

## Appendix E.02 – Land Cover

---

## APPENDIX E.02

### LAND COVER – ERRATA SHEET

No changes were made to the materials in this appendix. This Volume 2 file contains the same information as was presented in the Tier 1 Draft EIS published November 2015.



# Land Cover Effects Assessment Methodology

June 3, 2014  
Revised FINAL

Submitted by:



# Table of Contents

<b>1. LAND COVER .....</b>	<b>1</b>
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.<sup>1</sup> 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).<sup>2</sup> 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.

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 therein<sup>3</sup>. 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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"> <li>▪ Location of existing and proposed transportation corridors and facilities to assess compatibility with the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Location of existing and proposed passenger rail stations to assess potential effects on existing or proposed land cover classifications</li> </ul>
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul>
Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul>
Cultural and Historic Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul>
Section 4(f) Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul>
Agricultural Lands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 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</li> </ul>
Environmental Justice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supplemental information identifying the location for EJ populations to assess the potential to disrupt community cohesion with the proposed Tier 1 EIS Alternatives</li> </ul>
Noise and Vibration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supplemental information identifying the location of sensitive receptors to assess the potential for incompatible use</li> </ul>
Ecological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supplemental information identifying the location of federally-listed threatened and endangered species and habitats that could be affected by changes in land cover</li> </ul>

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.<sup>4</sup> Direct effects include encroachment or alteration of existing or planned land cover. Indirect effects,<sup>5</sup> 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 Route<sup>6</sup> for each of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. This ½-mile swath<sup>7</sup> 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

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

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

<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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"> <li>National Land Cover Database (NLCD)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use of GIS based Data Viewer tool GIS based analysis to quantify (acres) assessment of land covers in the Affected Environment</li> </ul>
State Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Capital Planning Commission and the District of Columbia's Office of Planning, <i>The Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital</i> (2004)</li> <li>Maryland Department of Planning: <i>Plan Maryland, A Sustainable Growth Plan for the 21st Century</i> (2011)</li> <li>Delaware Office of State Planning Coordination, <i>Delaware Strategies for State Policies and Spending</i> (2010)</li> <li>New Jersey State Planning Commission, <i>New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan</i> (2001)</li> <li><i>Land Use 2025: Rhode Island State Land Use Plans and Policies</i> (State Planning Council, 2005)</li> <li>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>)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals and Objectives reviewed to determine if the NEC FUTURE program is consistent with them</li> </ul>
MPO Plans <sup>8</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), <i>The TPB Vision</i></li> <li>Baltimore Regional Transportation Board, <i>Plan It 2035</i></li> <li>Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (DVRPC), <i>Connections: The Regional Plan for a Sustainable Future</i> (2009)</li> <li><i>Vision 2020, An Agenda for the Future</i> (Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District, 2011)</li> <li><i>Valley Vision: the Regional Land Use Plan for the Pioneer Valley</i> (Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, 2011)</li> <li><i>Central Naugatuck Valley Regional Plan of Conservation &amp; Development</i> (Council of Governments of the Central Naugatuck Valley, 2008)</li> <li><i>Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (South Central Region Council of Governments, 2009)</li> <li><i>2008 Regional Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (Capitol Region Council of Governments, 2008)</li> <li><i>Regional Plan of Conservation and Development</i> (Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, 2007)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Goals and Objectives reviewed to determine if the NEC FUTURE program is consistent with them</li> </ul>

Source: NEC FUTURE JV, 2014

<sup>8</sup> 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							Undeveloped Land						
		Potential Conversion (Acres)							Potential Conversion (Acres)						
		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)		
DC	District of Columbia	77	77	77	115	115	115	115	1	1	1	11	11	11	11
MD	Prince George's	228	228	228	605	605	605	605	17	17	17	98	98	98	98
MD	Anne Arundel	203	203	203	405	405	405	405	44	44	44	288	288	288	288
MD	Howard	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
MD	Baltimore City	142	142	142	196	196	196	196	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
MD	Harford	275	275	260	765	765	765	765	40	40	52	160	160	160	160
MD	Cecil	183	183	281	407	407	407	407	142	142	286	442	442	442	442
DE	New Castle	383	383	494	989	989	989	989	37	37	61	160	160	160	160
PA	Delaware	224	224	196	509	509	509	509	3	3	6	7	7	7	7
PA	Philadelphia	344	344	337	641	641	641	641	1	1	6	4	4	4	4
PA	Bucks	287	287	287	796	796	796	796	9	9	9	50	50	50	50
NJ	Mercer	180	180	180	471	471	471	471	25	25	25	118	118	118	118
NJ	Middlesex	403	403	569	893	893	893	893	59	59	68	226	226	226	226
NJ	Union	147	147	247	332	332	332	332	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	72	72	123	168	168	168	168	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	106	108	108	180	179	179	180	15	23	23	45	36	36	45
NY	New York	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
NY	Queens	80	80	125	125	357	357	125	0	0	0	0	21	21	0
NY	Kings	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NY	Bronx	130	130	130	254	130	130	254	27	27	27	55	27	27	55
NY	Westchester	208	208	383	432	208	208	432	0	0	0	88	0	0	88
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	348	348	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	640	640	0	0	0	0	0	77	77	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	592	773	908	798	773	773	798	21	22	26	30	22	22	30
CT	New Haven	500	500	956	505	1,025	1,025	505	116	116	271	140	277	277	140
CT	Hartford	0	0	397	183	244	203	196	0	0	110	33	54	56	45
CT	Tolland	0	0	5	5	5	287	287	0	0	95	95	95	91	91
CT	Windham	0	0	27	27	27	19	19	0	0	226	226	226	11	11
CT	Middlesex	132	147	132	132	132	132	132	84	95	84	84	84	84	84
CT	New London	317	474	317	317	317	317	317	272	399	272	272	272	272	272
RI	Kent	152	152	152	152	152	152	152	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
RI	Washington	188	232	188	188	188	188	188	338	507	338	338	338	338	338
RI	Providence	202	202	245	256	256	202	202	0	0	276	283	283	0	0
MA	Hampden	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
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MA	Bristol	179	179	206	412	412	179	179	81	81	114	265	265	81	81
MA	Norfolk	120	120	145	300	300	125	125	129	129	156	369	369	129	129
MA	Suffolk	149	149	150	165	165	220	220	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
DC	Total	77	77	77	115	115	115	115	1	1	1	11	11	11	11
MD	Total	1,285	1,285	1,367	3,081	3,081	3,081	3,081	259	259	414	1,056	1,056	1,056	1,056
DE	Total	383	383	494	989	989	989	989	37	37	61	160	160	160	160
PA	Total	855	855	819	1,946	1,946	1,946	1,946	12	12	21	61	61	61	61
NJ	Total	908	910	1,228	2,046	2,044	2,044	2,046	99	108	116	389	380	380	389
NY	Total	438	438	658	831	1,703	1,703	831	30	30	29	146	128	128	146
CT	Total	1,540	1,895	2,741	1,968	2,522	2,754	2,253	493	633	1,084	879	1,029	813	672
RI	Total	542	586	586	597	597	542	542	346	516	623	629	629	346	346
MA	Total	448	448	501	877	877	948	948	211	211	270	636	636	378	378
Grand Total		6,476	6,875	8,471	12,448	13,873	14,121	12,750	1,489	1,807	2,620	3,966	4,090	3,334	3,219

