatives Screening Public Open House Meetings – October 2017 .....	5-14
5.3.5 Cherry Hill/Patapsco Avenue, Baltimore City Public Open House Meeting – December 2018 .....	5-18

5.3.6 Other Stakeholder Involvement Activities .....	5-21
<b>5.4 Agency Coordination.....</b>	<b>5-22</b>
5.4.1 Cooperating and Participating Agency Coordination.....	5-22
5.4.2 Agencies, Roles, and Responsibilities .....	5-22
5.4.3 Agency Scoping .....	5-29
5.4.4 Section 106 Consultation .....	5-31
5.4.5 Section 4(f) Coordination.....	5-32
5.4.6 Additional Agency Involvement Activities.....	5-32

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>ES-1</b>
Table ES3.1-1: Ancillary Facilities .....	ES-8
Table ES3.2-1: Comparison of Previous and Current SCMAGLEV Project Elements.....	ES-10
Table ES3.2-2: DEIS Build Alternatives .....	ES-11
Table ES4.3-1: Build Alternatives Environmental Resource Impacts.....	ES-19
Table ES4.3-2: Build Alternatives Engineering Resource Impacts.....	ES-20
Table ES4.3-3: Federal Property Impacts .....	ES-23
Table ES5.0-1: Likely Federal Permits and Approvals.....	ES-25
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
Table 1.2-1: Likely Federal Permits and Approvals .....	1-6
<b>Chapter 3 Alternatives Considered .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
Table 3.4-1: DEIS Build Alternatives .....	3-13
Table 3.4-2: Summary of Build Alternatives J and J1 Alignments.....	3-19
Table 3.4-3: Summary of TMF Location Options .....	3-20
Table 3.4-4: Summary of Station Locations and Features .....	3-26
Table 3.4-5: Service Characteristics.....	3-37
Table 3.4-6: Summary of Major Utility Relocations.....	3-37
Table 3.4-7 Summary of Permanent Existing Public Roadway Relocations .....	3-38
Table 3.4-8: Summary of Stormwater Management Facility Locations by Build Alternative...	3-39

## **Chapter 4 Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences and Mitigation .....4-1**

Table 4.1-1: Resource Topic Organization .....	4.1-10
Table 4.2-1: Service Characteristics.....	4.2-5
Table 4.2.2: Forecasted Annual Ridership on the SCMALEV: Years 2030 (Opening Year) ..... and 2045 (Horizon Year).....	4.2-6
Table 4.2-3: Forecasted Source of SCMAGLEV Ridership and Forecasted Diversions to SCMAGLEV from other Modes for the Years 2030 and 2045, by Baltimore .....	
Station Alternative.....	4.2-7
Table 4.2-4: Future MARC No Build Peak Period Service Frequencies .....	4.2-10
Table 4.2-5: Year 2045 Peak Hour Access and Egress Mode for Each SCMAGLEV Trip, ..... by SCMAGLEV Station, by Station Alternative .....	4.2-17
Table 4.2-6: Changes in LOS and Delay Between the No Build and Build Alternatives in ..... Mount Vernon East Station Area (Camden Yards Station Alternative) .....	4.2-25
Table 4.2-7: Changes in LOS and Delay Between the No Build and Build Alternatives in ..... Mount Vernon East Station Area (Cherry Hill Station Alternative)s.....	4.2-25
Table 4.2-8: Proposed Parking Capacity Added at Each Station Area .....	4.2-33
Table 4.3-1: Property Ownership Classification within the SCMAGLEV Affected ..... Environment.....	4.3-4
Table 4.3-2: Federally Owned/Managed Land by Federal Agency within the SCMAGLEV..... Affected Environment.....	4.3-4
Table 4.3-3: Land Use Classification within the SCMAGLEV Affected Environment.....	4.3-5
Table 4.3-4: Changes in Land Use and Parcel Impacts by Build Alternative .....	4.3-10
Table 4.4-1: Neighborhoods and Community Facilities: Summary of Environmental..... Consequences by each Build Alternatives.....	4.4-5
Table 4.5-1: Regional Environmental Justice Demographics.....	4.5-4
Table 4.5-2: EJ Demographics in the SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.5-6
Table 4.5-3: Impacts Considered in Disproportionality Analysis .....	4.5-8
Table 4.6-1: Operations and Maintenance Impacts of Build Alternatives (2018\$ million).....	4.6-1
Table 4.6-2: Summary of Potential Travel Market Impacts of the Build Alternatives ..... Recurring, 2018\$ million) .....	4.6-1
Table 4.6-3: Property Premium and Tax Revenue of Build Alternatives (2018\$ million) .....	4.6-5
Table 4.6-4: SCMAGLEV Fiscal Acquisition Impacts for Build Alternatives J (2018\$) .....	4.6-7

