

Appendix E.02 - Land Cover



Land Cover Effects Assessment Methodology

June 3, 2014
Revised FINAL

Submitted by:

PARSONS
BRINCKERHOFF **AECOM**
A J O I N T V E N T U R E

Table of Contents

1. LAND COVER	1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.2 DEFINITIONS.....	1
1.3 RELATED RESOURCES	3
1.4 AGENCY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK.....	4
1.4.1 Regulatory Compliance	5
1.5 METHODOLOGY TO ASSESS EFFECTS.....	5
1.5.1 Existing Conditions.....	5
1.5.2 Environmental Consequences	7
1.5.3 Mitigation Strategies	8
1.6 TIER 1 EIS OUTCOMES	9
1.7 APPLICABILITY TO TIER 2 ASSESSMENTS	9

Tables

TABLE 1: LAND COVER CLASSIFICATIONS AND DEFINITIONS	2
TABLE 2: RELATED RESOURCE INPUTS TO LAND COVER ASSESSMENT	4
TABLE 3: LAND COVER DATA SOURCES	6

1. Land Cover

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This methodology explains how the NEC FUTURE program will address the potential effects of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives on existing and planned land cover in the Tier 1 EIS. The analysis will identify areas where the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives are incompatible with existing land cover and may result in a conversion of that land cover. It further describes consideration of potential acquisitions and displacements resulting from potential conversions of land cover.

This methodology presents the regulatory framework, involved government agencies, expected regulatory and other outcomes of the Tier 1 EIS process, and relevance to Tier 2, project-level assessments. It also identifies data sources, metrics and methods to be used to document existing conditions and analyze environmental consequences. This methodology may be revised as the NEC FUTURE program advances and new information is available.

1.2 DEFINITIONS

Land cover is the observed physical cover on the earth's surface. **Land use** is characterized by the arrangements, activities and inputs people undertake in a certain land cover type to produce, change or maintain it.¹ For purposes of this analysis, the identification of land cover classifications for the NEC FUTURE Study Area is based on the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) developed by the Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC) within the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).² Specific land uses are not discussed because land use is not reported consistently within the Study Area.

Table 1 identifies the land cover classifications used in the NEC FUTURE analysis. It should be noted that the NLCD dataset identifies 19 land cover categories. Four of the land cover categories apply only to Alaska, and therefore, are not applicable to the Study Area. Furthermore, similar NLCD categories were consolidated, resulting in 9 land cover categories that make up the NEC FUTURE land cover classifications to be used in the Tier 1 EIS.

¹<http://www.fao.org/docrep/003/X0596E/x0596e01e.htm> (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Natural Resources and Environment Department)

² MRLC partners include: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA); United States Forest Service (USFS); United States Geological Survey (USGS); Bureau of Land Management (BLM); National Park Service (NPS); National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS); and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Table 1: Land Cover Classifications and Definitions

NEC FUTURE Land Cover Classification	NLCD Classification	NLCD Definition
Open Water	Open Water	Areas of open water, generally with less than 25% cover of vegetation or soil.
Developed, Open Space	Developed, Open Space	Areas with a mixture of some constructed materials, but mostly vegetation in the form of lawn grasses. Impervious surfaces account for less than 20% of total cover. These areas most commonly include large-lot single-family housing units, parks, golf courses, and vegetation planted in developed settings for recreation, erosion control, or aesthetic purposes.
Developed, Low Intensity	Developed, Low Intensity	Areas with a mixture of constructed materials and vegetation. Impervious surfaces account for 20 to 49 percent of total cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units.
Developed, Medium Intensity	Developed, Medium Intensity	Areas with a mixture of constructed materials and vegetation. Impervious surfaces account for 50 to 79 percent of the total cover. These areas most commonly include single-family housing units.
Developed High Intensity	Developed High Intensity	Highly developed areas where people reside or work in high numbers. Examples include apartment complexes, row houses and commercial/industrial. Impervious surfaces account for 80 to 100 percent of the total cover.
Barren Land	Barren Land (Rock/Sand/Clay)	Areas of bedrock, desert pavement, scarps, talus, slides, volcanic material, glacial debris, sand dunes, strip mines, gravel pits and other accumulations of earthen material. Generally, vegetation accounts for less than 15 percent of total cover.
Forest/Shrub	Deciduous Forest	Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20 percent of total vegetation cover. More than 75 percent of the tree species shed foliage simultaneously in response to seasonal change.
	Evergreen Forest	Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20 percent of total vegetation cover. More than 75 percent of the tree species maintain their leaves all year. Canopy is never without green foliage.
	Mixed Forest	Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20 percent of total vegetation cover. Neither deciduous nor evergreen species are greater than 75 percent of total tree cover.
	Shrub/Scrub	Areas dominated by shrubs; less than 5 meters tall with shrub canopy typically greater than 20 percent of total vegetation. This class includes true shrubs, young trees in an early successional stage or trees stunted from environmental conditions.

Table 1: Land Cover Classifications and Definitions (continued)

NEC FUTURE Land Cover Classification	NLCD Classification	NLCD Definition
Grassland/Cultivated	Grassland/Herbaceous	Areas dominated by graminoid or herbaceous vegetation, generally greater than 80 percent of total vegetation. These areas are not subject to intensive management such as tilling, but can be utilized for grazing.
	Pasture/Hay	Areas of grasses, legumes, or grass-legume mixtures planted for livestock grazing or the production of seed or hay crops, typically on a perennial cycle. Pasture/hay vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of total vegetation.
	Cultivated Crops	Areas used for the production of annual crops, such as corn, soybeans, vegetables, tobacco, and cotton, and also perennial woody crops such as orchards and vineyards. Crop vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of total vegetation. This class also includes all land being actively tilled.
Wetland	Woody Wetlands	Areas where forest or shrubland vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of vegetative cover and the soil or substrate is periodically saturated with or covered with water.
	Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	Areas where perennial herbaceous vegetation accounts for greater than 80 percent of vegetative cover and the soil or substrate is periodically saturated with or covered with water.

Source: NEC FUTURE 2013, National Land Cover Database

In addition to describing land cover, this assessment also identifies where changes to the existing land cover may result in acquisitions and displacements. An **acquisition** is the process of acquiring real property (real estate) or some interest therein³. A **displacement** is the necessary relocation of a land occupant.

1.3 RELATED RESOURCES

While the NLCD provides a general description of land cover type, related resource data is useful to supplement those descriptions. For example, while the NLCD provides a broad geographic area of cover for open space, parklands data further differentiates that broad classification. Therefore, as appropriate, data and analyses from related resources will be used as an overlay or supplement to the NLCD for the assessment of land cover conditions and potential consequences.

These related resources are identified in Table 2. Note that effects assessments for those related resources will be documented within their respective Tier 1 EIS sections.

³ U.S. DOT, Federal Highway Administration, *Acquiring Real Property for Federal and Federal Aid Programs and Projects*, Publication No. June 2005

Table 2: Related Resource Inputs to Land Cover Assessment

Resource	Input to Land Cover Assessment
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location of existing and proposed transportation corridors and facilities to assess compatibility with the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives ▪ Location of existing and proposed passenger rail stations to assess potential effects on existing or proposed land cover classifications
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hydrologic features (major rivers, streams, etc.) and coastal zones that may be incompatible with the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives across all land cover classifications
Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information about parklands including type, protection, LWCF status, and accessibility to inform the potential for incompatible use and/or to identify the potential for change in use across all of the land cover classifications
Cultural and Historic Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information about eligible and listed historic sites (archaeological or architectural) within the Affected Environment to assess the potential effects within the Affected Environment and/or areas of concern within the Context Area across all of the land cover classifications
Section 4(f) Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information about the location of Section 4(f) resources within the Affected Environment that could result in a 'use' due to changes in land cover
Agricultural Lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information about specific agricultural lands to assess the potential for incompatibility of the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives with existing or proposed agricultural lands within the broader land cover classification of Grassland/Cultivated
Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information identifying the location for EJ populations to assess the potential to disrupt community cohesion with the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives
Noise and Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information identifying the location of sensitive receptors to assess the potential for incompatible use
Ecological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supplemental information identifying the location of federally-listed threatened and endangered species and habitats that could be affected by changes in land cover

Source: NEC FUTURE JV Team, 2013

1.4 AGENCY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

In general, land use is governed at the local level, with the exception of federally-owned lands. This Tier 1 EIS will consider programmatic effects on land cover and regional planning, consistent with the FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts as the overarching regulatory framework. The FRA procedures note that the EIS should evaluate the compatibility of each alternative on local land use controls and comprehensive regional planning. As such, the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS will assess state and MPO land use plans. Local land use planning and zoning will be addressed at the subsequent Tier 2 assessment. Specific regulatory compliance requirements applicable to Tier 2 are addressed in Section 1.7 of this methodology.

1.4.1 Regulatory Compliance

No formal agency approvals would be requested for the Tier 1 EIS. The requirements for subsequent Tier 2 evaluation, including compliance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), will be described in the Tier 1 EIS. During the Tier 1 EIS process, the FRA will initiate dialogue with states and MPOs, as no federal agency has jurisdiction over local land use. Coordination with these entities will be consistent with the NEC FUTURE's Agency Coordination Plan and support the Statement of Principles (SOP) established between the FRA and federal regulatory agencies as part of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Pilot program. The NEC FUTURE's Agency Coordination Plan (May 2013) identifies both states and MPOs as entities of which the FRA will coordinate with in support of the Tier 1 EIS document.

1.5 METHODOLOGY TO ASSESS EFFECTS

This effects assessment methodology identifies the approach and assumptions for describing existing conditions of land cover and environmental consequences of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives on those resources. It identifies data sources, defines the Affected Environment and Context Area considered, and the approach for assessing potential direct effects.⁴ Direct effects include encroachment or alteration of existing or planned land cover. Indirect effects,⁵ such as those resulting from induced growth as a result of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives, will be addressed in a separate methodology (see Indirect Effects Assessment Methodology).

1.5.1 Existing Conditions

The data sources listed in Table 3 will be used to establish the existing conditions for land cover. As stated in Section 1.2, the NLCD was selected as the best consistently available data in Geographic Information System (GIS) format. This information will be supplemented with parks data and other data obtained for the various resources identified in Table 2.

The existing conditions for land cover will be documented in the Tier 1 EIS for an established Affected Environment and Context Area. The Affected Environment is a ½-mile swath centered on the Representative Route⁶ for each of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. This ½-mile swath⁷ is intended to:

- ▶ Encompass and account for the improvements associated with a Representative Route including infrastructure improvements (such as embankments, aerial structures, track improvements), ancillary facilities (such as stations, yards and parking structures), or service changes
- ▶ Account for contiguous land cover that may extend beyond the Representative Route

⁴ Direct effects are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place (40 CFR § 1508.8)

⁵ Indirect effects are those that occur later in time or are further removed in distance (40 CFR § 1508.8)

⁶ Representative Route refers to a proposed route or potential alignment for a Tier 1 EIS Alternative. The Representative Route includes the physical footprint of the improvements associated with the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. The horizontal and vertical dimensions of the footprint of the Representative Route are based on prototypical cross-sections for these improvements. The Representative Route is used as a proxy for estimating the potential effects of a route whose location could shift during subsequent project-level reviews.

⁷ The swath sizes differ for the various related resources identified in Table 2. Information collected as part of the other Tier 1 EIS resources will be used to supplement that land cover existing conditions information, as needed. During the effects assessment, FRA will review swath sizes of related resources and adjust to reconcile any inconsistencies.

Table 3: Land Cover Data Sources

Topic	Data Source	Data Application
Land Cover	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ National Land Cover Database (NLCD) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of GIS based Data Viewer tool GIS based analysis to quantify (acres) assessment of land covers in the Affected Environment
State Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia's Office of Planning, <i>The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital</i> (2004) ▪ Maryland Department of Planning: <i>Plan Maryland, A Sustainable Growth Plan for the 21st Century</i> (2011) ▪ Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination, <i>Delaware Strategies for State Policies and Spending</i> (2010) ▪ New Jersey State Planning Commission, <i>New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan</i> (2001) ▪ <i>Land Use 2025: Rhode Island State Land Use Plans and Policies</i> (State Planning Council, 2005) ▪ Connecticut Office of Policy and Management Intergovernmental Policy Division, <i>Policies Plan for Connecticut: 2005-2010</i> (2005) (2013-2018 update titled: <i>Conservation and Development Policies: The Plan for Connecticut</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goals and Objectives reviewed to determine if the NEC FUTURE program is consistent with them
MPO Plans ⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), <i>The TPB Vision</i> ▪ Baltimore Regional Transportation Board, <i>Plan It 2035</i> ▪ Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), <i>Connections: The Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future</i> (2009) ▪ <i>Vision 2020, An Agenda for the Future</i> (Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, 2011) ▪ <i>Valley Vision: the Regional Land Use Plan for the Pioneer Valley</i> (Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, 2011) ▪ <i>Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Plan of Conservation & Development</i> (Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley, 2008) ▪ <i>Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (South Central Region Council of Governments, 2009) ▪ <i>2008 Regional Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (Capitol Region Council of Governments, 2008) ▪ <i>Regional Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, 2007) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goals and Objectives reviewed to determine if the NEC FUTURE program is consistent with them

Source: NEC FUTURE JV, 2014

⁸ This list of MPO plans represents MPOs within the NEC FUTURE Study Area that have land use plans. Not all of the MPOs within the NEC FUTURE Study Area have land use plans

The total area (acres) of land cover by classification will be estimated for the Affected Environment within each state on a county-by-county basis. Acres and percentage of land cover by classification will be presented in tables and also mapped using GIS. Land cover acres will be converted into percentages to represent the portion of the Affected Environment (state and county) that individual land cover classifications represent.