Geography		Developed Land							Undeveloped Land						
		Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)							Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)						
		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)		
DC	District of Columbia	77	0	0	62	62	62	62	3	0	0	9	9	9	9
MD	Prince George's	228	0	0	168	168	168	168	17	0	0	66	66	66	66
MD	Anne Arundel	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
MD	Baltimore County	254	0	0	398	398	398	398	16	0	0	52	52	52	52
MD	Baltimore City	182	41	51	322	322	322	322	2	0	0	10	10	10	10
MD	Harford	276	0	7	397	397	397	397	48	0	21	117	117	117	117
MD	Cecil	184	0	116	227	227	227	227	147	0	151	311	311	311	311
DE	New Castle	383	0	90	385	385	385	385	37	0	34	108	108	108	108
PA	Delaware	224	0	113	268	268	268	268	3	0	5	4	4	4	4
PA	Philadelphia	353	0	214	535	535	535	535	2	0	22	21	21	21	21
PA	Bucks	289	0	0	229	229	229	229	11	0	0	35	35	35	35
NJ	Mercer	182	0	0	117	117	117	117	26	0	0	70	70	70	70
NJ	Middlesex	405	0	153	376	376	376	376	61	0	11	146	146	146	146
NJ	Union	147	0	64	150	150	150	150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Essex	73	0	47	83	83	83	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NJ	Hudson	131	26	44	168	168	168	168	15	4	4	41	41	41	41
NY	New York	56	18	33	154	92	92	154	3	0	1	2	2	2	2
NY	Queens	97	0	74	74	425	425	74	0	0	5	5	31	31	5
NY	Kings	0	0	3	3	34	34	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
NY	Bronx	131	0	21	61	0	0	61	28	0	0	9	0	0	9
NY	Westchester	209	0	73	299	0	0	299	0	0	0	248	0	0	248
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	473	473	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	774	774	0	0	0	0	0	87	87	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	27	0	0	27	0	0	0	76	0	0	76
CT	Fairfield	597	171	300	286	171	171	286	22	2	5	154	2	2	154
CT	New Haven	507	0	448	136	554	554	136	119	0	156	242	169	169	242
CT	Hartford	0	0	515	411	457	457	411	0	0	144	143	233	233	143
CT	Tolland	0	0	45	45	45	298	298	0	0	274	274	274	127	127
CT	Windham	0	0	31	31	31	19	19	0	0	332	332	332	11	11
CT	Middlesex	132	6	0	0	0	0	0	84	5	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New London	317	274	0	0	0	0	0	279	243	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Kent	153	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Washington	188	49	0	0	0	0	0	338	150	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Providence	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
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	485	485	0	0	0	0	0	260	260
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	246	246	0	0	0	0	0	76	76
MA	Bristol	179	0	25	116	116	0	0	81	0	31	106	106	0	0
MA	Norfolk	122	0	23	73	73	5	5	129	0	11	123	123	0	0
MA	Suffolk	182	0	0	160	160	110	110	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
DC	Total	77	0	0	62	62	62	62	3	0	0	9	9	9	9
MD	Total	1,328	41	174	1,622	1,622	1,622	1,622	275	0	172	782	782	782	782
DE	Total	383	0	90	385	385	385	385	37	0	34	108	108	108	108
PA	Total	867	0	327	1,033	1,033	1,033	1,033	15	0	27	60	60	60	60
NJ	Total	938	26	308	895	895	895	895	102	4	15	256	256	256	256
NY	Total	492	18	204	618	1,798	1,798	618	31	0	6	341	121	121	341
CT	Total	1,553	451	1,339	909	1,258	1,499	1,150	504	250	911	1,146	1,010	542	678
RI	Total	549	49	169	216	216	0	0	347	150	282	291	291	0	0
MA	Total	483	0	48	350	350	846	846	212	0	43	230	230	336	336
Grand Total		6,669	586	2,659	6,089	7,617	8,139	6,611	1,525	404	1,489	3,224	2,868	2,215	2,571

