

Appendix B: Agency Correspondence



Marco Turra – Director
CSX Transportation
500 Water Street, J315
Jacksonville, FL 32202
Office (904) 359-1099
Marco_Turra@csx.com

May 28, 2014

Harry Romano
Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of Freight and Multimodalism
7201 Corporate Center Drive
Hanover MD 21076

MDOT

JUN 06 2014

Freight Logistics


Dear Mr. Romano,

We understand that Maryland DOT and the Federal Railroad Administration are working on the preliminary engineering and preparation of environmental impact statements for replacing the Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel. CSXT has trackage rights on the NEC between Washington and New York, including the B&P Tunnel, where CSX can operate four trains per day.

CSXT would welcome the opportunity to be included in the study. We believe that a joint study for the replacement of the B&P Tunnel would yield significant additional public benefit because new infrastructure could enable the movement of double stack freight trains on the I95 Corridor. To this end, CSXT would like to be included in the planning of the new or improved B&P Tunnel.

Thanks for the consideration and we look forward hearing back from you.

Sincerely,



Marco Turra

Cc: Jay Westbrook – CSXT AVP Passenger Operations
Dale Ophardt – CSXT AVP Engineering
Bob Gutman – CSXT AVP Network Planning



U.S. Department
of Transportation

1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE.
Washington, D.C. 20590

**Federal Railroad
Administration**

JUN 11 2014

Subject: Agency Scoping Invitation
Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project
Initiation of Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Agency Representative:

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), in coordination with the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), is initiating development of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the B&P Tunnel Project pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). As part of the development of the EIS, FRA is seeking your input to assist in determining and clarifying issues that are relevant to the scope of the study.

The B&P Tunnel is located between the West Baltimore MARC Station and Baltimore Pennsylvania Station along Amtrak's Northeast Corridor (NEC) (see attached map). This section of the NEC is used by Amtrak and MARC passenger trains, as well as Norfolk Southern freight trains. Opened in 1873, the tunnel is approaching the end of its useful service life. The intent of the study is to address tunnel deficiencies which hamper rail movement and create a low-speed bottleneck on a high-traffic section of the NEC. Note that the B&P Tunnel is not CSX Transportation's Howard Street Tunnel, which serves freight trains exclusively.

In compliance with NEPA, Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and other environmental laws and regulations, the study will consider potential impacts to surrounding communities and the environment and culminate in the development of the EIS. Various alternatives addressing study needs will be developed and evaluated, including the No Action Alternative as well as Build Alternatives, such as rehabilitation of the existing tunnel and a new tunnel on new alignment.

Any comments and suggestions your agency may have regarding factors that should be considered in the EIS would be appreciated. There are several ways your agency can participate in the scoping process:

- 1) Your agency may provide written comments via mail to:

B&P Tunnel Project
81 W. Mosher Street
Baltimore, MD 21217



Norfolk Southern Corporation
Three Commercial Place
Norfolk, VA 23510
Phone: 757-629-2838
Fax: 757-533-4884
Email: john.edwards@nscorp.com

John V. Edwards
General Director
Passenger Policy

July 24, 2014

Ms. Michelle W. Fishburne
Environmental Protection Specialist
USDOT FRA, Office of Program Delivery
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE., MS-20
Washington, DC 20590

Sent electronically to info@bptunnel.com

Re: Scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for
the Baltimore & Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project

Dear Ms. Fishburne:

On June 9, 2014, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) published its Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) related to the Baltimore & Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project along the Amtrak Northeast Corridor (NEC) in Baltimore, MD. Norfolk Southern appreciates the opportunity to provide these brief comments on the scope of the EIS for this important project.

Norfolk Southern operates freight trains on the NEC alongside Amtrak. The agricultural and consumer goods, metals and forest products it moves along the NEC help to fuel the economies of states from the mid-Atlantic to the Northeast and beyond. Much of the traffic it delivers to customers along the NEC originates in the Midwest and Western United States. Much of the traffic originating along the NEC is delivered to businesses, manufacturers, and wholesalers throughout the United States.

The NEC between Washington DC and Boston is a vital national asset for the transportation of goods in both domestic and international commerce, as well as for passenger transportation. Norfolk Southern welcomes the opportunity to work with the Federal Railroad Administration, the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), and Amtrak to ensure that this portion of the NEC, which dates from 1873, is brought into the 21st century. It is important to eliminate a significant chokepoint in this high traffic section of the Northeast freight and passenger rail corridor.


In all cases and at all locations within the study area, impacts to freight rail must be considered on all segments of the proposed route. Just as the current infrastructure constrains passenger

Ms. Michelle W. Fishburne
July 24, 2014
Page 2 of 2

operations, so has that infrastructure constrained current and potential freight operations, to the detriment of the people and economies of the NEC-served states. Adequate infrastructure is needed to prevent rail conflicts and ensure fluid operations for both passenger and freight operations. The potential for clearing the B&P Tunnel for high and wide loads (including those involving intermodal double stack), and the potential to replace or supplement the US Department of Defense Strategic Rail Corridor Network (STRACNET) route now utilizing the Howard Street Tunnel should be incorporated into the EIS.

Again, Norfolk Southern appreciates the forum for making comments to the scope of the B&P Tunnel EIS. We look forward to remaining involved in this process. We hope to help MDOT and FRA realize their vision for improved transportation options in Maryland and along the NEC.

Sincerely,



John V. Edwards



Maryland Department of Planning
Maryland Historical Trust

Sustainable _____ Attainable _____

August 4, 2014

David Valenstein
Chief, Environment and Systems Planning Division
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project
Agency Scoping/Initiation of Section 106 Review
Baltimore City, Maryland

Dear Mr. Valenstein,

The Maryland Historical Trust (Trust), a division of the Maryland Department of Planning, received the Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) initiation of the Environmental Impact Statement and Section 106 review process for the above-referenced project. We look forward to working with your agency and other involved parties to successfully complete the preservation requirements for the proposed undertaking.

The FRA will soon need to initiate detailed cultural resources studies so that significant historic properties within the project area are fully considered during the project planning process. We encourage early and frequent coordination with our office to ensure that the investigations are commensurate with the scale of the undertaking and consistent with our standards and guidelines. Considerable information already exists regarding identified historic and archeological resources in the project vicinity, as a result of multiple prior investigations for various projects. For example, the Baltimore & Potomac Railroad / Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad (MIHP No. B-5164) has already been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. This evaluation was conducted in 2012 and includes the Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel. A copy of the determination of eligibility (DOE) form is included as an attachment to this letter. Our inventory also includes numerous individual structures, bridges and historic districts within the project area for the Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel project. Please consult the Trust's library and staff as part of the detailed investigations to obtain the existing survey documentation. We look forward to working with the project team to ensure a reasonable and appropriate level of effort is performed for the current project.

We suggest that the FRA continue to identify opportunities to involve the general public and any other interested parties throughout the project planning process. Trust staff can provide assistance in identifying consulting parties. Thank you for initiating consultation with the Trust early in project planning for this undertaking. If you have questions or require any assistance, please contact me (for the historic built environment) at tim.tamburrino@maryland.gov \ 410-514-7637 or Beth Cole (for archeology) at beth.cole@maryland.gov \ 410-514-7631.

Sincerely,

Tim Tamburrino
Preservation Officer

TJT / 20140
Attachment

cc: Michelle Fishburne (FRA) via email
B&P Tunnel Project Office

Martin O Malley, Governor
Anthony G. Brown, Lt. Governor

Richard Eberhart Hall, AICP Secretary
Amanda Stakem Conn, Esq., Deputy Secretary



Maryland Department of Transportation
The Secretary's Office

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

James T. Smith, Jr.
Secretary

October 10, 2014

Mr. Joseph C. Szabo
Administrator
Federal Railroad Administration
U.S. Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington DC 20590

Dear Administrator Szabo:

As your partner on the \$60 million High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) grant for preliminary engineering (PE) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) work on Amtrak's Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel in Baltimore City, I wanted to make you aware of a recent discussion I had with Amtrak President Joseph Boardman and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) staff regarding this regionally significant project.

The discussion focused on freight capacity within the new or rehabilitated B&P Tunnel. Both Norfolk Southern (NS) and CSX Transportation, Inc. (CSX) hold rights to move freight on the Northeast Corridor, including the B&P Tunnel, and have expressed interest in addressing freight needs in the new or rehabilitated tunnel. With NS and CSX cooperation, current and future goods movement may significantly benefit from the ability of a new or rehabilitated B&P Tunnel to support double-stack intermodal and over-dimensional cargo to and from the Port of Baltimore. During our conversation, Amtrak indicated their willingness to work with the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) on an analysis to support a future B&P Tunnel that could also accommodate double-stack intermodal freight.

Amtrak and MDOT discussed the need to evaluate the connecting rail network to determine what additional clearances may be required before NS and CSX could operate double-stack intermodal freight into/out of the Port of Baltimore. Because of the constraints associated with the federal grant and project limits, MDOT will convene a working group, separate from the B&P Tunnel HSIPR study, to advance these investigations. MDOT anticipates the working group will include representatives from FRA, MDOT, Amtrak, and the two freight railroads.

Secretary James T. Smith, Jr.
Page Two

We look forward to working with you and your staff as MDOT advances these efforts. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Mr. Leif A. Dormsjo, MDOT Deputy Secretary for Planning and Project Management, at 410-865-1002 or by email at ldormsjo@mdot.state.md.us. Deputy Assistant Dormsjo will be happy to assist you. Of course, you should feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Smith', written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

James T. Smith, Jr.
Secretary

cc: Mr. Joseph H. Boardman, President, Amtrak
Mr. Leif A. Dormsjo, Deputy Secretary for Planning and Project Management, MDOT
Mr. Paul Nissenbaum, Associate Administrator for Railroad Policy and Development,
FRA

Zimbra

brolf@rkk.com

Fwd: B&P Tunnel-Draft Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report

From: "Alaina McCurdy" <McCurdy.Alaina@epa.gov>
To: "michelle fishburne" <michelle.fishburne@dot.gov>, "Eric Almquist" <ealmquist@rkk.com>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2014 10:07:27 AM
Subject: B&P Tunnel-Draft Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report

Hi Michelle and Eric,

Thank you for coordinating with EPA on the B&P Tunnel Draft Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report. We appreciate your efforts to keep us engaged in this project and for allowing us the opportunity to provide you with comments for your consideration. If possible, please forward this message to the appropriate MDOT contact for this project.

Below are some comments for your consideration on the report. Overall, the alternatives examined were clearly explained as were the various screening criteria. Of the 15 alternatives considered, four are recommended to be advanced for further study in the EIS. These include the no build alternative, restore/rehabilitate the existing tunnel, and two new location alternatives. While it was largely apparent why many of the alternatives considered were recommended to be dropped from further consideration, it was not always clear how each of the alternatives measured up against each of the identified screening criteria. We did see the screening criteria laid out for each alternative in Table 1, which we found very useful. We'd suggest including this information more explicitly in the narrative analysis and recommendation sections for each alternative in order to make it more clear throughout the document how alternatives 3-15 met each of the identified screening criteria. Currently for alternatives 3-7, the analysis sections only present reviewed and summarized information from the 2011 Baltimore's Railroad Network: Analysis and Recommendations report as opposed to focusing on how the alternatives were evaluated against the criteria. Again, we suggest including a more clear presentation of how the alternatives were evaluated against each of the screening criteria in

order to further improve the report.

One of the new location alternatives that was evaluated and recommended to be carried forward was Alternative 11: Robert Street South. The description of this alternative states that it would be a combination of underground tunnel, an aerial structure and at-grade sections. The map provided of this alternative currently shows the alignment and portal locations. If possible, we'd recommend noting the locations of the aerial structures and at-grade sections on the existing map, or adding a new map to show these areas. While we understand the provided discussion and rationale for retaining this alternative, if it hasn't already been considered, we'd recommend that FRA and MDOT consider evaluating a slightly modified Alternative 11 against the identified screening criteria. We're suggesting a modified Alternative 11 in addition to the other alternatives in an effort to think ahead about potential impacts to the community surrounding the south portal location. If possible, we'd suggest, that if it hasn't already been evaluated already, taking a closer look at potential slight alignment shifts or modifications to the south portal location and connection to the existing Amtrak corridor of Alt 11 to the north by a few blocks. It appears that if some modification were possible, the portal location could have potentially fewer adverse impacts to the community as well as reducing the length of track between the portal and existing track. EPA encourages FRA and MDOT to consider if efforts can be made to evaluate the south portal location in closer detail either further into the design of Alt 11, or evaluating at this stage a slightly modified Alt 11 in order to reduce adverse community impacts.

I also had a few questions in order to try to better understand Alternative 12: Robert Street North. I understand this alternative has some portion of cut and cover, however could you clarify the length, extent, and location of the cut and cover operation that would be required for this alternative? I was also interested in finding out where or for what length of this alternative would not meet the minimum tunnel separation between the existing MTA Metro rail line and proposed tunnel. Has any evaluation been conducted to investigate if realigning or slightly modifying the southern portal to the north would allow for greater tunnel separation and maintenance of operations through the existing tunnel?

The screening report considers environmental justice throughout the document. We encourage FRA and MDOT to conduct robust community outreach for this project, as it appears at this preliminary stage that many of the potential adverse impacts associated with the project could be to the community. We are aware that there are a number of large, influential churches in the vicinity of the southern portal locations, as well as community organizations, and suggest that project outreach include these organizations to the extent possible.

Again, thank you for coordinating with EPA on this project. If you have any questions or would like to discuss EPA's comments on the Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report, please feel free to contact me. We would certainly welcome the opportunity to discuss our comments with you in greater detail.

Sincerely,

Alaina

Alaina McCurdy
Office of Environmental Programs
U.S. EPA Region 3
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
phone: (215)814-2741
fax: (215)814-2783



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Chesapeake Bay Ecological Services Field Office
177 ADMIRAL COCHRANE DRIVE
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401
PHONE: (410)573-4599 FAX: (410)266-9127



Consultation Tracking Number: 05E2CB00-2015-SLI-0326

December 09, 2014

Project Name: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project.

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the

human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:

<http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF>

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 *et seq.*), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (<http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/>) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm>; <http://www.towerkill.com>; and <http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html>.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment



United States Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service

Project name: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel

Preliminary Species list

Provided by:

Chesapeake Bay Ecological Services Field Office
177 ADMIRAL COCHRANE DRIVE
ANNAPOLIS, MD 21401
(410) 573-4599

Consultation Tracking Number: 05E2CB00-2015-SLI-0326

Project Type: Transportation


Project Description: The proposed project involves replacing an existing 1.4 mile underground tunnel along one of three potential alignments in Baltimore City (see attached mapping). The project is in the planning phase and it remains to be determined whether the final tunnel design will extend beneath the Jones Falls or the track alignment will remain on the existing bridge structure above the stream before entering the B&P Tunnel.



United States Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service

Project name: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel

Project Location Map:



Project Coordinates: MULTIPOLYGON (((-76.6268744 39.3179166, -76.6194114 39.3110768, -76.638204 39.2952033, -76.6548552 39.2951369, -76.6553744 39.3094166, -76.6419891 39.3153933, -76.6387276 39.3158581, -76.6369251 39.3167213, -76.6333202 39.3166549, -76.6268744 39.3179166)))

Project Counties: Baltimore (city), MD



United States Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service

Project name: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel

Endangered Species Act Species List

There are a total of 0 threatened or endangered species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Critical habitats listed under the **Has Critical Habitat** column may or may not lie within your project area. See the **Critical habitats within your project area** section further below for critical habitat that lies within your project. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

There are no listed species identified for the vicinity of your project.

Preliminary



United States Department of Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service

Project name: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel

Critical habitats that lie within your project area

There are no critical habitats within your project area.

Preliminary



Larry Hogan, Governor
Boyd K. Rutherford, Lt. Governor
Mark J. Belton, Secretary
Mark L. Hoffman, Acting Deputy Secretary

15-MIS-201

June 29, 2015

Angela Willis
Maryland Transit Administration
6 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Subject: Fisheries Information for the Proposed Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project, in Baltimore, Maryland.

Dear Ms. Willis,

The above referenced project has been reviewed to determine fisheries species in the vicinity of the proposed project. The proposed activities include the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project, in Baltimore, Maryland.


Jones Falls, Stony Run (Patapsco River Basin) and tributaries near the site are classified as Use IV streams (Recreational Trout Waters). Generally, no instream work is permitted in Use IV streams during the period of March 1 through May 31, inclusive, during any year.

No anadromous fish have been documented near the project site. However, these streams may support many resident fish species documented by our Maryland Biological Stream Survey. There are Maryland Biological Stream Survey (MBSS) stations near the project location. The species collected at one of these stations has been itemized in the attached list. MBSS data can be accessed via the MDDNR web page at <http://streamhealth.maryland.gov>, allowing access to resource surveys in neighboring tributaries.

If you have further questions, please contact the Environmental Review Program at 410-260-8803.

Sincerely,

Alison Armocida
Environmental Review Program



The following fishes were collected at JONE-312-R-2002

Common name	Percent of total
LONGNOSE DACE	30.0
WHITE SUCKER	22.1
SATINFIN SHINER	19.4
TESSELLATED DARTER	10.2
BLUNTNOSE MINNOW	7.0
YELLOW BULLHEAD	4.2
REDBREAST SUNFISH	2.3
MUMMICHOG	1.5
SWALLOWTAIL SHINER	1.4
AMERICAN EEL	1.0
LARGEMOUTH BASS	0.5
NORTHERN HOGSUCKER	0.3

From: Holcomb, Eric [<mailto:Eric.Holcomb@baltimorecity.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 29, 2015 12:50 PM
To: Fishburne, Michelle (FRA)
Subject: Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project

Dear Ms. Fishburne

Please include the Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation as a consulting party on this project.

