

Appendix E.05 Hydrologic/Water Resources (Freshwater Resources)

APPENDIX E.05

HYDROLOGIC/WATER RESOURCES (FRESHWATER RESOURCES) – 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.



Freshwater Resources Assessment Methodology

January 31, 2014
FINAL

Submitted by:



Table of Contents

1.	FRESHWATER RESOURCES.....	1
1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	DEFINITIONS.....	1
1.2	RELATED RESOURCES.....	2
1.3	AGENCY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	2
1.3.1	<i>Regulatory Compliance</i>	4
1.4	METHODOLOGY TO ASSESS EFFECTS	4
1.4.1	<i>Existing Conditions</i>	5
1.4.2	<i>Environmental Consequences</i>	7
1.4.3	<i>Mitigation Strategies</i>	8
1.5	TIER 1 EIS OUTCOMES.....	9
1.6	APPLICABILITY TO TIER 2 ASSESSMENTS.....	9

Tables

TABLE 1 – RELATED RESOURCE INPUTS TO FRESHWATER RESOURCES ASSESSMENT	2
TABLE 2 – FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCY ROLES IN MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION OF FRESHWATER RESOURCES.....	3
TABLE 3 – DATA SOURCES FOR THE EVALUATION OF FRESHWATER RESOURCES	5

1. Freshwater Resources

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This methodology explains how the NEC FUTURE program will address the potential effects of the (Tier 1 EIS Alternatives) on freshwater resources in the Tier 1 EIS. Saltwater resources such as bays, estuaries, tidal marshes, other saltwater wetlands, and oceans are included in the Coastal Zone resource methodology.

This methodology presents the regulatory framework, involved government agencies, regulatory approvals 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

Freshwater resources include watersheds, water bodies, freshwater wetlands, navigable waterways and water quality. The identification of and evaluation of environmental consequences to water resources is important to assist in the planning and development of Tier 1 EIS program alternatives and to inform Tier 2 planning efforts. These resources and related terminology are defined below:

- ▶ *Watersheds*: A watershed is an area of land that drains into a particular body of water, such as a stream, river, pond, lake, bay or ocean. Watersheds included in this Tier 1 EIS will be evaluated at the Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC, see definition below) 12 level to focus in on the defined Affected Environment and Context Area. A watershed includes all bodies of water as defined by the HUC division.
- ▶ *Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC)*: The USGS has divided the U.S. into nesting hydrologic units, each represented by a hydrologic unit code (HUC). The HUCs are from 2 to 12 digits long, depending on the size of the hydrologic unit. For example, a six-digit HUC (i.e. a HUC level 6 watershed) would represent a hydrologic unit at the basin level, and thus include major basins approximately 10,000 square miles (mi²). A HUC level 12 watershed (the evaluation unit used for the NEC FUTURE Tier 1 EIS, and the finest unit of hydrologic classification) further divides the hydrologic unit to the subwatershed level, and thus includes second and third order streams (headwater streams). The average size of a HUC level 12 watershed is approximately 40 mi².
- ▶ *Water Bodies*: For purposes of this methodology, freshwater bodies include creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, and ponds that are above ground. Creeks, streams, and rivers typically run within a defined channel. Lakes and ponds are inundations of water that may or may not be connected to other water bodies.
- ▶ *Freshwater Wetlands*: As defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the term wetlands means “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support,

a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs and similar areas.”

- ▶ *Navigable Waterways*: The Rivers and Harbors Act defines navigable waterways as “those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tides and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible to use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.”
- ▶ *Water Quality*: Water quality refers to physical, chemical and biological characteristics of a water body. Water quality determines what activities or functions (drinking, recreation, etc.) are suitable for the water body. A water body that has poor water quality is referred to as “impaired.” Streams identified as “impaired” have established Total Daily Maximum Loads. A water body that has a good water quality is referred to as “high quality.” Water quality is determined and enforced at the state level, based on standards set by both the state and federal government.
- ▶ *Total Daily Maximum Load (TMDL)*: A TMDL is a calculation of the maximum amount of a pollutant that a water body can receive and still safely meet water quality standards.

The definitions listed above are based on data from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), United States Geological Survey (USGS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP).