Geography		Developed Land							Undeveloped Land						
		Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)						
		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)		
DC	District of Columbia	1,301	1,301	1,301	1,328	1,328	1,328	1,328	174	174	174	179	179	179	179
MD	Prince George's	3,242	3,242	3,242	3,316	3,316	3,316	3,316	1,074	1,074	1,074	1,103	1,103	1,103	1,103
MD	Anne Arundel	2,098	2,098	2,098	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,241	2,241	2,241	2,537	2,537	2,537	2,537
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
MD	Baltimore County	3,557	3,557	3,557	5,990	5,990	5,990	5,990	1,081	1,081	1,081	2,336	2,336	2,336	2,336
MD	Baltimore City	3,168	3,643	3,636	5,609	5,609	5,609	5,609	68	75	75	105	105	105	105
MD	Harford	2,808	2,808	2,787	4,763	4,763	4,763	4,763	2,777	2,777	2,784	4,242	4,242	4,242	4,242
MD	Cecil	2,306	2,306	3,597	3,603	3,603	3,603	3,603	3,387	3,387	6,451	6,456	6,456	6,456	6,456
DE	New Castle	5,479	5,479	6,519	6,406	6,406	6,406	6,406	1,420	1,420	1,826	1,740	1,740	1,740	1,740
PA	Delaware	3,812	3,812	3,355	5,311	5,311	5,311	5,311	168	168	152	231	231	231	231
PA	Philadelphia	6,045	6,045	6,817	9,876	9,876	9,876	9,876	263	263	503	457	457	457	457
PA	Bucks	4,087	4,087	4,086	4,156	4,156	4,156	4,156	1,149	1,149	1,149	1,180	1,180	1,180	1,180
NJ	Mercer	2,209	2,209	2,209	2,265	2,265	2,265	2,265	1,432	1,432	1,432	1,467	1,467	1,467	1,467
NJ	Middlesex	5,980	5,980	6,541	6,596	6,596	6,596	6,596	2,243	2,243	2,296	2,367	2,367	2,367	2,367
NJ	Union	2,566	2,566	2,648	2,648	2,648	2,648	2,648	25	25	27	27	27	27	27
NJ	Essex	1,332	1,332	1,382	1,383	1,383	1,383	1,383	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
NJ	Hudson	1,744	1,790	1,804	2,530	2,530	2,530	2,530	662	662	662	777	777	777	777
NY	New York	984	1,011	1,036	2,065	2,065	2,065	2,065	39	39	42	63	63	63	63
NY	Queens	1,649	1,649	2,512	2,512	6,121	6,121	2,512	20	20	30	30	208	208	30
NY	Kings	28	28	108	108	322	322	108	3	3	12	12	20	20	12
NY	Bronx	2,418	2,418	2,421	2,488	2,418	2,418	2,488	312	312	315	320	312	312	320
NY	Westchester	3,617	3,617	3,866	7,655	3,617	3,617	7,655	54	54	88	5,097	54	54	5,097
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	4,971	4,971	0	0	0	0	31	31	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	9,331	9,331	0	0	0	0	1,132	1,132	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	436	0	0	436	0	0	0	1,381	0	0	1,381
CT	Fairfield	9,956	11,452	12,694	13,152	11,452	11,452	13,152	762	853	907	3,855	853	853	3,855
CT	New Haven	7,694	7,694	12,046	9,929	12,360	12,360	9,929	3,341	3,341	5,149	7,765	5,204	5,204	7,765
CT	Hartford	0	0	6,438	7,415	6,055	8,615	9,975	0	0	1,916	2,338	2,640	3,134	2,833
CT	Tolland	0	0	717	717	717	2,351	2,351	0	0	4,903	4,903	4,903	5,132	5,132
CT	Windham	0	0	554	554	554	101	101	0	0	5,834	5,834	5,834	424	424
CT	Middlesex	2,030	2,052	2,030	2,030	2,030	2,030	2,030	1,709	1,719	1,709	1,709	1,709	1,709	1,709
CT	New London	4,707	8,393	4,707	4,707	4,707	4,707	4,707	4,406	9,515	4,406	4,406	4,406	4,406	4,406
RI	Kent	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	2,273	239	239	239	239	239	239	239
RI	Washington	2,673	3,300	2,673	2,673	2,673	2,673	2,673	6,608	8,202	6,608	6,608	6,608	6,608	6,608
RI	Providence	3,801	3,801	6,497	6,502	6,502	3,801	3,801	58	58	4,858	4,854	4,854	58	58
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	6,461	6,461	0	0	0	0	0	6,601	6,601
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	4,385	4,385	0	0	0	0	0	1,393	1,393
MA	Bristol	2,713	2,713	3,153	3,180	3,180	2,713	2,713	1,686	1,686	2,094	2,115	2,115	1,686	1,686
MA	Norfolk	2,010	2,010	2,024	2,054	2,054	2,116	2,116	2,423	2,423	2,410	2,466	2,466	2,423	2,423
MA	Suffolk	3,219	3,219	3,219	3,307	3,307	4,983	4,983	71	71	71	87	87	135	135
DC	Total	1,301	1,301	1,301	1,328	1,328	1,328	1,328	174	174	174	179	179	179	179
MD	Total	17,178	17,653	18,916	25,554	25,554	25,554	25,554	10,638	10,645	13,716	16,789	16,789	16,789	16,789
DE	Total	5,479	5,479	6,519	6,406	6,406	6,406	6,406	1,420	1,420	1,826	1,740	1,740	1,740	1,740
PA	Total	13,943	13,943	14,258	19,343	19,343	19,343	19,343	1,581	1,581	1,805	1,868	1,868	1,868	1,868
NJ	Total	13,830	13,877	14,585	15,422	15,422	15,422	15,422	4,366	4,366	4,422	4,643	4,643	4,643	4,643
NY	Total	8,696	8,724	9,943	15,265	28,846	28,846	15,265	428	428	487	6,904	1,820	1,820	6,904
CT	Total	24,386	29,590	39,186	38,503	37,874	41,616	42,245	10,218	15,428	24,825	30,810	25,549	20,863	26,124
RI	Total	8,746	9,373	11,442	11,447	11,447	8,746	8,746	6,904	8,498	11,704	11,700	11,700	6,904	6,904
MA	Total	7,942	7,942	8,396	8,541	8,541	20,664	20,664	4,181	4,181	4,576	4,668	4,668	12,267	12,267
Grand Total		101,502	107,881	124,547	141,811	154,763	167,926	154,973	39,910	46,722	63,533	79,300	68,956	67,072	77,416