The Context Area is 5 miles wide, centered on the Representative Route for each of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. Within the Context Area, land cover will be mapped, but total area will not be quantified, in order to qualitatively characterize the resources that could be affected should the Representative Route shift. For resources within the Context Area, general characteristics of, and relative size and location of, land cover will be presented; this information will be used to supplement the quantitative assessment of effects for the Affected Environment.

The goals and objectives of relevant state and regional plans will be compiled and reviewed to ascertain if the NEC FUTURE program supports those goals and objectives. Within the Study Area, Washington D.C., Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and Connecticut have undertaken state-level planning efforts to guide growth, conservation, development, and future land use. The remaining states do not have state level planning efforts. As such, land use planning documents developed by federally mandated metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) will be reviewed for those states. The FRA will coordinate with states and MPOs to confirm that the data presented with regard to land use appropriately captures their existing and future land use plans and policies.

1.5.2 Environmental Consequences

Environmental consequences will be quantitatively assessed for the Affected Environment. A qualitative assessment of resources present in the Context Area will be used to supplement the effects assessment.

For the Affected Environment, the effects analysis will identify the potential for a change in land cover as well as the compatibility of Tier 1 EIS Alternatives with existing and proposed land use plans. The analysis of land cover within the Affected Environment will be done using a two-part method described below:

Part 1 - Land Cover Analysis:

1. Overlay and analyze land cover using GIS
2. Using GIS, calculate land cover conversion acreage by classification and review consistency with state and regional plans for each Representative Route.
3. Overlay and analyze land cover using GIS data from related resources (see Table 2). Additional constraints by resource will be qualitatively described. Specific effects will be addressed quantitatively in the resource-specific sections.
4. Assess land cover in station areas as needed.
5. Identify, map and differentiate the areas of potential land use conversions (for example, an area that is currently designated as agricultural lands that may be converted to a transportation use).

6. Identify and map areas of potential concern, such as:
 - a. Concentrations of residential land use covers
 - b. Concentrations of minority and low-income populations
 - c. Concentrations of ecologically sensitive areas
 - d. Concentrations of Section 4(f) resources

Part 2 - State and Regional Plan Analysis:

1. Evaluate the compatibility of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives with state and regional plans for a future year (e.g. 2035, 2040).
 - a. An alternative will be considered “compatible” with land covers that include primarily developed lands, transportation corridors or other urban areas.
 - b. An alternative will be considered “incompatible” with land covers that primarily include undeveloped land such as water features, forests, parklands, wetlands, and agricultural lands.

For the Context Area, land cover will be qualitatively discussed with regard to potential for change in use or compatibility with adjacent land cover or land uses should there be a shift in a Representative Route.

Potential acquisitions and displacements will be identified in the Tier 1 EIS for each state on a county-by-county basis. Areas where land cover change is anticipated will be reviewed for potential acquisitions and/or displacements, as appropriate, using related resource data and aerial photographs. Since specific land uses are unknown, the acquisitions and displacements will not be quantified by use (residential, commercial, etc.), but rather distinguished by acres of land cover type (according to the defined land cover classifications given in Table 1).

Temporary construction effects to land cover will be described as to the location, duration and type of activity. The NEC FUTURE program overall approach to assessing construction-related effects at the Tier 1 EIS level is further described in a separate Construction Effects Assessment Approach document. Construction methods and activities for the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives will be the basis of this assessment and will be described in a separate chapter of the Tier 1 EIS.

1.5.3 Mitigation Strategies

A menu of potential mitigation measures will be developed on a programmatic scale for further consideration in Tier 2. An example of a programmatic mitigation measure for potential land cover conversions is to provide buffers or screening between proposed new transportation uses and nearby land covers that may be sensitive such as open space and wetland areas to transportation uses.

1.6 TIER 1 EIS OUTCOMES

The Tier 1 EIS land cover assessment will:

- ▶ Quantify acres of land cover by classification (presented in Table 1) within the Affected Environment.
- ▶ Map the distribution of land cover in the Affected Environment and the Context Area.
- ▶ Overlay related resource areas identified in Table 2 as appropriate to supplement land cover definitions
- ▶ Identify acres by land cover with potential for conversion for each Representative Route
- ▶ Identify acres and relative locations within each county of potential land cover conversions that may result in acquisitions and/or displacements of public and/or private lands
- ▶ Evaluate the compatibility of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives with state and regional planning efforts
- ▶ Identify potential mitigation strategies
- ▶ Describe regulatory compliance requirements for subsequent Tier 2 evaluations

Potential acquisitions and displacements will be broadly identified by state on a county-by-county basis. This data will not be used to identify specific properties or to relocate businesses and/or residences. Therefore, the NEC FUTURE program is not expected to initiate requirements with the *Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970* (the *Uniform Act*).

1.7 APPLICABILITY TO TIER 2 ASSESSMENTS

The Tier 1 analysis will identify areas where there are potential land cover conversions, potential for incompatibility with existing or proposed state and regional land use plans, and potential land conversions that could result in acquisitions or displacements. Subsequent Tier 2 assessments would then address specific effects to property, zoning regulations, neighborhoods or community facilities. The approach to determining acquisitions, easements and displacements including ownership (public or private) will be determined as part of project specific Tier 2 evaluations. Tier 2 assessments would also address compliance with the *Uniform Act*. Compliance with the *Uniform Act* ensures that property owners receive fair market value for their property and that displaced persons receive fair and equitable treatment and do not suffer disproportionate injuries because of programs designed for overall public benefit.

Additionally, the FRA will identify ways in which agency coordination during the Tier 1 process could create efficiencies and help streamline subsequent Tier 2 reviews and approvals. For example, if a particular portion or element of a Tier 1 EIS Alternative avoids conversion or any other impact on existing and planned land cover, the FRA may coordinate with states and MPOs to determine whether or not those portions need further evaluation during the Tier 2 environmental review process.

Application of Effects-Assessment Methodology

2.1 LAND COVER: APPLICATION OF EFFECTS-ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

2.1.1 Variations to Effects-Assessment Methodology

The following variations from the Effects-Assessment Methodology occurred during the process of developing the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis:

- ▶ The FRA mapped the land cover in the Context Area, as stated in the methodology. However, to identify the relative size and location of land cover types, the total area of each land use type was also calculated for the Context Area. The information was used to supplement the quantitative assessment of effects for the Affected Environment.
- ▶ Land cover is discussed generally as developed and undeveloped within Chapter 7 of the Tier 1 Draft EIS as defined below:
 - Developed: open space; low intensity; medium intensity; high intensity; and barren land. Barren land is included in the developed land covers because it has development potential and is compatible with transportation use.
 - Undeveloped: open water, forest/shrub, grassland/cultivated, and wetlands.
- ▶ The FRA reviewed the goals and objectives of future planning documents developed by federally mandated metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) for all MPOs in the Study Area, not just for those states that do not have state-level planning efforts, as stated in the methodology.

2.1.2 Data Variations

The following variations from the identified data sources in the Effects-Assessment Methodology occurred during the process of developing the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis:

- ▶ The FRA compiled an initial list of planning documents from states, regions, and MPOs in the Study Area and then shared this list with the MPOs at a webinar meeting on July 28, 2014. Following the MPOs' reviews of the initial list, additional planning documents were identified and collected by the FRA to ensure that all relevant planning documents were included in the data.

2.1.3 Criteria for Analysis

Existing Conditions

- ▶ For each Action Alternative and the existing NEC, the FRA calculated the total number of acres of undeveloped land cover and the total number of acres of developed land cover within the Affected Environment and Context Area for each county and state.

Environmental Consequences

- ▶ Developed and undeveloped land covers were calculated for the Affected Environment and the Context Area by county.
- ▶ Potential Conversions: For each Action Alternative, the FRA calculated the number of potential conversions of land cover for each land cover type by overlaying the Representative Route with

the National Land Cover Database (NLCD) for each county and state. Where the Representative Route would be a major bridge or tunnel, acres of land cover were not calculated since the potential for conversion of the land cover at surface grade would be negligible for these construction types. Major bridge and tunnel construction types are constructed above and below surface grade, respectively, to preserve the existing land cover type.

- ▶ **Acquisitions and Displacements:** For each Action Alternative, the FRA calculated the acres of potential acquisitions and displacements of land cover for each land cover type by overlaying the Representative Route with the NLCD for each county and state. For the purpose of this analysis, the FRA considered only those land covers where the Representative Route did not represent the existing NEC right-of-way, since the potential for acquisitions or displacements along the existing NEC would be negligible.

Environmental Consequences – Stations

- ▶ For each Action Alternative, the FRA calculated the number of acres by land cover type within new station areas for each county and state. There was no potential to convert land cover, or acquire or displace private or public land at existing stations where no modifications would occur. Potential for conversion, acquisition, or displacement of private or public land was negligible at stations where modifications would be proposed and there would be an increase in the station footprint. The potential for conversion of land cover, acquisition, or displacement of public or private property is associated with areas where new stations are proposed.

2.1.4 Land Use Plans

The FRA reviewed the existing goals and objectives of planning documents developed by the states and MPOs within the Study Area to identify compatibility of NEC FUTURE with these plans. Consistent with the NEC FUTURE goals (as identified in Chapter 3) related to passenger rail improvements, environmental sustainability, and economic growth, the FRA performed the following:

1. Identified land cover-related goals and objectives of improved passenger rail transportation, transit-oriented development, and preservation of the built or natural environment
2. Reviewed the existing goals and objectives of planning documents developed by the states and MPOs within the Study Area
3. Identified those planning documents that included land-cover related goals and objectives of improved passenger rail transportation, transit-oriented development, and preservation of the built or natural environment

NEC FUTURE was considered compatible with planning documents that identified all of these goals and objectives, and partially compatible with planning documents that identified some but not all three of these goals and objectives.