Thank you,

Eric Holcomb

Executive Director

Commission For Historical And Architectural Preservation Division

Baltimore City Department of Planning

8th Floor, 417 E Fayette St

Baltimore MD 21202-3416

t 443-984-2728 f 410-396-5662

e-mail: eholcomb@baltimorecity.gov

MISSION

TO PROVIDE THE HIGHEST LEVEL OF SERVICES AND LEADERSHIP IN URBAN AND STRATEGIC PLANNING, HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION, ZONING, DESIGN, DEVELOPMENT, AND CAPITAL BUDGETING TO PROMOTE THE SUSTAINED ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE.

For more information, contact our website at www.baltimorecity.gov/government/planning/index.html

This message contains information which may be confidential and privileged. Unless you are the addressee (or are authorized to receive for the addressee), you may not use, copy or disclose to anyone the message or any information contained in this message. If you have received this message in error, please advise the sender by reply e-mail, and delete or destroy this message.



PRESERVATION
MARYLAND

April 29, 2015

Ms. Michelle Fishburne
Environmental Protection Specialist
Department of Transportation
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project

Dear Ms. Fishburne:

Preservation Maryland is pleased to serve as a Section 106 Consulting Party for the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project in Baltimore, Maryland.

Thank you for the invitation and I look forward to hearing more from you about this project.

Sincerely,

Margaret De Arcangelis
Preservation Services Director

From: Johns Hopkins [<mailto:hopkins@baltimoreheritage.org>]

Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 9:48 AM

To: Fishburne, Michelle (FRA)

Cc: Cole, Beth

Subject: B&P Tunnel Section 106 Consulting Party

Ms. Fishburne - Thank you for your letter inviting us to be a Section 106 consulting party on the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Tunnel project. We indeed would like to do so and look forward to the first meeting whenever that is scheduled.

Thank you again and we look forward to participating. Johns

Johns Hopkins, Executive Director

[Baltimore Heritage](#)

11 ½ West Chase Street, Baltimore, MD 21201

office 410.332.9992

From: Agnes M. Smith -GOCI- [<mailto:agnes.smith@maryland.gov>]

Sent: Tuesday, May 12, 2015 12:15 PM

To: Fishburne, Michelle (FRA)

Cc: Lisa Savoy; Keith Colston -GOCI-

Subject: Section 106 Consulting Party Invitation

STATE OF MARYLAND
Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs

Larry Hogan
Governor

E. Keith Colston
Administrative Director

Commissioners

Chair
Lisa Savoy

Vice Chair
Ashley Minner

Donna Abbott

Virginia Busby

Bob Gajdys

Robert F. Killen

Rico Newman

Rebecca Stone

Leannora E. Winters



Boyd K. Rutherford
Lt. Governor

May 12, 2015

Greetings Ms. Michelle Fishburne,

On behalf of the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs, I would like to state comments and concerns of our commissioners.

- What impact will the project have on lower income people who live in the area and/or rely on existing transportation systems in the area?
- How many Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples live in the area will be affected?
- How many Native Americans/Indigenous Peoples use the existing transportation systems?
- Could census data be utilized to supply the appropriate data?
- Have there been any Native American/Indigenous remains found during the construction?
- COMMENT: At a minimum the human impact on the people disrupted by the magnitude and length of a project of this size must be taken into consideration.
- COMMENT: There is a concern if any native remains are found during the construction. MCLIA with assistance from the DNR and MHT were able to place over 180 unidentified remains in appropriate places of repose" back to Mother Earth, but MCLIA would need an existing procedure to address this issue with the Maryland Historical Trust. Recommendations were previously provided to MHT to develop new procedures but no action has been taken that we are aware of.
- COMMENT: Commission members strongly agree that MCLIA should consult.
- COMMENT: If 106 is being required, MCLIA should be listed as "party of interest" that we will be informed if items of native cultural interest are uncovered, and MCLIA should comment on any project that could potentially affect our communities

As Chair of the Maryland Commission on Indian Affairs (MCLIA), I respectfully share the questions and comments above concerning participation as a consulting party in the Section 106 (36 CFR Part 800.3(f)) process for the Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project in Baltimore Maryland.

Sincerely,

Lisa Savoy, Chair MCLIA

301 West Preston Street, Suite 1500, Baltimore, Maryland 21201
TELEPHONE: 410-767-7631 • FAX: 410-333-5957 • TTY: 1-800-735-2258
WEBSITE: www.americanindian.maryland.gov

--

Agnes M. Smith
Project Coordinator, Governor's Ethnic Commissions
Governor's Office of Community Initiatives
301 W. Preston Street, Suite 1500
Baltimore MD 21201
410-767-7491 (Office)
410-333-5957 (Fax)
Agnes.Smith@maryland.gov



Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Representatives
Department of Anthropology
Gladfelter Hall
Temple University
1115 W. Polett Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19122
temple@delawaretribe.org

June 14, 2015

US Department of Transportation
Federal Railroad Administration
Attn: Michelle Fishburne
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project in Baltimore, Maryland

Dear Michelle Fishburne,

Thank you for informing the Delaware Tribe regarding the above referenced project. The Delaware Tribe is committed to protecting historic sites important to our tribal heritage, culture and religion.

We are interested in learning more about the above project and look forward to receiving the results of the engineering and environmental studies. We would also like to continue as a consulting party on this project. We appreciate your cooperation and look forward to working together on our shared interests in preserving Delaware cultural heritage.

If you have any questions, feel free to contact this office by phone at (609) 220-1047 or by e-mail at temple@delawaretribe.org.

Sincerely,

Blair Fink
Delaware Tribe Historic Preservation Representatives
Department of Anthropology
Gladfelter Hall
Temple University
1115 W. Polett Walk
Philadelphia, PA 19122



Larry Hogan, Governor
Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor

David R. Craig, Secretary
Wendy W. Peters, Deputy Secretary

Maryland Department of Planning
Maryland Historical Trust

November 20, 2015

Ms. Michelle Fishburne
Environmental Protection Specialist
Federal Railroad Administration
1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20590

Re: Baltimore and Potomac (B&P) Tunnel Project
Section 106 Architectural Historic Properties Effects Assessment Report
Baltimore City, Maryland

Dear Ms. Fishburne:

Thank you for providing the Maryland Historical Trust (Trust) with Federal Railroad Administration's (FRA) assessment of effects on historic standing structures for the above-referenced undertaking. FRA's submittal represents ongoing consultation to assess the project's effects on historic properties, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985, as amended, State Finance and Procurement Article §§ 5A-325 and 5A-326 of the Annotated Code of Maryland. We conducted a thorough review of the materials and we are writing to provide our comments and concurrence.

Assessment of Effects: The FRA's efforts to identify and evaluate historic properties within the Area of Potential Effects for the B&P Tunnel Project resulted in the identification eighteen (18) architectural historic properties that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (National Register). The Trust completed a thorough review of the information presented in the *Architectural Historic Properties Effects Assessment Report* (FRA and MDOT 2015) and took into consideration the views of the public and the Section 106 Consulting Parties provided at the various project and consulting parties meetings. Based upon the results of the FRA's studies and consultation, the Trust agrees with the FRA's effects assessments. The three alternative alignments remaining under consideration (Alternative 3, Options A, B and C) will have an **adverse effect** on historic properties. Alternative 3, Option A will adversely affect six historic properties, while Alternative 3, Option B will adversely affect eight historic properties. Alternative 3, Option C will adversely affect ten historic properties. The affected properties are listed below:

Architectural historic properties adversely affected under Alternative 3, Option A include:

Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Railroad (MIHP No. B-5287)
Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Bridge over Jones Falls Valley (MIHP No. B-5288)
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad (MIHP No. B-5164)
Reservoir Hill Historic District (MIHP No. B-1379)
Midtown Edmondson Historic District
Lafayette Avenue Bridge over Amtrak (MIHP No. B-4553)

Architectural historic properties adversely affected under Alternative 3, Option B include:

Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Railroad (MIHP No. B-5287)
Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Bridge over Jones Falls Valley (MIHP No. B-5288)
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad (MIHP No. B-5164)
Reservoir Hill Historic District (MIHP No. B-1379)

Midtown Edmondson Historic District
Lafayette Avenue Bridge over Amtrak (MIHP No. B-4553)
Atlas Safe Deposit and Storage Company Warehouse Complex (MIHP No. B-5188-2)
Greater Rosemont Historic District (MIHP No. B-5112)

Architectural historic properties adversely affected under Alternative 3, Option C include:


Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Railroad (MIHP No. B-5287)
Baltimore & Ohio Belt Line Bridge over Jones Falls Valley (MIHP No. B-5288)
Baltimore & Potomac Railroad (MIHP No. B-5164)
Reservoir Hill Historic District (MIHP No. B-1379)
Midtown Edmondson Historic District
Lafayette Avenue Bridge over Amtrak (MIHP No. B-4553)
Greater Rosemont Historic District (MIHP No. B-5112)
Edmondson Avenue Historic District (MIHP No. B-5187)
Ward Baking Company (MIHP No. B-5112-2)
Fire Department Engine House No. 36 (MIHP No. B-5112-4)

Continuing Section 106 Consultation: We commend the FRA's exemplary efforts to engage and seek the views of the public and Consulting Parties throughout the project planning process. This vital feedback, along with comments from resource and regulatory agencies, has assisted in the evaluation of project alternatives and will continue to inform the selection process as the FRA endeavors to balance a multitude of project goals and environmental considerations. All of the currently proposed alternatives impact historic properties by varying degrees. As FRA continues to refine the project plans, it should continue to thoroughly explore modifications to further avoid and reduce impacts to historic properties. This ongoing minimization work may assist FRA in the identification of a preferred alternative.

We look forward to further coordination with FRA and the Section 106 Consulting Parties to successfully complete the Section 106 review process, including the execution of an effective agreement document and the completion of archeological investigations once a preferred alignment has been selected.

If you have questions or need further assistance, please contact Beth Cole at 410-514-7631 / beth.cole@maryland.gov or Tim Tamburrino at 410-514-7637 or tim.tamburrino@maryland.gov. Thank you for providing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Hughes
Director / State Historic Preservation Officer
Maryland Historical Trust

EH/TJT/EJC
201504398

Distribution List:

Laura Schick (FRA)	Jacqueline Thorne (MDOT)	Jean-Wolfers-Lawrence (MTA)
Erik Almquist (RK&K)	Christine Taniguchi (RK&K)	Johns Hopkins (Baltimore Heritage)
Lauren Schiszik (CHAP)	Nicholas Redding (Preservation Maryland)	Kyle Leggs (Baltimore City Department of Planning)
Jason Vaughan (Baltimore National Heritage Area)		Steve Howard (Mount Royal Improvement Association) -- via email

NR-ELIGIBILITY REVIEW FORM

B-5164

Baltimore & Potomac RR/Phil. Baltimore & Wash. RR

Page 2

station was not part of this evaluation. The evaluated alignment was originally built in 1872 as the B&P Railroad, merging with the PW&B Railroad to create the PB&W Railroad in 1902. Please note that the zip codes this railroad alignment runs through are the following (from southwest to northeast): 21229, 21223, 21216, 21217, and 21201.

The evaluated alignment includes the following building and structures:

•The Baltimore & Potomac Tunnel is a brick-round arch 7,499-foot-long tunnel with rough-cut stone retaining walls, beginning at N. Gilmor Avenue and Winchester Street in west Baltimore, continuing northeast and emerging just south of W. North Avenue near Interstate 83. The two track tunnel includes two round arch bridges, one carrying N. Fulton Avenue and the second carrying N. Vincent Street, leading up to the tunnel entrance at the southwest end. A builder's stone with the build date, the B&P name, and the president, vice-president, and directors names, is apparently mounted on a retaining wall adjacent to one of the tunnel entrance (completed in 1873)

•Four railroad tracks at the southwest portion of the segment until about W. Lafayette Avenue, and double tracks continuing northeast and into the B&P Tunnel, consisting of track beds with ballast and siding along some segments (widened to three and four tracks in the early 1930s; tracks likely replaced over the years)

•Overhead catenary lines along the alignment with what appears to be a traction power substation located at the northern end of the evaluated segment (circa 1935)

•Railroad bridges (listed from southwest to northeast):

1) one reinforced concrete arch bridge with metal railing over Gwynns Falls Park, Western Maryland Railroad, and W. Baltimore Street (built in 1914)

2) two steel-plate viaducts with concrete retaining walls over N. Franklinton Road and N. Warwick Avenue (built in the circa 1920s)

3) one reinforced concrete bridge, with Art Deco details and a cast-in-place image of the Pennsylvania Railroad's keystone symbol on either side, located over W. Mulberry Street (built in the circa 1920s)

4) one steel and concrete bridge with rough-cut stone retaining walls, located over W. Franklin Street (the steel bridge supports appear to date to the nineteenth century, with a concrete circa 1980s West Baltimore MARC Station platform above)

•Two-story brick Gwynn Junction Tower located on the northwest side of the 1914 bridge's southwest end. The building rests on a masonry base and is sheltered by a pyramidal hipped roof clad with asphalt shingles and a red brick chimney. The building has remnants of wood window sashes and frames. It is currently not being used, likely due to there no longer being interlocking tracks at this location, and in poor condition (built in the circa early twentieth century)

•The West Baltimore MARC Station is an open platform located west of N. Smallwood Street between W. Mulberry and W. Franklin streets (built in the circa 1980s)

•Various ancillary buildings including sheds located along the tracks at the northern end of the evaluated segment (appear to be mostly modern)

Note that Amtrak prohibited access to of the alignment; all observations and photographs were made from public rights-of-way due to this legal restriction.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST REVIEW

Eligibility recommended

Eligibility not recommended

Criteria: A B C D Considerations: A B C D E F G

MHT Comments:

Reviewer, Office of Preservation Services

Date

Reviewer, National Register Program

Date

NR-ELIGIBILITY REVIEW FORM

B-5164

Baltimore & Potomac RR/Phil., Baltimore & Wash. RR

Page 4

completed soon thereafter, allowing for continued travel to the east on Union Railroad tracks to the Bayview junction where connections could be made with the Philadelphia, Wilmington & Baltimore (PW&B) Railroad. Access to these connections meant a continuous PRR link, including New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. P&B would soon utilize Baltimore's Union Station, with a second, larger Union Station replacing the original completed in 1886. The B&P Railroad merged with the PW&B Railroad in 1902 to create the PB&W Railroad, the new name also given to the evaluated alignment. The second Union Station building was replaced in 1911 by the Classical Revival building standing today, renamed Pennsylvania Station in 1928. The Edmondson Avenue Station was built in 1919, located at the intersection of the alignment with Edmondson Avenue. The ultimately underutilized station served local trains; the brick building still stands, although today it houses a restaurant. Junction towers were constructed in the circa early twentieth century, including one that still stands today (although abandoned) called the Gwynn Junction Tower at Gwynns Falls Park. The B&P Junction Tower built near Pennsylvania Station closed in 1987 and appears to no longer exist. Plans were announced in 1928 to electrify the PW&B Railroad and commence with an improvement project that included the elimination of grade crossings, widening the main line to three and four tracks, and new B&P and Union tunnels. The evaluated line was electrified by 1935. Thanks to financial assistance from the Public Works Administration, PW&B eliminated the grade crossings, widened the main line, and built the new Union Tunnel. A new B&P Tunnel, however, proved to be too expensive.

The PRR absorbed the New York Central Railroad, creating the Penn Central Transportation Company in 1968, and continued to own and operate the evaluated alignment. Although Penn Central declared bankruptcy two years later, it continued to operate the PB&W Railroad until Amtrak bought most of the railroad assets, including the evaluated alignment, in 1976. Today the alignment is an active part of Amtrak's Northeast Corridor. The MARC commuter trains, serving the Baltimore-Washington metropolitan area, have utilized the alignment since 1983; the West Baltimore MARC Station is located at 400 N. Smallwood Street. Norfolk Southern freight trains also have trackage rights to the alignment.

Significance Evaluation

The B&P Railroad/PB&W Railroad alignment, between the Baltimore City and County line to the west and Penn Station to the east, was evaluated for significance under National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Criteria A, B, and C, using the guidelines set forth in the National Register Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation." The property was not evaluated for eligibility under Criterion D as part of this assessment.

The evaluated segment is a critical component of the B&P Railroad (later the PB&W Railroad) alignment that established a reliable connection between Baltimore and Washington, D.C., and ultimately to Philadelphia and New York, for the Pennsylvania Railroad. The segment was built during an era when the railroad became critical for both passenger and freight service, contributing to the continued growth and prominence of industrial cities like Baltimore. This link also connected to rural southern Maryland where people could now have better access to efficient transportation, and their agricultural products could be easily transported to major commercial markets like Washington, D.C, Baltimore and beyond. The railroad alignment has seen some modifications, most notably bridge replacements and catenary line additions during the first decades of the twentieth century; however, these changes do not diminish the railroad alignment's association with this historic context, and instead enhances it, because the importance of this railroad alignment to the social, economic, commercial, industrial and agricultural development of Baltimore and southern Maryland continued well into the twentieth century. Therefore, the B&P Railroad/PB&W Railroad is eligible under Criterion A.

Research has not shown that the alignment is associated with the lives of individuals significant in the past. Therefore, this segment of the B&P Railroad/PB&W Railroad is not eligible under Criterion B.

MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST REVIEW

Eligibility recommended _____

Eligibility not recommended _____

Criteria: ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D Considerations: ☐ A ☐ B ☐ C ☐ D ☐ E ☐ F ☐ G

MHT Comments:

Reviewer, Office of Preservation Services



Date

Reviewer, National Register Program

Date

**Baltimore & Potomac Railroad/Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad
(B-5164)**

Baltimore, Maryland



Site Plan

0 1,500 3,000 6,000
Feet

May 2012

Appendix C: List of Project Technical Reports and Documents

Technical Reports and Supporting Documents

Technical Reports and Supporting Documents are available on the project website: www.bptunnel.com

DEIS Air Quality Technical Report

Prepared by KB Environmental Sciences, Inc August 2015

Alternatives Report

Prepared by RK&K October 2015

Hazardous Materials Assessment

Prepared by RK&K August 2015

Natural Resources Technical Report

Prepared by RK&K August 2015

Noise Technical Report

Prepared by: KB Environmental Sciences, Inc. June 2015

Phase IA Archeological Study

Prepared by RK&K October 2015

Preliminary Alternatives Screening Report

Prepared by RK&K December 2014

Project Scoping Report

Prepared by RK&K October 2015

Vibration Technical Report

Prepared by AECOM August 2015

Historical Resources Survey Report

Prepared by RK&K August 2015

Noise and Air Quality Technical Memorandum for Ventilation Plants

Prepared by KB Environmental Sciences, Inc October 2015

Appendix D: Table of Minority Race and/or Ethnicity and Low Income Populations and Potential Environmental Justice Block Groups

Table 1: Minority Race and/or Ethnicity and Low Income Populations and Potential Environmental Justice Block Groups

Geography/ Block Groups	Total Population	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	Asian Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino	Total Minority	Minority (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Minority)	Total Households	Total Low- Income Households	Low-income Household (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Low-Income)
Maryland	5,834,299	3,406,243	1,717,582	332,620	17,535	2,570	195,644	162,105	493,310	2,921,366	50.10	n/a	2,146,240	558,329	9.80	n/a
Baltimore City	621,445	174,590	389,758	14,822	1,563	178	1,362	12,400	26,772	446,855	71.90	n/a	241,455	142,162	23.80	n/a
Study Area Block Groups	65,762	8,400	53,407	1,515	82	34	163	1,317	844	57,362	87.20	n/a	26,358	241	68.50	n/a
1001 002	541	23	485	0	0	0	0	32	1	518	95.70	Yes	352	200	14.60	Yes
1101 001	2612	1658	661	165	0	0	0	43	85	954	36.50	No	1370	438	32.10	No
1102 001	1892	998	400	259	0	15	0	49	171	894	47.30	No	1366	62	34.10	Yes
1204 001	600	46	524	0	0	0	0	15	15	554	92.30	Yes	182	136	42.00	Yes
1205 001	861	144	576	0	0	11	26	48	56	717	83.30	Yes	324	171	29.10	Yes
1205 002	1212	395	724	47	0	0	0	31	15	817	67.40	Yes	588	468	72.70	No
1206 003	733	147	479	98	9	0	0	0	0	586	79.90	Yes	644	67	19.10	Yes
1207 003	978	518	346	45	0	0	0	53	16	460	47.00	No	350	17	6.90	No
1301 001	584	87	489	0	0	0	0	0	8	497	85.10	Yes	246	227	56.60	No
1301 002	638	41	450	9	0	0	0	138	0	597	93.60	Yes	401	113	22.00	Yes
1301 003	1087	47	1026	2	0	0	0	10	2	1040	95.70	Yes	514	60	18.30	No
1301 004	579	25	544	0	0	0	0	10	0	554	95.70	Yes	328	89	24.80	No
1302 001	846	161	572	20	0	0	0	22	71	685	81.00	Yes	359	188	42.00	No
1302 002	1516	153	1250	0	23	0	0	90	0	1363	89.90	Yes	448	72	24.80	Yes
1302 003	699	81	572	23	0	0	23	0	0	618	88.40	Yes	290	10	6.20	No
1302 004	454	38	401	0	0	0	0	15	0	416	91.60	Yes	162	74	23.50	No
1303 001	613	55	549	0	9	0	0	0	0	558	91.00	Yes	315	45	22.00	No
1303 002	515	0	503	0	0	0	0	0	12	515	100.00	Yes	205	147	47.90	No
1303 003	674	0	657	0	0	0	0	7	10	674	100.00	Yes	307	62	22.50	Yes
1304 001	903	22	879	0	0	0	0	0	2	881	97.60	Yes	276	68	25.50	No
1304 002	884	0	869	0	0	0	0	15	0	884	100.00	Yes	267	80	31.10	No
1304 003	457	12	445	0	0	0	0	0	0	445	97.40	Yes	257	127	25.10	No
1401 001	1146	500	188	393	0	0	0	57	8	646	56.40	Yes	505	71	16.00	No
1401 002	1226	807	160	146	0	0	0	43	70	419	34.20	No	443	214	39.90	No
1401 003	1063	274	728	39	0	0	0	22	0	789	74.20	Yes	536	112	12.40	Yes
1401 004	1571	777	547	158	0	0	0	89	0	794	50.50	Yes	900	192	70.80	No
1402 001	646	70	543	0	0	0	0	0	33	576	89.20	Yes	271	86	36.00	Yes
1402 002	566	17	549	0	0	0	0	0	0	549	97.00	Yes	239	75	70.80	Yes



Geography/ Block Groups	Total Population	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	Asian Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino	Total Minority	Minority (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Minority)	Total Households	Total Low- Income Households	Low-income Household (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Low-Income)
1402 003	433	9	424	0	0	0	0	0	0	424	97.90	Yes	106	216	63.20	Yes
1402 004	1147	0	1147	0	0	0	0	0	0	1147	100.00	Yes	342	142	68.60	Yes
1403 001	355	10	345	0	0	0	0	0	0	345	97.20	Yes	207	29	14.50	Yes
1403 002	561	0	561	0	0	0	0	0	0	561	100.00	Yes	200	93	36.90	No
1403 003	646	74	538	10	0	0	0	0	24	572	88.50	Yes	252	123	43.30	Yes
1403 004	807	0	732	48	0	0	0	27	0	807	100.00	Yes	284	68	28.50	Yes
1501 001	778	0	778	0	0	0	0	0	0	778	100.00	Yes	239	203	51.70	No
1501 002	1072	0	1072	0	0	0	0	0	0	1072	100.00	Yes	393	191	37.30	Yes
1501 003	1694	5	1672	0	0	0	0	17	0	1689	99.70	Yes	512	83	22.20	Yes
1502 001	1352	0	1352	0	0	0	0	0	0	1352	100.00	Yes	374	64	33.90	No
1502 002	719	0	700	0	0	0	0	19	0	719	100.00	Yes	189	65	23.30	Yes
1502 003	689	0	681	0	0	0	0	8	0	689	100.00	Yes	279	41	15.00	No
1503 001	828	0	828	0	0	0	0	0	0	828	100.00	Yes	273	57	17.90	No
1503 002	923	0	923	0	0	0	0	0	0	923	100.00	Yes	319	90	50.30	No
1503 003	610	0	483	0	0	0	0	127	0	610	100.00	Yes	179	53	19.40	Yes
1504 001	685	0	671	0	0	0	0	14	0	685	100.00	Yes	273	101	30.20	No
1504 002	1086	0	1077	0	0	0	0	0	9	1086	100.00	Yes	334	43	24.60	No
1601 001	468	0	406	0	0	0	0	0	62	468	100.00	Yes	175	70	31.70	No
1601 002	613	5	585	7	0	0	0	16	0	608	99.20	Yes	221	227	53.40	Yes
1601 003	757	1	661	0	20	0	67	7	1	756	99.90	Yes	425	75	28.50	Yes
1601 004	584	0	584	0	0	0	0	0	0	584	100.00	Yes	263	22	7.60	No
1602 001	770	0	770	0	0	0	0	0	0	770	100.00	Yes	290	123	42.40	No
1602 002	635	7	609	19	0	0	0	0	0	628	98.90	Yes	290	146	39.90	Yes
1602 003	1204	0	1204	0	0	0	0	0	0	1204	100.00	Yes	366	23	10.40	Yes
1603 001	950	31	904	3	4	8	0	0	0	919	96.70	Yes	221	99	35.90	No
1603 002	704	28	676	0	0	0	0	0	0	676	96.00	Yes	276	34	21.80	Yes
1604 001	496	0	496	0	0	0	0	0	0	496	100.00	Yes	156	117	36.70	No
1604 002	1490	2	1470	0	0	0	18	0	0	1488	99.90	Yes	319	40	25.30	Yes
1604 003	539	0	539	0	0	0	0	0	0	539	100.00	Yes	158	86	43.70	No
1604 004	692	0	692	0	0	0	0	0	0	692	100.00	Yes	197	74	20.10	Yes
1605 001	759	0	759	0	0	0	0	0	0	759	100.00	Yes	369	24	17.10	No
1605 002	336	0	336	0	0	0	0	0	0	336	100.00	Yes	140	146	54.50	No
1605 003	931	0	931	0	0	0	0	0	0	931	100.00	Yes	268	45	16.30	Yes
1605 004	730	0	606	0	0	0	0	0	124	730	100.00	Yes	276	56	16.70	No
1605 005	949	0	949	0	0	0	0	0	0	949	100.00	Yes	335	634	74.90	No



Geography/ Block Groups	Total Population	White Alone	Black or African American Alone	Asian Alone	American Indian and Alaska Native Alone	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	Hispanic or Latino	Total Minority	Minority (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Minority)	Total Households	Total Low- Income Households	Low-income Household (Percent)	Potential EJ Area (based on Low-Income)
1702 001	1842	5	1772	0	0	0	0	56	9	1837	99.70	Yes	847	145	37.10	Yes
1702 002	1214	53	1116	11	0	0	0	9	25	1161	95.60	Yes	391	112	40.40	Yes
1702 003	430	27	364	0	0	0	29	10	0	403	93.70	Yes	277	139	39.70	Yes
1703 001	793	0	785	0	0	0	0	8	0	793	100.00	Yes	350	114	26.60	Yes
1703 002	1215	13	1172	0	0	0	0	30	0	1202	98.90	Yes	429	82	30.90	No
2001 001	811	13	798	0	0	0	0	0	0	798	98.40	Yes	265	39	16.40	No
2001 002	656	14	602	0	10	0	0	23	7	642	97.90	Yes	238	56	32.60	No
2002 001	462	42	395	0	0	0	0	25	0	420	90.90	Yes	172	16	14.20	Yes
2002 002	249	0	249	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	100.00	Yes	113	80	47.30	No
2002 003	441	0	441	0	0	0	0	0	0	441	100.00	Yes	169	40	30.30	Yes
2002 004	249	0	249	0	0	0	0	0	0	249	100.00	Yes	132	55	23.10	No
2002 005	727	7	702	0	0	0	0	18	0	720	99.00	Yes	238	183	39.70	No
2004 002	1317	67	1225	0	7	0	0	10	8	1250	94.90	Yes	461	136	41.10	Yes
2006 001	1268	891	260	13	0	0	0	104	0	377	29.70	Yes	331	241	68.50	Yes

Source: 2013 American Community Survey- 5-Year Estimate, 2009-2013

Notes:

Race Alone categories do not include Hispanic or Latino population.

Hispanic or Latino persons may identify as any race.

Two or more races does not include persons who identify as Hispanic or Latino.

Total Minority persons includes all persons who identify as non-White, non-Hispanic or Latino, plus all persons who identify as Hispanic or Latino, regardless of race.

Appendix E:
Socioeconomic Tables

Table 1: Population Summary

Geographical Area	Population		Geographical Area	Population	
Census Tract-Block Group	Total	Percentage within Study Area	Census Tract-Block Group	Total	Percentage within Study Area
1001-2	541	0.8%	1502-3	689	1.1%
1101-1	2,612	4.0%	1503-1	828	1.3%
1102-1	1,892	2.9%	1503-2	923	1.4%
1204-1	600	0.9%	1503-3	610	0.9%
1205-1	861	1.3%	1504-1	685	1.1%
1205-2	1,212	1.9%	1504-2	1,086	1.7%
1206-3	733	1.1%	1601-1	468	0.7%
1207-3	978	1.5%	1601-2	613	0.9%
1301-1	584	0.9%	1601-3	757	1.2%
1301-2	638	1.0%	1601-4	584	0.9%
1301-3	1,087	1.7%	1602-1	770	1.2%
1301-4	579	0.9%	1602-2	635	1.0%
1302-1	846	1.3%	1602-3	1,204	1.9%
1302-2	1,516	2.3%	1603-1	950	1.5%
1302-3	699	1.1%	1603-2	704	1.1%
1302-4	454	0.7%	1604-1	496	0.8%
1303-1	613	0.9%	1604-2	1,490	2.3%
1303-2	515	0.8%	1604-3	539	0.8%
1303-3	674	1.0%	1604-4	692	1.1%
1304-1	903	1.4%	1605-1	759	1.2%
1304-2	884	1.4%	1605-2	336	0.5%
1304-3	457	0.7%	1605-3	931	1.4%
1401-1	1,146	1.8%	1605-4	730	1.1%
1401-2	1,226	1.9%	1605-5	945	1.5%
1401-3	1,063	1.6%	1702-1	1,842	2.8%
1401-4	1,571	2.4%	1702-2	1,214	1.9%
1402-1	646	1.0%	1702-3	430	0.7%
1402-2	566	0.9%	1703-1	793	1.2%
1402-3	433	0.7%	1703-2	1,215	1.9%

Geographical Area	Population		Geographical Area	Population	
1402-4	1,147	1.8%	2001-1	811	1.3%
1403-1	355	0.5%	2001-2	656	1.0%
1403-2	561	0.9%	2002-1	462	0.7%
1403-3	646	1.0%	2002-2	249	0.4%
1403-4	807	1.2%	2002-3	441	0.7%
1501-1	778	1.2%	2002-4	249	0.4%
1501-2	1,072	1.7%	2002-5	727	1.1%
1501-3	1,694	2.6%	2004-2	1,317	2.0%
1502-1	778	1.2%	2006-1	1,268	2.0%
1502-2	719	1.1%			
STUDY AREA				80,045	100
Maryland				5,834,299	N/A
Baltimore City				621,445	N/A

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey

Table 2: Racial Composition by Block Group

Census Tract-Block Group	White Alone (%)	African American or Black Alone (%)	Asian Alone (%)	Other Alone (%)	Two or More Races (%)	Hispanic (%)
1001-2	4.3	89.6	0.0	0.2	5.9	0.2
1101-1	65.4	26.4	6.3	0.0	1.9	3.3
1102-1	54.9	21.1	13.7	0.8	4.0	9.0
1204-1	7.7	89.8	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5
1205-1	20.2	67.2	0.0	1.3	5.6	6.5
1205-2	33.8	59.7	3.9	0.0	2.6	1.2
1206-3	20.1	65.3	13.4	1.2	0.0	0.0
1207-3	54.6	35.4	4.6	0.0	5.4	1.6
1301-1	14.9	83.7	0.0	0.0	1.4	1.4
1301-2	6.4	70.5	1.4	0.0	21.6	0.0
1301-3	4.3	94.5	0.2	0.0	1.0	0.2
1301-4	4.3	94.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
1302-1	19	67.6	2.4	0.0	2.6	8.4
1302-2	10.1	82.5	0.0	1.5	5.9	0.0
1302-3	11.6	81.8	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
1302-4	8.4	88.3	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0
1303-1	9	89.6	0.0	1.5	0.0	0.0
1303-2	2.3	97.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3
1303-3	0	99.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.5
1304-1	2.7	97.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
1304-2	0	98.3	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0
1304-3	2.6	97.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1401-1	43.6	17.1	34.3	0.0	5.0	0.7
1401-2	69.6	13.6	11.9	0.0	4.9	5.7

Census Tract-Block Group	White Alone (%)	African American or Black Alone (%)	Asian Alone (%)	Other Alone (%)	Two or More Races (%)	Hispanic (%)
1401-3	25.8	68.5	3.7	0.0	2.1	0.0
1401-4	49.5	34.8	10.1	0.0	5.7	0.0
1402-1	15.9	84.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.1
1402-2	3	97.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1402-3	2.1	97.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1402-4	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1403-1	2.8	97.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1403-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1403-3	15.2	83.3	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.7
1403-4	0	90.7	5.9	0.0	3.3	0.0
1501-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1501-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1501-3	0.3	98.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
1502-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1502-2	0	97.4	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0
1502-3	0	98.8	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0
1503-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1503-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1503-3	0	79.2	0.0	0.0	20.8	0.0
1504-1	0	98.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
1504-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8
1601-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	13.2
1601-2	0.8	95.4	1.1	0.0	2.6	0.0
1601-3	0.1	87.3	0.0	2.6	0.9	0.1
1601-4	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Census Tract-Block Group	White Alone (%)	African American or Black Alone (%)	Asian Alone (%)	Other Alone (%)	Two or More Races (%)	Hispanic (%)
1602-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1602-2	1.1	95.9	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1602-3	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1603-1	3.3	95.2	0.3	1.3	0.0	0.0
1603-2	4	96.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1604-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1604-2	0.1	98.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1604-3	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1604-4	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1605-1	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1605-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1605-3	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1605-4	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	17.0
1605-5	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1702-1	0.3	96.7	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.5
1702-2	4.4	94.0	0.9	0.0	0.7	2.1
1702-3	6.3	84.7	0.0	0.0	2.3	0.0
1703-1	0	99.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
1703-2	1.1	96.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
2001-1	1.6	98.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2001-2	3.2	91.8	0.0	1.5	3.5	1.1
2002-1	9.1	85.5	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0
2002-2	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2002-3	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2002-4	0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Census Tract- Block Group	White Alone (%)	African American or Black Alone (%)	Asian Alone (%)	Other Alone (%)	Two or More Races (%)	Hispanic (%)
2002-5	1	96.6	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.0
2004-2	5.1	93.0	0.0	0.5	1.4	0.6
2006-1	70.3	20.5	1.0	0.0	8.2	0.0