Geography		Developed Land							Undeveloped Land						
		Context Area (Acres)							Context Area (Acres)						
		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)		
DC	District of Columbia	17,698	17,698	17,700	17,737	17,737	17,737	17,737	1,085	1,085	1,086	1,090	1,090	1,090	1,090
MD	Prince George's	28,980	28,980	28,982	29,031	29,033	29,033	29,031	13,232	13,231	13,231	13,271	13,271	13,271	13,271
MD	Anne Arundel	22,231	22,232	22,229	22,346	22,348	22,348	22,346	20,886	20,887	20,886	20,992	20,993	20,993	20,992
MD	Howard	1,837	1,837	1,837	1,885	1,885	1,885	1,885	1,544	1,544	1,543	1,568	1,568	1,568	1,568
MD	Baltimore County	28,145	28,145	28,140	35,043	35,044	35,044	35,043	13,704	13,703	13,664	19,838	19,837	19,837	19,838
MD	Baltimore City	27,998	28,846	28,809	30,379	30,381	30,381	30,379	2,257	2,443	2,442	2,486	2,486	2,486	2,486
MD	Harford	20,597	20,597	20,557	24,682	24,682	24,682	24,682	29,225	29,226	29,172	36,383	36,386	36,386	36,383
MD	Cecil	13,967	13,967	16,142	16,141	16,140	16,140	16,141	37,901	37,900	46,655	46,652	46,652	46,652	46,652
DE	New Castle	45,803	45,800	46,334	46,142	46,142	46,142	46,142	16,416	16,415	16,480	16,477	16,479	16,479	16,477
PA	Delaware	26,803	26,805	22,891	28,153	28,153	28,153	28,153	4,152	4,152	3,618	4,280	4,280	4,280	4,280
PA	Philadelphia	50,363	50,363	51,352	55,080	55,079	55,079	55,080	5,818	5,818	6,055	6,837	6,836	6,836	6,837
PA	Bucks	24,919	24,921	24,919	24,942	24,942	24,942	24,942	12,180	12,181	12,181	12,188	12,188	12,188	12,188
NJ	Mercer	24,061	24,061	24,062	24,124	24,126	24,126	24,124	13,956	13,956	13,956	14,002	14,003	14,003	14,002
NJ	Middlesex	52,039	52,039	52,282	52,315	52,314	52,314	52,315	25,090	25,091	25,185	25,198	25,195	25,195	25,198
NJ	Union	23,129	23,129	23,174	23,175	23,175	23,175	23,175	1,485	1,485	1,487	1,488	1,487	1,487	1,488
NJ	Essex	14,066	14,066	14,089	14,089	14,090	14,090	14,089	233	233	233	233	233	233	233
NJ	Hudson	16,163	16,253	16,252	16,795	16,795	16,795	16,795	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338	3,338
NY	New York	10,798	10,811	10,829	11,169	11,169	11,169	11,169	433	433	435	455	455	455	455
NY	Queens	11,835	11,835	13,347	13,347	40,548	40,548	13,347	132	132	134	133	1,088	1,088	133
NY	Kings	2,582	2,582	3,093	3,093	7,157	7,157	3,093	45	45	46	46	60	60	46
NY	Bronx	19,453	19,453	19,483	19,530	19,452	19,452	19,530	1,933	1,932	1,931	1,938	1,933	1,933	1,938
NY	Westchester	25,116	25,117	25,114	53,646	25,117	25,117	53,646	3,352	3,352	3,352	54,641	3,352	3,352	54,641
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	46,643	46,643	0	0	0	0	1,163	1,163	0	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	85,291	85,291	0	0	0	0	10,674	10,674	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	3,500	0	0	3,500	0	0	0	13,269	0	0	13,269
CT	Fairfield	65,646	66,929	67,342	85,768	67,116	67,116	85,768	11,879	12,346	12,851	43,356	12,357	12,357	43,356
CT	New Haven	51,299	51,297	79,800	74,681	79,816	79,816	74,681	29,537	29,536	48,823	71,782	49,016	49,016	71,782
CT	Hartford	0	0	58,276	66,921	59,549	83,302	90,673	0	0	23,129	26,871	26,349	35,612	36,135
CT	Tolland	0	0	8,392	8,392	8,392	11,894	11,894	0	0	47,520	47,521	47,522	58,318	58,318
CT	Windham	0	0	6,090	6,090	6,090	488	488	0	0	59,371	59,374	59,375	6,597	6,597
CT	Middlesex	9,561	9,562	11,023	9,561	10,624	10,624	9,561	17,560	17,566	23,933	17,559	23,225	23,225	17,559
CT	New London	27,354	33,269	27,353	27,353	27,353	27,353	27,353	40,436	68,928	40,433	40,437	40,437	40,437	40,437
RI	Kent	18,721	18,725	18,726	18,719	18,722	18,722	18,719	6,739	6,739	6,739	6,733	6,739	6,739	6,733
RI	Washington	20,429	20,491	20,428	20,426	20,427	20,427	20,426	70,413	70,981	70,413	70,408	70,413	70,413	70,408
RI	Providence	33,684	33,683	48,156	48,154	48,154	33,684	33,684	3,589	3,589	45,605	45,606	45,606	3,589	3,589
MA	Hampden	0	0	0	0	0	676	676	0	0	0	0	0	4,084	4,084
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	45,441	45,441	0	0	0	0	0	75,832	75,832
MA	Middlesex	2,089	2,089	2,089	2,093	2,093	41,056	41,056	277	277	277	278	278	20,984	20,984
MA	Bristol	19,601	19,601	21,344	21,359	21,359	19,601	19,601	23,173	23,174	26,586	26,585	26,585	23,173	23,173
MA	Norfolk	29,270	29,270	29,236	29,310	29,309	36,391	36,391	24,123	24,125	24,124	24,156	24,158	25,485	25,485
MA	Suffolk	22,297	22,297	22,296	22,354	22,354	32,542	32,542	2,100	2,100	2,100	2,101	2,101	3,623	3,623
DC	Total	17,698	17,698	17,700	17,737	17,737	17,737	17,737	1,085	1,085	1,086	1,090	1,090	1,090	1,090
MD	Total	143,756	144,603	146,695	159,508	159,512	159,512	159,508	118,748	118,933	127,593	141,190	141,194	141,194	141,190
DE	Total	45,803	45,800	46,334	46,142	46,142	46,142	46,142	16,416	16,415	16,480	16,477	16,479	16,479	16,477
PA	Total	102,084	102,089	99,163	108,175	108,174	108,174	108,175	22,150	22,151	21,854	23,304	23,304	23,304	23,304
NJ	Total	129,458	129,549	129,858	130,499	130,500	130,500	130,499	44,101	44,102	44,199	44,259	44,257	44,257	44,259
NY	Total	69,784	69,798	71,865	104,285	235,378	235,378	104,285	5,895	5,894	5,898	70,482	18,724	18,724	70,482
CT	Total	153,859	161,057	258,276	278,766	258,941	280,594	300,419	99,411	128,377	256,061	306,901	258,281	225,562	274,183
RI	Total	72,834	72,899	87,309	87,300	87,303	72,833	72,829	80,741	81,309	122,757	122,747	122,757	80,741	80,730
MA	Total	73,257	73,257	74,965	75,116	75,115	175,707	175,707	49,673	49,676	53,088	53,120	53,122	153,182	153,182
Grand Total		808,534	816,751	932,165	1,007,526	1,118,802	1,226,577	1,115,300	438,220	467,942	649,015	779,569	679,208	704,531	804,896