Data Matrices

Geography		Developed Land Potential Conversion (Acres)							Undeveloped Land Potential Conversion (Acres)							Developed Land Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Undeveloped Land Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							
State	County	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				
					via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	
DC	District of Columbia	77	77	77	115	115	115	115	1	1	1	11	11	11	11	77	0	0	62	62	62	62	3	0	0	9	9	9	9	
MD	Prince George's	228	228	228	605	605	605	605	17	17	17	98	98	98	98	228	0	0	168	168	168	168	17	0	0	66	66	66	66	
MD	Anne Arundel	203	203	203	405	405	405	405	44	44	44	288	288	288	288	203	0	0	110	110	110	110	45	0	0	227	227	227	227	
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Baltimore County	254	254	254	704	704	704	704	14	14	14	65	65	65	65	254	0	0	398	398	398	398	16	0	0	52	52	52	52	
MD	Baltimore City	142	142	142	196	196	196	196	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	182	41	51	322	322	322	322	2	0	0	10	10	10	10	
MD	Harford	275	275	260	765	765	765	765	40	40	52	160	160	160	160	276	0	7	397	397	397	397	48	0	21	117	117	117	117	
MD	Cecil	183	183	281	407	407	407	407	142	142	286	442	442	442	442	184	0	116	227	227	227	227	147	0	151	311	311	311	311	
DE	New Castle	383	383	494	989	989	989	989	37	37	61	160	160	160	160	383	0	90	385	385	385	385	37	0	34	108	108	108	108	
PA	Delaware	224	224	196	509	509	509	509	3	3	6	7	7	7	224	0	113	268	268	268	268	268	3	0	5	4	4	4	4	
PA	Philadelphia	344	344	337	641	641	641	641	1	1	6	4	4	4	353	0	214	535	535	535	535	535	2	0	22	21	21	21	21	
PA	Bucks	287	287	287	796	796	796	796	9	9	9	50	50	50	50	289	0	0	229	229	229	229	11	0	0	35	35	35	35	
NJ	Mercer	180	180	180	471	471	471	471	25	25	25	118	118	118	118	182	0	0	117	117	117	117	26	0	0	70	70	70	70	
NJ	Middlesex	403	403	569	893	893	893	893	59	59	68	226	226	226	226	405	0	153	376	376	376	376	61	0	11	146	146	146	146	
NJ	Union	147	147	247	332	332	332	332	0	0	0	0	0	0	147	0	64	150	150	150	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Essex	72	72	123	168	168	168	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	0	47	83	83	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Hudson	106	108	108	180	179	179	180	15	23	23	45	36	36	45	131	26	44	168	168	168	168	15	4	4	41	41	41	41	
NY	New York	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	2	2	2	2	2	2	56	18	33	154	92	92	92	154	3	0	1	2	2	2	2	
NY	Queens	80	80	125	125	357	357	125	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	97	0	74	74	425	425	74	0	0	5	5	31	31	5	
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	34	34	34	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	
NY	Bronx	130	130	130	254	130	130	254	27	27	27	55	27	27	55	131	0	21	61	0	0	61	28	0	0	9	0	0	9	
NY	Westchester	208	208	383	432	208	208	432	0	0	0	88	0	0	88	209	0	73	299	0	0	299	0	0	0	248	0	0	248	
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	348	348	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	473	473	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	640	640	0	0	0	0	77	77	0	0	0	0	0	774	774	0	0	0	0	0	0	87	87	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	27	0	0	0	76	0	0	76	
CT	Fairfield	592	773	908	798	773	798	798	21	22	26	30	22	22	30	597	171	300	286	171	171	286	22	2	5	154	2	2	154	
CT	New Haven	500	500	956	505	1025	1025	505	116	116	271	140	277	277	140	507	0	448	136	554	554	136	119	0	156	242	169	169	242	
CT	Hartford	0	0	397	183	244	203	196	0	0	110	33	54	56	45	0	0	515	411	457	457	411	0	0	144	143	233	233	143	
CT	Tolland	0	0	5	5	5	287	287	0	0	95	95	95	91	91	0	0	45	45	45	298	298	0	0	274	274	274	127	127	
CT	Windham	0	0	27	27	27	19	19	0	0	226	226	226	11	11	0	0	31	31	31	19	19	0	0	332	332	332	11	11	
CT	Middlesex	132	147	132	132	132	132	132	84	95	84	84	84	84	84	132	6	0	0	0	0	0	84	5	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New London	317	474	317	317	317	317	317	272	399	272	272	272	272	272	317	274	0	0	0	0	0	279	243	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Kent	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Washington	188	232	188	188	188	188	188	338	507	338	338	338	338	338	188	49	0	0	0	0	0	338	150	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	202	202	245	256	256	202	202	0	0	276	283	283	0	0	208	0	169	216	216	0	0	1	0	282	291	291	0	0	
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	424	424	0	0	0	0	0	166	166	0	0	0	0	485	485	0	0	0	0	0	260	260	0	0
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246	246	0	0	0	0	0	76	76	0	0
MA	Bristol	179	179	206	412	412	179	179	81	81	114	265	265	81	81	179	0	25	116	116	0	0	81	0	31	106	106	0	0	
MA	Norfolk	120	120	145	300	300	125	125	129	129	156	369	369	129	129	122	0	23	73	73	5	5	129	0	11	123	123	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	149	149	150	165	165	220	220	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	182	0	0	160	160	110	110	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	
DC	Total	77	77	77	115	115	115	115	1	1	1	11	11	11	11	77	0	0	62	62	62	62	3	0	0	9	9	9	9	
MD	Total	1285	1285	1367	3081	3081	3081	3081	259	259	414	1056	1056	1056	1056	1328	41	174	1622	1622	1622	1622	275	0	172	782	782	782	782	
DE	Total	383	383	494	989	989	989	989	37	37	61	160	160	160	160	383	0	90	385	385	385	385	37	0	34	108	108	108	108	
PA	Total	855	855	819	1946	1946	1946	1946	12	12	21	61	61	61	61	867	0	327	1033	1033	1033	1033	15	0	27	60	60	60	60	
NJ	Total	908	910	1228	2046	2044	2044	2046	99	108	116	389	380	380	389	938	26	308	895	895	895	895	102	4	15	256	256	256	256	
NY	Total	438	438	658	831	1703	1703	831	30	30	29	146	128	128	146	492	18	204	618	1798	1798	618	31	0	6	341	121	121	341	
CT	Total	1540	1895	2741	1968	2522	2754	2253	493	633	1084	879	1029	813	672	1553	451	1339	909	1258	1499	1150	504	250	911	1146	1010	542	678	
RI	Total	542	586	586	597	597	542	542	346	516	623	629	629	346	346	549	49	169	216	216	0	0	347	150	282	291	291	0	0	
MA	Total	448	448	501	877	877	948	948	211	211	270	636	636	378	378	483	0	48	350	350	846	846	212	0	43	230	230	336	336	
Grand Total		6476	6875	8471	12448	13873	14121	12750	1489	1807	2620	3966	4090	3334	3219	6669	586	2659	6089	7617	8139	6611	1525	404	1489	3224	2868	2215	2571	

Geography		Developed Land								Undeveloped Land								Developed Land								Undeveloped Land							
		Affected Environment (Acres)								Affected Environment (Acres)								Context Area (Acres)								Context Area (Acres)							
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				
DC	District of Columbia	1301	1301	1301	1328	1328	1328	1328	174	174	174	179	179	179	17698	17698	17700	17737	17737	17737	17737	1085	1085	1086	1090	1090	1090	1090					
MD	Prince George's	3242	3242	3242	3316	3316	3316	3316	1074	1074	1074	1103	1103	1103	28980	28980	28982	29031	29033	29033	29031	13232	13231	13231	13271	13271	13271	13271					
MD	Anne Arundel	2098	2098	2098	2273	2273	2273	2273	2241	2241	2241	2537	2537	2537	22231	22232	22229	22346	22348	22348	22346	20886	20887	20886	20992	20993	20993	20992					
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	1837	1837	1837	1885	1885	1885	1885	1544	1544	1543	1568	1568	1568	1568					
MD	Baltimore County	3557	3557	3557	5990	5990	5990	5990	1081	1081	1081	2336	2336	2336	28145	28145	28140	35043	35044	35044	35043	13704	13703	13664	19838	19837	19837	19838					
MD	Baltimore City	3168	3643	3636	5609	5609	5609	5609	68	75	75	105	105	105	27998	28846	28809	30379	30381	30379	30381	2257	2443	2442	2486	2486	2486	2486					
MD	Harford	2808	2808	2787	4763	4763	4763	4763	2777	2777	2784	4242	4242	4242	20597	20597	20557	24682	24682	24682	24682	29225	29226	29172	36383	36386	36386	36383					
MD	Cecil	2306	2306	3597	3603	3603	3603	3603	3387	3387	6451	6456	6456	6456	13967	13967	16142	16141	16140	16140	16141	37901	37900	46655	46652	46652	46652	46652					
DE	New Castle	5479	5479	6519	6406	6406	6406	6406	1420	1420	1826	1740	1740	1740	45803	45800	46334	46142	46142	46142	46142	16416	16415	16480	16477	16479	16479	16477					
PA	Delaware	3812	3812	3355	5311	5311	5311	5311	168	168	152	231	231	231	26803	26805	22891	28153	28153	28153	28153	4152	4152	3618	4280	4280	4280	4280					
PA	Philadelphia	6045	6045	6817	9876	9876	9876	9876	263	263	503	457	457	457	50363	50363	51352	55080	55079	55079	55080	5818	5818	6055	6837	6836	6836	6837					
PA	Bucks	4087	4087	4086	4156	4156	4156	4156	1149	1149	1149	1180	1180	1180	24919	24921	24919	24942	24942	24942	24942	12180	12181	12181	12188	12188	12188	12188					
NJ	Mercer	2209	2209	2209	2265	2265	2265	2265	1432	1432	1432	1467	1467	1467	24061	24061	24062	24124	24126	24126	24124	13956	13956	13956	14002	14003	14003	14002					
NJ	Middlesex	5980	5980	6541	6596	6596	6596	6596	2243	2243	2296	2367	2367	2367	52039	52039	52282	52315	52314	52314	52314	25090	25091	25185	25198	25195	25195	25198					
NJ	Union	2566	2566	2648	2648	2648	2648	2648	25	25	27	27	27	27	23129	23129	23174	23175	23175	23175	23175	1485	1485	1487	1488	1487	1487	1488					
NJ	Essex	1332	1332	1382	1383	1383	1383	1383	5	5	5	5	5	5	14066	14066	14089	14089	14090	14090	14090	233	233	233	233	233	233	233					
NJ	Hudson	1744	1790	1804	2530	2530	2530	2530	662	662	662	777	777	777	16163	16253	16252	16795	16795	16795	16795	3338	3338	3338	3338	3338	3338	3338					
NY	New York	984	1011	1036	2065	2065	2065	2065	39	39	42	63	63	63	10798	10811	10829	11169	11169	11169	11169	433	433	435	455	455	455	455					
NY	Queens	1649	1649	2512	2512	6121	6121	2512	20	20	30	30	208	208	30	11835	11835	13347	13347	40548	40548	132	132	134	133	1088	1088	133					
NY	Kings	28	28	108	108	322	322	108	3	3	12	12	20	20	12	2582	2582	3093	3093	7157	7157	3093	45	45	46	46	60	60	46				
NY	Bronx	2418	2418	2421	2488	2418	2418	2488	312	312	315	320	312	312	320	19453	19453	19483	19530	19452	19452	1933	1932	1931	1938	1933	1933	1938					
NY	Westchester	3617	3617	3866	7655	3617	3617	7655	54	54	88	5097	54	54	5097	25116	25117	25114	53646	25117	25117	53646	3352	3352	3352	54641	3352	3352	54641				
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	4971	4971	0	0	0	0	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	46643	46643	0	0	0	0	0	1163	1163	0					
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	9331	9331	0	0	0	0	1132	1132	0	0	0	0	0	85291	85291	0	0	0	0	0	10674	10674	0					
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	436	0	0	436	0	0	0	1381	0	0	1381	0	0	3500	0	0	3500	0	0	0	13269	0	0	13269					
CT	Fairfield	9956	11452	12694	13152	11452	11452	13152	762	853	907	3855	853	853	3855	65646	66929	67342	85768	67116	67116	85768	11879	12346	12851	43356	12357	43356					
CT	New Haven	7694	7694	12046	9929	12360	9929	9929	3341	3341	5149	7765	5204	5204	7765	51299	51297	79800	74681	79816	79816	29537	29536	48823	71782	49016	49016	71782					
CT	Hartford	0	0	6438	7415	6055	8615	9975	0	0	1916	2338	2640	3134	2833	0	0	58276	66921	59549	83302	90673	0	0	23129	26871	26349	35612	36135				
CT	Tolland	0	0	717	717	717	2351	2351	0	0	4903	4903	4903	5132	5132	0	0	8392	8392	8392	11894	11894	0	0	47520	47521	47522	58318	58318				
CT	Windham	0	0	554	554	554	101	101	0	0	5834	5834	5834	424	424	0	0	6090	6090	6090	488	488	0	0	59371	59374	59375	6597	6597				
CT	Middlesex	2030	2052	2030	2030	2030	2030	2030	1709	1719	1709	1709	1709	1709	9561	9562	11023	9561	10624	10624	9561	17560	17566	23933	17559	23225	23225	17559					
CT	New London	4707	8393	4707	4707	4707	4707	4707	4406	9515	4406	4406	4406	4406	27354	33269	27353	27353	27353	27353	27353	40436	68928	40433	40437	40437	40437	40437					
RI	Kent	2273	2273	2273	2273	2273	2273	2273	239	239	239	239	239	239	18721	18725	18726	18719	18722	18722	18719	6739	6739	6739	6733	6739	6739	6733					
RI	Washington	2673	3300	2673	2673	2673	2673	2673	6608	8202	6608	6608	6608	6608	20429	20491	20428	20426	20427	20427	20427	70413	70981	70413	70408	70413	70413	70408					
RI	Providence	3801	3801	6497	6502	6502	3801	3801	58	58	4858	4854	4854	58	33684	33683	48156	48154	48154	33684	33684	3589	3589	45605	45606	45606	3589	3589					
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	0	0	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	0	676	676	676	0	0	0	0	0	4084	4084					
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	6461	6461	6461	0	0	0	6601	6601	6601	0	0	0	0	45441	45441	45441	0	0	0	0	0	75832	75832					
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	4385	4385	4385	0	0	0	1393	1393	1393	2089	2089	2089	2093	2093	41056	41056	277	277	277	278	278	20984	20984					
MA	Bristol	2713	2713	3153	3180	3180	2713	2713	1686	1686	2094	2115	2115	1686	19601	19601	21344	21359	21359	19601	19601	23173	23174	26586	26585	26585	23173	23173					
MA	Norfolk	2010	2010	2024	2054	2116	2116	2423	2423	2410	2466	2466	2423	2423	29270	29270	29236	29310	29309	36391	36391	24123	24125	24124	24156	24158	25485	25485					
MA	Suffolk	3219	3219	3219	3307	3307	4983	4983	71	71	71	87	87	135	135	22297	22297	22296	22354	22354	32542	2100	2100	2100	2101	2101	3623	3623					
DC	Total	1301	130																														