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey

Table 3: Limited English Speaking Status

Geography/ Block Groups	Households	Limited English Speaking Households	Percentage of Limited English Speaking Households
Maryland	2,146,240	66,425	3.09%
Baltimore City	241,455	5,274	2.18%
Study Area Block Groups	26,358	422	1.60%
1001-2	352	0	0.00%
1101-1	1,370	12	0.88%
1102-1	1,366	105	7.69%
1204-1	182	11	6.04%
1205-1	324	0	0.00%
1205-2	588	16	2.72%
1206-3	644	98	15.22%
1207-3	350	0	0.00%
1301-1	246	0	0.00%
1301-2	401	0	0.00%
1301-3	514	0	0.00%
1301-4	328	0	0.00%
1302-1	359	23	6.41%
1302-2	448	0	0.00%
1302-3	290	0	0.00%
1302-4	162	0	0.00%
1303-1	315	0	0.00%
1303-2	205	0	0.00%
1303-3	307	0	0.00%
1304-1	276	0	0.00%
1304-2	267	0	0.00%
1304-3	257	0	0.00%
1401-1	505	19	3.76%
1401-2	443	64	14.45%
1401-3	536	0	0.00%
1401-4	900	0	0.00%
1402-1	271	0	0.00%
1402-2	239	0	0.00%
1402-3	106	0	0.00%
1402-4	342	0	0.00%
1403-1	207	0	0.00%
1403-2	200	0	0.00%
1403-3	252	24	9.52%
1403-4	284	12	4.23%

Geography/ Block Groups	Households	Limited English Speaking Households	Percentage of Limited English Speaking Households
1501-1	239	0	0.00%
1501-2	393	0	0.00%
1501-3	512	0	0.00%
1502-1	374	0	0.00%
1502-2	189	0	0.00%
1502-3	279	0	0.00%
1503-1	273	0	0.00%
1503-2	319	0	0.00%
1503-3	179	0	0.00%
1504-1	273	0	0.00%
1504-2	334	0	0.00%
1601-1	175	0	0.00%
1601-2	221	0	0.00%
1601-3	425	0	0.00%
1601-4	263	0	0.00%
1602-1	290	0	0.00%
1602-2	290	9	3.10%
1602-3	366	19	5.19%
1603-1	221	0	0.00%
1603-2	276	0	0.00%
1604-1	156	0	0.00%
1604-2	319	0	0.00%
1604-3	158	0	0.00%
1604-4	197	0	0.00%
1605-1	369	0	0.00%
1605-2	140	0	0.00%
1605-3	268	0	0.00%
1605-4	276	0	0.00%
1605-5	335	0	0.00%
1702-1	847	0	0.00%
1702-2	391	0	0.00%
1702-3	277	0	0.00%
1703-1	350	4	1.14%
1703-2	429	6	1.40%
2001-1	265	0	0.00%
2001-2	238	0	0.00%
2002-1	172	0	0.00%
2002-2	113	0	0.00%
2002-3	169	0	0.00%

Geography/ Block Groups	Households	Limited English Speaking Households	Percentage of Limited English Speaking Households
2002-4	132	0	0.00%
2002-5	238	0	0.00%
2004-2	461	0	0.00%
2006-1	331	0	0.00%

Source: 2013 American Community Survey- 5-Year Estimate, 2009-2013

Note: A "limited English speaking household" is one in which no member 14 years old and over (1) speaks only English or (2) speaks a non-English language and speaks English "very well." In other words, all members 14 years old and over have at least some difficulty with English. By definition, English-only households cannot belong to this group. Previous Census Bureau data products have referred to these households as "linguistically isolated".

Table 4: Commuting Characteristics

Geography/ Block Groups	Commute Time					Commute Mode			
	Less than 15 minutes	15 to 24 minutes	25 to 34 minutes	35 to 44 minutes	45 minutes or more	Car, truck, or van	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	Walked	Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other
Maryland	495,886 (18%)	711,985 (26%)	585,386 (21%)	245,374 (9%)	732,496 (26%)	2,413,682 (87%)	256,052 (9%)	68,435 (2%)	32,958 (1%)
Baltimore City	43,680 (17%)	82,250 (32%)	61,860 (24%)	16,430 (6%)	51,570 (20%)	185,598 (73%)	46,934 (18%)	17,377 (7%)	5,881 (2%)
Study Area Block Groups	4,009 (18%)	6,506 (30%)	4,644 (21%)	1,243 (6%)	5,542 (25%)	12,952 (59%)	6,780 (31%)	1,664 (8%)	548 (2%)
1001-2	55	25	10	19	12	57	64	0	0
1101-1	502	697	234	64	314	829	377	502	103
1102-1	270	447	181	73	216	749	176	141	121
1204-1	31	109	76	24	49	148	85	40	16
1205-1	71	130	71	3	41	184	78	43	11
1205-2	102	142	124	12	139	311	163	26	19
1206-3	57	22	30	0	56	121	23	10	11
1207-3	36	71	115	5	50	148	81	14	34
1301-1	29	50	105	0	34	129	32	57	0
1301-2	0	127	9	11	26	139	34	0	0
1301-3	13	50	108	27	88	189	91	5	1
1301-4	31	50	43	19	88	168	63	0	0
1302-1	121	168	13	12	27	258	44	0	39
1302-2	42	154	64	0	54	192	90	12	20
1302-3	77	123	123	24	29	345	19	12	0
1302-4	30	98	16	0	24	129	39	0	0
1303-1	120	78	47	0	68	248	51	10	4

Geography/ Block Groups	Commute Time					Commute Mode			
	Less than 15 minutes	15 to 24 minutes	25 to 34 minutes	35 to 44 minutes	45 minutes or more	Car, truck, or van	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	Walked	Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other
1303-2	47	20	21	25	4	52	56	9	0
1303-3	42	24	50	17	97	90	140	0	0
1304-1	38	31	74	25	45	155	58	0	0
1304-2	10	105	110	22	31	146	120	12	0
1304-3	16	5	16	0	35	28	19	20	5
1401-1	279	73	125	0	57	276	117	101	40
1401-2	92	251	74	20	76	369	99	45	0
1401-3	113	81	30	57	77	314	44	0	0
1401-4	154	274	109	0	96	396	99	138	0
1402-1	32	0	77	0	61	94	76	0	0
1402-2	25	85	54	0	18	73	53	56	0
1402-3	22	0	8	0	33	30	33	0	0
1402-4	0	85	0	0	24	12	76	21	0
1403-1	9	11	20	0	47	46	35	6	0
1403-2	34	59	35	0	0	128	0	0	0
1403-3	83	34	93	0	30	146	73	11	10
1403-4	40	26	51	0	69	82	64	40	0
1501-1	54	71	59	0	193	203	150	0	24
1501-2	24	23	115	13	72	196	51	0	0
1501-3	65	96	66	0	171	147	251	0	0
1502-1	45	86	167	0	107	220	166	0	19
1502-2	28	30	82	24	66	52	160	18	0
1502-3	74	34	19	13	87	151	76	0	0
1503-1	0	26	60	36	161	193	90	0	0
1503-2	28	118	92	14	120	254	118	0	0
1503-3	0	58	43	44	54	117	82	0	0

Geography/ Block Groups	Commute Time					Commute Mode			
	Less than 15 minutes	15 to 24 minutes	25 to 34 minutes	35 to 44 minutes	45 minutes or more	Car, truck, or van	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	Walked	Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other
1504-1	39	59	19	32	40	180	9	0	0
1504-2	11	49	64	41	54	179	40	0	0
1601-1	15	0	44	0	41	36	64	0	0
1601-2	5	117	0	7	81	83	127	0	0
1601-3	10	24	36	36	80	74	112	0	0
1601-4	101	50	15	0	69	127	102	6	0
1602-1	60	119	140	11	110	299	115	26	0
1602-2	9	68	61	29	69	168	54	14	0
1602-3	40	64	136	35	132	184	212	11	0
1603-1	72	30	15	35	71	192	31	0	0
1603-2	0	60	17	25	81	78	96	9	0
1604-1	11	43	70	53	80	83	130	44	0
1604-2	47	80	42	40	133	228	114	0	0
1604-3	0	90	18	22	60	102	88	0	0
1604-4	29	11	98	31	38	92	91	0	24
1605-1	21	134	48	0	79	240	42	0	0
1605-2	11	62	30	22	26	139	12	0	0
1605-3	0	11	16	58	78	87	76	0	0
1605-4	14	43	45	14	71	95	92	0	0
1605-5	31	46	94	28	132	256	75	0	0
1702-1	16	57	11	12	34	78	39	13	0
1702-2	12	71	43	0	154	99	170	11	0
1702-3	45	71	46	0	32	116	78	0	0
1703-1	45	40	57	0	88	132	98	0	0
1703-2	29	224	95	0	75	282	88	43	10
2001-1	34	67	17	46	115	135	138	6	0

Geography/ Block Groups	Commute Time					Commute Mode			
	Less than 15 minutes	15 to 24 minutes	25 to 34 minutes	35 to 44 minutes	45 minutes or more	Car, truck, or van	Public transportation (excluding taxicab)	Walked	Taxicab, motorcycle, bicycle, or other
2001-2	10	65	24	21	82	95	92	15	0
2002-1	41	88	56	5	8	141	32	25	0
2002-2	12	21	30	0	5	34	34	0	0
2002-3	44	88	54	0	11	39	114	44	0
2002-4	9	0	66	0	0	62	13	0	0
2002-5	21	64	56	0	162	143	160	0	0
2004-2	48	191	26	20	105	255	124	0	11
2006-1	176	52	36	17	0	105	102	48	26

Source: 2013 American Community Survey- 5-Year Estimate, 2009-2013

Table 5: 2013 Labor Force Characteristics and Median Household Income

Geo-graphical Area	Population		Average Median Household Income (US Dollars) ¹	Geo-graphical Area	Population		Average Median Household Income (US Dollars) ¹
Census Tract-Block Group	Residents in Labor Force	Un-employed Residents in Labor Force (%)		Census Tract-Block Group	Residents in Labor Force	Un-employed Residents in Labor Force (%)	
1001-2	164	12.2	9,755	1502-3	368	21.2	25,893
1101-1	1,778	7.3	47,500	1503-1	224	9.4	38,875
1102-1	1,348	10.8	39,516	1503-2	401	7.2	32,361
1204-1	374	9.9	43,500	1503-3	341	22.9	19,256
1205-1	373	23.1	30,323	1504-1	232	22.4	27,431
1205-2	853	15.0	31,012	1504-2	413	36.1	33,000
1206-3	254	29.9	9,136	1601-1	152	46.1	27,552
1207-3	344	22.4	37,813	1601-2	288	9.0	35,063
1301-1	374	12.8	37,500	1601-3	252	17.9	11,875
1301-2	161	8.1	11,127	1601-4	355	18.6	17,917
1301-3	335	38.2	30,887	1602-1	448	10.7	53,846
1301-4	284	3.2	26,250	1602-2	399	28.3	21,750
1302-1	468	4.9	53,583	1602-3	537	24.2	30,385
1302-2	280	19.6	26,014	1603-1	203	18.2	29,073
1302-3	397	14.4	55,208	1603-2	301	20.9	21,912
1302-4	320	26.9	57,813	1604-1	415	10.8	33,654
1303-1	452	3.3	47,950	1604-2	454	27.3	25,990
1303-2	266	4.1	21,904	1604-3	149	24.2	43,235
1303-3	344	29.7	18,438	1604-4	272	37.5	21,292
1304-1	326	31.3	43,553	1605-1	205	19.5	24,147
1304-2	356	39.3	35,446	1605-2	197	12.2	49,423
1304-3	143	42.7	27,917	1605-3	368	16.3	17,031
1401-1	816	10.7	78,365	1605-4	293	24.6	27,128
1401-2	610	4.1	33,583	1605-5	409	24.4	34,375
1401-3	409	4.4	15,991	1702-1	317	49.8	8,643
1401-4	655	0.0	43,553	1702-2	506	34.0	23,347
1402-1	326	39.3	12,446	1702-3	187	0.0	14,271

Geo-graphical Area	Population		Average Median Household Income (US Dollars) ¹	Geo-graphical Area	Population		Average Median Household Income (US Dollars) ¹
Census Tract-Block Group	Residents in Labor Force	Un-employed Residents in Labor Force (%)		Census Tract-Block Group	Residents in Labor Force	Un-employed Residents in Labor Force (%)	
1402-2	189	7.4	20,505	1703-1	361	34.1	21,196
1402-3	139	20.1	11,667	1703-2	573	32.3	38,542
1402-4	141	19.9	14,333	2001-1	521	26.1	30,710
1403-1	318	11.3	9,177	2001-2	450	13.1	32,500
1403-2	216	51.4	35,893	2002-1	196	18.4	44,643
1403-3	218	4.1	24,485	2002-2	50	20.0	22,250
1403-4	187	34.2	20,000	2002-3	193	15.0	25,074
1501-1	302	9.3	29,398	2002-4	129	19.4	17,031
1501-2	346	23.4	19,583	2002-5	407	12.5	25,948
1501-3	578	31.8	19,764	2004-2	623	29.1	33,322
1502-1	515	33.6	29,296	2006-1	540	28.1	34,519
1502-2	321	36.8	37,824				
STUDY AREA					36,055	20.3	\$29,474
Maryland					3,214,633	8.2	\$73,538
Baltimore City					312,986	13.9	\$41,385

Source: US Census Bureau 2013. American Community Survey 2009-2013. Accessed March 2015 at

http://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_13_5YR_B19013&prodType=table

¹ in 2013 inflation adjusted dollars.

Table 6: Summary of Resident Occupations

Geographic Area/Census Tract-Block Group	Management, Business, Science, and Arts (%)	Service (%)	Sales and Office (%)	Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance (%)	Production, Transportation, and Material-Moving (%)
Maryland	44.2	16.9	23.2	7.9	7.7
Baltimore City	38.4	21.6	23.5	6.1	10.5
Study Area Total Block Groups	33.2	25.1	25.2	4.4	12.0
1001-2	21.5	33.1	8.3	0.0	37.2
1101-1	42.5	24.4	29.1	0.0	4.0
1102-1	79.5	10.0	6.6	1.2	2.8
1204-1	53.3	18.6	22.7	0.0	5.5
1205-1	43.1	28.1	6.4	12.8	9.5
1205-2	23.1	38.7	23.3	10.4	4.5
1206-3	18.2	40.6	6.7	20.6	13.9
1207-3	33.9	29.6	14.4	13.0	9.0
1301-1	38.1	26.1	11.0	0.0	24.8
1301-2	54.9	5.2	16.2	0.0	23.7
1301-3	41.2	30.9	21.2	0.0	6.8
1301-4	32.6	29.5	25.7	0.0	12.3
1302-1	44.8	22.2	25.2	0.0	7.8
1302-2	45.2	31.8	11.1	0.0	11.8
1302-3	22.1	26.6	27.1	0.0	24.2
1302-4	51.5	22.0	17.5	9.0	0.0
1303-1	46.8	35.6	17.4	0.0	0.3
1303-2	27.8	38.9	16.7	7.1	9.5
1303-3	11.7	49.1	38.3	0.0	0.9
1304-1	40.8	9.2	17.0	7.3	25.7
1304-2	25.5	18.3	39.9	4.3	11.9
1304-3	44.1	20.6	35.3	0.0	0.0
1401-1	59.2	8.8	30.3	1.6	0.0
1401-2	66.1	4.7	18.3	0.0	10.9
1401-3	67.5	15.7	5.6	0.0	11.2

Geographic Area/Census Tract-Block Group	Management, Business, Science, and Arts (%)	Service (%)	Sales and Office (%)	Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance (%)	Production, Transportation, and Material-Moving (%)
1401-4	82.2	5.3	10.0	0.0	2.5
1402-1	25.3	23.5	38.2	2.9	10.0
1402-2	40.1	24.2	19.2	0.0	16.5
1402-3	33.7	48.4	9.5	0.0	8.4
1402-4	19.3	33.0	0.0	24.8	22.9
1403-1	16.1	28.7	55.2	0.0	0.0
1403-2	11.7	28.3	16.6	26.2	17.2
1403-3	37.5	25.9	11.2	4.4	21.1
1403-4	38.9	11.1	15.2	0.0	34.8
1501-1	4.2	29.4	48.3	3.4	14.6
1501-2	9.5	38.0	26.2	20.8	5.4
1501-3	7.9	53.7	33.0	0.0	5.3
1502-1	17.8	45.3	16.6	5.1	15.2
1502-2	18.3	43.9	8.3	14.3	15.2
1502-3	15.7	28.8	29.2	11.0	15.3
1503-1	18.1	17.1	32.1	0.0	32.8
1503-2	25.9	26.4	30.2	0.0	17.5
1503-3	11.1	26.1	32.7	8.0	22.1
1504-1	15.3	4.8	46.0	28.6	5.3
1504-2	23.7	23.7	36.1	0.0	16.4
1601-1	50.8	49.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
1601-2	24.5	43.2	17.8	0.0	14.5
1601-3	37.4	49.2	8.0	0.5	4.8
1601-4	37.1	41.1	21.8	0.0	0.0
1602-1	19.8	25.2	29.4	4.0	21.6
1602-2	29.2	22.5	33.5	6.8	8.1
1602-3	4.9	39.6	33.4	8.6	13.5
1603-1	9.9	10.8	58.7	17.9	2.7
1603-2	20.8	41.2	13.0	15.3	9.7
1604-1	3.8	34.5	23.8	5.4	32.6
1604-2	8.5	39.2	28.1	3.5	20.8

Geographic Area/Census Tract-Block Group	Management, Business, Science, and Arts (%)	Service (%)	Sales and Office (%)	Natural Resources, Construction, and Maintenance (%)	Production, Transportation, and Material-Moving (%)
1604-3	2.5	38.2	24.6	19.6	15.1
1604-4	16.9	50.2	18.8	0.0	14.0
1605-1	4.6	39.0	28.0	10.6	17.7
1605-2	8.4	6.7	67.4	5.1	12.4
1605-3	27.3	16.2	29.8	7.6	19.2
1605-4	16.4	18.2	48.2	0.0	17.3
1605-5	23.9	20.2	45.9	5.4	4.5
1702-1	3.8	46.9	46.9	0.0	2.3
1702-2	5.0	24.6	31.5	0.0	38.8
1702-3	44.8	8.8	36.1	0.0	10.3
1703-1	33.9	7.8	41.7	2.6	13.9
1703-2	46.0	11.9	19.4	5.1	17.5
2001-1	35.8	15.1	40.5	8.6	0.0
2001-2	21.7	21.7	34.3	9.2	13.0
2002-1	22.7	30.8	24.2	11.6	10.6
2002-2	0.0	22.1	33.8	0.0	44.1
2002-3	16.1	24.4	55.6	0.0	3.9
2002-4	13.5	31.3	13.5	14.6	27.1
2002-5	16.2	19.8	28.4	0.0	35.6
2004-2	20.6	18.4	25.2	8.7	26.9
2006-1	12.8	19.9	37.0	17.8	12.5

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey

Appendix F: Public Comments

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

Public Comments

The following table provides the public comments received that were associated with the scope of the B&P Tunnel Project. The comments were collected from the release of the Notice of Availability, in June 2014, to the release of the DEIS and Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation, in December 2015. The comments were submitted via written comment card, online comment form, e-mail to info@bptunnel.com, and e-mail to a Project representative.