Geography		Open Water							Developed, Open Space							Developed, Low Intensity						
		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	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	1,068	1,068	1,068	1,068
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	1,033	690	952	1,021	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	1,121	1,396	1,478	1,212	1,814	1,928	2,508	3,336	3,854	3,833	3,336

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity							Developed, High Intensity							Barren Land							
		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	34	34	34	55	55	55	55	34	34	34	40	40	40	40	0	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	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	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	141	141	336	336	336	336	22	22	22	74	74	74	74	2	2	2	3	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	0
MD	Harford	121	121	110	324	324	324	324	6	6	5	72	72	72	72	0	0	0	4	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	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	11
PA	Delaware	140	140	102	286	286	286	286	42	42	53	137	137	137	137	0	0	0	1	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	0
PA	Bucks	187	187	186	473	473	473	473	25	25	25	78	78	78	78	0	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	0
NJ	Middlesex	247	247	353	521	521	521	521	35	35	54	75	75	75	75	0	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	0
NJ	Essex	25	25	47	66	66	66	66	47	47	75	101	101	101	101	0	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	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	0
NY	Queens	45	45	57	57	153	153	57	32	32	62	62	176	176	62	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	0
NY	Bronx	66	66	62	123	66	66	123	47	47	50	96	47	47	96	0	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	0
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	122	122	0	0	0	0	34	34	0	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	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	0
CT	Fairfield	241	320	396	330	320	320	330	117	143	155	144	143	143	144	0	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	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	0
CT	Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	108	108	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	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	0
CT	Middlesex	30	34	30	30	30	30	30	12	16	12	12	12	12	12	0	1	0	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	15
RI	Kent	79	79	79	79	79	79	79	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	0	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	8
RI	Providence	89	89	104	111	111	89	89	106	106	107	109	109	106	106	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	173	173	0	0	0	0	0	69	69	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	0
MA	Bristol	84	84	93	184	184	84	84	24	24	26	57	57	24	24	0	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	0
MA	Suffolk	75	75	75	83	83	90	90	47	47	48	55	55	102	102	0	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	0
MD	Total	624	624	637	1,363	1,363	1,363	1,363	91	91	96	265	265	265	265	3	3	3	9	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	11
PA	Total	523	523	437	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	189	189	185	454	454	454	454	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
NJ	Total	503	505	680	1,099	1,097	1,097	1,099	214	214	308	469	469	469	469	0	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	1	0
CT	Total	552	692	986	724	892	992	845	201	233	286	242	270	245	16	16	19	16	19	24	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	8
MA	Total	183	183	202	336	336	373	373	80	80	85	137	137	207	207	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Grand Total		3,094	3,247	3,788	5,803	6,241	6,356	5,940	1,148	1,180	1,408	2,142	2,332	2,398	2,211	30	30	34	46	51	56	51	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	73	0	11	11	11	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	28	30	30	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	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	1,482	2,233	2,333	1,826	1,734	88	111	198	272	287	236	221	680	777	882	1,377	1,396	1,198	1,179			



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	0	161	161	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	226	226	0	0	0	0	0	231	231	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	66	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New London	24	9	0	0	0	0	0	50	84	0	0	0	0	112	68	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Kent	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RI	Washington	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	0	0	0	0	69	16	0	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	0	114	114
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	57	57	0	0	0	0	0	65	65
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	2	34	329	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	1,159	1,310	1,135	1,835	135	787	1,325	1,798	1,944	1,472

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity								Developed, High Intensity								Barren Land							
		Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)								Acquisition & Displacement (Acres)								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				
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	52	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	213	213	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	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	4	0	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	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	75	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2		
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	79	79	0	0	0	0	45	45	0	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		3,162	226	955	2,237	2,755	2,909	2,391	1,243	84	495	1,517	1,872	1,936	1,581	30	0	10	26	33	40	33	33		