1.3 RELATED RESOURCES

The effects assessments from other resources evaluated as part of the Tier 1 EIS will be used to assess the effects on freshwater resources. These related resources are identified in Table 1. Note that the effects assessments for those related resources will be documented within their respective Tier 1 EIS sections.

Table 1 – Related Resource Inputs to Freshwater Resources Assessment

Resource	Input to Freshwater Resources Assessment
Agricultural Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify agricultural lands in proximity to freshwater resources
Ecological Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effects on ecological resources that overlap with identified freshwater resources
Coastal Zones & Saltwater Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effects on coastal zones & saltwater wetlands that overlap with identified freshwater resources
Wild & Scenic Rivers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of wild & scenic rivers that have water quality designations associated with them

Source: NEC FUTURE JV Team, 2013

1.4 AGENCY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Freshwater resources are subject to regulation by multiple federal agencies, including the USACE, USEPA, and United States Coast Guard (USCG). Applicable legislation and regulations, listed in

Table 2 will be considered, consistent with a Tier 1 level of assessment, in the evaluation of freshwater resources for the NEC FUTURE program.

Table 2 – Management and Regulation of Freshwater resources

Federal Agency	Regulatory Oversight	Description of Regulation	Regulated Resource
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clean Water Act, Section 404 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waters of the U.S., including wetlands Dredge and fill of wetlands
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Clean Water Act, Section 303(d) and Section 402 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 402 developed and implemented the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Section 303(d) authorizes tribes to develop a list of impaired waters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water quality
U.S. Coast Guard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, Section 9 and Section 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defines navigable waters of the United States as “those waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tides and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible to use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.” Section 9 pertains to the regulation of bridges, dams, dikes and causeways over navigable waters of the U.S. Section 10 regulates the construction of wharves, piers, dolphins, bulkheads, jetties, etc., in ports, canals, harbors, navigable rivers or other waters of the U.S.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Navigable waterways
New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Jersey assumed implementation of the federal Section 404 program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wetlands within the state of New Jersey, except those within the New Jersey Meadowlands

Source: NEC FUTURE JV Team, 2013

In addition to federal regulations mentioned above, each state and the District of Columbia have their own state regulations pertaining to freshwater resources. However, compliance with state-level regulations, with the exception of New Jersey as noted in Table 2, will be applicable at the

Tier 2 project level when more specific information will be available regarding alignments and service associated with alternatives.

Additionally, the following Executive Orders (EO), Department of Transportation (DOT) Orders and policies pertain to freshwater resources:

- ▶ *Executive Order (EO) 11990, Protection of Wetlands*: EO 11990, states that federal agencies should ensure that their actions “minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and to enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands” in carrying out their responsibilities.
- ▶ *DOT Order 5660.1A, "Order on Preservation of the Nation's Wetlands"*: DOT Order 5660.1A requires agencies within the DOT to assess their impacts on wetlands and associated wildlife and directs them to evaluate alternatives and measures that avoid and minimize impacts on wetlands.
- ▶ *Presidential Wetland Policy, 1993; Reaffirmation of the Presidential Wetland Policy, 1995*: The premise of this policy is for improved federal wetlands regulatory program and “a goal of no net loss of the Nation’s remaining wetlands and increasing the quality and quantity of the Nation’s wetlands.”

1.4.1 Regulatory Compliance

No formal agency approvals would be sought for the Tier 1 EIS. The requirements for subsequent Tier 2 evaluations, including compliance with the Clean Water Act and Rivers and Harbors Act, will be described in the Tier 1 EIS. During the Tier 1 EIS, the FRA will engage in on-going coordination with the USACE, EPA, USCG and NJDEP to identify potential opportunities to streamline subsequent Tier 2 environmental reviews (see Section 1.7). Coordination with these agencies 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.

Within the Tier 1 EIS potential effects on freshwater resources will be identified. However, because no field work or investigations are being done as part of the Tier 1 EIS, site specific effects cannot be measured. Calculations of effects presented in the Tier 1 EIS are based on available GIS information and would not provide sufficient information to seek USACE/NJDEP approvals or Section 404 permits. Therefore, these approvals and permits would be obtained during Tier 2 evaluations.