Table 4.6-5: SCMAGLEV Fiscal Acquisition Impacts for Build Alternatives J1 (2018\$) .....	4.6-8
Table 4.6-6: Construction and Professional Services Impacts in Terms of Job-Years .....	4.6-16
Table 4.6-7: Construction and Professional Services Impacts in Terms of Earnings (2018\$ million) .....	4.6-17
Table 4.6-8: Low and High Estimates of Annual Revenue Loss Impact by NAICS Code and Station/TMF, thousands of 2018 dollars .....	4.6-19
Table 4.7-1: Recreational Facilities and Parklands in the SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.7-6
Table 4.7-2: Total Permanent (P) and Temporary (T) Property Impacts to Recreational Facilities and Parklands by Build Alternative .....	4.7-10
Table 4.7-3: Summary of Permanent (P) and Temporary (T) Property Impacts to Recreational Facilities and Parklands by Build Alternative (in Acres) .....	4.7-11
Table 4.7-4: Permanent (P) and Temporary (T) Property Impacts to Recreational Facilities and Parklands, Build Alternatives J [in Acres] .....	4.7-17
Table 4.7-5: Permanent (P) and Temporary (T) Property Impacts to Recreational Facilities and Parklands, Build Alternatives J1 [in Acres] .....	4.7-18
Table 4.8-1: Resources in the Above-ground APE by Build Alternative .....	4.8-10
Table 4.8-2: Resources in the Archaeological APE by Build Alternative .....	4.8-14
Table 4.8-3: Archeological Sensitivity by Project Element .....	4.8-16
Table 4.8-4: Alignment J – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources .....	4.8-18
Table 4.8-5: Alignment J1 – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources .....	4.8-23
Table 4.8-6: Alignment J – Potential Impacts to Archaeological Resources .....	4.8-28
Table 4.8-7: Alignment J1 – Potential Impacts to Archaeological Resources .....	4.8-28
Table 4.8-8: Mount Vernon Square East Station – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources (District of Columbia) .....	4.8-30
Table 4.8-9: Cherry Hill Station – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources (Maryland) .....	4.8-32
Table 4.8-10: Camden Yards Station – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources (Maryland) .....	4.8-33
Table 4.8-11: BARC Airfield TMF – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources (Maryland) .....	4.8-35
Table 4.8-12: BARC West TMF – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources (Maryland) .....	4.8-36
Table 4.8-13: MD 198 TMF – Potential Impacts to Above-ground Resources .....	4.8-36
Table 4.8-14: Summary of Impacts to Above-Ground and Archaeological Cultural Resources .....	4.8-37