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/11/2014	E-mail	To Whom It May Concern: Please build the Great Circle Passenger Tunnel and make upgrades to the B&P tunnel for commuter train or other future uses. This should have been done decades ago, and we can't afford to wait any longer. Thank You.
6/11/2014	E-mail	I would like to see CSX and Amtrak work together to construct a single tunnel that would solve both rail road's Baltimore tunnel problems. The CSX mainline crosses the Amtrak line at Falls Road just west of Penn Station by the northern entrance to your tunnel. There is an existing CSX line along the Gwynns Falls which also intersects with Amtrak's line south of your tunnel. CSX trains could share the new tunnel you are building for Amtrak and Marc trains, and they could also share the cost. Why build two new tunnels when one comprehensive tunnel could fix everything? By constructing a three or four track tunnel (2 tracks for Amtrak and 1 or 2 tracks for freight), Amtrak trains would be able to go fast and CSX would be able to double stack containers. The tunnel could be divided, just like the Fort McHenry tunnel is under the harbor, for safety reasons. Freight traffic could use one tube and passenger traffic could use the other. A consolidated tunnel would surely cut costs for everyone involved.
6/12/2014	E-mail	Ideally there should be contingency plans for emergency and/or cheaper alternatives to tunneling...if structural problems come to light at grade re-routing of tracks around Baltimore or somewhere through the city.
6/12/2014	E-mail	I hope the timeline can be speeded up. 3+ years just for a study seems very slow. Please add me to your emailing list. Thanks.
6/12/2014	E-mail	This is from an engineer wantabe. I am curious just how you will excavate at the north end what with CSX and North Av. right above the tunnel portal? I think the job has been under estimated by at least a billion. You can expect CSX to cooperate so long as you lead the way. If anything goes wrong with their right of way they will point the finger at you.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/13/2014	Online comment form	If possible, either the new tunnel or the old tunnel refurbished after the new one takes most of the traffic, it would be really beneficial to have an interchange at Upton station for the Baltimore Metro and MARC. Amtrak on the other hand would want to bypass that area completely.
6/13/2014	Online comment form	Hello, Do we need to RSVP for the above mentioned Open House on Thursday, June 19th?
6/19/2014	Comment card	I live near the West Baltimore MARC, and there have been rumors that this new tunnel and rail alignment might end up passing our station. Both the city and the state have invested and plan to invest a lot in that station, and my neighborhood is putting a lot of hope in that development for our community. Please ensure that any new route connects with the West Baltimore MARC station (and future Red Line) **also please consider me as a volunteer for promoting your public meetings. People are more than willing to help you door knock (canvas) if you ask them
6/19/2014	Comment card	1. Old tunnel a. Save the bats b. Gate the opening 2. Air vents & escape hatches 3. Recycle tunnel waste 4. Don't go over budget
6/19/2014	Comment card	Project scoping should address potential to provide a double-track, double stack route through Baltimore to help further open up the port to customers to the west.
6/19/2014	Online comment form	I am the Legislative Representative for SMART-TD Local 1470 at Washington, DC. We are the labor union that represents the Conductors and Assistant Conductors of Amtrak, and also MARC Penn Line trains. SMART-TD is the same union that represents the train crews on Norfolk Southern freight trains that use the present tunnel. Today, June 19, 2014 at the hearing I am designated to represent all SMART-TD members both passenger and freight. The present B&P Tunnel which was put in service in 1873 is outdated and unsafe, is an impediment to modern high speed passenger rail service and modern high capacity freight cars which comprise 21st Century American freight trains. The present tunnel is a dangerous place for a conductor or assistant conductor to be "on the ground" to inspect his/her train when the train is stopped in the tunnel and cannot be moved until all cars have been visually inspected. This applies to all SMART-TD members no matter if they are Amtrak/MARC passenger train crew or NS freight crew. The present tunnel could be a nightmare scenario in the event that passengers would have to be taken off passenger cars and walked to one of the emergency exits.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/19/2014	Comment card	Hard to say at this point. I represent the Bolton Hill Community and we are looking to maximize functionality for transportation to Washington while minimizing disruption to the neighborhood. We are an historic district with (mostly) well restored Victorian townhomes.
6/19/2014	Comment card	Consider issues affecting water mains and other DPW utilities that may be impacted due to tunneling-settlement and or leaving during and after construction.
6/19/2014	Comment card	1. I believe there is an old freight line just to the west of the tunnel that leads up to York and Harrisburg. I feel a great long term goal would be to utilize this infrastructure for future passenger service. 2. I assume the plan is for 4 tracks (min) as I've read the goal is to increase the number of tracks around BWI Rail Station. 3. Another great long term goal would be to have a rail connection between Baltimore and Frederick. 4. The CSX Howard Street tunnel is very limiting perhaps this study can relocate the CSX trains... Then MTA can use Howard Street for local transit (light rail, with fewer stops at lights).
6/19/2014	Comment card	I came of interest to see if it was remembered about the 1930s tunnel plan. As a kid I saw what was the intent, later cancelled, without me knowing at the time what was up. Glad to see you didn't forget history.
6/19/2014	Comment card	Very informative conversation with Eric Almquist of RKK. Please keep me posted about future developments.
6/19/2014	Comment card	Coordination with freight (NS,CSX) and Amtrak and MTA is important; the deeper, the better in order to minimize impact on the residential structures above, and minimize noise coming from the trains
6/19/2014	Comment card	The B&P Tunnel Project is really needed in Baltimore, MD. Some influential organizations that you should contact for your meetings are: 1. WOL Radio (Baltimore, MD) C/O Larry Young 2. NAACP Baltimore City Branch Office c/o Tessa Hill Aston and Joe Aston 3. Baltimore Afro American Newspaper c/o The Editor and Staff 4. Talmadge Branch 6 Bladen St. Room 152 Annapolis, MD 21401/ 3224 Belair Rd. Baltimore MD 21213 5. WEAA Radio 88.9 FM c/o Mr. Faraji Muhammad 443-473-7947
6/20/2014	Online comment form	I am greatly interested in the B&P Tunnel Project and note from the website that a public meeting took place yesterday. Would it be possible to get a copy of the agenda or the minutes for that meeting? Thanks in advance.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/22/2014	Online comment form	Thank you for hosting the B&P Tunnel Open House; It was well done.
6/24/2014	Online comment form	Will there be any consideration to construction of a MARC train station near the Upton area to provide a transfer location to the Baltimore Metro? The two lines cross each other, so it would be nice to be able to transfer between the two modes.
7/3/2014	Online comment form	I ride Amtrak and have been through this tunnel several times. I support a quality, safe, environmental friendly, and expeditious replacement of the BP tunnel.
7/8/2014	Online comment form	On your main page (www.bptunnel.com) -- you stated: A Public Open House was held on June 19, 2014 at Coppin State University. If you were not able to attend, click here to view the Meeting Displays. The link to view the Meeting Displays is not working -- I got http://www.bptunnel.com/index.php/component/content/?id=122&Itemid=1624 One note: I'm not clear if the new tunnels will be "in additional" to existing tunnels -- in your Purpose and Need subpage, you stated: The existing tunnel is not suited for modern high-speed usage due to tight clearances and sharp curves, which limits train speeds through the tunnel to 30 MPH Does this means it's a possible we will not continue existing tunnels? I was under the impression existing tunnels will be rebuilt. If so, will it be safer when the trains run thru "S" curves in the future? Thank you.
7/9/2014	Online comment form	A station should be considered in Upton that would allow for a connection to Metro Subway service.
7/22/2014	Online comment form	The project timeline needs to be tightened. It seems that getting this to the construction phase is way too long.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
7/24/2014	Letter	[Letter Comment from Norfolk Southern located in Appendix B.]
7/31/2014	Online comment form	When planning new infrastructure, it is wise to leave future expansion options as open as possible. Unfortunately, the needs of the future are difficult to predict. Therefore, we must make some assumptions, which I will list here. 1) All predictions I have read are for increased urbanization over the next 50 years. This suggests a growing population in the Baltimore/Washington area. 2) Before 2008, significant investment in Baltimore for residential and commercial construction was planned. This suggests a growing city population. 3) A growing population suggests a growing demand for transportation. Given the extent to which roads have expanded within their rights of ways, it seems unlikely that future transportation needs can be addressed solely by road construction. There will need to be an intelligent mix of road and rail transportation modes available. 4) It seems likely that energy costs will increase making travel by automobile less attractive. This trend is supported by lower rates of driver license and car ownership than in years past that I have observed in today's young. 5) Acquisition of new, linear rights of ways for new rail or highway projects will be increasingly difficult in the future. Therefore, preserving those that exist is critically important. Given the above assumptions, replacing the B&P tunnels with equivalent ones that are not falling down, while an improvement over the current situation, is not enough. Providing the option of significantly expanded capacity is desirable. Construction of a new tunnel with a higher speed limit than the B&P tunnels will expand capacity. But building a replacement tunnel in such a way that the current B&P tunnels could be rebuilt and used would provide more than twice the current capacity. It is my understanding that the B&P tunnels pass close enough one of the subway's station (Upton I believe) that it is possible to insert a connection in a rebuilt B&P tunnel. While rebuilding the B&P and creation of the subway connection may not be in the current financial plan, it would be wise to keep them as an option in the future.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
		As automobile travel becomes more expensive and congested, even those in Carroll County will be interested in a rail option into Baltimore and Washington. (Even now, the subway between Owings Mills and the beltway carries 14% of the inbound corridor traffic between 6:00 and 9:00 AM and 17% during the peak hour. See http://www.GetOnTRAC.org/Reports/HRT_LRT_Highway_Study.pdf) Therefore, restoring access to the wye that links Pen Station and the NEC to Westminster would be wise and should be a design requirement of the replacement project.
08/12/2014	Online comment form	I commute via MARC every day from DC to Baltimore round trip. Please consider upgrading connectivity in the tunnel to support commuter productivity for MARC and Amtrak. In the tunnel, calls drop, wireless connectivity is disconnected and most commuters are unable to be productive at or near the Baltimore station. This is highly disruptive and antiquated. Thank you for upgrading these tunnels!
10/20/2014	Online comment form	It is essential to build a new B&P tunnel that can accommodate tall double-decker Amtrak Superliner passenger rail cars, double stack freight cars for late night freight trains, and a tunnel with a broad smooth curve to maintain Amtrak Acela speeds. The new B&P tunnel is setting the standard for high speed rail tunnels on the east coast, especially since the ARK tunnel was eliminated and Amtrak struggles to win support and funding for the Gateway Hudson River tunnels.
10/20/2014	Online comment form	I am very concerned that I was notified only today about next week's meeting. I would like to be involved and better understand this project. My home falls right on the line of one of the projected tunnels. What does this mean? The map is SO difficult to read and the numbers on the lines are never defined. Why is there not more transparency about this process? When are the next meetings? I would like more than 8 days' notice to be able to arrange my schedule to attend. You MUST engage neighbors and stakeholder more proactively or expect to be subjected to lawsuits by affected homeowners. I am saving the information that I receive from you all and how poorly specified the information is that you provide. Anticipate significant push-back from the community if you continue to proceed with such poor clarity.
10/23/2014	Online comment form	I am concerned about preliminary alternative #3 that is very close to my house in Reservoir Hill. How would damage to property be prevented and mitigated?
10/29/2014	Comment card	It seems as though #2 and #3 make the most sense- Perhaps keeping the existing tunnel for freight and use #3 for passenger, decreasing time for rail travelers
10/29/2014	Comment card	Please consider the historic nature of the neighborhoods impacted by #4 Route. It comes so close to the most impressive housing stock in Baltimore (Reservoir Hill), much less the east coast. I'm not so sure these 100+ year old homes would not be shaken into oblivion. Please try any other route. Thank You.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/29/2014	Comment card	• Both alignments for new tunnels go very close to historic homes. I have concerns about vibrations during construction and long term as a result of the tunnel being used by trains frequently, and the effect on the foundations of the homes. • I also have concerns regarding Alt 3 and the potential changes to the ground water patterns in Whitlock Farm. This is a farm that sustains and enhances the community I live in. • What types of soil/geotech analysis will be done to determine the effect of the proposed tunnels? • Were alternatives considered that utilize existing roadway corridors? If so, why did they drop out? Will the alternative analysis be posted for review in further detail? • Should structural failures occur as a result of the potential tunnel either during construction or down the line, who would be liable? • Is there any research available regarding historic structures on top of tunnels? • What will be done with the existing tunnel should a new alignment be pursued? Will it be maintained? Filled? Secure? • Are there any potential impacts to the reservoir? • Will this be a high speed rail? What speeds can be expected? • Can you meet with the Reservoir Hill Neighborhood Council? • Please define what is meant by infeasible geometry • Alt 3 goes beneath a residential area however in the alternative analysis it is shown as minimal. What is the difference between minimal and yes? • What weighting was used in the analysis? • Why were alternatives that missed Penn Station eliminated? • Tunnel separation goal seems to be a deal breaker why is that? Why even consider or show them? • We already hear a lot of train noise as it is, will this increase as a result?
10/29/2014	Comment card	1. I got conflicting answers from staff tonight – yes I purposely asked different people the same question 2. Experience tells me that at this point, alternatives presented, may already be squashed 3. I was told cost of the 4 major alternatives have not yet been attached to the proposals – Really? Does that make sense? 4. I will definitely take Ms. Thorne up on her offer to address a combination of Bolton Park Neighborhood, Mt. Royal Improvement Association, Historic Mt. Royal Terrace Association for a Q&A – probably January-February 2015 and she will attempt to include our local political representatives
10/29/2014	Comment card	After understanding the project and the proposed solutions, I can voice my strong opinion against Alternative 11. It's not understandable that a Historic Neighborhood like Bolton Hill can have a proposal with 2 tunnels going through it (current and Alternative 11). Residents of a historic neighborhood are required to maintain our houses is costly and require having many inspections. Having 2 tunnels though the neighborhood is not an option – No to Alternative 11