1.5 METHODOLOGY TO ASSESS EFFECTS

This effects assessment methodology identifies the approach and assumptions for describing existing conditions of freshwater resources and environmental consequences of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives on the resources. It identifies data sources, defines the Affected Environment and Context Area considered for freshwater resources, and presents the approach for evaluating potential direct effects.¹ Direct effects include encroachment or alteration of freshwater resources

¹ Direct Effects are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place (40 CFR § 1508.8)

a result of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. Indirect effects,² such as those induced by growth, 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 freshwater resources.

Table 3 – Data Sources for the Evaluation of Freshwater Resources

Resource	Data Source	Data Application
Watersheds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service National Cartography and Geospatial Center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of watersheds
Freshwater resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Geological Survey, National Hydrology Data Set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of freshwater resources, watersheds
Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory ▪ New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection NJ-Geo-Web mapping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wetlands
Navigable Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Waterway Network (Bureau of Transportation Statistics, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Bureau of Census, and the U.S. Coast Guard by Vanderbilt University and Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Additional agencies with input into network development include Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, Maritime Administration, Military Traffic Management Command, Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Federal Railroad Administration.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of navigable waterways crossed by Tier 1 EIS Alternatives
Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service National Cartography and Geospatial Center ▪ Clean Water Act 303 (d) List of Impaired Streams ▪ State waters of special consideration lists (designated high quality, critical areas, water supply, etc): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maryland Department of the Environment, Water Management Administration. 2000. Stormwater Design Manual. ○ New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), Water Monitoring and Standards. 2012. NJDEP Surface Water Quality Standards of New Jersey (dataset) ○ Department of Environmental Conservation. 2010. New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Query data to identify impaired and high quality water bodies and uses

² Indirect Effects are those effects that occur later in time or are further removed in distance (40 CFR § 1508.8)

Table 3 – Data Sources for the Evaluation of Freshwater Resources (continued)

Resource	Data Source	Data Application
Water Quality (con'td)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection. 2011. Surface Water Quality Classification Polygon (dataset) ○ Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, Office of Freshwater resources. 2012. RI Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report (dataset). ○ Rhode Island Department of Health, Safe Drinking Water Program. 2002. Surface Water Protection Areas (dataset) ○ Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. 2012. Outstanding Resource Waters (dataset). ○ Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. 2010. Wellhead Protection Areas (dataset) ○ Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. 2010. Public Water Supplies (dataset). ○ Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. 2010. Surface Water Supply Protection Areas (dataset). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Query data to identify impaired and high quality water bodies and uses

Source: NEC FUTURE JV, 2013

Existing freshwater resources will be documented in the Tier 1 EIS for an established affected environment and context area. The affected environment is a 2,000-foot-wide swath centered on the Representative Route³ for the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. The 2,000-foot swath is sufficiently wide 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 freshwater resources that may extend beyond the Representative Route

The Context Area is five miles wide, centered on the Representative Route for each of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. Within the Context Area, freshwater resources will be mapped but 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, freshwater resources will be presented; this information will be used to supplement the quantitative assessment of effects within the Affected Environment.

Specific details are described below regarding how existing conditions will be documented for each of the topics covered under freshwater resources.

³ 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.

Watersheds

Each of the HUC12/major watersheds that the Tier 1 EIS Tier 1 EIS Alternatives traverse will be documented. Specific features or unique characteristics of that watershed will be qualitatively described in text format.

Water Bodies

Water bodies will be identified within the Affected Environment and Context Area. Within the Affected Environment, water bodies will be listed by name, if applicable. Major water bodies identified within the Context Area will be mapped.

Wetlands

Using the available GIS data from the NWI and NJDEP, wetlands will be mapped and quantified by type (consistent with the wetland classifications as defined by the USFWS/NJDEP) and area (acreage) within the Affected Environment. Within the Context Area, major wetland areas will be mapped.

Navigable Waterways

Navigable waterways within the Affected Environment will be identified and listed. Navigable waterways will be mapped for the Context Area.

Water Quality

Water bodies within the Affected Environment that are included in each state's waters of special consideration lists or the 303(d) Impaired Streams list will be identified. Water bodies will be listed as "impaired" or as "high quality" consistent with each state's individual designations. Uses associated with those water bodies will also be noted as available. For the Context Area, water bodies found to have some unique water quality characteristics or those that are significantly impaired will be identified.