Geography		Forest/Shrub							Grassland/Cultivated							Wetlands						
		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	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	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	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	
MD	Harford	24	0	14	50	50	50	50	2	0	0	19	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	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	1
PA	Philadelphia	0	0	3	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	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	2	5	0	0	13	13	13	13
NJ	Mercer	13	0	0	29	29	29	29	0	0	0	2	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	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	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	9	3	3	33	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	2	1
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	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	0
NY	Bronx	15	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	4	0	0	0	4
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	223	0	0	223	0	0	0	11	0	0	11	0	0	10	0	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	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	70	70	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	71	0	0	71	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
CT	Fairfield	17	1	2	142	1	1	142	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	1	2	3	1	1	3
CT	New Haven	78	0	105	199	111	111	199	0	0	20	22	24	24	22	36	0	30	11	34	34	11
CT	Hartford	0	0	82	102	169	169	102	0	0	3	5	16	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	9
CT	Windham	0	0	251	251	251	11	11	0	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	48	48	48	0	0	0
CT	Middlesex	42	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	40	4	0	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	0
RI	Kent	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	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	0
RI	Providence	0	0	235	242	242	0	0	0	0	15	15	15	0	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	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	201	201	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	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	6
MA	Bristol	42	0	22	64	64	0	0	2	0	4	7	7	0	0	37	0	5	34	34	0	0
MA	Norfolk	75	0	5	79	79	0	0	5	0	1	4	4	0	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	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	99	88	0	18	192	192	192	192
DE	Total	16	0	11	25	25	25	25	1	0	0	2	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	3	6	0	17	25	25	25	25
NJ	Total	56	0	8	137	137	137	137	1	0	0	3	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	2	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	52
RI	Total	81	85	235	242	242	0	0	60	21	15	15	15	0	0	201	44	28	30	30	0	0
MA	Total	117	0	27	143	143	264	264	6	0	4	10	10	18	18	87	0	11	75	75	44	44
Grand Total		683	282	1,072	2,267	1,895	1,418	1,790	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	1,336	1,336	1,337	1,373	1,373	1,373	1,373
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	1,312	1,312	1,312	1,312	1,283	1,283	1,283	1,869	1,869	1,869	1,869
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	1,571	1,571	1,571	1,571	883	883	872	1,497	1,497	1,497	1,497
MD	Cecil	115	115	119	120	120	120	120	911	911	1,484	1,488	1,488	1,488	782	782	1,104	1,105	1,105	1,105	1,105	1,105
DE	New Castle	145	145	245	201	201	201	201	1,000	1,000	1,378	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,577	1,577	1,778	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754
PA	Delaware	1	1	27	20	20	20	20	320	320	250	447	447	447	447	1,034	1,034	465	1,245	1,245	1,245	1,245
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	1,230	1,230	1,230	1,258	1,258	1,258	1,258
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	1,116	1,116	1,227	1,243	1,243	1,243	1,243	1,975	1,975	2,259	2,283	2,283	2,283	2,283
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	2,913	780	780	2,913	886	886	940	1,784	886	886	1,784
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	848	848	0	0	0	0	1,391	1,391	1,391	0
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	14	14	0	0	0	0	2,732	2,732	0	0	0	0	0	3,330	3,330	3,330	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	2,069	2,391	2,664	3,117	2,391	2,391	3,117	2,258	2,683	3,028	3,269	2,683	2,683	3,269
CT	New Haven	257	257	352	373	344	344	373	1,661	1,661	3,180	2,482	3,213	3,213	2,482	2,108	2,108	3,897	2,833	3,989	3,989	2,833
CT	Hartford	0	0	256	170	177	273	266	0	0	1,039	1,365	1,026	1,471	1,811	0	0	1,818	2,087	1,509	2,098	2,676
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	2,326	956	956	956	956	956	1,279	2,259	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279
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	1,011	1,228	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011	1,011
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	1,798	1,798	0	0	0	0	0	1,588	1,588
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	277	277	0	0	0	0	0	1,017	1,017	0	0	0	0	0	1,315	1,315
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	4,254	4,260	4,825	6,235	6,235	6,235	6,235	5,416	5,452	5,762	7,186	7,186	7,186	7,186
DE	Total	145	145	245	201	201	201	201	1,000	1,000	1,378	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,279	1,577	1,577	1,778	1,754	1,754	1,754	1,754
PA	Total	554	554	675	698	698	698	698	1,502	1,502	1,672	1,817	1,817	1,817	1,817	2,742	2,742	2,390	3,201	3,201	3,201	3,201
NJ	Total	200	200	201	203	203	203	203	1,668	1,668	1,789	1,825	1,825	1,825	1,825	3,021	3,023	3,318	3,393	3,393	3,393	3,393
NY	Total	33	33	59	419	92	92	419	1,116	1,116	1,238	3,513	4,819	4,819	3,513	1,312	1,313	1,472	2,521	6,473	6,473	2,521
CT	Total	645	925	1,107	1,191	1,017	1,122	1,295	5,312	7,008	9,315	9,396	9,062	9,602	9,936	6,350	7,761	11,064	10,511	10,502	11,530	11,538
RI	Total	237	237	365	362	362	237	237	639	822	1,080	1,082	1,082	639	639	1,722	1,939	2,224	2,225	2,225	1,722	1,722
MA	Total	77	77	100	101	101	598	598	963	963	1,068	1,083	1,083	3,807	3,807	1,893	1,893	2,068	2,100	2,100	4,922	4,922
Grand Total		2,203	2,489	3,073	3,584	3,078	3,561	4,061	16,604	18,491	22,516	26,384	27,356	30,178	29,205	24,157	25,824	30,201	33,018	36,962	40,309	36,365