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/29/2014	Comment card	If the existing tunnel is not chosen, please do not seal it up entirely. Bats come out of there at dusk and feed on our mosquitoes. Also keep this on mind for a new tunnel. Thanks
	Comment card	Are the proposed alternatives compatible with Amtrak's plan for high speed rail through the existing West Baltimore MARC station of is this being proposed as a separate project?
10/29/2014	Comment card	9 & 10 lines NO. 11 Yes
10/29/2014	Comment card	Reservoir Hill has been turning around slowly but surely. It has a history of brokenness and violence, but in the past 20 years people have been investing in the neighborhood, renovating houses, starting farms and gardens, and staying active with the school and neighborhood association. If option 3 cannot be achieved without boring underground and without tearing down houses, I ask that you please reject it. It would be a huge setback for the neighborhood to have it cut in half during construction as well as forcing people out of their homes. Please only consider option 3 if the construction can be done without forcing people out and tearing down homes.
10/29/2014	Comment card	I am strongly in favor of the recommended options to move forward, specifically options 3 & 4. I count the days will we have true high speed rail and hope this project can help in that regard.
10/29/2014	Comment card	Please build a new tunnel. We need it.
10/29/2014	Comment card	Exactly where is the tunnel going to run in neighborhood of Eutaw Place?
10/29/2014	Comment card	We are concerned regarding the relatively shallow route of option 11. With such a shallow route the vibrations are likely to damage fragile water lines and compromise existing homes' foundations.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/29/2014	Comment card	Alternative 11- No. This is disastrous for a historic area where the houses owners are required to spend so much money to keep them in good shape. Insulting to propose another tunnel under the neighborhood. Shame on you!
10/29/2014	Comment card	No to Alternative 11. Two tunnels though Bolton Hill is not an option. Look for areas where the houses are abandoned and blighted!
10/29/2014	Comment card	My historic row house is directly above the proposed route of Alternative #3. I am extremely concerned about the damage tunnel construction and operation will cause to a fragile historic home, mine as well as the entire Historic Reservoir Hill community (bus and truck traffic on Eutaw Place currently cause structural damage problems for residents). I realize your routes are geologically and geographically dictated, however, perhaps further exploration of routes south and west of this community – for example the Sandtown area in the blighted uninhabited urban areas would better serve us all. What impact will #3 have on the underground water storage tanks proposed for construction in Druid Hill Park west of Druid Lake have?
10/29/2014	Comment card	The boards indicate that alternatives will be evaluated according to surface foot print and potential uses for the old, unused infrastructure. But nowhere are these matters explored (or even mentioned) relative to each alternative. I understand that subsequent engineering and design will address these, but as residents within the affected area our experience will be largely determined by portals, air shafts, and residual air rights. To omit even general information about these raises suspicion that bigger players than residents will have the most say in their location, design, and adaptive reuse. So, as to which alternative – it all depends.
10/29/2014	Comment card	None of the proposed... 1. Convert Howard Street Tunnel from freight to passenger to accommodate higher trains in new tunnel. 2. Build new tunnel for freight to service the port.
10/29/2014	Comment card	Route #3 goes right under my house and land. The potential for structural damage to a 125 year old house may be great depending not just on depth but geological formations, most of this section of #3 route has newly renovated housing. And #3 goes primarily through low-middle income African American community. Also, likewise I am ending row in the middle of a block so the potential for block housing shift is worrisome. The buses on Park Avenue to the curve of the road already shake walls and cupboard. I drew a black line to show potential for an underground route under North Avenue that would be shorter, less disruptive to housing and smoother curves. This is always going to be a problem with reconnects with existing tracks parallel to Xway.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/29/2014	Comment card	A big no to Alternative 11! Are you kidding me? Community impacts? We have enough human traffic and crime near Robert Street!
10/29/2014	Comment card	New construction should be a priority to replace the Civil War era B&P Tunnel. China spends billions on its high speed rail infrastructure; the U.S. should be able to replace a Civil War era tunnel. Alternative 3 and 11 look great. It would be ideal for the new tunnel construction, Alternative 3 or 11 to be tall enough for Amtrak Superliner railcars and double stack Norfolk Southern trains. A public-private partnership might help fund the cost for a taller tunnel for double stack cars or Superliner equipment.
10/29/2014	Comment card	Regarding Alternative 11: 1. Concern about access to Spicers Run parking lot at Robert and Linden (100 + homes) 2. Noise, vibration concerns both during construction and after completion 3. Subjacent and sub lateral support concerns
10/29/2014	Comment card	Alternative 11 is not an option. 2 tunnels in a historic neighborhood is not fair. Horrible proposal –Shame! Restore existing rail tunnel. No to alternative 11
10/29/2014	Comment card	Plan/Option #3 makes the most sense. Using existing Wilson Street tunnel for slow traffic- after it is checked for issues- would be fine. Please keep us updated.
10/29/2014	Comment card	I live 4 houses above Whitelock Street. The tunnel on the map is very close to my house. Our houses are soft brick with soft mortar. Every time a bus goes by my house vibrates and windows rattle. The stone façade has cracks and stones have shifted. I do not want another destructive source of vibrations near my house. Upper Eutaw Madison is a historic district with some of the most significant and important houses in Baltimore. It should not be disturbed. The map that came in the mail showed the tunnel near the synagogue. The map at the school shows the tunnel at Whitelock. Everyone in the 2400 block has cracks in their walls (plaster & brick & stone). These are fragile properties and irreplaceable.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/29/2014	Comment card	There appears to have been little cooperation with CSX. I'm surprised in light of the issues with the Howard Street Tunnel that the B&P Tunnel is moving forward with no plans to address freight issues. Is it true that CSX is anticipating a separate tunnel of their own roughly parallel to the planned Amtrak tunnel?
10/29/2014	Comment card	Upon review of proposed alternative route #11 (Robert St. South), I count 5 city parks that the route passes underground. I know the names of three of the parks: Maple Leaf Park, Arnold Sumpter Park, and the median of Eutaw Place. On the map provided on this website, I saw two additional city parks. However, I do not know the names of those 2 additional city parks. On page 53 of your Draft Preliminary Screening Report (http://www.bptunnel.com/images/BPT_Draft_PASR.pdf) under the column: number of parks within surface footprint, you list only one park and do not identify that park. (See Map on Page 22) I believe this needs to be corrected. Is it possible for the proposed underground railway tracks to run underneath W. North Avenue?
11/07/2015	Letter	<i>[Please see letter attachment.]</i>
3/16/2015	E-mail	[...] I am from New York City. As someone who frequently rides Amtrak, I strongly agree that the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel should get replaced. Thus, I would like to know: 1. When will construction likely begin and end? 2. Who would pay for this major construction project?
3/20/2015	E-mail	I understand that the four April dates will each include a formal presentation as well as the opportunity for questions. I also understand that the May meeting will be an "open house" without a formal presentation. However, the format of the June meeting is not clear ... Presentation, no presentation, q&a, etc. What is it? Also, what are the dates and locations for the May and June meetings? Thanks in advance for providing the requested information.
3/24/2015	E-mail	We are the owners of the Dollar General at 1620 Pennsylvania Ave which was built over the tunnel. In addition we own the bed of the railroad back to Argyle Street and the land alongside the tracks toward Pitcher Street. Please see the attached plan. I am interested in meeting to see how these proposals effect our property. Would you be available sometime next week to meet and review? Please let me know.
3/25/2015	E-mail	Thank you for getting back to me. If I understand correctly, then it is likely that construction will not begin until several years after 2017?

Date	Method Received	Comment
4/6/2015		[..]: As a proud Baltimore City resident, I am very excited about all the positive changes going on in my community of Reservoir Hill. I have been living in my home for 22 years, raised a family, and witnessed the physical and economic changes as a result of shared relationships with local colleges, universities, and neighborhood groups. I am also very aware of the B&P Tunnel project, and may be able to assist with the public outreach, and engagement of community stakeholders. As a program consultant, and recent book author on leadership development and neighborhood engagement, I wish to present a professional development opportunity for your staff. My book and training series is based on current best-practices and research that assists coalition building between residents, local law enforcement, businesses, and other community stakeholders for the purpose of strategic planning and execution of problems, issues, and solutions. I have attached some brief information about my 6-hour training course, and information about the textbook, however; I also custom design programs in accordance with organizational needs. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions. I look forward to speaking with you soon regarding possible participation in your area. www.drtinastevenson.com
4/9/2015	E-mail	Hello, Thankfully, we were just notified through our Bolton Hill Calendar of Events that was emailed to us today, that there will be a meeting at Mount Royal Elementary Middle school on Tuesday April 14, 2015 concerning the Wilson St. Tunnel (information session). Our question is...why haven't we received any information about the tunnel study from any of you since the last meeting (last year)? We happen to live a half a block from Wilson Street, which by the way collapsed several years ago because of the train traffic going through the tunnel, taking with it a few of the homes walls that faced Wilson Street. Don't you think you have an obligation to keep those of us living so close to the tunnel informed of your studies, and don't you think it would be helpful to interview those of us that any changes would impact the most? We have noticed a huge increase in the noise and vibration from passing trains over the past year which we are not happy about, and are opposed to any increase in the number of trains using the tunnel, and any being allowed to increase their speeds. Are you aware that our neighborhood is a registered Historic District with homes built in 1885 on both sides of this tunnel, and that many of us have invested hundreds of thousands of our hard earned dollars restoring them, and we do not wish to have our 126 year old foundations shaken repeatedly day after day? Nor, do we want the train noise that comes through our walls. Are you also aware that this Bolton Hill neighborhood provides the city with substantial property tax revenue because of the high property values, and that our values could be jeopardized by an increase in tunnel activity? During the last meeting at Mount Royal School (last year) there was a promise made that our concerns would be considered and that we would be included in the research, but to date not a single person has come by our neighborhood or sent out a single notice or phone call...even though our contact information was left with you at the meeting. Please get back to us with any relevant information concerning this project.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
4/12/2015	E-mail	Hello, I checked our email and we have not received any correspondence about the Tunnel Project until we received this reply. Please be sure to update your email list so that our email address is included in all future mailings. Could you please sign your emails with the name of who is replying to us...not just the project name?
4/13/2015	Comment card	I'd encourage alternative uses for the existing tunnel. The trains need a tunnel that will allow higher (highest possible) speed.
4/13/2015	Comment card	Will they check the Amtrak land in my backyard? I was told this when I moved into my home in October 1992.
4/13/2015	Online comment form	If you are interested in including community names on the map, where is Sandtown? Where is Midtown Edmondson? The maps need to be MUCH clearer and more transparent. It seems like you are trying to be misleading and deceptive. Don't indict the community for lack of involvement when you are not transparent about what is happening where and when.
4/13/2015	Online comment form	Next time you are hosting at Gilmore Elementary state 'Stricker Street entrance' on the notice. Everybody was going to Gilmore Street Side-- this is a mobility issue.
4/2014/2015	Comment card	Please provide us with a detailed and accurate cross section of the terrain and the proposed tunnel to grade. Please mark off at ALL major streets for alternative 11 (in particular) and 3. What provisions are being made on a contingency basis to address possible damage or negative effects on communities above the tunnel?
4/2014/2015	Comment card	If the speed through the tunnel is limited to 30mph, what will be the speed limit for Alternatives 3 and 11? With both alternatives 3 and 11, what will be the change in passenger travel for a trip from Baltimore to Washington? MARC? Amtrak? Will MARC trains utilize this tunnel? With Alternative 3 and 11, how will the existing tunnel be used? How does this project relate to Amtrak's long term plan for high speed rail in the Northeast Corridor, which includes a 6-mile tunnel under Baltimore? Will Norfolk Southern contribute to the cost of a new tunnel?
4/2014/2015	Comment card	What's the impact of speed and capacity in RLT & BLT neighborhoods? What are the vibration impacts due to speed and increased capacity?

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
4/2014/2015	Comment card	The concept of 4 bores is new. It seems that once 2 tunnels are finished, the old Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel can be retrofit. The impact of design for a freight tunnel seems as an appropriate consideration for the Environmental Impact statement (EIS). It certainly is MDOT's responsibility to do this kind of planning.
4/2014/2015	Comment card	Please give a detailed profile of alternatives 3 and 11 (i.e. in depth). Talk more about ideas for funding of the tunnel and not just the planning. Discuss consequences for residents whose houses the tunnel will pass under.
4/2014/2015	Comment card	Q1: What will the restrictions on hazardous materials be, especially in regard to crude oil freight? Q2: Is there an economic impact study available for public scrutiny, describing the benefits expected from the new tunnel construction?
4/2015/2015	Comment card	What benefit in time will the new construction be- if the trains are going faster, it will take longer to stop mitigating in part the need to slow down for the eastbound track coming into Penn Station anyway.
4/2015/2015	Online comment form	I recently bought a home less than 1/4 miles away from Penn Station, and I'm really excited about the new Amtrak tunnel. I think it will make the commute between Baltimore and DC better, and increase the value of my house. So yeah, let's do this!
4/2015/2015	E-mail	Ms. Phillip, You did a great job laying out the status of the B&P project and facilitating a constructive discussion last night. There are many folks following this closely and doing their own research (I am not one of them), but I sense from what I overhear in the community that there's great concern that the tunnels under Reservoir Hill will compromise an already-tenuous effort to rebuild the community. I think you'll hear more of that concern as things move forward – I think there's a sense that all indications are that the Grand Circle alternative seems to make the most business sense, even though it also has the potential for creating the most furor. It's not an easy process I'm sure and, again, applaud you for how well you communicate the facts and invite discussion.
4/23/2015	E-mail	I am a McCulloh street resident, I live in the 2300 block and am a home owner. I would like to know will residents be asked to relocate, and what impact will the project have on homeowners?

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
5/2/2015	E-mail	I attended the community event at Gilmore Elementary School a few weeks ago regarding the BP Tunnel. At the session, I asked to be provided the addresses of where the soil drilling has taken place so I can better identify the locations being considered for the tunnel. I was told that someone would email me this data. I even was approached by an engineer afterwards to make sure he had my name and email address so he could connect the request to me. Can you help me understand why I haven't received this information and when I can expect it? Also, I learned in the Baltimore Sun today that the meeting on 5/5 would be postponed to "June" but no date was specified. It is very important to me to be able to attend that meeting and to be sure my neighbors are also informed. Can you please send me the June date/time/location for this meeting so we can start planning our schedules to attend?
5/4/2015	E-mail	My home [address redacted] is frighteningly close to your proposed build site. I would like to see a more exact location for your design as it appears that this project could affect the value of my all original 1843 Victorian home or even worse cause damage to my home during your build or by the tunnel itself. This house is the oldest standing home in Reservoir Hill and most valuable homes in the area and largely irreplaceable.
5/7/2015	E-mail	I didn't see any clarification of my questions in this response. The map you present in your website is vague at best and without further information this just becomes more concerning by the week. Please respond in a meaningful way.
6/2/2015	E-mail	A basic need is for CSX to be able to use the new B&P Tunnel. The easiest access for CSX would be to use the Amtrak line. What degree of impediment to double-stacking is presented by the Hoffman Street Tunnels? Can their floors be lowered to permit the required additional height? If there is a true problem with those Hoffman tunnels, how does CSX gain access from their current alignment to the western-most bore of the new B&P Tunnel?
6/2/2015	E-mail	Friends: Is this a repeat of the previous Open Houses on this subject- or will "new" information be presented. I have been to two— which were very similar.
6/3/2015	E-mail	Would you kindly tell me whether the May 5th meeting that was set for Mt. Royal Elementary will be rescheduled? Or will this be the only opportunity for this stage of public input?
6/2014/2015	E-mail	Thank you for beginning to use email! This is the first email I have received from you all, and is the best way for me to get and spread information to the community. See you Tuesday.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/16/2015	Comment card	1. Route 3 is the best option— less of an impact on the lives of people; 2. What ever happened to the B&O train stop on Edmondson Avenue— 2100 Edmondson Avenue
6/16/2015	Comment card	It seems as if the least destructive, most cost efficient option here is to reconstruct the existing tunnel (option 2). It is the most direct route into Penn Station. Option 3 is not only the most detrimental plan to the historic communities it will undermine but undoubtedly it is the most expensive option. Why would you route the tunnel so far north of Penn Station? Trains will have to turn south to reach Penn Station and then turn back north. I am concerned about the noise levels with these tunnels and trains. How will it be addressed and what data are you using to gauge it? What requirements do you have to meet to put this project through? What standards are used concerning the vent plants in residential areas?
6/16/2015	Comment card	STRONG preference for #11A or 11B. Much less apparent disruption to residences at the north and south portals. And, shorter route= fewer homes dealing with construction vibration/noise and possibly ongoing vibration/noise. Third choice: 3C. What can I expect for vibration and noise both during and after construction if the tracks are, say, 100' below my house? What can I expect for compensation if I own a house that isn't demolished but is severely impacted-- a few houses away from the wall/tracks?
6/16/2015	Comment card	Consult with the Opportunity Collaborative, opportunitycollaborative.org
6/16/2015	Comment card	There is negligible speed difference between any of the 3 and 11 alternatives sufficient to choose one over another. 3C is best in my view: allows high platforms at W. Balt MARC and preserves American Ice which would be a prime TOD structure. 11B is second best, except for losing American Ice. 11A is worst: No Red Line interchange and moves W Balt MARC away from the parking lots which would have severe impact on adjacent neighborhoods.
6/16/2015	Comment card	All of this seems to place my house in a precarious place. The threat of contamination from the water into the Jones Falls is not environmentally helpful. My house is over a hundred years old and already [unknown] the effect just from regular [unknown] traffic. Does anyone think about the effect of constant rail traffic juggling my house's foundation continually? None of this seems like a useful direction for homosapiens and structures in which they live. If there were a democratic vote, I think we would all be forced to oppose.
6/16/2015	Comment card	11A (1) It moves the MARC Train Station. What are you going to do with the 660 parking spots at the existing station? Have you notified commuters of this alternative? Have you considered the impact on the community you're moving the station to (as far as people parking in their neighborhood?) (2) Portal comes up near Ice House, but cuts into the Business district of Edmondson Avenue (the economic engine of the neighborhood). Not a good thing. 11B: No. It comes up in the middle of my neighborhood and cuts through the business district of the community. It essentially destroys the community. This is not a viable option from the community perspective. 3A: Yes. This is the best option. It does not wipe out the Midtown-Edmondson neighborhood, and uses part of the existing rail. Easy. 3B and 3C: No. They both take swaths out of the neighborhood. BUT if you give real development money directly to the community (money that is majority-controlled by the community-- in coordination with the city), and put it in a legal agreement, then we can talk.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
6/16/2015	Comment card	(1) I just wanted to thank you for finally reaching out via email. Please keep using email along with the postal mail. (2) Also, if you need volunteers please reach out to people and ask! There are more people than you think who are willing to volunteer for flyering (for example). (3) I appreciated all the visual maps; very helpful in understanding the potential impacts.
6/16/2015	Comment card	Take #2 off the table now!!! Option #3 would be my choice, but it would depend on how much \$ is available for development in the Midtown-Edmondson community. If you have a negative impact, it has to be countered with development \$.
6/16/2015	Comment card	I very much like a lot of the ideas that have gone into this project. I do think that 11A is measurably worse in terms of impact to residential property, and I would strongly urge that that consideration were to outweigh 30 seconds or so of headway time. 9Since all trains begin/end at Penn Sta., it seems natural to have trains going slightly slower when that close to the station.) Again, some great ideas, and I look forward to seeing what happens! Thanks!
6/16/2015	Comment card	Alternative 11-A may cause a problem if the MARC Station is relocated from its present location. Over 500 commuters park their cars on the lots located off Mulberry & Franklin Sts. If the MARC Station is relocated would the commuters be willing to park elsewhere or would you provide rides for them from one (parking) location to the MARC train?
6/16/2015	Comment card	We are opposed to a new route for this tunnel, especially the northern circle route. It would go under 2 historic districts— Mount Royal Terrace and Upper Eutaw Madison. The vibrations from these trains would destroy our 100-150 year old homes. The noise and vibration would destroy our quality of life. It would also severely reduce our property values. We do not want any tunnels and ESPECIALLY not 4 tunnels. We do not want double stack freight trains carrying oil or dangerous chemicals and explosives to run under our homes ("bomb trains"). This is a heavily populated area-- we do not want this danger under our homes. This is a total nightmare. We are also opposed to the route under the Bolton Hill District.
6/16/2015	Comment card	As a 30-year resident, community activist, and 20-year liaison for the Commission on Historical and Architectural Preservation (CHAP), I strongly oppose a tunnel that will run under my 1890 house which we have worked years to preserve— and to work with our community to preserve all our historic neighborhoods and homes. We see this as a destruction of property values-- and possibly a destruction of lives.
6/16/2015	Comment card	Proposed Circle Route is to go under 2 historic districts! This is unacceptable! I am strongly against this project!
6/17/2015	E-mail	I attended yesterday's open house and visited both the posters and the auditorium presentation. Here are the questions/concerns that I continue to have that do not seem to be being disclosed: (1) At the April meeting, the project was presented as being related to commuter travel only. However, subsequent reports suggest this will be a frequently traveled commercial route with double-decker container cars. What is true? Will the tunnel be used for commercial interests? What hazardous items could be transported through the tunnel? What protections will be in place if there is a chemical or