1.5.2 Environmental Consequences

Environmental consequences of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives will be assessed within the Affected Environment. A qualitative assessment of resources present in the Context Area will be used to supplement that effects assessment.

For the Affected Environment, potential effects of Tier 1 EIS Alternatives on freshwater resources will be determined primarily through the use of GIS data overlays of the various freshwater resources and footprints associated with the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. Representative effects will be calculated for those resources identified within the Affected Environment as described in Section 1.5.1. Potential environmental consequences on watersheds and water quality will be discussed qualitatively.

Watersheds

Effects on watersheds will be discussed qualitatively, and would be based on the effects identified on water bodies, wetlands and water quality within a specific watershed.

Water Bodies

Effects on water bodies will be calculated using GIS. The linear feet of the portion of a water body affected will be determined by overlaying the relevant GIS layers with the Representative Route of a Tier 1 EIS Alternative. This analysis will identify where a Representative Route of a Tier 1 EIS Alternative intersects a water body and qualitatively assess other identified effects related to resources noted in Table 1 to determine if the crossing is a potential area of environmental impact.

Wetlands

Impacts on wetlands will be quantitatively described by determining, using GIS overlays, the total area of wetlands within the Affected Environment that is crossed by the Representative Route associated with an alternative. Wetland effects will be presented by wetland type and acreage.

Navigable Waterways

Potential impacts on navigable waterways will be quantitatively described by identifying, using GIS tools, all navigable waterways that are traversed by the Representative Route of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives. Data will be reviewed to determine if the navigable waterway is currently crossed by a transportation structure or if the Tier 1 EIS Alternative proposes a new crossing of a navigable waterway.

Water Quality

Understanding the designated water quality of a water body is important so that existing conditions are not exacerbated or worsened. For those water bodies that are identified as "impaired", it is important not to exacerbate the condition further or to expose the water to the surrounding environment, and in particular agricultural lands, livestock or humans. For high quality waters, it is important to avoid effects that would degrade the water quality so that the water body is no longer suitable for the uses identified (drinking, recreation, fish spawning, etc). For water bodies identified to be within the Representative Route of the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives, the results of a qualitative assessment of program related activities and their potential to influence the water quality of those water bodies will be described.

For the Context Area, freshwater resources will be qualitatively discussed with regard to the potential to be affected should there be a shift in a Representative Route.

Temporary construction-related effects to freshwater resources 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 level is further described in a separate Construction Effects Assessment Approach document. Construction methods and activities for Tier 1 EIS Alternatives will be the basis of this assessment and will be described in Chapter 2.

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 programmatic mitigation measures for freshwater resources would be to incorporate the use of pervious materials in design, minimize the length of river/stream

crossings, and to employ appropriate stormwater management measures to minimize stormwater runoff.

1.6 TIER 1 EIS OUTCOMES

This Tier 1 EIS freshwater resources assessment will:

- ▶ Quantify the area and type of wetlands within the Representative Route, and thus potentially affected by, each Tier 1 EIS Alternative;
- ▶ Quantify the linear feet of water resources crossed by, and thus potentially affected by, each Tier 1 EIS Alternatives (crossed by Tier 1 EIS Alternatives);
- ▶ Identify navigable waterways that will be crossed by the Tier 1 EIS Alternatives;
- ▶ Identify relevant freshwater resources that are designated as “high quality” and present the potential to affect those resources; identify relevant freshwater resources that are designated as “impaired” and present the potential to affect those resources
- ▶ Qualitatively describe effects on HUC level 12 watersheds based on identified effects to water bodies, wetlands, and water quality within each watershed
- ▶ Identify potential mitigation strategies
- ▶ Describe regulatory compliance requirements for Tier 2 evaluations

1.7 APPLICABILITY TO TIER 2 ASSESSMENTS

FRA would identify ways in which agency coordination during the Tier 1 process could create efficiencies and help streamline subsequent Tier 2 approvals. For example, if a particular portion or element of a Tier 1 EIS Alternative avoids direct and/or indirect effects on freshwater resources, FRA would coordinate with USACE, EPA, USCG and NJDEP to determine whether or not those portions need further evaluation in regards to freshwater resources at a Tier 2 level.