Geography		Developed, Medium Intensity							Developed, High Intensity							Barren Land							
		Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (Acres)							Affected Environment (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	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	0
MD	Baltimore County	1,006	1,006	1,006	1,852	1,852	1,852	1,852	383	383	383	798	798	798	798	113	113	113	160	160	160	160	
MD	Baltimore City	1,304	1,558	1,559	2,088	2,088	2,088	2,088	1,276	1,455	1,448	2,623	2,623	2,623	2,623	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
MD	Harford	673	673	671	1,226	1,226	1,226	1,226	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	1,735	1,735	2,042	2,012	2,012	2,012	2,012	1,113	1,113	1,262	1,301	1,301	1,301	1,301	55	55	59	60	60	60	60	
PA	Delaware	1,557	1,557	1,403	2,093	2,093	2,093	2,093	899	899	1,235	1,523	1,523	1,523	1,523	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	
PA	Philadelphia	2,375	2,375	2,548	3,401	3,401	3,401	3,401	2,754	2,754	2,887	5,161	5,161	5,161	5,161	2	2	11	5	5	5	5	
PA	Bucks	1,470	1,470	1,470	1,491	1,491	1,491	1,491	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	1,981	1,981	2,095	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107	893	893	944	945	945	945	945	15	15	17	17	17	17	17	
NJ	Union	1,235	1,235	1,273	1,273	1,273	1,273	1,273	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	1,282	1,282	1,282	1,282	12	12	12	16	16	16	16	
NY	New York	231	233	238	618	618	618	618	589	613	632	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,175	0	0	0	12	12	12	12	
NY	Queens	307	307	410	410	1,436	1,436	410	1,247	1,247	1,888	1,888	4,135	4,135	1,888	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	1,288	1,288	1,295	1,330	1,288	1,288	1,330	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Westchester	1,218	1,218	1,292	2,009	1,218	1,218	2,009	733	733	751	948	733	733	948	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	2,190	2,190	0	0	0	0	0	541	541	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	2,159	2,159	0	0	0	0	1,029	1,029	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	3,509	4,035	4,476	4,332	4,035	4,035	4,332	2,114	2,335	2,519	2,427	2,335	2,335	2,427	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	
CT	New Haven	2,749	2,749	3,595	3,361	3,735	3,735	3,361	1,133	1,133	1,310	1,209	1,357	1,357	1,209	42	42	64	44	66	66	44	
CT	Hartford	0	0	2,613	2,950	2,539	3,594	4,006	0	0	965	1,010	975	1,442	1,478	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	1,795	2,871	1,795	1,795	1,795	1,795	1,795	552	809	552	552	552	552	552	124	128	124	124	124	124	124	
RI	Kent	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	1,067	628	628	628	628	628	628	628	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
RI	Washington	952	1,168	952	952	952	952	952	235	243	235	235	235	235	235	49	52	49	49	49	49	49	
RI	Providence	1,290	1,290	2,487	2,488	2,488	1,290	1,290	2,164	2,164	2,717	2,719	2,719	2,164	2,164	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	1,933	1,933	0	0	0	0	0	1,100	1,100	0	0	0	0	0	42	42	
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	1,546	1,546	0	0	0	0	0	505	505	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	
MA	Bristol	1,177	1,177	1,323	1,338	1,338	1,177	1,177	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	1,563	1,563	1,563	1,608	1,608	2,125	2,125	1,175	1,175	1,175	1,203	1,203	2,266	2,266	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	4,770	5,024	5,256	7,225	7,225	7,225	7,225	2,546	2,725	2,790	4,560	4,560	4,560	4,560	192	192	284	348	348	348	348	
DE	Total	1,735	1,735	2,042	2,012	2,012	2,012	2,012	1,113	1,113	1,262	1,301	1,301	1,301	1,301	55	55	59	60	60	60	60	
PA	Total	5,402	5,402	5,420	6,985	6,985	6,985	6,985	4,291	4,291	4,759	7,329	7,329	7,329	7,329	6	6	17	12	12	12	12	
NJ	Total	5,084	5,101	5,277	5,512	5,512	5,512	5,512	4,002	4,029	4,143	4,628	4,628	4,628	4,628	55	55	58	64	64	64	64	
NY	Total	2,383	2,385	2,573	3,770	8,268	8,268	3,770	3,885	3,909	4,660	5,437	9,193	9,193	5,437	0	0	0	24	93	93	24	
CT	Total	8,550	10,158	13,010	12,969	12,635	14,249	14,583	3,971	4,454	5,522	5,373	5,394	5,934	5,912	203	210	275	255	281	301	275	
RI	Total	3,309	3,525	4,506	4,507	4,507	3,309	3,309	3,027	3,035	3,581	3,582	3,582	3,027	3,027	50	52	51	51	51	50	50	
MA	Total	3,315	3,315	3,467	3,534	3,534	7,377	7,377	1,763	1,763	1,782	1,814	1,814	4,503	4,503	7	7	11	11	11	54	54	
Grand Total		34,951	37,048	41,954	46,927	51,091	55,350	51,186	25,219	25,939	29,118	34,655	38,432	41,106	37,328	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	33	342	342	342	352	352	352	352
MD	Anne Arundel	1,335	1,335	1,335	1,566	1,566	1,566	1,566	72	72	72	86	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	0	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
MD	Baltimore County	474	474	474	1,086	1,086	1,086	1,086	58	58	58	247	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	2	21	21	21	38	38	38	38
MD	Harford	1,201	1,201	1,203	1,989	1,989	1,989	1,989	817	817	821	922	922	922	922	622	622	623	1,113	1,113	1,113	1,113
MD	Cecil	2,095	2,095	4,263	4,264	4,264	4,264	4,264	483	483	1,267	1,269	1,269	1,269	1,269	694	694	803	803	803	803	803
DE	New Castle	459	459	510	521	521	521	521	71	71	77	76	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	1	75	75	76	114	114	114	114
PA	Philadelphia	67	67	91	74	74	74	74	14	14	14	24	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	41	408	408	408	416	416	416	416
NJ	Mercer	526	526	526	538	538	538	538	193	193	193	203	203	203	203	694	694	694	708	708	708	708
NJ	Middlesex	1,368	1,368	1,412	1,450	1,450	1,450	1,450	198	198	198	213	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	0	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
NJ	Essex	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	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	16	507	507	507	611	611	611	611
NY	New York	7	7	7	10	10	10	10	0	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	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	0
NY	Bronx	179	179	179	181	179	179	181	16	16	18	18	16	16	18	107	107	108	110	107	107	110
NY	Westchester	42	42	56	4,319	42	42	4,319	0	0	0	289	0	0	289	10	10	23	165	10	10	165
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	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	0
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	1,156	0	0	1,156	0	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	85	0	0	85
CT	Fairfield	544	604	642	3,124	604	604	3,124	8	11	11	190	11	11	190	134	152	165	303	152	152	303
CT	New Haven	2,038	2,038	3,129	5,699	3,176	3,176	5,699	42	42	238	466	238	238	466	1,004	1,004	1,431	1,226	1,445	1,445	1,226
CT	Hartford	0	0	1,192	1,739	1,953	2,247	2,032	0	0	110	114	222	262	154	0	0	357	316	288	352	381
CT	Tolland	0	0	4,020	4,020	4,020	4,255	4,255	0	0	338	338	338	291	291	0	0	519	519	519	487	487
CT	Windham	0	0	4,213	4,213	4,213	402	402	0	0	637	637	637	5	5	0	0	911	911	911	9	9
CT	Middlesex	1,010	1,016	1,010	1,010	1,010	1,010	1,010	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	616	620	616	616	616	616	616
CT	New London	2,051	5,853	2,051	2,051	2,051	2,051	2,051	308	625	308	308	308	308	308	1,790	2,511	1,790	1,790	1,790	1,790	1,790
RI	Kent	121	121	121	121	121	121	121	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93	93	93	93	93	93	93
RI	Washington	2,445	3,385	2,445	2,445	2,445	2,445	2,445	1,068	1,272	1,068	1,068	1,068	1,068	1,068	2,909	3,359	2,909	2,909	2,909	2,909	2,909
RI	Providence	20	20	3,836	3,835	3,835	20	20	0	0	246	246	246	0	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	0
MA	Worcester	0	0	0	0	0	4,953	4,953	0	0	0	0	0	340	340	0	0	0	0	0	1,100	1,100
MA	Middlesex	0	0	0	0	0	930	930	0	0	0	0	0	35	35	0	0	0	0	0	152	152
MA	Bristol	949	949	1,200	1,212	1,212	949	949	100	100	144	145	145	100	100	589	589	679	686	686	589	589
MA	Norfolk	1,197	1,197	1,198	1,226	1,226	1,197	1,197	81	81	77	82	82	81	81	1,135	1,135	1,125	1,147	1,147	1,135	1,135
MA	Suffolk	34	34	34	49	49	36	36	0	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	0	106	106	106	109	109	109	109
MD	Total	5,841	5,843	8,013	9,672	9,672	9,672	9,672	1,462	1,462	2,250	2,559	2,559	2,559	2,559	3,045	3,045	3,155	4,172	4,172	4,172	4,172
DE	Total	459	459	510	521	521	521	521	71	71	77	76	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	65	540	540	662	658	658	658	658
NJ	Total	1,922	1,922	1,968	2,022	2,022	2,022	2,022	402	402	402	431	431	431	431	1,842	1,842	1,851	1,987	1,987	1,987	1,987
NY	Total	229	229	244	5,667	1,390	1,390	5,667	16	16	18	407	46	46	407	149	149	167	411	292	292	411
CT	Total	5,642	9,510	16,257	21,855	17,027	13,744	18,572	387	707	1,672	2,084	1,784	1,145	1,445	3,544	4,286	5,789	5,681	5,721	4,851	4,811
RI	Total	2,586	3,526	6,403	6,401	6,401	2,586	2,586	1,068	1,272	1,314	1,314	1,314	1,068	1,068	3,012	3,463	3,622	3,622	3,622	3,012	3,012
MA	Total	2,180	2,180	2,432	2,488	2,487	8,094	8,094	181	181	221	227	227	556	556	1,743	1,743	1,823	1,853	1,853	3,019	3,019
Grand Total		19,340	24,149	36,282	49,117	40,012	38,521	47,626	3,641	4,165	6,011	7,165	6,504	5,947	6,608	14,726	15,919	18,167	19,434	19,355	19,043	19,121