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
		nuclear spill from cargo in the tunnel? To what extent are the ""venting plants"" prepared to handle various levels of hazards? Please disclose this information publicly. (2) What are the risks to people who live in homes in the path of the tunnel? Some of the people who work on this project have said there will be no impact whatsoever (arguing that the soil/environmental reports have demonstrated this), others have said there is no way the impact could be tested or known. The risks need to be better explicated in these public settings. When I spoke individually with someone on the project, he admitted that it would not be an unexpected side effect that homes will have foundation problems, cracks, reverberations, shaking and noise issues. Where have you disclosed this in any of your materials? (3) Some people (allegedly not affiliated with your group but advocating this project) have suggested that the ills of West Baltimore could be solved by the tunnel forcing the disruption and community dissolution of Sandtown. How do you respond to this? What are you doing to insure this project doesn't destroy communities by lowering quality of life as well as tearing down homes? (4) When I expressed concerns about potential damage to my home (located directly on the path of Alt 11), I was told that if I had to choose between a crack in my basement vs. having my home razed, wouldn't I prefer the crack in the basement? I think this kind of persuasive argument is in poor taste. Why should I have to deal with damage to my foundation and the subsequent costs to repair as well as the degraded property value? The upside is that my house is likely to be still standing; the reality is that the quality of life due to noise, vibrations and damage will be significantly diminished to the point that who would want to live there? For folks like myself who have spent years investing in community development in this neighborhood, your project will negate all of our work in a way that is more invasive than even the worst crime or drug problem. No one will want to live in a neighborhood where having only cracks in the basement and shaking is seen as the upside.
6/25/2015	E-mail	Hi there, I was at a tunnel meeting at Mt. Royal Elementary a couple months ago, and received notice of the Open House being postponed, but did not receive the rescheduled meeting date, or this email noting upcoming meetings. Was I dropped from the list? July 7 is the night of our community meeting, and July 16 has already filled up for community events here in Reservoir Hill, so our staff may not be able to attend the event that evening. Might there be the possibility of a presentation at one of our community meetings? Our residents are very concerned about the implications of a train tunnel running beneath their homes.
7/2/2015	E-mail	Please consider the comments below: (1) Route NEC Through Downtown (New Baltimore Penn Station near Lexington Market) via tunnel under Route 40) – Alternative 5 (2) Abandon Baltimore Penn Station and transfer Unused NEC to Freight/CSX/NS (3) Rehab Current B&P/Union Tunnels (Low Cost when no rail traffic is present) (4) Transfer Howard Tunnel to MTA (5) Rehab Howard Tunnel for Express LRT or MARC or Heavy Rail (6) Route Downtown Portion of New Red Line Alternative with NEC Tunnel Map Link: https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=zQQBCxHd6New.kaQfCWXvG8gk

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
		The main reason to build the NEC tunnel through downtown is economic development. There is potential for multiple 20+ story buildings on top of the new NEC station. The new station could be build using a Public-Private Partnership. The current Baltimore Penn Station should be abandoned as it provides little economic benefit because it is too far from the downtown core. The Red Line could be added to the tunnel through downtown and run on the surface along Route 40 or adjacent road east of downtown.
7/7/2015	Comment card	[not legible] sound and impact- Are any homeowners impacted? If so, which alternative impacts the residents the least?
7/7/2015	Comment card	Option 11 A seems to have too large a residential impact considering that 11B could avoid them. However, both would destroy the Ice House. Not a deal killer but I'm not seeing the major advantages in comparison to the Option 3.
7/8/2015	E-mail	How extensive will the blasting be for options 3 and 11? What level of vibrations will be experienced day-to-day if these options are implemented? I live in Historic Mount Royal Terrace and some of these options will result in lines being built close to or directly under my house, option 11 being more dramatic than option 3. The house itself is around 120 years old and I am already worried about the foundation over the next decade - without a train line running underneath or near it. What will happen if these lines are run under my house? What will happen if the trains or their construction effectively ruin my houses foundation? Will I be evacuated during construction? I am not opposed to this project and understand that renovations are necessary but I believe that there are other parts of West Baltimore that are not historic and could be helped in their improvement by this line removing some of their abandoned properties. In short I am providing this input to attempt to steer the decision away from Option 11, as I am concerned that it will effect my neighbors and my own living circumstances dramatically and believe that options 2 and 3, or other alternatives, will effect less populated areas. I understand that renovating the existing tunnel may be painful and take longer but I think this may help with concerns over the existing tunnel being abandoned and left to decay. Thank you for taking the time to understand and consider my concerns.
7/2014/2015	Comment card	We were told this is for passenger rail— so why is the track being designed to accommodate commercial transport including hazardous materials? I sent an email on 6/17/2015 with several questions. I received an email back from "info@bptunnel.com" on 6/19/2015 saying that the team was developing a thorough response to my questions. Will I ever get a response?
7/16/2015	Comment card	The option Alternative 3 Option B would be less disturbance on P. Flanigan's business operation or its recycle center operation. Alter[native] option 3A and 3C go thru the Flanigan operations. Not acceptable!!

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
7/16/2015	Comment card	Concerned about impact on year 1895 structure of house. How much consistent vibration will be expected on a house constructed in 1895? All other ramifications i.e. insurance, saleability of house, taxes, etc.
7/16/2015	Comment card	I believe ability to accommodate high speed rail should be an evaluated.
7/16/2015	Comment card	(1) Baltimore remains a port city. Freight HazMat is a major risk. How will this tunnel mitigate our HazMat risks, i.e. will this compromise a freight train fix. Will this tunnel be used for frieght through downtown Baltimore when the CSX tunnel fails, e.g. 2003 fire
7/16/2015	Comment card	Prefer Alts 3B or 3C. Let's build some infrastructure already!
7/16/2015	Comment card	Reconstruction or modernization of the existing B&P Tunnel in place 18 ft. increase vertical in tunnel clearance all tracks along cover between wall and tracks options to Alt 3 and 11 impact 11A Green/minor modification needed to Red Line/ Acternation 3 Option A. South Portal Rendering to Red Line Light Rail system and Green Line Bus on Charles St. also in Baltimore City also parts of Balto County
7/16/2015	Comment card	Thank you for organizing this community meeting. The concerns that I hear many people raise are hyperbole given that the tunnel will be roughly three times as deep as the current tunnel. Options 11 appear to have more negative impacts than Options 3. Above all, I'd like to see Baltimore's historical heritage preserved as much as possible, which means I would not like to see the demolition of the Ice House to accommodate option 11.
7/16/2015	Comment card	What are the residential impacts for North Portal for Reservoir Hill- Eutaw Place homeowners/ residents? What is/has the impact of the ventilation system to residents long term?
7/16/2015	Comment card	Alternative 11 (both A and B) will have a tremendous negative impact through 9 historic neighborhood with historic homes. Will the homeowners be compensated for the damage that will occur during and after[?] construction of tunnel will devastate these homes. We put our life savings into these homes. The liability will be on Amtrak! Be ready for litigation, because historic homes on the National Registry will be affected.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
7/16/2015	Comment card	All studies arc north. Why was no study arc South? [Illustration included on comment sheet.]
9/1/2015	Comment card	When will final design be selected?
9/1/2015	Comment card	Vent shaft location in any scenario is unacceptable. You must find an alternate solution.
9/1/2015	Comment card	We have serious concerns about the tunnels running under our street. We are especially troubled by the placement of the vent shaft on Whitelock St. The impact on property values will be severe. We will oppose this proposal (3A, 3B, 3C).
9/1/2015	Comment card	(1) I wish more information could be presented on the following [illegible]: 1. Noise level (decibel) 2. Emissions (diesel); (2) Could you list the emails for the senior members of this project (Vice President)? Thank you.
9/1/2015	Comment card	Depth of tunnel of opt 3 & 11 under Mount Royal Terrace
9/1/2015	Comment card	—Get over your need for exact figures. Engineers know the value of estimates and community members need them. Sound is a major concern. — You mentioned the federal statute prohibiting impact on historic properties and all parks if at all avoidable. Is a community garden considered a park under this statute? If not, what are the requirements to be a "park," and what is the process/responsible agency to receive such designation? ---Reservoir Hill is regularly one of Baltimore's shining stars in terms of attracting residents, development, property values, historic character, etc. This is absolutely the worst place for a vent shaft. ---There was clearly much more demand for Q+A. --- You stated the design requirement is 2 trains in a bore at the same time and are not questioning that. You need to back up and question the assumption that that is a requirement. It is only [illegible] with at least 3 trains traveling in a single direction. Fine. Settle for 2, and eliminate the mid-point vent altogether. It is not addressing the concern or question at all to state that it is an absolute, unquestioned requirement to have two at a time.
9/2/2015	E-mail	Thank you very much for your time at the meeting last night in Reservoir Hill (September 1). You and the team from the architectural firm, MDOT and Amtrak gave a very informative presentation that seems to have crystallized several uncertainties surrounding the study. This is a very exciting project that has the potential to benefit the citizens of Baltimore and all those that use Amtrak along the northeast corridor.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
		That being said, I was wondering if you could find answers to a few questions that remained unanswered (or were answered a bit vaguely) during the presentation and question and answer session: • How many diesel locomotives use the BP tunnel every day? - o What is the projected use of diesel in the 2020-2040 time period? • What type of freight cargo passes through the tunnel? - o Is there any oil or hazardous/flammable materials included on these freight trains? - o Will there be (are there currently) restrictions on the type of cargo that is allowed to be transported through the tunnel? - o Do future forecasts anticipate an increase in freight trains through the tunnel? • What is the approximate decibel level of the exhaust fans for the new NYC vents installed? - o Would it be accurate to assume a similar decibel level for the current system envisioned? • Are any alternatives to a central vent stack available or may any ""workarounds"" be engineered, thereby avoiding locating a central vent stack in Reservoir Hill? - o A two mile tunnel is not extremely long, and as I mentioned in my question last evening, there are several examples of lengthy tunnels without a central vent stack, including the Channel Tunnel, several in the EU (which have similar safety standards to the US), many examples in the Western portion of the United States and even in the Appalachians. • As a part of your assumptions you noted that you must engineer the tunnels so that one of the four tunnels can accommodate two trains simultaneously. Does this assume that the other three tunnels are closed or otherwise inoperable? - o Would a middle vent stack be necessary if only one train were in the tunnel at a time? How would this affect train time tables? - o What is the probability of more than two of the four planned tunnels being inoperable at any one time? • In the event of an emergency would the ventilation shaft have fire suppression equipment to prevent burning embers and other hazardous material from escaping into the surrounding historic neighborhood? • Would the ventilation system contain any environmental remediation equipment (i.e. scrubbers) that would reduce airborne particulates? • Will the neighborhood impact statement include an analysis of the effect of the placement of the ventilation shaft on nearby property values? - o Will the neighborhood impact statement include an estimate on the cost to residents of the use and enjoyment of the Whitelock corridor as a park and garden (or future commercial development)? - o As this is currently a study, are you considering the cost of ""uncertainty"" that this study is creating for potential investors and homeowners in the neighborhood? There are over 5,000 people (2010 census) living in the two census tracts that constitute Reservoir Hill and the proposed location of the ventilation shaft would displace a park and garden and limit/curtail potential commercial and residential redevelopment along the Whitelock corridor. The presence of such a ventilation unit in Reservoir Hill is potentially burdensome, disruptive and damaging the

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
		improving quality of life for its residents and may curtail individuals and investors from investing in this capital starved community. I look forward to the answers to the above questions and further conversations and public meetings.
9/8/2015	E-mail	I just want to find out how to enter some public comments. We bought a home @ [redacted address] Madison Ave. last November and are in the Madison Park Historic District and have the CHAP credit on our home until 2024. It seems counter-intuitive that the city of Baltimore would attract folks into historic districts with CHAP credits only to destroy the neighborhood with this tunnel project. So please let me know how to make my comments known. Thanks so much.
9/12/2015	E-mail	I attended the Sept. 1 RHIC meeting where you presented an update on the BPTunnel Project. I reviewed the website pages and did not see the renderings of the version (2 routes) that was presented at that time. The routes in Reservoir Hill appeared to lie under Lennox St and farther north under Whitelock Street. 1. Where are these referenced images for Reservoir Hill? 2. On either route, what blocks of houses in Reservoir Hill only streets are affected by the presented options? 3. Do I understand correctly that as stated that most of the tunnel will be at the lowest point be buried 150' under level ground at the lowest point with a unknown height of the tunnel which may mean the highest point of the tunnel would be 120' from the basement of housing? 4. When the tunnel reaches Mount Royal Terrace and begin its slope upward to meet the ground level tracks heading to Penn Station, what is the lowest depth of the base of the tunnel? At Park Ave? Thanks
9/28/2015	E-mail	This is Julio Barreto. Can you please give me a call? I would like to get more information about how the tunnel plans will impact the ACME Building. We have a possible interest in purchasing and developing the ACME Building; however, the plans for the tunnel will determine what we do with the ACME Building.
9/29/2015	E-mail	We are in support of Alternative 3A, 3B and 3C.
9/29/2015	E-mail	My name is [redacted] and I contacted you months ago about this tunnel design requesting further information about it's location and it appears in option 3C the southernmost tunnel goes below the corner of my home. This is an all original Victorian dated from the 1830's with original plaster walls and coffered ceiling. How do you plan on digging a 20' hole beside our home without damaging it? How do you plan on completing this project with an existing neighborhood? I have done restoration for years and I will tell you it is not possible. This home is worth as much as whole blocks of homes on the west side (500K conservatively)... I am just beside myself that there has been no direct contact with us about this matter. It appears we have a major issue on our hands here. Do I need to contact my attorney?

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
9/30/2015	E-mail	Thank you for inviting the Senator to attend the events in October. Regretfully, at this time she will not be able to make any of the meetings due to prior commitments. Please accept our wishes for successful events and let us know of future ones.
10/2/2015	E-mail	Thank you for your invitation for Congresswoman Edwards to attend one of this month's meetings on the status of the Baltimore and Potomac Tunnel Project. Unfortunately, the Congresswoman is unable to attend a meeting due to scheduling conflicts, but I have passed the invitation on to our staff in the hopes that a member of our legislative team may be able to attend. Someone will be in touch with you shortly. Thanks again and please let me know if I can be of any further assistance.
10/5/2015	E-mail	Where is the next meeting scheduled for Reservoir Hill residents?
10/5/2015	Online comment form	project updates
10/09/2015	Letter	[Please see letter attachment.]
10/13/2015	Comment card	WHY WAS I LOCKED OUT OF THE MT ROYAL ELEM MEETING ON OCT 13, this evening at 6:10 PM?
10/13/2015	Comment card	I have 5 major concerns. 1) How will this tunnel project benefit our Reservoir Hill neighborhood? 2) Are there any safety concerns I should have walking to/from bus stops chemical tainted air 3) Will the trains make a lot of noise? I get up at 4am every morning for work, i really need uninterrupted sleep :) 4) Is this something that will go on as planned, that we have no control over, no matter how much it may cause problems for our neighborhood? (if any) 5) Who do we contact directly if problems arise? Thank you for your attention to these concerns.
10/13/2015	Comment card	1) Remember the bats in the old tunnel 2) Vent shafts— make it blend into the surroundings— that is a rowhouse etc. Thank you All
10/13/2015	Comment card	Is there any new technology for the venting systems?