Geography		Open Water							Developed, Open Space							Developed, Low Intensity						
		Potential Conversion (Acres)							Potential Conversion (Acres)							Potential Conversion (Acres)						
State	County	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
					via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)
DC	District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	8	8	8	18	18	18	18
MD	Prince George's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	54	54	54	54	92	92	92	237	237	237	237
MD	Anne Arundel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	41	41	41	41	79	79	79	165	165	165	165
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	9	9	74	74	74	74	80	80	80	217	217	217	217
MD	Baltimore City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	8	8	8	8	11	11	13	18	18	18	18
MD	Harford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	16	114	114	114	114	135	135	128	250	250	250	250
MD	Cecil	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	47	85	85	85	85	107	107	146	180	180	180	180
DE	New Castle	2	2	2	12	12	12	12	16	16	48	103	103	103	103	111	111	145	260	260	260	260
PA	Delaware	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	8	12	12	12	12	38	38	33	74	74	74	74
PA	Philadelphia	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	10	10	10	10	21	21	63	50	50	50	50
PA	Bucks	1	1	1	9	9	9	9	11	11	11	46	46	46	46	63	63	63	199	199	199	199
NJ	Mercer	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	15	15	15	15	47	47	47	119	119	119	119
NJ	Middlesex	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	19	19	28	57	57	57	57	101	101	135	240	240	240	240
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	5	5	9	13	13	13	13
NJ	Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2
NJ	Hudson	6	9	9	14	10	10	14	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	14	14	14	27	27	27	27
NY	New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	3	3	6	6	22	22	6
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	9	4	4	9	14	14	14	26	14	14	26
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	12	27	78	12	12	78	56	56	107	102	56	56	102
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	0	0	0	118	118	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172	172	0	0	0	0	180	180	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	1	1	2	4	1	1	4	46	77	88	85	77	77	85	188	233	268	239	233	233	239
CT	New Haven	5	5	5	9	5	5	9	82	82	170	85	180	180	85	204	204	425	204	457	457	204
CT	Hartford	0	0	7	1	1	1	1	0	0	65	32	40	27	28	0	0	153	60	75	60	65
CT	Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	5	5	5	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	83	83
CT	Windham	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	3	3	0	0	8	8	8	10	10
CT	Middlesex	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	23	24	23	23	23	23	23	65	72	65	65	65	65	65
CT	New London	21	27	21	21	21	21	21	50	100	50	50	50	50	50	112	161	112	112	112	112	112
RI	Kent	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
RI	Washington	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	7	27	7	7	7	7	7	69	81	69	69	69	69	69
RI	Providence	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	14	14	0	0	6	6	20	23	23	6	6
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	88	88	0	0	0	0	0	93	93
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Bristol	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	6	6	11	22	22	6	6	64	64	76	148	148	64	64
MA	Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	29	57	57	22	22	65	65	71	148	148	66	66
MA	Suffolk	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
DC	Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	8	8	8	18	18	18	18
MD	Total	1	1	0	2	2	2	2	62	62	92	375	375	375	375	504	504	539	1068	1068	1068	1068
DE	Total	2	2	2	12	12	12	12	16	16	48	103	103	103	103	111	111	145	260	260	260	260
PA	Total	1	1	3	9	9	9	9	21	21	38	68	68	68	68	122	122	159	323	323	323	323
NJ	Total	6	9	10	15	11	11	15	24	24	33	78	78	78	78	168	168	207	400	400	400	400
NY	Total	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	17	17	33	88	269	269	88	78	78	132	139	394	394	139
CT	Total	28	33	36	37	30	32	39	203	283	417	296	390	448	364	569	670	1033	690	952	1021	779
RI	Total	4	4	6	6	6	4	4	12	32	25	26	26	12	12	103	116	117	119	119	103	103
MA	Total	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	34	34	46	85	85	122	122	151	151	169	318	318	245	245
Grand Total		41	50	58	84	73	74	85	389	490	732	1121	1396	1478	1212	1814	1928	2508	3336	3854	3833	3336

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity Potential Conversion (Acres)							Developed, High Intensity Potential Conversion (Acres)							Barren Land Potential Conversion (Acres)						
State	County	Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
					via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)
DC	District of Columbia	34	34	34	55	55	55	55	34	34	34	40	40	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Prince George's	113	113	113	278	278	278	278	13	13	13	36	36	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Anne Arundel	115	115	115	193	193	193	193	2	2	2	6	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	141	141	141	336	336	336	336	22	22	22	74	74	74	74	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
MD	Baltimore City	82	82	80	110	110	110	110	46	46	46	60	60	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Harford	121	121	110	324	324	324	324	6	6	5	72	72	72	72	0	0	0	4	4	4	4
MD	Cecil	52	52	78	121	121	121	121	2	2	8	17	17	17	17	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
DE	New Castle	201	201	236	478	478	478	478	53	53	63	136	136	136	136	2	2	3	11	11	11	11
PA	Delaware	140	140	102	286	286	286	286	42	42	53	137	137	137	137	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
PA	Philadelphia	196	196	149	342	342	342	342	122	122	106	239	239	239	239	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	187	187	186	473	473	473	473	25	25	25	78	78	78	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Mercer	88	88	88	231	231	231	231	43	43	43	107	107	107	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	247	247	353	521	521	521	521	35	35	54	75	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Union	79	79	127	162	162	162	162	62	62	109	156	156	156	156	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	25	25	47	66	66	66	66	47	47	75	101	101	101	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	64	65	65	119	117	117	119	27	27	27	31	31	31	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	New York	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Queens	45	45	57	57	153	153	57	32	32	62	62	176	176	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	66	66	62	123	66	66	123	47	47	50	96	47	47	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	97	97	175	178	97	97	178	44	44	75	74	44	44	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	122	122	0	0	0	0	34	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	192	192	0	0	0	0	95	95	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	241	320	396	330	320	320	330	117	143	155	144	143	143	144	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New Haven	170	170	298	171	320	320	171	44	44	59	44	64	64	44	0	0	4	0	4	4	0
CT	Hartford	0	0	148	78	108	97	89	0	0	31	14	21	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
CT	Windham	0	0	3	3	3	6	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Middlesex	30	34	30	30	30	30	30	12	16	12	12	12	12	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New London	111	169	111	111	111	111	111	28	30	28	28	28	28	28	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
RI	Kent	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Washington	92	102	92	92	92	92	92	13	13	13	13	13	13	13	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
RI	Providence	89	89	104	111	111	89	89	106	106	107	109	109	106	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	173	173	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Bristol	84	84	93	184	184	84	84	24	24	26	57	57	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Norfolk	24	24	34	69	69	26	26	9	9	11	26	26	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Suffolk	75	75	75	83	83	90	90	47	47	48	55	55	102	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DC	Total	34	34	34	55	55	55	55	34	34	34	40	40	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Total	624	624	637	1363	1363	1363	1363	91	91	96	265	265	265	265	3	3	3	9	9	9	9
DE	Total	201	201	236	478	478	478	478	53	53	63	136	136	136	136	2	2	3	11	11	11	11
PA	Total	523	523	437	1100	1100	1100	1100	189	189	185	454	454	454	454	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
NJ	Total	503	505	680	1099	1097	1097	1099	214	214	308	469	469	469	469	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Total	216	216	302	367	638	638	367	127	127	191	237	399	399	237	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
CT	Total	552	692	986	724	892	992	845	201	233	286	242	270	270	245	16	16	19	16	19	24	20
RI	Total	260	270	275	281	281	260	260	159	159	160	162	162	159	159	8	8	9	9	9	8	8
MA	Total	183	183	202	336	336	373	373	80	80	85	137	137	207	207	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Grand Total		3094	3247	3788	5803	6241	6356	5940	1148	1180	1408	2142	2332	2398	2211	30	30	34	46	51	56	51

Geography		Forest/Shrub							Grassland/Cultivated							Wetlands						
		Potential Conversion (Acres)							Potential Conversion (Acres)							Potential Conversion (Acres)						
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)		
DC	District of Columbia	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	9	9	9
MD	Prince George's	13	13	13	73	73	73	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	24	24	24	24
MD	Anne Arundel	23	23	23	175	175	175	175	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	21	21	21	107	107	107	107
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	8	8	8	26	26	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	37	37	37	37
MD	Baltimore City	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
MD	Harford	24	24	34	79	79	79	79	2	2	2	21	21	21	21	14	14	16	59	59	59	59
MD	Cecil	94	94	191	291	291	291	291	9	9	43	87	87	87	87	39	39	52	64	64	64	64
DE	New Castle	16	16	24	48	48	48	48	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	18	18	34	96	96	96	96
PA	Delaware	2	2	1	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	2	2	2
PA	Philadelphia	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
PA	Bucks	3	3	3	18	18	18	18	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	5	5	5	21	21	21	21
NJ	Mercer	13	13	13	55	55	55	55	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	12	12	12	61	61	61	61
NJ	Middlesex	42	42	49	167	167	167	167	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	16	16	18	56	56	56	56
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	14	30	25	25	30
NY	New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	15	15	15	31	15	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	24	12	12	24
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	71	0	0	71	0	0	0	9	0	0	9	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	66	66	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	17	18	20	23	18	18	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	2	2	2
CT	New Haven	76	76	181	94	190	190	94	0	0	20	0	24	24	0	35	35	64	37	58	58	37
CT	Hartford	0	0	63	15	24	26	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	18	29	29	18
CT	Tolland	0	0	73	73	73	79	79	0	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	0	11	11	11	9	9
CT	Windham	0	0	166	166	166	11	11	0	0	20	20	20	0	0	0	39	39	39	0	0	0
CT	Middlesex	42	44	42	42	42	42	42	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	40	49	40	40	40	40	40
CT	New London	91	195	91	91	91	91	91	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	153	170	153	153	153	153	153
RI	Kent	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
RI	Washington	78	159	78	78	78	78	78	60	84	60	60	60	60	60	196	262	196	196	196	196	196
RI	Providence	0	0	230	235	235	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	0	0	0	0	28	30	30	0	0
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	123	123	0	0	0	0	0	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Bristol	42	42	64	147	147	42	42	2	2	5	10	10	2	2	37	37	44	107	107	37	37
MA	Norfolk	75	75	90	220	220	75	75	5	5	9	13	13	5	5	50	50	56	136	136	50	50
MA	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DC	Total	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	9	9	9
MD	Total	163	163	269	647	647	647	647	11	11	45	114	114	114	114	85	85	100	292	292	292	292
DE	Total	16	16	24	48	48	48	48	1	1	1	4	4	4	4	18	18	34	96	96	96	96
PA	Total	6	6	7	25	25	25	25	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	6	6	11	26	26	26	26
NJ	Total	56	56	62	223	223	223	223	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	37	42	44	147	142	142	147
NY	Total	15	15	15	102	103	103	102	0	0	0	9	1	1	9	14	14	14	33	24	24	33
CT	Total	226	334	637	504	604	457	366	8	9	60	39	63	32	8	231	257	351	300	333	292	259
RI	Total	81	162	312	317	317	81	81	60	84	76	76	76	60	60	201	266	229	231	231	201	201
MA	Total	117	117	155	366	366	241	241	6	6	15	23	23	18	18	87	87	100	244	244	116	116
Grand Total		681	869	1482	2233	2333	1826	1734	88	111	198	272	287	236	221	680	777	882	1377	1396	1198	1179