Table 4.8-15: Potential Adverse Effects on Above-Ground Historic Properties by Build Alternative .....	4.8-38
Table 4.8-16: Table 4.8-16: Potential Adverse Effects to Archaeological Historic Properties by Build Alternative .....	4.8-42
Table 4.9-1: Visual Resource Ranking .....	4.9-3
Table 4.9-2: Number of Visually Sensitive Resources Impacted by Build Alternatives.....	4.9-6
Table 4.9-3: Detailed Summary of Visually Sensitive Resources Impacted by Build Alternatives .....	4.9-23
Table 4.10-1: Existing Watersheds within the SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment ..	4.10-5
Table 4.10-2: Critical Area Impact Summary .....	4.10-26
Table 4.11-1: Affected Environment Wetlands and Waterways Summary .....	4.11-4
Table 4.11-2: Permanent Wetland Impact Summary .....	4.11-9
Table 4.11-3: Permanent Nontidal Waterway Impact Summary .....	4.11-13
Table 4.11-4: Tidal Waterway Impact Summary .....	4.11-13
Table 4.12-1: Presence of Habitat Types within the SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment .....	4.12-4
Table 4.14-1: Summary of Total Farmland Soil Impact.....	4.14-4
Table 4.14-2: Summary of Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Scores .....	4.14-5
Table 4.15-1: Medium High and Medium Risk Hazardous Materials Sites.....	4.15-8
Table 4.16-1: Nonattainment and Maintenance Status.....	4.16-7
Table 4.16-2: Worst-Case CO Intersections and Predicted CO Concentrations .....	4.16-9
Table 4.16-3: Cherry Hill Station Alternatives Mesoscale No-Build to Build Net Change in Daily and Annual Emissions .....	4.16-10
Table 4.16-4: Camden Yards Station Alternatives Mesoscale No-Build to Build Net Change in Daily and Annual Emissions .....	4.16-10
Table 4.16-5: Mesoscale Operational Emissions (tons per Year) .....	4.16-11
Table 4.16-6: Worst-case Construction Emissions for All Build Alternatives .....	4.16-12
Table 4.16-7: Worst-case Combined Construction and Operational Emissions for All Build Alternatives (tons per Year) .....	4.16-13
Table 4.17-1: Corridor wide Impact Counts for Noise and Vibration .....	4.17-2
Table 4.17-2: FRA Ground-borne Vibration and Noise Criteria.....	4.17-3
Table 4.17-3: General Assessment Construction Noise Criteria.....	4.17-4

Table 4.17-4: Construction Vibration Damage Criteria .....	4.17-4
Table 4.17-5: Build Alternatives and Project Source Evaluation Matrix .....	4.17-7
Table 4.17-6: Baseline Noise Monitoring Results .....	4.17-9
Table 4.17-7: Corridor wide Impact Counts for Noise and Vibration .....	4.17-11
Table 4.18-1: Identified EMF/EMI Sensitive Receptors .....	4.18-4
Table 4.18-2: Identified EMF/EMI Sensitive Receptors near TMF's.....	4.18-7
Table 4.18-3: Potential Issues Related to Increased Electric and Magnetic Fields .....	4.18-9
Table 4.19-1: Units of Measurement .....	4.19-3
Table 4.19-2: State Energy Overview and Consumption by Sector .....	4.19-4
Table 4.19-3: U.S. Energy Consumption by Transportation Mode.....	4.19-4
Table 4.19-4: Energy Consumption by Source .....	4.19-5
Table 4.19-5: 2045 Projected Transportation Energy Consumption for No Build .....	
Alternative .....	4.19-7
Table 4.19-6: 2045 Projected Transportation Energy Consumption for Build .....	
Alternatives .....	4.19-10
Table 4.19-7: 2045 Comparison of Changes in Energy Use.....	4.19-11
Table 4.19-8: Boring Machine Energy Consumption .....	4.19-14
Table 4.19-9: Energy Consumption from Worker Transportation.....	4.19-15
Table 4.19-10: Energy Consumption from Construction Trucking .....	4.19-15
Table 4.20-1: Major Public Utilities in SCMAGLEV Project Affected Environment.....	4.20-2
Table 4.22-1: Hazard Frequency and Severity Indicators .....	4.22-5
Table 4.22-2: 2017 Offenses known to Law Enforcement for Affected Localities.....	4.22-8
Table 4.22-3: First Responders by Vertical Access Locations (Stations and Fresh .....	
Air/Emergency Egress Facilities) .....	4.22-10
Table 4.23-1: Representative Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions .....	4.23-6