Application of Effects-Assessment Methodology

5.1 FRESHWATER RESOURCES: APPLICATION OF EFFECTS-ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

5.1.1 Variations to Effects-Assessment Methodology

There were no variations to the Effects-Assessment Methodology during the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis.

5.1.2 Data Variations

There were no variations from the identified data sources in the Effects-Assessment Methodology during the development of the Tier 1 Draft EIS analysis.

5.1.3 Criteria for Analysis

Existing Conditions

▶ Freshwater Wetlands

- Data calculations were based on the National Wetlands Inventory.
- The FRA calculated the total number of acres of freshwater wetlands within the Affected Environment by overlaying the Affected Environment of each Action Alternative with the National Wetlands Inventory dataset for each county and state.
- The FRA calculated the average total number of acres of freshwater wetlands within the Affected Environment by county. All counties encompassing the average of 250 or more acres of freshwater wetlands within the Affected Environment of each Action Alternative and the existing NEC were further identified as having the most potential impacts to freshwater wetlands. Waterbodies within those counties and the Affected Environment of each Action Alternative were also identified.
- The FRA calculated the total number of acres of freshwater wetlands present within each county and separately for each state as a percentage of the total area of the Affected Environment within that same county or state.

▶ Water Quality

- The FRA calculated the total number of waterbodies with special water quality designations within the Affected Environment by overlaying the Affected Environment of each Action Alternative with the National Hydrography dataset coded with state-specific water quality information.

▶ Navigable Waters

- The FRA identified Navigable Waters present within the Affected Environment of each Action Alternative.

Environmental Consequences

▶ Freshwater Wetlands

- Data calculations were based on the National Wetlands Inventory.
- The FRA calculated the total number of acres of freshwater wetlands within the Representative Route by overlaying the Representative Route of each Action Alternative with the National Wetlands Inventory dataset for each county and state.
- The FRA calculated the average total number of acres of freshwater wetlands within the Affected Environment by county. All counties encompassing the average of 15 or more acres of freshwater wetlands within the Representative Route of each Action Alternative and the existing NEC were further identified as having the most potential impacts to freshwater wetlands. Waterbodies within those counties and the Representative Route of each Action Alternative were also identified.
- The FRA calculated the total number of acres of freshwater wetlands present within each county and separately for each state as a percentage of the total area of the Representative Route within that same county or state.

▶ Water Quality

- The FRA calculated the total number of waterbodies with special water quality designations within the Representative Route of each Action Alternative by overlaying the Representative Route with the National Hydrography dataset coded with state-specific water quality information.

▶ Navigable Waters

- The FRA calculated the number of Navigable Waters crossed in each county and state.

Environmental Consequences – Stations

The FRA calculated the number of acres of freshwater wetlands present within station areas for each county and state using the same GIS data layers and processes as described earlier in this section for the Environmental Consequences analysis.