Geography		Open Water							Developed, Open Space							Developed, Low Intensity						
		Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)						
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)		
DC	District of Columbia	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	0	0	6	6	6	6
MD	Prince George's	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	34	34	34	34	92	0	0	61	61	61	61
MD	Anne Arundel	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	35	35	35	35	80	0	0	52	52	52	52
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	0	0	62	62	62	62	81	0	0	123	123	123	123
MD	Baltimore City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	29	29	29	29	14	5	9	23	23	23	23
MD	Harford	8	0	0	7	7	7	7	13	0	4	101	101	101	101	136	0	2	85	85	85	85
MD	Cecil	4	0	0	3	3	3	3	21	0	28	69	69	69	69	108	0	51	82	82	82	82
DE	New Castle	2	0	4	10	10	10	10	16	0	35	82	82	82	82	111	0	27	76	76	76	76
PA	Delaware	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	5	0	7	15	15	15	15	38	0	28	42	42	42	42
PA	Philadelphia	1	0	6	7	7	7	7	4	0	20	15	15	15	15	21	0	59	36	36	36	36
PA	Bucks	3	0	0	9	9	9	9	12	0	0	25	25	25	25	65	0	0	74	74	74	74
NJ	Mercer	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	10	10	10	10	47	0	0	27	27	27	27
NJ	Middlesex	2	0	1	3	3	3	3	19	0	10	39	39	39	39	103	0	51	134	134	134	134
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	3	8	8	8	8
NJ	Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	2
NJ	Hudson	6	0	0	7	7	7	7	2	1	1	4	4	4	4	15	2	2	14	14	14	14
NY	New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	3	8	0	1	11	2	2	11
NY	Queens	0	0	4	4	8	8	4	0	0	1	1	8	8	1	3	0	9	9	29	29	9
NY	Kings	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
NY	Bronx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	3	0	0	3	14	0	4	5	0	0	5
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	12	0	10	129	0	0	129	56	0	18	69	0	0	69
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	90	0	0	0	0	161	161	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	226	0	0	0	0	231	231	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
CT	Fairfield	1	0	0	7	0	0	7	48	32	45	74	32	32	74	188	41	67	85	41	41	85
CT	New Haven	6	0	1	9	0	0	9	87	0	88	59	96	96	59	206	0	221	36	244	244	36
CT	Hartford	0	0	13	8	12	12	8	0	0	77	77	80	80	77	0	0	177	124	113	113	124
CT	Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	35	35	35	92	92	0	0	9	9	9	87	87
CT	Windham	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	19	19	19	3	3	0	0	9	9	9	10	10
CT	Middlesex	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	1	0	0	0	0	0	66	2	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New London	24	9	0	0	0	0	0	50	84	0	0	0	0	0	112	68	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Kent	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Washington	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	0	0	0	0	0	69	16	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Providence	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	18	21	21	0	0	8	0	24	30	30	0	0
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	105	105	0	0	0	0	114	114	0
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	0	0	0	0	65	65	0
MA	Bristol	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	5	12	12	0	0	64	0	11	39	39	0	0
MA	Norfolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	7	16	16	0	0	65	0	6	30	30	0	0
MA	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	3	3	0	0	24	0	0	15	15	3	3
DC	Total	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	0	0	6	6	6	6
MD	Total	13	0	0	11	11	11	11	62	11	2	34	329	329	329	511	5	61	425	425	425	425
DE	Total	2	0	4	10	10	10	10	16	0	35	82	82	82	82	111	0	27	76	76	76	76
PA	Total	4	0	7	17	17	17	17	21	0	27	55	55	55	55	125	0	87	152	152	152	152
NJ	Total	8	0	2	10	10	10	10	25	1	11	54	54	54	54	170	2	57	184	184	184	184
NY	Total	0	0	5	10	9	9	10	18	0	13	147	325	325	147	80	0	32	104	424	424	104
CT	Total	32	9	17	27	16	16	27	209	117	263	264	261	303	305	572	111	483	263	415	495	342
RI	Total	4	0	3	4	4	0	0	12	21	18	21	21	0	0	105	16	24	30	30	0	0
MA	Total	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	36	0	12	32	32	162	162	153	0	17	84	84	182	182
Grand Total		64	10	37	92	79	85	98	400	140	413	984	1159	1310	1135	1835	135	787	1325	1798	1944	1472

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Developed, High Intensity Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Barren Land Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)			
DC	District of Columbia	34	0	0	17	17	17	17	34	0	0	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Prince George's	113	0	0	61	61	61	61	13	0	0	13	13	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Anne Arundel	115	0	0	21	21	21	21	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	141	0	0	166	166	166	166	22	0	0	46	46	46	46	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
MD	Baltimore City	108	25	29	118	118	118	118	57	9	11	152	152	152	152	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Harford	121	0	2	146	146	146	146	6	0	0	63	63	63	63	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3
MD	Cecil	52	0	26	52	52	52	52	2	0	6	15	15	15	15	2	0	4	8	8	8	8	8
DE	New Castle	201	0	22	154	154	154	154	53	0	5	66	66	66	66	2	0	1	8	8	8	8	8
PA	Delaware	140	0	49	122	122	122	122	42	0	28	89	89	89	89	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
PA	Philadelphia	199	0	66	187	187	187	187	128	0	70	297	297	297	297	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	187	0	0	102	102	102	102	25	0	0	28	28	28	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Mercer	89	0	0	57	57	57	57	43	0	0	24	24	24	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	247	0	69	157	157	157	157	35	0	22	45	45	45	45	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
NJ	Union	79	0	33	71	71	71	71	62	0	29	70	70	70	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	25	0	18	31	31	31	31	47	0	28	51	51	51	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	72	12	16	64	64	64	64	42	12	26	86	86	86	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	New York	16	2	4	36	11	11	36	31	16	28	102	79	79	102	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
NY	Queens	47	0	12	12	128	128	12	47	0	53	53	260	260	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	30	30	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	66	0	7	22	0	0	22	47	0	7	31	0	0	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	97	0	35	83	0	0	83	44	0	11	19	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	171	171	0	0	0	0	0	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	213	213	0	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	242	77	152	101	77	77	101	118	22	37	26	22	22	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New Haven	170	0	121	34	173	173	34	44	0	15	6	37	37	6	0	0	3	0	3	3	3	0
CT	Hartford	0	0	196	162	198	198	162	0	0	64	48	64	48	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	0
CT	Tolland	0	0	1	1	1	111	111	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5
CT	Windham	0	0	3	3	3	6	6	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Middlesex	30	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New London	111	98	0	0	0	0	0	28	24	0	0	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Kent	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Washington	92	12	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Providence	90	0	77	107	107	0	0	110	0	49	57	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	189	189	0	0	0	0	0	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	45	45	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
MA	Bristol	84	0	8	48	48	0	0	24	0	2	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Norfolk	26	0	9	21	21	2	2	10	0	1	7	7	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Suffolk	89	0	0	77	77	23	23	61	0	0	65	65	84	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DC	Total	34	0	0	17	17	17	17	34	0	0	37	37	37	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Total	650	25	57	564	564	564	564	102	9	18	290	290	290	290	3	0	4	13	13	13	13	13
DE	Total	201	0	22	154	154	154	154	53	0	5	66	66	66	66	2	0	1	8	8	8	8	8
PA	Total	526	0	116	411	411	411	411	195	0	98	414	414	414	414	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
NJ	Total	512	12	136	381	381	381	381	230	12	103	275	275	275	275	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
NY	Total	226	2	58	158	525	525	158	169	16	102	207	520	520	207	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	2
CT	Total	554	175	472	300	452	565	414	202	47	117	82	124	126	84	16	0	4	0	6	10	5	5
RI	Total	261	12	77	107	107	0	0	163	0	49	57	57	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Total	199	0	17	145	145	292	292	95	0	3	89	89	207	207	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3
Grand Total		3162	226	955	2237	2755	2909	2391	1243	84	495	1517	1872	1936	1581	30	0	10	26	33	40	33	33

Geography		Forest/Shrub							Grassland/Cultivated							Wetlands						
State	County	Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)						
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
					via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)
DC	District of Columbia	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7	7	7	7
MD	Prince George's	13	0	0	49	49	49	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	17	17	17	17	
MD	Anne Arundel	23	0	0	143	143	143	143	0	0	0	6	6	6	22	0	0	77	77	77	77	
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Baltimore County	8	0	0	19	19	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	31	31	31	31	
MD	Baltimore City	1	0	0	7	7	7	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	
MD	Harford	24	0	14	50	50	50	50	2	0	0	19	19	19	15	0	6	41	41	41	41	
MD	Cecil	94	0	104	211	211	211	211	9	0	35	73	73	73	39	0	12	24	24	24	24	
DE	New Castle	16	0	11	25	25	25	25	1	0	0	2	2	2	18	0	18	71	71	71	71	
PA	Delaware	2	0	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	1	1	1	
PA	Philadelphia	0	0	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	13	11	11	11	11	
PA	Bucks	3	0	0	11	11	11	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	0	0	13	13	13	13	
NJ	Mercer	13	0	0	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	2	2	2	12	0	0	38	38	38	38	
NJ	Middlesex	42	0	8	107	107	107	107	1	0	0	1	1	1	16	0	2	35	35	35	35	
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Hudson	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	3	33	33	33	33	
NY	New York	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	2	1	
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	15	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	4	0	0	4	
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	223	0	0	223	0	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	0	10	0	0	10	
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	70	70	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	71	0	0	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	2	
CT	Fairfield	17	1	2	142	1	1	142	0	0	0	2	0	0	4	1	2	3	1	1	3	
CT	New Haven	78	0	105	199	111	111	199	0	0	20	22	24	24	36	0	30	11	34	34	11	
CT	Hartford	0	0	82	102	169	169	102	0	0	3	5	16	5	0	0	45	28	37	37	28	
CT	Tolland	0	0	228	228	228	113	113	0	0	16	16	16	1	1	0	31	31	31	9	9	
CT	Windham	0	0	251	251	251	11	11	0	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	48	48	48	0	0	
CT	Middlesex	42	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	40	4	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New London	91	195	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	0	0	0	0	157	31	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Kent	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Washington	78	85	0	0	0	0	0	60	21	0	0	0	0	196	44	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	0	0	235	242	242	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	0	1	0	28	30	30	0	0	
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	201	201	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	38	38	
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	62	62	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	
MA	Bristol	42	0	22	64	64	0	0	2	0	4	7	7	0	37	0	5	34	34	0	0	
MA	Norfolk	75	0	5	79	79	0	0	5	0	1	4	4	0	50	0	6	41	41	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DC	Total	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7	7	7	7	
MD	Total	163	0	118	480	480	480	480	11	0	36	99	99	99	88	0	18	192	192	192	192	
DE	Total	16	0	11	25	25	25	25	1	0	0	2	2	2	18	0	18	71	71	71	71	
PA	Total	6	0	3	15	15	15	15	0	0	0	3	3	3	6	0	17	25	25	25	25	
NJ	Total	56	0	8	137	137	137	137	1	0	0	3	3	3	37	3	5	106	106	106	106	
NY	Total	15	0	0	300	92	92	300	0	0	0	12	5	5	12	16	0	18	16	16	18	
CT	Total	228	197	669	923	760	404	568	8	8	69	74	85	41	30	236	36	156	122	150	81	
RI	Total	81	85	235	242	242	0	0	60	21	15	15	15	0	201	44	28	30	30	0	0	
MA	Total	117	0	27	143	143	264	264	6	0	4	10	10	18	87	0	11	75	75	44	44	
Grand Total		683	282	1072	2267	1895	1418	1790	88	29	124	219	222	171	168	691	83	257	646	672	542	515