## **Chapter 5 Public Involvement and Agency Coordination .... 5-1**

Table 5.2-1: Public Involvement by NEPA Milestone.....	5-3
Table 5.3-1: Scoping Flier Distribution .....	5-9
Table 5.3-2: Scoping Public Open House Meeting Dates and Times .....	5-11
Table 5.3-3: Comments by Topic .....	5-11
Table 5.3-4: Purpose and Need and Initial Alternatives Open House Meetings.....	5-13



Table 5.3-5: Purpose and Need and Initial Alternatives Open House Flier Distribution..... 5-14  
 Table 5.3-6: Cherry Hill/Patapsco Avenue, Baltimore City Open House ..... 5-20  
 Table 5.3-7: Cherry Hill/Patapsco Avenue, Baltimore City Open House Flier Distribution ..... 5-20  
 Table 5.4-1: Lead Agencies and Invited Cooperating and Participating Agencies ..... 5-25  
 Table 5.4-2: List of Agency Meetings ..... 5-33

## LIST OF FIGURES

**Executive Summary ..... ES-1**  
 Figure ES1.3-1: Project Study Area ..... ES-5

**Chapter 1 Introduction..... 1-1**  
 Figure 1.1-1: Project Study Area ..... 1-3

**Chapter 2 Purpose and Need ..... 2-1**  
 Figure 2.1-1: Population..... 2-4  
 Figure 2.1-2: Employment..... 2-4

**Chapter 3 Alternatives Considered ..... 3-1**  
 Figure 3.1-1: SCMAGLEV Guideway ..... 3-2  
 Figure 3.2-1: Typical Tunnel and Viaduct Sections ..... 3-3  
 Figure 3.4-1: Build Alternatives J-01 through J-03 – BWP East with Cherry Hill Station ..... 3-14  
 Figure 3.4-2: Build Alternatives J-04 through J-06 – BWP East with Camden Station..... 3-15  
 Figure 3.4-3: Build Alternatives J1-01 through J1-03 – BWP West with Cherry Hill Station... 3-16  
 Figure 3.4-4: Build Alternatives J1-04 through J1-06 – BWP West with Camden Station ..... 3-17  
 Figure 3.4-5: Conceptual TMF Layout..... 3-21  
 Figure 3.4-6: MOW Facility Illustration ..... 3-24  
 Figure 3.4-7: Station Layout Concept (BWI Marshall Airport and Mount Vernon Square  
 East Stations) ..... 3-27  
 Figure 3.4-8: Concept Plans for Mount Vernon Square East Station and BWI Marshall  
 Airport Station ..... 3-28  
 Figure 3.4-9: Concept Plans for Cherry Hill Station ..... 3-29

Figure 3.4-10: Concept Plans for Cherry Hill Station ..... 3-30

Figure 3.4-11: Concept Plans for Camden Yards Station ..... 3-31

Figure 3.4-12: Plan View (top-down) of Generic Station Layout ..... 3-31

Figure 3.4-13: Typical Fresh Air and Emergency Egress Site Layout..... 3-32

Figure 3.4-14: Electric Power Substation Layout..... 3-35

**Chapter 4 Affected Environment, Environmental  
Consequences and Mitigation ..... 4-1**

Figure 4.1-1: Build Alternatives Geographic Context..... 4.1-3

Figure 4.5-1: Environmental Justice Population Areas ..... 4.5-7

Figure 4.6-1: Washington-Baltimore-Arlington Combined Statistical Area (2012) ..... 4.6-4

Figure 4.6-2: Median Home Value for Washington, D.C., Baltimore City and Inner  
Suburbs (2019, Q4) ..... 4.6-5

Figure 4.6-3: Median Household Income for Washington, D.C., Baltimore City and  
Inner Suburbs (2018) ..... 4.6-6