Data Matrices

Geography		Freshwater Wetlands																																																										
		Environmental Consequences (Acres)																																																										
		Existing NEC						Alternative 1						Alternative 2						Alternative 3 via CC and PVD (3.1)						Alternative 3 via LI and PVD (3.2)						Alternative 3 via LI and WOR (3.3)						Alternative 3 via CC and WOR (3.4)																						
State	County	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O											
DC	District of Columbia	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	4	0	0																	
MD	Prince George's	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	0															
MD	Anne Arundel	0	12	*	0	1	0	0	0	12	*	0	1	0	0	0	12	*	0	1	0	0	65	0	0	3	0	0	65	0	0	3	0	0	65	0	0	3	0	0	65	0	0	3	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0													
MD	Baltimore County	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	7	18	2	0	2	0	7	18	2	0	2	0	7	18	2	0	2	0	7	18	2	0	2	0	7	18	2	0	2	0									
MD	Baltimore City	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0											
MD	Harford	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4	17	1	0	21	0	4	17	1	0	21	0	4	17	1	0	21	0	4	17	1	0	21	0	4	17	1	0	21	0									
MD	Cecil	0	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	5	0	1	5	2	0	7	0	2	8	4	0	16	0	2	8	4	0	16	0	2	8	4	0	16	0	2	8	4	0	16	0	2	8	4	0	16	0										
DE	New Castle	1	4	0	0	2	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	9	7	0	0	2	0	15	40	4	0	3	0	15	40	4	0	3	0	15	40	4	0	3	0	15	40	4	0	3	0	15	40	4	0	3	0											
PA	Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	0	5	2	0	4	0	5	2	0	4	0	5	2	0	4	0	5	2	0	4	0	5	2	0	4	0	5	2	0	4	0										
PA	Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0									
PA	Philadelphia	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	0	4	6	0	22	0	5	0	16	0	22	0	5	0	16	0	22	0	5	0	16	0	22	0	5	0	16	0	22	0	5	0	16	0	22	0									
PA	Bucks	0	2	0	0	5	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	8	0	0	10	0	0	8	0	0	10	0	0	8	0	0	10	0	0	8	0	0	10	0	0	8	0	0	10	0	0										
NJ	Salem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
NJ	Gloucester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0								
NJ	Camden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
NJ	Burlington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
NJ	Mercer	4	15	0	0	2	0	4	15	0	0	3	0	4	15	0	0	3	0	14	85	1	0	7	0	14	85	1	0	7	0	14	85	1	0	7	0	14	85	1	0	7	0	14	85	1	0	7	0	14	85	1	0	7	0					
NJ	Middlesex	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	3	21	0	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0	8	99	3	0	0	0					
NJ	Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
NJ	Union	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	0					
NJ	Essex	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
NJ	Bergen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
NJ	Hudson	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	*	0	1	0	0	0	*	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0					
NY	New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
NY	Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Westchester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Fairfield	0	1	*	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Litchfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	New Haven	2	4	1	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0																																															