Geography		Open Water							Developed, Open Space							Developed, Low Intensity						
		Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)						
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)		
DC	District of Columbia	23	23	23	24	24	24	24	150	150	150	156	156	156	156	125	125	125	129	129	129	129
MD	Prince George's	14	14	14	14	14	14	14	760	760	760	781	781	781	781	1336	1336	1337	1373	1373	1373	1373
MD	Anne Arundel	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	519	519	519	589	589	589	589	866	866	866	941	941	941	941
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	14	14	14	18	18	18	18	771	771	771	1312	1312	1312	1312	1283	1283	1283	1869	1869	1869	1869
MD	Baltimore City	0	6	6	6	0	6	6	320	327	326	494	494	494	494	265	301	300	401	401	401	401
MD	Harford	137	137	137	218	218	218	218	972	972	964	1571	1571	1571	1571	883	883	872	1497	1497	1497	1497
MD	Cecil	115	115	119	120	120	120	120	911	911	1484	1488	1488	1488	1488	782	782	1104	1105	1105	1105	1105
DE	New Castle	145	145	245	201	201	201	201	1000	1000	1378	1279	1279	1279	1279	1577	1577	1778	1754	1754	1754	1754
PA	Delaware	1	1	27	20	20	20	20	320	320	250	447	447	447	447	1034	1034	465	1245	1245	1245	1245
PA	Philadelphia	126	126	221	232	232	232	232	436	436	676	610	610	610	610	478	478	695	698	698	698	698
PA	Bucks	427	427	427	446	446	446	446	746	746	746	759	759	759	759	1230	1230	1230	1258	1258	1258	1258
NJ	Mercer	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	353	353	353	363	363	363	363	465	465	465	480	480	480	480
NJ	Middlesex	49	49	50	50	50	50	50	1116	1116	1227	1243	1243	1243	1243	1975	1975	2259	2283	2283	2283	2283
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	94	98	98	98	98	98	276	276	283	283	283	283	283
NJ	Essex	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	47	47	52	52	52	52	52	72	72	76	77	77	77	77
NJ	Hudson	131	131	131	132	132	132	132	59	59	59	69	69	69	69	233	235	236	271	271	271	271
NY	New York	3	3	3	7	7	7	7	47	47	47	71	71	71	71	117	118	120	190	190	190	190
NY	Queens	17	17	25	25	36	36	25	22	22	35	35	115	115	35	73	73	180	180	435	435	180
NY	Kings	3	3	12	12	17	17	12	0	0	3	3	6	6	3	0	0	2	2	6	6	2
NY	Bronx	9	9	10	10	9	9	10	268	268	270	275	268	268	275	236	236	230	242	236	236	242
NY	Westchester	2	2	8	324	2	2	324	780	780	883	2913	780	780	2913	886	886	940	1784	886	886	1784
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	848	848	0	0	0	0	1391	1391	1391	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	2732	2732	0	0	0	0	0	3330	3330	3330	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	40	0	0	40	0	0	0	216	0	0	216	0	0	0	123	0	0	123
CT	Fairfield	77	86	89	238	86	86	238	2069	2391	2664	3117	2391	2391	3117	2258	2683	3028	3269	2683	2683	3269
CT	New Haven	257	257	352	373	344	344	373	1661	1661	3180	2482	3213	3213	2482	2108	2108	3897	2833	3989	3989	2833
CT	Hartford	0	0	256	170	177	273	266	0	0	1039	1365	1026	1471	1811	0	0	1818	2087	1509	2098	2676
CT	Tolland	0	0	25	25	25	99	99	0	0	488	488	488	903	903	0	0	213	213	213	733	733
CT	Windham	0	0	74	74	74	9	9	0	0	361	361	361	42	42	0	0	125	125	125	43	43
CT	Middlesex	54	55	54	54	54	54	54	626	631	626	626	626	626	626	704	711	704	704	704	704	704
CT	New London	257	527	257	257	257	257	257	956	2326	956	956	956	956	956	1279	2259	1279	1279	1279	1279	1279
RI	Kent	24	24	24	24	24	24	24	170	170	170	170	170	170	170	406	406	406	406	406	406	406
RI	Washington	185	185	185	185	185	185	185	426	610	426	426	426	426	426	1011	1228	1011	1011	1011	1011	1011
RI	Providence	28	28	155	153	153	28	28	42	42	484	485	485	42	42	305	305	807	808	808	305	305
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	208	208	0	0	0	0	0	1798	1798	0	0	0	0	0	1588	1588
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	277	277	0	0	0	0	0	1017	1017	0	0	0	0	0	1315	1315
MA	Bristol	48	48	71	71	71	48	48	360	360	461	466	466	360	360	783	783	953	959	959	783	783
MA	Norfolk	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	476	476	480	488	488	488	488	760	760	764	778	778	788	788
MA	Suffolk	18	18	18	19	19	55	55	127	127	127	129	129	142	142	350	350	350	363	363	445	445
DC	Total	23	23	23	24	24	24	24	150	150	150	156	156	156	156	125	125	125	129	129	129	129
MD	Total	289	295	299	386	380	386	386	4254	4260	4825	6235	6235	6235	6235	5416	5452	5762	7186	7186	7186	7186
DE	Total	145	145	245	201	201	201	201	1000	1000	1378	1279	1279	1279	1279	1577	1577	1778	1754	1754	1754	1754
PA	Total	554	554	675	698	698	698	698	1502	1502	1672	1817	1817	1817	1817	2742	2742	2390	3201	3201	3201	3201
NJ	Total	200	200	201	203	203	203	203	1668	1668	1789	1825	1825	1825	1825	3021	3023	3318	3393	3393	3393	3393
NY	Total	33	33	59	419	92	92	419	1116	1116	1238	3513	4819	4819	3513	1312	1313	1472	2521	6473	6473	2521
CT	Total	645	925	1107	1191	1017	1122	1295	5312	7008	9315	9396	9062	9602	9936	6350	7761	11064	10511	10502	11530	11538
RI	Total	237	237	365	362	362	237	237	639	822	1080	1082	1082	639	639	1722	1939	2224	2225	2225	1722	1722
MA	Total	77	77	100	101	101	598	598	963	963	1068	1083	1083	3807	3807	1893	1893	2068	2100	2100	4922	4922
Grand Total		2203	2489	3073	3584	3078	3561	4061	16604	18491	22516	26384	27356	30178	29205	24157	25824	30201	33018	36962	40309	36365

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity Affected Environment (Acres)								Developed, High Intensity Affected Environment (Acres)								Barren Land Affected Environment (Acres)							
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3						
					via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)				via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)			
DC	District of Columbia	404	404	404	412	412	412	412	620	620	620	630	630	630	630	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
MD	Prince George's	796	796	796	807	807	807	807	349	349	349	355	355	355	355	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
MD	Anne Arundel	558	558	558	586	586	586	586	142	142	142	144	144	144	144	12	12	12	13	13	13	13			
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
MD	Baltimore County	1006	1006	1006	1852	1852	1852	1852	383	383	383	798	798	798	798	113	113	113	160	160	160	160			
MD	Baltimore City	1304	1558	1559	2088	2088	2088	2088	1276	1455	1448	2623	2623	2623	2623	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
MD	Harford	673	673	671	1226	1226	1226	1226	272	272	272	444	444	444	444	8	8	8	25	25	25	25			
MD	Cecil	433	433	666	666	666	666	666	124	124	196	196	196	196	196	56	56	148	148	148	148	148			
DE	New Castle	1735	1735	2042	2012	2012	2012	2012	1113	1113	1262	1301	1301	1301	1301	55	55	59	60	60	60	60			
PA	Delaware	1557	1557	1403	2093	2093	2093	2093	899	899	1235	1523	1523	1523	1523	1	1	3	3	3	3	3			
PA	Philadelphia	2375	2375	2548	3401	3401	3401	3401	2754	2754	2887	5161	5161	5161	5161	2	2	11	5	5	5	5			
PA	Bucks	1470	1470	1470	1491	1491	1491	1491	637	637	637	645	645	645	645	3	3	3	3	3	3	3			
NJ	Mercer	817	817	817	834	834	834	834	548	548	548	560	560	560	560	27	27	27	30	30	30	30			
NJ	Middlesex	1981	1981	2095	2107	2107	2107	2107	893	893	944	945	945	945	945	15	15	17	17	17	17	17			
NJ	Union	1235	1235	1273	1273	1273	1273	1273	959	959	993	993	993	993	993	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
NJ	Essex	384	384	405	406	406	406	406	829	829	848	849	849	849	849	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NJ	Hudson	668	685	687	893	893	893	893	773	800	811	1282	1282	1282	1282	12	12	12	16	16	16	16			
NY	New York	231	233	238	618	618	618	618	589	613	632	1175	1175	1175	1175	0	0	0	12	12	12	12			
NY	Queens	307	307	410	410	1436	1436	410	1247	1247	1888	1888	4135	4135	1888	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Kings	0	0	8	8	19	19	8	28	28	95	95	291	291	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Bronx	627	627	626	641	627	627	641	1288	1288	1295	1330	1288	1288	1330	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Westchester	1218	1218	1292	2009	1218	1218	2009	733	733	751	948	733	733	948	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	2190	2190	0	0	0	0	541	541	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	2159	2159	0	0	0	0	1029	1029	0	0	0	0	0	81	81	81	0			
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	84	0	0	84	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	12	0	0	12			
CT	Fairfield	3509	4035	4476	4332	4035	4035	4332	2114	2335	2519	2427	2335	2335	2427	7	8	8	8	8	8	8			
CT	New Haven	2749	2749	3595	3361	3735	3735	3361	1133	1133	1310	1209	1357	1357	1209	42	42	64	44	66	66	44			
CT	Hartford	0	0	2613	2950	2539	3594	4006	0	0	965	1010	975	1442	1478	0	0	2	3	7	9	5			
CT	Tolland	0	0	14	14	14	576	576	0	0	2	2	75	75	75	0	0	0	0	64	64	64			
CT	Windham	0	0	20	20	20	16	16	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	46	46	46	0	0			
CT	Middlesex	498	503	498	498	498	498	498	172	176	172	172	172	172	172	30	31	30	30	30	30	30			
CT	New London	1795	2871	1795	1795	1795	1795	1795	552	809	552	552	552	552	552	124	128	124	124	124	124	124			
RI	Kent	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	1067	628	628	628	628	628	628	628	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			
RI	Washington	952	1168	952	952	952	952	952	235	243	235	235	235	235	235	49	52	49	49	49	49	49			
RI	Providence	1290	1290	2487	2488	2488	1290	1290	2164	2164	2717	2719	2719	2719	2164	0	0	1	1	1	0	0			
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	1933	1933	0	0	0	0	0	1100	1100	0	0	0	0	0	42	42			
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	1546	1546	0	0	0	0	0	505	505	0	0	0	0	0	2	2			
MA	Bristol	1177	1177	1323	1338	1338	1177	1177	391	391	409	411	411	391	391	3	3	6	6	6	3	3			
MA	Norfolk	575	575	580	587	587	596	596	197	197	198	200	200	242	242	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
MA	Suffolk	1563	1563	1563	1608	1608	2125	2125	1175	1175	1175	1203	1203	2266	2266	3	3	3	3	3	6	6			
DC	Total	404	404	404	412	412	412	412	620	620	620	630	630	630	630	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
MD	Total	4770	5024	5256	7225	7225	7225	7225	2546	2725	2790	4560	4560	4560	4560	192	192	284	348	348	348	348			
DE	Total	1735	1735	2042	2012	2012	2012	2012	1113	1113	1262	1301	1301	1301	1301	55	55	59	60	60	60	60			
PA	Total	5402	5402	5420	6985	6985	6985	6985	4291	4291	4759	7329	7329	7329	7329	6	6	17	12	12	12	12			
NJ	Total	5084	5101	5277	5512	5512	5512	5512	4002	4029	4143	4628	4628	4628	4628	55	55	58	64	64	64	64			
NY	Total	2383	2385	2573	3770	8268	8268	3770	3885	3909	4660	5437	9193	9193	5437	0	0	0	24	93	93	24			
CT	Total	8550	10158	13010	12969	12635	14249	14583	3971	4454	5522	5373	5394	5912	5912	203	210	275	255	281	301	275			
RI	Total	3309	3525	4506	4507	4507	3309	3309	3027	3035	3581	3582	3582	3027	3027	50	52	51	51	51	50	50			
MA	Total	3315	3315	3467	3534	3534	7377	7377	1763	1763	1782	1814	1814	4503	4503	7	7	11	11	11	54	54			
Grand Total		34951	37048	41954	46927	51091	55350	51186	25219	25939	29118	34655	38432	41106	37328	570	580	757	827	921	983	889			