Figure 4.6-4: Origin of Commuters to Washington, D.C. MSA (2017)..... 4.6-7

Figure 4.6-5: Origin of Commuters to Baltimore MSA (2017) ..... 4.6-7

Figure 4.9-1: Common Aesthetic Areas (CAA) within the AVE ..... 4.9-5

Figure 4.9-2: CAA #4 – Illustrative Rendering of FA/EE Proposed in New Carrollton,  
Looking East..... 4.9-8

Figure 4.9-3: CAAs #5, #6, #7, #8, #9 – Illustrative Rendering of Alignment J Tunnel  
Portal at Explorer Road Interchange with Ramps to BARC West TMF,  
Looking North ..... 4.9-9

Figure 4.9-4: CAAs #5, #6, #7, #8, #9 – Illustrative Rendering of Alignment J1 Tunnel  
Portal at Explorer Road Interchange with Ramps to BARC Airstrip TMF,  
Looking North ..... 4.9-9

Figure 4.9-5: CAA #11 and #12- Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Build Alternative J1  
Parallel to Southbound BWP Crossing the Patuxent River,  
Looking Southwest ..... 4.9-10

Figure 4.9-6: CAA #10 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Build Alternative J1  
Tunnel Portal near Brock Bridge Elementary School and Maryland City,  
Looking East..... 4.9-11

Figure 4.9-7: CAA #13 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Alignment J1 FA/EE  
near Fort George G. Meade and NPS BW Parkway, Looking North..... 4.9-12

Figure 4.9-8:CAA #1 - Illustrative Rendering of Possible Entrance to Proposed Mount .....  
Vernon Station, Looking Northeast ..... 4.9-14

Figure 4.9-9: CAA #16 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Station at BWI Marshall .....  
Airport – Parking Garage and Terminal, Looking East ..... 4.9-15

Figure 4.9-10: CAAs #18 and #19 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Cherry Hill .....  
Station, Tunnel Portal, Maintenance of Way Facility, and Parking Structures, .....  
Looking North ..... 4.9-16

Figure 4.9-11: CAA #20 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed Station near Camden .....  
Yards in Downtown Baltimore on Pratt Street, Looking East ..... 4.9-18

Figure 4.9-12: CAAs #5 and #6 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed BARC Airstrip .....  
TMF and Corresponding Ramps with Alignment J1, Looking East ..... 4.9-19

Figure 4.9-13: CAAs #5, #6, and #8 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed BARC West .....  
TMF with and Corresponding Ramps with Alignment J, Looking North..... 4.9-20

Figure 4.9-14: CAAs #10, #11, and #12 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed MD 198 .....  
TMF with and Corresponding Ramps with Alignment J near Tipton Airport, .....  
Fort George G. Meade, and NSA, Looking West ..... 4.9-21

Figure 4.9-15: CAAs #10 and #12 - Illustrative Rendering of Proposed MD 198 TMF .....  
with and Corresponding Ramps with Alignment J near Patuxent Research.....  
Refuge, Fort George G. Meade, and NSA, Looking North ..... 4.9-22

Figure 4.10-1: Watershed Boundaries ..... 4.10-6

Figure 4.10-2: Groundwater Wellhead Protection Areas ..... 4.10-10

Figure 4.13-1: Physiographic Provinces ..... 4.13-3

Figure 4.17-1: Noise Impact Criteria for High-Speed Rail Project ..... 4.17-3

Figure 4.17-2: Typical A-Weighted Maximum Sound Levels ..... 4.17-5

Figure 4.17-3: Typical Levels of Ground-borne Vibration ..... 4.17-6

Figure 4.17-4: Viaduct vs. Tunnel Noise Impacts ..... 4.17-15

Figure 4.17-5: Comparison of Vibration Impacts ..... 4.17-16

Figure 4.17-6: Comparison of Ground-borne Noise Impacts ..... 4.17-17

Figure 4.18-1: Schematic of Magnetic Shields ..... 4.18-8

Figure 4.19-1: BGE and PEPCO Service Areas in the Baltimore-Washington Corridor..... 4.19-6