Geography		Freshwater Wetlands Affected Environment (Acres)																																										
		Existing NEC						Alternative 1						Alternative 2						Alternative 3 via CC and PVD (3.1)						Alternative 3 via LI and PVD (3.2)						Alternative 3 via LI and WOR (3.3)						Alternative 3 via CC and WOR (3.4)						
		E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	
DC	District of Columbia	3	24	2	7	23	0	3	24	2	7	23	0	3	25	2	7	23	0	3	25	2	8	25	0	3	25	2	8	25	0	3	25	2	8	25	0	3	25	2	8	25	0	
MD	Prince George's	2	145	2	0	4	0	2	145	2	0	4	0	2	145	2	0	4	0	2	151	2	0	4	0	2	151	2	0	4	0	2	151	2	0	4	0	2	151	2	0	4	0	
MD	Anne Arundel	14	399	14	0	13	0	14	399	14	0	13	0	14	399	14	0	13	0	15	424	15	0	13	0	15	424	15	0	13	0	15	424	15	0	13	0	15	424	15	0	13	0	
MD	Howard	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		
MD	Baltimore County	5	48	14	0	8	7	5	48	14	0	8	7	5	48	14	0	8	7	40	150	50	0	15	13	40	150	50	0	15	13	40	150	50	0	15	13	40	150	50	0	15	13	
MD	Baltimore City	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	5	0	10	0	0	1	5	0	10	0	0	1	5	0	10	0	0	1	5	0	10	0	
MD	Harford	4	84	13	0	92	0	4	84	13	0	92	0	5	84	13	0	92	0	21	189	24	0	100	0	21	189	24	0	100	0	21	189	24	0	100	0	21	189	24	0	100	0	
MD	Cecil	41	122	32	0	85	2	41	122	32	0	85	2	44	143	66	0	102	2	44	143	66	0	103	2	44	143	66	0	103	2	44	143	66	0	103	2	44	143	66	0	103	2	
DE	New Castle	67	218	38	0	27	0	67	218	38	0	27	0	134	240	56	0	30	0	123	267	51	0	30	0	123	267	51	0	30	0	123	267	51	0	30	0	123	267	51	0	30	0	
PA	Delaware	0	2	5	0	13	0	0	2	5	0	13	0	38	13	46	0	35	0	38	16	15	0	36	0	38	16	15	0	36	0	38	16	15	0	36	0	38	16	15	0	36	0	
PA	Montgomery	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PA	Philadelphia	0	12	1	0	177	0	0	12	1	0	177	0	63	18	5	46	197	0	156	14	40	0	304	0	156	14	40	0	304	0	156	14	40	0	304	0	156	14	40	0	304	0	
PA	Bucks	6	186	59	198	44	0	6	186	59	198	44	0	6	186	59	198	44	0	6	193	60	213	45	0	6	193	60	213	45	0	6	193	60	213	45	0	6	193	60	213	45	0	
NJ	Salem	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Gloucester	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Camden	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Burlington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Mercer	68	629	8	0	31	0	68	629	8	0	31	0	68	629	8	0	31	0	70	643	8	0	32	0	70	643	8	0	32	0	70	643	8	0	32	0	70	643	8	0	32	0	
NJ	Middlesex	91	871	38	0	5	2	91	871	38	0	5	2	92	891	38	0	5	2	96	915	40	0	5	2	96	915	40	0	5	2	96	915	40	0	5	2	96	915	40	0	5	2	
NJ	Somerset	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Union	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	2	8	0	0	15	0	
NJ	Essex	15	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	15	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1	0	0	0	
NJ	Bergen	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NJ	Hudson	7	0	13	0	1	1	7	0	13	0	1	1	7	0	13	0	1	1	8	0	14	0	2	8	8	0	14	0	2	8	8	0	14	0	2	8	8	0	14	0	2	8	
NY	New York	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Richmond	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Queens	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NY	Bronx	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	
NY	Westchester	14	4	9	0	0	0	14	4	9	0	0	0	14	4	10	0	0	0	33	157	73	171	3	0	14	52	16	0	0	0	14	4	9	0	0	0	33	157	73	171	3	0	
NY	Putnam	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	10	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	43	10	34	0	0		
NY	Nassau	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	0	0	0	1	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Suffolk	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	52	16	0	0	0	5	52	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	16	57	29	15	10	0	22	82	30	15	10	0	22	84	34	0	10	0	40	244	53	125	13	0	22	82	30	15	10	0	22	82	30	15	10	0	40	244	53	125	13	0	
CT	Litchfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	104	298	54	31	5	0	104	298	54	31	5	0	120	591	101	53	5	0	111	391	100	140	28	0	120	594	101	48	5	0	120	594	101	48	5	0	111	391	100	140	28	0	
CT	Hartford	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	290	56	104	79	0	32	277	49	15	79	0	28	231	44	50	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CT	Tolland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	220	18	5	8	0	9	220	18	5	8	0	9	220	18	5	8	0	9	220	18	5	8	0	9	220	18	5	8	0	9
CT	Windham	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79	305	28	79	10	0	79	305	28	79	10	0	79	305	28	79	10	0	79	305	28	79	10	0	79	305	28	79	10	0	
CT	Middlesex	8	154	40	0	0	0	8	154	40	0	0	0	8	155	40	0	0	0	8	155	40	0	0	0	8	154	40	0	0	0	8	154	40	0	0	0	8	155	40	0	0	0	
CT	New London	51	358	23	0	3	0	68	730	53	138	6	0	51	358	23	0	3	0	51	358	23	0	3	0	51	358	23	0	3	0	51	358	23	0	3	0	51	358	23	0	3	0	
RI	Washington	87	1312	86	77	45																																						

Geography		Station ID	Station Type	Freshwater Wetlands Stations (Acres)																																			
State	County			Alternative 1						Alternative 2						Alternative 3 via CC and PVD (3.1)						Alternative 3 via LI and PVD (3.2)						Alternative 3 via LI and WOR (3.3)						Alternative 3 via CC and WOR (3.4)					
				E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O	E	FS	P	L	R	O
NJ	Middlesex	68	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Union	69	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Union	70	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Union	71	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Union	72	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Essex	73	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Essex	74	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Essex	75	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NJ	Hudson	76	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	New York	77	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	New York	9993	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Queens	144	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Queens	145	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Bronx	78	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Bronx	79	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Bronx	80	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Bronx	81	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	82	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	83	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	84	Existing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	85	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	86	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	87	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	88	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Westchester	151	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Putnam	153	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Nassau	146	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Suffolk	148	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
NY	Suffolk	149	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	89	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	90	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	91	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	92	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	93	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	94	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	95	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	96	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	97	Existing	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	98	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	99	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	100	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	101	Existing	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	102	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	Fairfield	103	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	104	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	105	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	107	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	108	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
CT	Fairfield	154	New	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
CT	New Haven	109	Existing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
CT	New Haven	110																																					