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/13/2015	Comment card	Much of our meeting focused on ventilation building, which I am very concerned about and have addressed at length in a previous comment. However, I am also concerned about the possibility of hazardous freight traveling under our community. Have there been any studies on the worst case scenario of what could happen if there was an accident with a train carrying crude oil or other hazardous materials?
10/13/2015	Comment card	Excellent presentation. Maybe work with Planning or Urban design to convey impacts and potential design mitigations. Also, closing of Madison Park could open opportunities that offset impacts on Whitelock Street
10/13/2015	Comment card	When it comes to developers yall minds are already made up. The community gets details later. Would you want this in your community. It may be a good thing but not disrupting communities.
10/13/2015	Comment card	One alternative is not to build in Reservoir Hill. Try using other areas that are not community bounded. Restore the old. I am a resident of Reservoir Hill and do not want this project in the community. Why can't you build other properties that do not impact people's community, homeowner, children, [illegible] health in the long run. You will be tearing up the property at our expense.
10/13/2015	Comment card	You have my permission to put the vent in the Druid Park.
10/13/2015	Comment card	I would like to acquire a copy of the report "Alternatives Report October 2015." Please let me know the cost, I am willing to pay. I do not have a computer.
10/13/2015	Comment card	The reasons for eliminating Alternative 11A seem to also be impacts to be expected in Reservoir Hill. The land you are considering for the vent has deep historical significance and is the meeting ground of our community.
10/13/2015	Comment card	We don't want the train tunnel under our neighborhood, Reservoir Hill. We are 5,000 residents or more. We don't want chemical transportation under our homes.

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

Date	Method Received	Comment
10/13/2015	Comment card	*Please contact about these concerns. The proposed location of the ventilation building is unacceptable for the Reservoir Hill community. For the past five years, neighbors and volunteers have worked tirelessly to create an urban farm and community park that has transformed a long neglected group of vacant lots and once notorious open air drug market into a green hub of positive activity. Whitelock Community Farm has the mission of providing access to healthy food for all neighbors regardless of income, beautifying the community and creating green, local jobs. Whitelock Community Farm has created partnerships with local schools, trained local youth through a summer internship program, and built relationships across racial and economic divides through community workshops and potlucks. Reservoir Hill is classified as a food desert [NEED SECOND SHEET]
11/23/2015	E-mail	My concern is that Alternative 3C will require the demolition of the firehouse located at Edmondson Avenue and North Bentalou Street. The firehouse was built in 1910 and Engine Company 36 has occupied the building the entire 105 years. The firehouse is located within the Midtown Edmondson Avenue Historical District. Engine Company 36 is considered to be an essential part of the community. There are at least five Baltimore City Public Schools that it serves; Carver Vocational-Technical High School, where one of the B&P Tunnel Project public meetings was held, is one of the five schools. Emanuel Tire, a company that shreds and stores tires, and P. Flanigan Company are also served by Engine 36; a major fire at these businesses would severely affect the area. Most of the rowhouses in the service area are wood-framed structures built during or shortly after World War I. Removal of the firehouse and the engine company it houses would endanger the immediate area. The next closest engine companies (North Avenue and Poplar Grove Street; and Lafayette Avenue near Gilmore Street) are at least 3 to 5 additional minutes away from Carver Vo-Tech High School. Given the schools, businesses, and types of structures in the area, considerable damage to property and harm to persons could occur during the increased response time. Within the past seven years the neighborhood associations in the service area have rallied twice to prevent scheduled closing/removal of Engine 36 for the reasons given above. I hope that you will consider my comments concerning Alternative 3C during your impact studies. Thank you.
11/30/2015	E-mail	What is the problem with the website? It looks as tho you have It it lapse.



November 7, 2014

B&P Tunnel Project
81 W Mosher Street
Baltimore, MD 21217

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to share comments regarding the conceptual plan for "Alternate 3". I recently attended the open house at the Mt. Royal Elementary Middle School. I became aware of the project from press releases and flyers in June of 2014.

The southern section of the Great Tunnel route goes through property owned by P. Flanigan and Sons. P. Flanigan and Sons exists to build and maintain transportation infrastructure. We have contracts with numerous state and local agencies. The location that would be affected by the great circle route is essential to our business.

At this location, we produce approximately 300,000 tons of hot mix asphalt each year. The aggregate for this material arrives by CSX train and is unloaded on site. We typically have three to four trains service our yard on a weekly basis. This location is also used as an aggregate recycling yard. We accept reclaimed asphalt pavement and concrete rubble at this facility.

I-83, 1-95, and Rt. 40 are minutes from this site. Also, Monroe St is classified by Baltimore City DOT as a truck route. The location of this facility in relationship to the surrounding highways is critical to the hundreds of trucks that use this site on a daily basis.

We have approximately three hundred employees. We are a union company. Therefore, our employees receive excellent benefits such as health care, retirement, and paid vacation. The majority of the people who have these jobs are city residents, many within the Sandtown Winchester neighborhood. I know of no other employer in this area of the city that provides high paying, union, jobs. Furthermore, our jobs are available to those with a past criminal offense on their record and minimal formal education. We believe in second chances and on the job training.

Much of our work consists of excavating roadway pavement and replacing it with new pavement. The location that would be affected by this plan is absolutely critical to our business. This operation is in use night and day all year long. Any disruption to the use of this facility would prohibit the business from performing its contractual obligations. Disruption to truck traffic, train traffic, natural gas, electricity, or water would cause the operation to halt. Furthermore, the asphalt plant on this location consists of conveyor belts, numerous scales, and sensitive equipment used to produce a quality product.

The location of this site is truly unique. The combination of truck routes, the active rail line, major utilities such as our electrical sub-station and large natural gas line are critical to our business and the many people that we employ.

The purpose of this letter is threefold. Firstly, to alert you to the fact that the train track which enters our yard is active. Secondly, the facility potentially impacted by Alternate 3 is active at all times and is essential to the business of P. Flanigan and Sons. Thirdly, the location of this facility is truly unique and essential to our business. Founded in 1885, we have employed generations of Baltimoreans and we hope to continue this tradition for years to come.

Sincerely,


A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Pierce J. Flanigan, IV". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the "IV" clearly visible at the end.

Pierce J. Flanigan, IV

Maryland Department of Transportation
Office of the Secretary
7201 Corporate Center Drive
Hanover, MD 21076

06 October 2015

Re: The B&P Tunnel Project Evaluation.



The reason for this communication is my concern that there does not appear to be very much input from MTA into the study of the replacement tunnel(s), and I believe that the final decision actually depends upon such input.

Please see <http://bptunnel.com/index.php/2014-05-18-15-34-28/alternatives-report> for links to the two parts of the latest study report.

In summary, the next step is to decide on the final selection from alternatives 3A, 3B, or 3C.

If I were making the decision, i.e. if I were the Federal DOT/Amtrak, I would immediately choose 3A:

- 1 it is the least costly
- 2 it has the least impact on the community

In looking at the 51 evaluation criteria listed in Part 2 of the report, my opinion is that 3A evaluates to be vastly superior to the other alternatives. The only negative I see is that the speed is slightly lower than the other two.

The speed is lower because 3A joins the current trackage north of the West Baltimore MARC station and thus has to deal with the curvature at the station. Amtrak and the freight railroads can deal with that, but can MARC?

In order to modernize that station, especially with a high-level platform, MARC will have to build a new station farther from parking and in a less desirable location overall. Either of the other two alternatives would be much better for MARC and its customers.

While 3C (my layman's choice) would be most expensive choice and be somewhat more disruptive to the community, it may be that there is much lower cost to MARC, perhaps to the extent that the extra cost to Amtrak is offset to a significant degree.

I would not want to see Maryland forced into an expensive, undesirable situation at the W Baltimore Station because there was not enough input from MTA.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Baltimore MD 21228

[REDACTED]

cc: MTA by email

Appendix G: List of Permits and Approvals

List of Anticipated Permits and Approvals

The following federal, state, and local permits and approvals may be required for implementation of Alternative 3A, 3B, and 3C.

Table 1: Anticipated Permits and Approvals Required for the Preferred Alternative

Project Impacts/Compliance	Authorizing or Coordinating Agency	Regulatory Requirement/Permit Application
Federal Authorizations/Compliance		
Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Compliance: Environmental Review
Archeological and Historic Resources	Maryland Historic Trust (MHT), Baltimore City's Commission for Historical & Architectural Preservation (CHAP), Consulting Parties	National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Compliance
Public Parks/Lands & Historic Sites	Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Section 4(f) Compliance
Noise & Vibration	Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Noise and vibration assessment / control / mitigation
Air Quality	Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), US Environmental Protection Agency	Clean Air Act
State Authorizations/Compliance		
Development within 100-Year Floodplain	Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Nontidal Wetlands and Waterways Permit and Individual Water Quality Certification: Joint Federal/State Application for the Alteration of any Floodplain Waterway, Tidal or Nontidal Wetland in Maryland
Stormwater Management and Erosion and Sediment Control	MDE Sediment, Stormwater & Dam Safety Program	Stormwater Management Approval: Waterway Construction Permit; Erosion and Sediment Control Plan Approval
Stormwater Management Associated with Construction Activity	MDE Sediment, Stormwater & Dam Safety Program	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Notice of Intent (NOI) for general permit coverage

Project Impacts/Compliance	Authorizing or Coordinating Agency	Regulatory Requirement/Permit Application
Dewatering and Groundwater Withdrawal for Dewatering Operations	MDE	MDE Water Appropriations Permit
Operation/Equipment that Discharges Emissions	MDE, Air Permits Program	Air Quality Permit to Construct
Noise & Vibration	MDE	Compliance to MDE 26.02.03 Control of Noise Pollution or receive variance during construction phase
Local Authorizations/Compliance		
Development within 100-Year Floodplain	Baltimore City Department of Planning	Submission of Development Plans with elevation of project
Dewatering and Groundwater Withdrawal for Dewatering Operations	Baltimore City Department of Planning	Well Construction Permit
Clearing Forest	Baltimore City Department of Planning	Forest Conservation Act Approval: Forest Stand Delineation, Forest Conservation Plan
Removal of Street Trees	Baltimore City Department of Recreation and Parks, Forestry Division	Baltimore City Street Tree Removal and Replacement Approval/Permit
Construction Projects	Baltimore City Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD)	Building Permit. Upload construction plans to E-plans
Construction within Right of Way	Baltimore City Department of General Services (DGS)	Developers Agreement
Impacts to Surrounding Transportation Network & Communities	Baltimore City Department of Transportation (DOT)	Traffic Impact Study (TIS)
New Facilities	Baltimore City Department of General Services	Construction Permit
Noise & Vibration	Baltimore City Department of Planning	Construction sites exempt to Health Code of Baltimore City (9-103.b Noise Regulation)
Railroad Access	Amtrak, Norfolk Southern, MARC	Railroad Access Permit, required in conjunction with railroad agreements

Appendix H: List of Authorizing Laws and Regulations

**APPLICABLE LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE
B&P TUNNEL PROJECT**

AGENCY	LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES
FEDERAL	
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP)	National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, Section 106 (36 CFR 60 and 36 CFR 800)
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (40 CFR Parts 1500 - 1508)
US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (23 CFR Part 200)
US Department of Transportation (Federal Railroad Administration)	Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 USC Part 303)
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009 (48 CFR Parts 1201-1253)
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act (PRIIA) of 2008
Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Railroad Noise Emissions Compliance Regulation (49 CFR Part 210)
Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST)	DOT Order 5610.1D - Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)	Clean Water Act, Section 404 Review/ Federal Pollution Control Act (33 CFR Part 320 and 40 CFR Part 230)
U.S. Department of the Interior	Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (43 CFR Parts 7, 43, and 79)
U.S. Department of the Interior	Archeological and Historic Preservation Act (43 CFR Part 7)
U.S. Department of the Interior	Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)	DOT Order 5610.2(a)-Department of Transportation Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)	DOT Order 5650.2 Floodplain Management
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT)	Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act) (49 CFR Part 24)
U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)	Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (78 FR 2731 and 64 FR 28545)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Clean Water Act, Section 401 (Water Quality Certification), Section 402 (NPDES), Section 404

AGENCY	LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, & Liability Act (CERCLA) (40 CFR Parts 300-374)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Noise Control Act of 1972 (40 CFR Part 201)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Pollution Prevention Act of 1990
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (RCRA) (40 CFR Parts 260-282)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) (40 CFR Parts 302, 350, 355, 370, and 374)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	Toxics Substance Control Act (TSCA)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Bald and Golden Eagle Management Act (50 CFR Parts 13 and 22)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Endangered Species Act (ESA) (50 CFR Part 402)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, Section 7 and Section 10 (50 CFR Part 83)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	Migratory Bird Treaty Act (50 CFR Part 10, 12, 20, and 21)
STATE	
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Forest Conservation Act (Natural Resource Article 5-1601 through 1613, COMAR 08.19.01 and COMAR 08.19.04)
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Maryland's Enforceable Coastal Policies
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act (Annotated Code of Maryland 10-2A-01 and COMAR 08.03.08)
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Roadside Tree Law (Natural Resource Article 5-401 through 5-411); Forest and Parks: Roadside Tree Care (COMAR 08.07.02); Tree Planting (COMAR 08.07.02.09)
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR)	Soil Conservation Policies (Agricultural Article 8-102)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Air Quality: Ambient Air Quality Standards (COMAR 26.11.04); General Emission Standards, Prohibitions, and Restrictions COMAR (26.11.06); Control of Asbestos (COMAR 26.11.04)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Non Tidal Wetlands (COMAR 26.23.01)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Occupational, Industrial, and Residential Hazards: Control of Noise Pollution (COMAR 26.02.03); Hazardous Substances (COMAR 26.02.04); Procedures

AGENCY	LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES
	for Abating Lead Containing Substances from Buildings (COMAR 26.02.07)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Regulation of Water Supply, Sewage Disposal, and Solid Waste (COMAR 26.04.07)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Water Management: Erosion and Sediment Control (COMAR 26.17.01); Stormwater Management (COMAR 26.17.02); Construction on Nontidal Waters and Floodplains (COMAR 26.17.04); Water Appropriation or Use (COMAR 26.17.06)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Water Pollution: Water Quality, Permits, and Underground Injection Control (COMAR 26.08.02, COMAR 26.08.04, and COMAR 26.08.07)
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)	Water Supply, Sewerage, Solid Waste, and Pollution Control Planning and Funding (COMAR 26.03.07)
Maryland Department of Transportation	Transportation Planning Process - the Action Plan (COMAR 11.01.06.02)
Maryland Historic Trust	Maryland Historic Trust Act of 1985, State Finance and Procurement (Annotated Code of Maryland, Article 5A-325 and 5A-326)
LOCAL	
Baltimore Board of Estimates/ Department of Recreation and Parks	Code of Public Local Laws Railroads -General Provisions (Article 4 Subtitle 18-1 to 18-4); Franchises (Subtitle 18-5); Railway Easements in Annex (Subtitle 18-13 to 18-14)
Baltimore City Department of Health	Baltimore City Code - Revised Articles; Health Code of Baltimore City - Waste Control (Title 7 Subtitle 5); Waste Water from Hydraulic Fracturing; Noise Regulation (Title 9 Subtitles 1 and 2)
Baltimore City Department of Planning	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Natural Resources -Division IV Forest and Tree Conservation (Article 7 Subtitle 41-1 to 41-4)
Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Jones' Falls (Article 25 Subtitle 18-1 to 18-2)
Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Natural Resources -Division II Stormwater Management (Article 7 Subtitle 21-1 to 21-6); Natural Resources - Division II Stormwater Management Plans (Article 7 Subtitle 22-1 to 22-10); Permits, Fees, Security (Article 7 Subtitle 25-1 to 25-4); Inspections (Article 7 Subtitle 26-1 to 26-8)

AGENCY	LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND POLICIES
Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Natural Resources -Division III Soil Erosion and Sediment Control (Article 7 Subtitle 31-1 to 31-10); Plans (Article 7 Subtitle 32-1 to 32-9); Permits, Fees, Security (Article 7 Subtitle 33-1 to 33-3)
Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Stormwater Remediation Fees -General Provisions; Watershed Protection and Restoration; Fee Imposition and Collection; Stormwater Utility (Article 27, Subtitle 1, 2, 3, and 5)
Baltimore City Department of Public Works (DPW)	Code of Public Local Laws Streets, Bridges, and Highways (Article 4 Subtitle 21-1 to 21-32)
Baltimore City Department of Public Works/ Department of Recreation and Parks	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Natural Resources -Division V Trees Along City Streets (Article 7 Subtitle 53-1 to 53-26)
Baltimore City Department of Transportation/Department of Public Works	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Surveys, Streets, and Highways Article 26 - Survey Authority; Opening, Widening, Closing Streets; Bridges; Street Cuts (Article 26, Subtitle 1, 3, 14, and 15)
Baltimore City Department of Transportation/Department of Public Works	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Transit and Traffic - Definitions; General Provisions; General Administration; Parking, Standing, and Stopping Regulations; Grade Crossings ; Commercial Vehicle Monitoring System (Article 31 Subtitles 1, 2, 6, 19, and 34)
Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation (CHAP)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Historic and Architectural Preservation (Article 6 Subtitle 8-1 to 8-15)
Commission for Historical and Architectural Preservation (CHAP)	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles; Historic and Architectural Preservation (Article 6 Subtitle 9-1 to 9-8)
Environmental Control Board	Baltimore City Code - Unrevised Articles Mayor, City Council and Municipal Agencies (Article 1 Subtitle 40-1 to 40-14)