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	0
MD	Prince George's	2	Existing	0	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	0
MD	Prince George's	4	Existing	0	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	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

Geography		Station ID	Station Type	Developed Land						Undeveloped Land					
State	County			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	3	3	3	3	3	3	
NJ	Middlesex	63	Existing	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	
NJ	Middlesex	65	Existing	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	
NJ	Middlesex	67	Existing	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	
NJ	Union	69	Existing	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	
NJ	Union	71	Existing	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	
NJ	Essex	73	Existing	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	
NJ	Essex	75	Existing	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	
NY	New York	77	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	New York	9,993	Existing	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	
NY	Queens	145	New	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	78	New	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	79	New	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	80	New	21	21	21	21	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	81	New	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	
NY	Westchester	83	Existing	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	
NY	Westchester	85	Existing	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	
NY	Westchester	87	New	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	
NY	Westchester	151	New	0	0	37	0	0	37	0	0	4	0	4	
NY	Putnam	153	Existing	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	
NY	Suffolk	148	New	0	0	0	41	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	149	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	90	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	92	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	94	New	21	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	
CT	Fairfield	96	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	98	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	100	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	102	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	104	Existing	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	
CT	Fairfield	107	New	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	
CT	Fairfield	154	New	0	0	14	0	0	14	0	0	28	0	28	
CT	New Haven	109	Existing	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	



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	8	0	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	10	0	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	4	0	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	29	29	29	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
RI	Providence	130	New	21	21	21	21	21	0	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

---

## Land Use Planning Documents

---

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in Overall Goals, Objectives, Recommendations			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: <a href="http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/activities/vision/default.asp">http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/activities/vision/default.asp</a>	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

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in Overall Goals, Objectives, Recommendations			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
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	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	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
NJ	Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Hunterdon, Middlesex, Monmouth, Morris, Ocean, Passaic, Somerset, Sussex, Union,	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

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in Overall Goals, Objectives, Recommendations			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
CT	Beacon Falls, Bethlehem, Cheshire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Oxford, Prospect, Southbury, Thomaston,	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,	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 Regiona: 2011-2040. Bridgeport, CT: Greater Bridgeport Regional Council.	Y	Y	Y	Compatible
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	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,	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
CT	Hartford, Andover, Avon, Bloomfield, Canton, East Granby, East Hartford, East Windsor, Ellington, Enfield, Farmington,	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,	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	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	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	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	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	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

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in Overall Goals, Objectives, Recommendations			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
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,	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	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	O	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

State	County	MPO*	Plan Document	Presence in Overall Goals, Objectives, Recommendations			Compatibility
				Rail Transportation	Transit Oriented Development	Preservation of Built or Natural Environment	
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
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	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,	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