Geography		Forest/Shrub							Grassland/Cultivated							Wetlands						
		Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)						
		Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Existing NEC	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)	via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)				via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)		
DC	District of Columbia	45	45	45	46	46	46	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	106	106	109	109	109	109
MD	Prince George's	686	686	686	704	704	704	704	33	33	33	33	33	33	342	342	342	352	352	352	352	
MD	Anne Arundel	1335	1335	1335	1566	1566	1566	1566	72	72	72	86	86	86	825	825	825	875	875	875	875	
MD	Howard	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	
MD	Baltimore County	474	474	474	1086	1086	1086	1086	58	58	58	247	247	247	536	536	536	985	985	985	985	
MD	Baltimore City	47	49	49	60	60	60	60	0	0	0	2	2	2	21	21	21	38	38	38	38	
MD	Harford	1201	1201	1203	1989	1989	1989	1989	817	817	821	922	922	922	622	622	623	1113	1113	1113	1113	
MD	Cecil	2095	2095	4263	4264	4264	4264	4264	483	483	1267	1269	1269	1269	694	694	803	803	803	803	803	
DE	New Castle	459	459	510	521	521	521	521	71	71	77	76	76	76	745	745	993	941	941	941	941	
PA	Delaware	93	93	46	96	96	96	96	0	0	3	1	1	1	75	75	76	114	114	114	114	
PA	Philadelphia	67	67	91	74	74	74	74	14	14	14	24	24	24	57	57	178	128	128	128	128	
PA	Bucks	274	274	274	277	277	277	277	39	39	39	41	41	41	408	408	408	416	416	416	416	
NJ	Mercer	526	526	526	538	538	538	538	193	193	193	203	203	203	694	694	694	708	708	708	708	
NJ	Middlesex	1368	1368	1412	1450	1450	1450	1450	198	198	198	213	213	213	627	627	636	655	655	655	655	
NJ	Union	13	13	14	14	14	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	12	12	12	12	12	
NJ	Essex	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
NJ	Hudson	14	14	14	19	19	19	19	11	11	11	16	16	16	507	507	507	611	611	611	611	
NY	New York	7	7	7	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	28	31	46	46	46	46	
NY	Queens	1	1	1	1	165	165	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4	7	7	4	
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	
NY	Bronx	179	179	179	181	179	179	181	16	16	18	18	16	18	107	107	108	110	107	107	110	
NY	Westchester	42	42	56	4319	42	42	4319	0	0	0	289	0	0	289	10	10	23	165	10	10	
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	969	969	0	0	0	0	30	30	0	0	0	0	0	119	119	0	
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	1156	0	0	1156	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	85	0	0	85	
CT	Fairfield	544	604	642	3124	604	604	3124	8	11	11	190	11	11	134	152	165	303	152	152	303	
CT	New Haven	2038	2038	3129	5699	3176	3176	5699	42	42	238	466	238	238	1004	1004	1431	1226	1445	1445	1226	
CT	Hartford	0	0	1192	1739	1953	2247	2032	0	0	110	114	222	154	0	0	357	316	288	352	381	
CT	Tolland	0	0	4020	4020	4020	4255	4255	0	0	338	338	338	291	291	0	519	519	519	487	487	
CT	Windham	0	0	4213	4213	4213	402	402	0	0	637	637	637	5	5	0	911	911	911	9	9	
CT	Middlesex	1010	1016	1010	1010	1010	1010	1010	30	30	30	30	30	30	616	620	616	616	616	616	616	
CT	New London	2051	5853	2051	2051	2051	2051	2051	308	625	308	308	308	308	1790	2511	1790	1790	1790	1790	1790	
RI	Kent	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	93	93	93	93	93	93	
RI	Washington	2445	3385	2445	2445	2445	2445	2445	1068	1272	1068	1068	1068	1068	2909	3359	2909	2909	2909	2909	2909	
RI	Providence	20	20	3836	3835	3835	20	20	0	0	246	246	246	0	10	10	620	620	620	10	10	
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	29	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	4953	4953	0	0	0	0	0	340	0	0	0	0	0	1100	1100	
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	930	930	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	152	152	
MA	Bristol	949	949	1200	1212	1212	949	949	100	100	144	145	145	100	589	589	679	686	686	589	589	
MA	Norfolk	1197	1197	1198	1226	1226	1197	1197	81	81	77	82	82	81	1135	1135	1125	1147	1147	1135	1135	
MA	Suffolk	34	34	34	49	49	36	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	19	19	19	43	43	
DC	Total	45	45	45	46	46	46	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	106	106	109	109	109	109	
MD	Total	5841	5843	8013	9672	9672	9672	9672	1462	1462	2250	2559	2559	2559	3045	3045	3155	4172	4172	4172	4172	
DE	Total	459	459	510	521	521	521	521	71	71	77	76	76	76	745	745	993	941	941	941	941	
PA	Total	434	434	411	446	446	446	446	53	53	56	65	65	65	540	540	662	658	658	658	658	
NJ	Total	1922	1922	1968	2022	2022	2022	2022	402	402	402	431	431	431	1842	1842	1851	1987	1987	1987	1987	
NY	Total	229	229	244	5667	1390	1390	5667	16	16	18	407	46	46	149	149	167	411	292	292	411	
CT	Total	5642	9510	16257	21855	17027	13744	18572	387	707	1672	2084	1784	1145	3544	4286	5789	5681	5721	4851	4811	
RI	Total	2586	3526	6403	6401	6401	2586	2586	1068	1272	1314	1314	1314	1068	3012	3463	3622	3622	3622	3012	3012	
MA	Total	2180	2180	2432	2488	2487	8094	8094	181	181	221	227	227	556	1743	1743	1823	1853	1853	3019	3019	
Grand Total		19340	24149	36282	49117	40012	38521	47626	3641	4165	6011	7165	6504	5947	6608	14726	15919	18167	19434	19355	19043	19121

Geography		Station ID	Station Type	Developed Land						Undeveloped Land					
State	County			New Stations (Acres)								New Stations (Acres)			
				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)			via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)						
DC	District of Columbia	1	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Prince George's	2	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Prince George's	3	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Prince George's	4	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Anne Arundel	5	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MD	Anne Arundel	6	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	21	21
MD	Anne Arundel	6	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	21	21
MD	Baltimore County	7	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore County	15	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	8	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	9	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	10	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	11	New	0	0	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	12	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Baltimore City	13	New	39	39	39	39	39	39	2	2	2	2	2	2
MD	Baltimore City	14	New	0	0	40	40	40	40	0	0	1	1	1	1
MD	Harford	16	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Harford	17	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Cecil	22	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MD	Cecil	23	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	New Castle	24	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	New Castle	25	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	New Castle	26	New	20	20	20	20	20	20	*	*	*	*	*	*
DE	New Castle	27	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	New Castle	28	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
DE	New Castle	29	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	30	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	31	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	32	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	33	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	34	New	41	41	41	41	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	35	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	36	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	37	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	38	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	39	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	40	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	41	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	42	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Delaware	43	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	44	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	45	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	46	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	47	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	48	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	49	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	50	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	51	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Philadelphia	52	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	53	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	54	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	55	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	56	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PA	Bucks	57	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Mercer	58	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Mercer	60	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Mercer	61	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Potential impacts of less than 0.5 acres.

Geography		Station ID	Station Type	Developed Land						Undeveloped Land					
State	County			New Stations (Acres)								New Stations (Acres)			
				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)			via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)						
NJ	Middlesex	62	New	38	38	38	38	38	38	3	3	3	3	3	3
NJ	Middlesex	63	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	64	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	65	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	66	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	67	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Middlesex	68	New	0	0	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Union	69	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Union	70	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Union	71	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Union	72	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	73	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	74	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	75	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	76	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	New York	77	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	New York	9993	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Queens	144	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Queens	145	New	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	78	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	79	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	80	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	81	New	17	17	17	17	17	17	3	3	3	3	3	3
NY	Westchester	82	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	83	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	84	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	85	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	86	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	87	New	41	41	41	41	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	88	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Westchester	151	New	0	0	37	0	0	37	0	0	4	0	0	4
NY	Putnam	153	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Nassau	146	New	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Suffolk	148	New	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Suffolk	149	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	89	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	90	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	91	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	92	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	93	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	94	New	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	95	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	96	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	97	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	98	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	99	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	100	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	101	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	102	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	103	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	104	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	105	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	107	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	108	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	154	New	0	0	14	0	0	14	0	0	28	0	0	28
CT	New Haven	109	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New Haven	110	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

*Potential impacts of less than 0.5 acres.

Geography		Station ID	Station Type	Developed Land						Undeveloped Land					
State	County			New Stations (Acres)								New Stations (Acres)			
				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3				Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3			
via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)			via CC and PVD (3.1)	via LI and PVD (3.2)	via LI and WOR (3.3)	via CC and WOR (3.4)						
CT	New Haven	111	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	112	New	0	21	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	113	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	156	New	0	41	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	114	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	115	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	116	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	155	New	0	0	17	0	0	17	0	0	25	0	25	
CT	Middlesex	117	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Middlesex	118	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Middlesex	119	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Middlesex	120	New	34	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	
CT	New London	121	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New London	124	New	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	
CT	New London	122	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Hartford	160	New	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Hartford	160	Existing	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Hartford	161	New	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	
CT	Hartford	164	New	0	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Tolland	165	New	0	13	13	13	0	0	0	29	29	29	0	
CT	Tolland	166	New	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	0	0	14	14	
RI	Washington	123	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Washington	125	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Washington	126	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Kent	127	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	128	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	129	New	0	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	130	New	21	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Bristol	131	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Bristol	132	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Bristol	133	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	172	Existing	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	173	New	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Worcester	174	New	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	17	17	
MA	Worcester	175	New	0	0	0	0	35	35	0	0	0	7	7	
MA	Middlesex	176	New	0	0	0	0	18	18	0	0	0	3	3	
MA	Middlesex	178	New	0	0	0	0	19	19	0	0	0	1	1	
MA	Middlesex	181	New	0	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	*	*	
MA	Suffolk	182	New	0	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Norfolk	134	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Norfolk	135	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Norfolk	136	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	137	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	138	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	139	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	140	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	141	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	142	New	0	0	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	
MA	Suffolk	143	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Grand Total			New	448	536	607	725	898	780	25	41	135	79	92	148

*Potential impacts of less than 0.5 acres.

Land Use Planning Documents

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in overall Goals, Objectives,			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
DC	All	State	National Capital Planning Commission. (2004). Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital. Washington, D.C.: National Capital Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
DC	DC: District of Columbia MD: Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	Greater Washington 2050 Coalition. (2010). Region Forward: A comprehensive guide for regional planning and measuring progress in the 21st century . Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
DC	DC: District of Columbia MD: Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. (1998). Transportation: The TPB Vision. Retrieved January 23, 2015, from Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments: http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/activities/vision/default.asp	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MD	All	State	Maryland Department of Planning. (2011). Plan Maryland: A Sustainable Growth Plan for the 21st Century. Baltimore, MD: Maryland Department of Planning.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MD	Anne Arundel, Baltimore City, Baltimore County, Carroll, Harford, Howard	Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB)	Baltimore Regional Transportation Board. (2011). Plan It 2035: Baltimore Regional Transportation Board regional long-range transportation plan for 2016-2035. Baltimore, MD: Baltimore Regional Transportation Board.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MD	Cecil	Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)	Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Council. (2011). WILMAPCO 2040 Regional Transportation Plan Update. Newark, DE: Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Council.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MD	Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	Region Forward, A Comprehensive Guide for Regional Planning and Measuring Progress in the 21st Century (2010)	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MD	Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	The TPB Vision (1998)	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
DE	All	State	Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination. (2010). Delaware Strategies for State Policies and Spending. Dover, DE: Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination.	N	Y	Y	Partially Compatible
DE	Dover and Kent	Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization	Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization. (2013). Metropolitan Transportation Plan: 2040 Update. Dover/Kent County Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
DE	New Castle	Wilmington Metropolitan Area Planning Council (WILMAPCO)	WILMAPCO 2040 Regional Transportation Plan Update (2011)	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Cumberland, Dauphin, Perry, and Harrisburg City	Harrisburg Area Transportation Study	Harrisburg Area Transportation Study. (2014). 2040 Regional Transportation Plan: Vision, Goals and Objectives. Harrisburg Area Transportation Study.	Y	Y	N	Partially Compatible
PA	Cumberland, Dauphin, Perry, and Harrisburg City	Harrisburg Area Transportation Study	Harrisburg Area Transportation Study. (2010). 2035 Regional Transportation Plan: 2011-2035. Harrisburg Area Transportation Study.	Y	Y	N	Partially Compatible
PA	Lancaster	Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission	Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission. (2014). Lancaster County Congestion Management Process. Lancaster, PA: Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission.	Y	Y	N	Partially Compatible
PA	Lancaster	Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission	Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission. (2012). Connections 2040: The Transportation Element. Lancaster, PA: Lancaster County Transportation Coordinating Committee Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Lebanon	Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization	Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization. (2007). Lebanon County Comprehensive Plan. Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Lebanon	Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization	Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization. (2012). 2013 Long Range Transportation Plan. Lebanon County Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Lehigh and Northampton	Lehigh Valley Planning Commission	Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. (2010). Lehigh Valley Surface Transportation Plan: 2011-2030. Lehigh Valley Transportation Study.	Y	Y	N	Partially Compatible
PA	Lehigh and Northampton	Lehigh Valley Planning Commission	Lehigh Valley Planning Commission. (2005). Comprehensive Plan: The Lehigh Valley: 2030. Allentown, PA: Lehigh Valley Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Carbon, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Pike, Schuylkill and Wayne	Northeastern Pennsylvania Alliance (MPO)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PA	Berks	Reading Area Transportation Study MPO	Berks County Planning Commission. (2013). Berks County Comprehensive Plan 2030. Reading Area Transportation Study MPO.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
PA	Berks	Reading Area Transportation Study MPO	DRAFT Reading Area Transportation Study Long Range Transportation Plan (June 2014)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
PA	York	York Area Metropolitan Planning Organization	York Area Metropolitan Planning Organization. (2013). YAMPO Long Range Transportation Plan: 2009 - 2035. York, PA: York Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
PA	Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission. (2013). Connections 2040: Plan for Greater Philadelphia. Philadelphia, PA: Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
NJ	All	State	New Jersey State Planning Commission. (2001). The New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan New. Trenton, NJ: New Jersey State Planning Commission.	N	Y	Y	Partially Compatible