Figure 4.19-2: Benchmarking Projected SCMAGLEV Energy Intensity to Comparable .....  
Trains on a Usable Area Basis ..... 4.19-9

Figure 4.19-3: Benchmarking Projected SCMAGLEV Energy Intensity to Comparable .....  
Trains on a Seat Basis ..... 4.19-10

Figure 4.19-4: PJM Day-Ahead Congestion Costs ..... 4.19-13  
 Figure 4.19-5: Demand Profile on Standard Weekday ..... 4.19-14  
 Figure 4.22-1: SCMAGLEV U-Shaped Guideway ..... 4.22-7  
 Figure 4.22-2: Viaduct with Maintenance Walkways ..... 4.22-17  
 Figure 4.22-3: Emergency Evacuation Exits for Tunnel Sections ..... 4.22-18  
 Figure 4.23-1 Cumulative Effects Geographic Boundary..... 4.23-5

## **Chapter 5 Public Involvement and Agency Coordination .... 5-1**

Figure 5.0-1: The Five Key Steps for NEPA Public Participation Council on Environmental  
Quality (CEQ) NEPA Regulations (40 C.F.R. 1501.7) ..... 5-1  
 Figure 5.1-1: Screen Capture of Project Website ..... 5-4  
 Figure 5.3-1: Environmental Justice Communities and Scoping Flier Distribution  
Locations..... 5-10  
 Figure 5.3-2: Preliminary Alternative Alignments and Public Open House Meeting  
Locations..... 5-15  
 Figure 5.3-3: Summary of Public Comments from April 2017 and October 2017  
Purpose and Need and Preliminary Alternatives Screening Open House  
Meetings ..... 5-16  
 Figure 5.3-4: Cherry Hill/Patapsco Avenue Mailing Area and Proposed 2018 Elements ..... 5-19

## **LIST OF APPENDICIES AND TECHNICAL REPORTS**

Appendix A Glossary, Acronyms, References, Distribution List, and List of Preparers  
 Appendix B Mapping Atlas  
 Appendix C Alterantives Development Summary  
 Appendix D.1 Permits and Authorizations  
 Appendix D.2 Transportation Technical Report  
 Appendix D.3 Socioeconomic Environment Technical Report  
 Appendix D.4 Economic Impact Analysis Technical Report  
 Appendix D.5 Cultural Resources\*  
 Appendix D.6 Aesthetics, Visual Quality and Light Emissions  
 Appendix D.7 Natural Environment Technical Report  
 Appendix D.8 Hazardous Materials Sites and Solid Waste  
 Appendix D.9 Air Quality Technical Report  
 Appendix D.10 . Noise and Vibration  
 Appendix D.11 Electromagnetic Fields and Interference  
 Appendix E Public Involvement Agency Coordination

Appendix F	Draft 4(f) Evaluation
Appendix G.1	Facility Parcel Impact Submittal
Appendix G.2	DEIS Drawings
Appendix G.3	Electromagnetic Fields
Appendix G.4	Operations Plan
Appendix G.5	Train Speed Profiles
Appendix G.6	Safety and Security Technical Memorandum
Appendix G.7	Construction Planning Memorandum
Appendix G.8	Traffic Control Plans Memorandum Stations and Viaduct
Appendix G.9	Capital and Construction Cost Tables
Appendix G.10	Electrical Coordination Technical Memorandum
Appendix G.11	Sponsor's Proposal for Preferred Alternative Selection
Appendix G.12	Trainset Maintenance Facility (TMF) Alternatives Assessment Comparison
Appendix G.13	Preliminary Geotechnical Engineering Assessment Report
Appendix G.14	Public Transportation Impacts Technical Memorandum
Appendix G.15	Operations and Maintenance Memorandum

\*The Draft Programmatic Attachment is included in Appendix D.5 as an attachment.