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in overall Goals, Objectives,			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
NJ	Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Hunterdon, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Somerset, Sussex, Union, Warren	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority	North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority. (2013). Plan 2040, NJTPA Regional Transportation Plan for Northern New Jersey. North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
NJ	Atlantic, Salem, Cumberland, Cape May	South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization	South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization. (2012). South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization Regional Transportation Plan 2040. Vineland, NJ: South Jersey Transportation Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
NJ	Bucks, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia in Pennsylvania	Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission	Connections 2040: Plan for Greater Philadelphia (2013)	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
NY	Bronx, Kings, Nassau, New York, Putnam, Queens, Richmond, Rockland, Suffolk, Westchester	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council	New York Metropolitan Transportation Council. (2013). Plan 2040, Regional Transportation Plan, A Shared Vision for a Sustainable Region. New York, NY: New York Metropolitan Transportation Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
NY	Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga, and Schenectady	Capital District Transportation Committee	Capital District Transportation Committee. (2011). New Visions 2035 Plan Update: Choosing Our Future, New Visions for a Quality Region. Albany, NY: Capital District Transportation Committee.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
NY	Dutchess	Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County Transportation Council	Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County Transportation Council. (2012). Moving Dutchess: The 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan for Dutchess County. Poughkeepsie-Dutchess County Transportation Council.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
NY	Ulster	Ulster County Transportation Council	Ulster County Transportation Council. (2010). Year 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan. Kingston, NY: Ulster County Transportation Council.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
NY	Orange	Orange County Transportation Council	Orange County Transportation Council. (2011). Orange County Transportation Council Long Range Transportation Plan: 2011-2040. Goshen, NY: Orange County Transportation Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	All	State	Office of Policy and Management, Intergovernmental Policy Division. (2005). Conservation and Development Policies Plan for Connecticut: 2005-2010. Hartford, CT: State of Connecticut.	N	Y	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Beacon Falls, Bethlehem, Cheshire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Oxford, Prospect, Southbury, Thomaston, Waterbury, Watertown, Wolcott, and Woodbury	Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley	Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley. (2008). Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Plan of Conservation and Development: 2008. Waterbury, CT: Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Beacon Falls, Bethlehem, Cheshire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Oxford, Prospect, Southbury, Thomaston, Waterbury, Watertown, Wolcott, and Woodbury	Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley	Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley. (2011). Central Naugatuck Valley Long Range Regional Transportation Plan: 2011-2040. Waterbury, CT: Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Bridgeport, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Stratford and Trumbull	Greater Bridgeport Regional Council	Geater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency. (2008). Growth Management Alternatives: Regional Conservation and Development Plan Update. Bridgeport, CT: Geater Bridgeport Regional Planning Agency.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Bridgeport, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Stratford and Trumbull	Greater Bridgeport Regional Council	Greater Bridgeport Regional Council. (2011). Regional Transportation Plan for the Greater bridgeport Planning Region: 2011-2040. Bridgeport, CT: Greater Bridgeport Regional Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Ansonia, Bridgeport, Derby, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Stratford, Seymour, Shelton & Trumbull	Greater Bridgeport/Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (GBVMPO)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CT	Bristol, New Britain, Berlin, Burlington, Plainville, Plymouth, and Southington	Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency	Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency. (2011). Long-Range Transportation Plan for Central Connecticut, 2011-2040. Bristol, CT: Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Bristol, New Britain, Berlin, Burlington, Plainville, Plymouth, and Southington	Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency	Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency. (2013). PLAN of Conservation and Development for the Central Connecticut Region, 2013-2023. Bristol, CT: Central Connecticut Regional Planning Agency.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Bethel, Bridgewater, Brookfield, Danbury, New Fairfield, New Milford, Newtown, Redding, Ridgefield and Sherman	Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials	Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials. (2011). 2011-2040 Regional Transportation Plan for Greater Danbury, CT. Brookfield, CT: Housatonic Valley Council of Elected Officials.	Y	N	N	Partially Compatible
CT	Hartford, Andover, Avon, Bloomfield, Canton, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Hebron, Manchester, Marlborough, Newington, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Somers, South Windsor, Stafford, Suffield, tolland, Wernon, West Hartford, Wethersfield, Windsor, Windsor Locks	Capitol Region Council of Governments	Capitol Region Council of Governments. (2009). Achieving the Balance: A Plan of Conservation and Development for the Capitol Region. Hartford, CT: Capitol Region Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in overall Goals, Objectives,			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
CT	Hartford, Andover, Avon, Bloomfield, Canton, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Hebron, Manchester, Marlborough, Newington, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Somers, South Windsor, Stafford, Suffield, Tolland, Wernon, West Hartford, Wethersfield, Windsor, Windsor Locks	Capitol Region Council of Governments	Capitol Region Council of Governments. (2011). Capitol Region Transportation Plan: A Guide for Transportation Investments Through The Year 2040. Hartford, CT: Capitol Region Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Hartford, Andover, Avon, Bloomfield, Canton, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Farmington, Glastonbury, Granby, Hebron, Manchester, Marlborough, Newington, Rocky Hill, Simsbury, Somers, South Windsor, Stafford, Suffield, Tolland, Wernon, West Hartford, Wethersfield, Windsor, Windsor Locks	Capitol Region Council of Governments	Capitol Region Council of Governments. (2014). Regional Plan of Conservation and Development: Vibrant. Green. Connected. Competitive. Hartford, CT: Capitol Region Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Ashford, Brooklyn, Canterbury, Chaplin, Eastford, Hampton, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Scotland, Sterling, Thompson, Union, and Woodstock	Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
CT	Canaan, Cornwall, Goshen, Kent, North Canaan, Norfolk, Salisbury and Sharon	Northwestern Connecticut Council of Governments	Northwestern Connecticut Council of Governments. (2009). Plan of Conservation and Development. Northwestern Connecticut Council of Governments.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Bethany, Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Hamden, Madison, Meriden, Milford, New Haven, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Wallingford, West Haven, and Woodbridge	South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG)	South Central Regional Council of Governments. (2009). Plan of Conservation and Development. North Haven, CT: South Central Regional Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Bethany, Branford, East Haven, Guilford, Hamden, Madison, Meriden, Milford, New Haven, North Branford, North Haven, Orange, Wallingford, West Haven, and Woodbridge	South Central Regional Council of Governments (SCRCOG)	South Central Regional Council of Governments. (2009). Plan of Conservation and Development. North Haven, CT: South Central Regional Council of Governments.	Y	N	N	Partially Compatible
CT	Bozrah, Colchester, East Lyme, Franklin, Griswold, City of Groton, Town of Groton, Ledyard, Lisbon, Montville, New London, North Stonington, Norwich, Preston, Salem, Sprague, Stonington, Stonington Borough, Voluntown, Waterford	Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments (SECCOG)	Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments. (2007). Regional Plan of Conservation and Development 2007. Norwich, CT: Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Bozrah, Colchester, East Lyme, Franklin, Griswold, City of Groton, Town of Groton, Ledyard, Lisbon, Montville, New London, North Stonington, Norwich, Preston, Salem, Sprague, Stonington, Stonington Borough, Voluntown, Waterford	Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments (SECCOG)	Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments. (2011). Long Range Transportation Plan 2011-2040 for Southeastern Connecticut. Norwich, CT: Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Greenwich, Stamford, Darien, New Canaan, Norwalk, Wilton, Westport, Weston	Southwestern Regional Planning Agency (SWRPA)	Southwestern Regional Planning Agency. (2006). Regional Plan of Conservation and Development 2006-2015. Stamford, CT: Southwestern Regional Planning Agency.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
CT	Greenwich, Stamford, Darien, New Canaan, Norwalk, Wilton, Westport, Weston	Southwestern Regional Planning Agency (SWRPA)	Southwestern Regional Planning Agency. (2011). Going Forward: The Plan to Maintain & Improve Mobility, Southwestern Region Long Range Transportation Plan 2011-2040 (2011). Stamford, CT: Southwestern Region Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	N	Partially Compatible
CT	Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Haddam, East Hampton, Essex, Haddam, Killingworth, Lyme, Middlefield, Middletown, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Portland and Westbrook	Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments	Midstate Regional Planning Agency. (2011). 2011-2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Middletown, CT: Midstate Regional Planning Agency.	Y	N	N	Partially Compatible
CT	Chester, Clinton, Cromwell, Deep River, Durham, East Haddam, East Hampton, Essex, Haddam, Killingworth, Lyme, Middlefield, Middletown, Old Lyme, Old Saybrook, Portland and Westbrook	Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in overall Goals, Objectives,			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
CT	Ansonia, Dery, Seymour, Shelton	Valley Council of Governments	Valley Regional Planning Commission. (2008). Strategic Plan of Conservation & Development for the All-American Valley. Derby, CT: Valley Council of Governments.	N	Y	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Ansonia, Dery, Seymour, Shelton	Valley Council of Governments	Valley Council of Governments. (2012). Long Range Regional Transportation Plan Update 2011-2040. Derby, CT: Valley Council of Govern.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
CT	Chaplin, Columbia, Coventry, Hampton, Lebanon, Mansfield, Scotland, Willington, Windham	Windham Region Council of Governments	Windham Region Council of Governments. (2005). Regional Transportation Plan 2005. Willimantic, CT: Windham Region Council of Governments.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
RI	Bristol, Kent, Newport, Providence, Washington	State	Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program. (2012). Transportation 2035: Long Range Transportation Plan. Providence, RI: State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Statewide Planning Program.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
RI	All	State	Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program. (2006). Land Use 2025. Providence, RI: State of Rhode Island, Department of Administration, Statewide Planning Program.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Berkshire	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission. (2014). Sustainable Berkshires, Community Strategies for a Sustainable Future. Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.	N	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Berkshire	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission	Berkshire Regional Planning Commission. (2012). 2012 Berkshire Regional Transportation Plan. Berkshire Regional Planning Commission.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Essex, Middlesex, Norfolk, Suffolk	Boston Region MPO/Central Transportation Planning Staff	Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization. (2012). The Long-Range Transportation Plan, Paths to a Sustainable Region. Boston Region Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	0	Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Metropolitan Area Planning Council. (2008). Metro Future, Making a Greater Boston Region: Regional Plan, Goals and Objectives. Metropolitan Area Planning Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Barnstable	Cape Cod Commission	Cape Cod Commission. (2013). Cape Cod Regional Policy Plan. Cape Cod Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Barnstable	Cape Cod Commission	Cape Cod Commission. (2013). Cape Cod 2012 Regional Transportation Plan: 2012-2035. Cape Cod Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Worcester	Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission (CMRPC/CMMPO)	Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission. (2011). 2012 Regional Transportation Plan: Multimodal - Intermodal. Central Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	N	N	Partially Compatible
MA	Franklin	Franklin Regional Council of Governments	Franklin Regional Council of Governments. (2013). Sustainable Franklin County: Fanklin County's Regional Plan for Sustainable Development. Frankling Regional Council of Governments.	N	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Franklin	Franklin Regional Council of Governments	Franklin Regional Council of Governments. (2011). 2012 Regional Transportation Plan. Greenfield, MA: Franklin Regional Council of Governments.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Dukes	Martha's Vineyard Commission	Martha's Vineyard Commission. (2009). Island Plan: Charging the Future of the Vineyard. Oak Bluffs, MA: Martha's Vineyard Commission.	N	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Dukes	Martha's Vineyard Commission	Martha's Vineyard Commission. (2011). Martha's Vineyard Regional Transportation Plan. Oak Bluffs, MA: Martha's Vineyard Commission.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Essex	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission. (2009). Merrimack Valley Priority Growth Strategy. Haverhill, MA: Merrimack Valley Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Essex	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission	Merrimack Valley Planning Commission. (2011). Merrimack Valley 2012 Regional Transportation Plan. Haverhill, MA: Merrimack Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Worcester, Middlesex	Montachusett Regional Planning Commission	Montachusett Regional Planning Commission. (2011). Montachusett Regional Strategic Framework Plan. Fitchburg, MA: Montachusett Regional Planning Commission.	N	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Worcester, Middlesex	Montachusett Regional Planning Commission	Montachusett Regional Planning Commission. (2011). Montachusett Regional Transportation Plan 2012. Fitchburg, MA: Montachusett Regional Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Nantucket	Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission	Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission. (2011). Nantucket Regional Transportation Plan: 2012 - 2035. Nantucket, MA: Nantucket Planning and Economic Development Commission.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Plymouth	Old Colony Planning Council	Old Colony Planning Council. (2011). 2012 Old Colony Regional Transportation Plan. Brockton, MA: Old Colony Planning Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Bristol	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District. (2014). Growing the Economy of Southeastern Massachusetts: Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy . Taunton, MA: Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Bristol	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District. (2011). 2012 Regional Transportation Plan. Taunton, MA: Southeastern Massachusetts Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in overall Goals, Objectives,			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
MA	Middlesex	Northern Middlesex Council of Governments	Northern Middlesex Council of Governments. (2011). Northern Middlesex Regional Transportation Plan. Lowell, MA: Northern Middlesex Metropolitan Planning Organization.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Hampden, Hampshire	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission. (2014). Valley Vision 4: The Regional Land Use Plan for the Pioneer Valley. Springfield, MA: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Hampden, Hampshire	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission. (2011). 2012 Regional Transportation Plan for the Pioneer Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization. Springfield, MA: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.	Y	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Hampden, Hampshire	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission	Pioneer Valley Planning Commission. (2013). Our Next Future: An Action Plan for Building a Smart, Sustainable and Resilient Pioneer Valley. Springfield, MA: Pioneer Valley Planning Commission.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
MA	Bristol, Plymouth, Suffolk, Norfolk, Middlesex, Essex	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, Old Colony Planning Council, Metropolitan Area Planning Council	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, Old Colony Planning Council, Metropolitan Area Planning Council. (1999). Southeastern Massachusetts Vision 2020, An Agenda for the Future. Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, Old Colony Planning Council, Metropolitan Area Planning Council.	N	N	Y	Partially Compatible
MA	Bristol	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District. (2007). Report of the Futures Task Force. Taunton, MA: Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible