



TIER 1 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
VOLUME 1 (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)

Table of Contents

Contents

Summary

S.1	BACKGROUND	S-2
S.2	CONSIDERATION OF OTHER TRANSPORTATION MODES AND FREIGHT RAIL SERVICE	S-4
S.3	NEED FOR NEC FUTURE	S-5
S.4	STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED (CHAPTER 3)	S-6
S.5	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE (CHAPTER 4)	S-7
S.6	ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES	S-9
S.6.1	No Action Alternative	S-9
S.6.2	Transportation Effects (Chapter 5)	S-10
S.6.3	Economic Effects (Chapter 6)	S-11
S.6.4	Environmental Consequences (Chapter 7)	S-12
S.6.5	Construction Effects (Chapter 8)	S-15
S.6.6	Costs	S-16
S.6.7	Comparison of Alternatives: Summary of Findings (Chapter 9)	S-17
S.6.8	Phasing and Implementation (Chapter 10)	S-17
S.7	NEXT STEPS	S-18

1. Introduction

1.1	STRUCTURE OF THE TIER 1 FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	1-1
1.2	WHAT IS THE FRA ACHIEVING WITH NEC FUTURE?	1-2
1.2.1	What is NEC FUTURE?	1-2
1.2.2	What decision is the FRA making?	1-3
1.2.3	What is the Federal Transit Administration’s role in NEC FUTURE?	1-4
1.3	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT PROCESS	1-4
1.3.1	What is a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement?	1-4
1.3.2	What is the difference between the Tier 1 Draft EIS and Tier 1 Final EIS?	1-4
1.3.3	How does the public provide feedback on the Tier 1 Final EIS?	1-4
1.3.4	What is the process for Tier 2 project studies?	1-5
1.3.5	How can Tier 2 project sponsors use the analysis documented in this Tier 1 EIS?	1-5
1.3.6	Can other projects not mentioned in NEC FUTURE be identified after the Record of Decision?	1-5
1.3.7	Does finalization of this Tier 1 EIS/Record of Decision allow construction to begin?	1-6
1.3.8	What happens after the Record of Decision?	1-6
1.3.9	How can the NEC FUTURE Section 106 Programmatic Agreement be used for Tier 2 actions?	1-6
1.4	IDENTIFICATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	1-6
1.4.1	How did the FRA decide on a Preferred Alternative?	1-7
1.4.2	How did public comments inform the FRA’s decision-making?	1-8
1.5	WHAT DOES THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE MEAN FOR CONNECTING CORRIDORS?	1-8
1.6	IMPLEMENTING THE SELECTED ALTERNATIVE	1-9
1.6.1	How will the Tier 1 decision guide the next steps toward implementation?	1-9
1.6.2	What is the Service Development Plan?	1-9
1.6.3	Who will be responsible for advancing the NEC FUTURE investment program?	1-10
1.7	ROLE OF THE PUBLIC IN FUTURE DECISIONS	1-10

2. Readers’ Guide

2.1	HOW TO “USE” VOLUME 1 AND VOLUME 2	2-1
2.2	CONSISTENCY BETWEEN THE TIER 1 DRAFT EIS AND TIER 1 FINAL EIS	2-1
2.2.1	Key Concepts	2-2
2.2.2	Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative	2-6
2.2.3	Tier 1 EIS Terminology	2-6

2.3	CONTENTS OF VOLUME 1	2-8
2.3.1	Main Body.....	2-8
2.3.2	Appendices	2-9
2.4	CONTENTS OF VOLUME 2	2-10
3.	Purpose and Need	
3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	3-1
3.2	PURPOSE STATEMENT.....	3-1
3.3	NEED STATEMENT.....	3-1
3.4	RESPONSE TO TIER 1 DRAFT EIS COMMENTS.....	3-2
4.	Preferred Alternative	
4.1	APPROACH TO DEVELOPING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	4-1
4.2	FACTORS CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	4-2
4.2.1	Tier 1 Draft EIS Findings.....	4-3
4.2.2	Public and Stakeholder Comments	4-12
4.2.3	FRA Policy Objectives	4-16
4.3	NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE	4-20
4.3.1	Disinvestment Scenario	4-21
4.4	DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	4-22
4.4.1	Selecting a Vision.....	4-24
4.4.2	Elements Included in the Preferred Alternative.....	4-25
4.4.3	Elements Not Included in the Preferred Alternative	4-30
4.4.4	Future Opportunities for Expansion	4-30
4.4.5	Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative	4-30
4.5	DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.....	4-42
4.5.1	Technology Considerations	4-43
4.5.2	Service Planning	4-44
4.5.3	Travel Times	4-47
4.5.4	Capacity for Existing and New Markets.....	4-51
4.5.5	Stations/Metropolitan Areas Served.....	4-52
4.5.6	Pricing.....	4-61
4.5.7	Rolling Stock.....	4-61
4.5.8	Rail-Airport Connections	4-62
4.5.9	Connecting Transit and Rail Services.....	4-63
4.5.10	Ancillary Facilities and Supporting Structures	4-67
4.6	INFRASTRUCTURE ELEMENTS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.....	4-70
4.6.1	Chokepoint Relief Projects	4-71
4.6.2	New Track.....	4-72
4.6.3	Curve Modifications	4-73
4.6.4	New Segment	4-73
4.6.5	Highway-Railroad Grade Crossings.....	4-77
4.6.6	Ownership	4-79
4.7	GEOGRAPHIC DEPICTION AND ORIENTATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	4-79
4.7.1	Washington, D.C.....	4-82
4.7.2	Maryland	4-82
4.7.3	Delaware	4-83
4.7.4	Pennsylvania.....	4-85
4.7.5	New Jersey.....	4-87
4.7.6	New York	4-88
4.7.7	Connecticut	4-90
4.7.8	Rhode Island.....	4-92
4.7.9	Massachusetts	4-92

4.8	SHARED ACCESS AND CONSIDERATION OF FREIGHT.....	4-94
4.8.1	Existing Freight Access to the NEC and the Hartford/Springfield Line	4-94
4.8.2	Freight Rail Interface with Preferred Alternative	4-96
4.9	COST	4-96
4.9.1	Capital Costs	4-97
4.9.2	Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Costs	4-98
4.10	KEY FEATURES AND BENEFITS OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.....	4-98
4.10.1	Key Features	4-99
4.10.2	Key Benefits.....	4-100
4.11	LOOKING AHEAD.....	4-102
5.	Transportation	
5.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	5-1
5.2	METHODOLOGY.....	5-2
5.2.1	Representative Stations and Station-Pairs	5-3
5.2.2	Ridership Model	5-4
5.2.3	Integrated Rail Network	5-5
5.3	TRANSPORTATION EFFECTS.....	5-6
5.3.1	Corridor-wide Analysis	5-7
5.3.2	Stations Analysis.....	5-9
5.3.3	Integrated Rail Network	5-18
5.4	TIER 2 ASSESSMENTS.....	5-21
6.	Economic Effects and Growth, and Indirect Effects	
6.1	INTRODUCTION.....	6-1
6.2	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	6-1
6.2.1	Economic Development Response	6-2
6.2.2	Travel-Market Effects	6-2
6.2.3	Construction and Rail Sector Employment Effects.....	6-2
6.2.4	Indirect Effects.....	6-3
6.3	ECONOMIC AND GROWTH EFFECTS.....	6-3
6.3.1	Introduction.....	6-3
6.3.2	Construction Effects	6-4
6.3.3	Rail Sector Employment Effects.....	6-6
6.3.4	Travel-Market Effects	6-8
6.3.5	Economic Development Response	6-17
6.3.6	Indirect Effects.....	6-32
7	Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Strategies	
	INTRODUCTION AND GUIDE TO EFFECTS ASSESSMENT	7-I
	BOUNDARIES FOR DEFINING ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.....	7-II
	Calculation of Environmental Consequences.....	7-vi
	Approach to the Analysis of the No Action Alternative.....	7-vii
	Level of Detail and Data Considerations.....	7-ix
	HOW TO READ CHAPTER 7.....	7-IX
	ORGANIZATION OF CHAPTER 7 RESOURCE AREAS	7-X
7.1	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS.....	7.1-1
7.1.1	Introduction.....	7.1-1
7.1.2	Stations.....	7.1-11
7.2	LAND COVER.....	7.2-1
7.2.1	Introduction.....	7.2-1
7.2.2	Resource Overview.....	7.2-1
7.2.3	Affected Environment	7.2-3

7.2.4	Environmental Consequences	7.2-4
7.2.5	Stations.....	7.2-8
7.2.6	Context Area.....	7.2-9
7.2.7	State and Regional Plan Analysis.....	7.2-9
7.2.8	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.2-17
7.2.9	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.2-18
7.2.10	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.2-19
7.3	AGRICULTURAL LANDS (PRIME FARMLAND AND TIMBERLAND).....	7.3-1
7.3.1	Introduction.....	7.3-1
7.3.2	Resource Overview.....	7.3-1
7.3.3	Affected Environment	7.3-1
7.3.4	Environmental Consequences	7.3-3
7.3.5	Stations.....	7.3-5
7.3.6	Prime Farmland and Prime Timberland Land Use Plan Review	7.3-6
7.3.7	Context Area.....	7.3-7
7.3.8	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.3-7
7.3.9	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.3-7
7.3.10	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.3-8
7.4	PARKLANDS AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS.....	7.4-1
7.4.1	Introduction.....	7.4-1
7.4.2	Resource Overview.....	7.4-1
7.4.3	Affected Environment	7.4-3
7.4.4	Environmental Consequences	7.4-4
7.4.5	Stations.....	7.4-14
7.4.6	Context Area.....	7.4-15
7.4.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.4-16
7.4.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.4-17
7.4.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.4-17
7.5	HYDROLOGIC/WATER RESOURCES.....	7.5-1
7.5.1	Introduction.....	7.5-1
7.5.2	Resource Overview.....	7.5-2
7.5.3	Affected Environment	7.5-3
7.5.4	Environmental Consequences	7.5-4
7.5.5	Stations.....	7.5-9
7.5.6	Context Area.....	7.5-9
7.5.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.5-10
7.5.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.5-12
7.5.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.5-13
7.6	ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	7.6-1
7.6.1	Introduction.....	7.6-1
7.6.2	Resource Overview.....	7.6-2
7.6.3	Affected Environment	7.6-3
7.6.4	Environmental Consequences	7.6-10
7.6.5	Stations.....	7.6-17
7.6.6	Context Area.....	7.6-20
7.6.7	Anthropogenic Influences	7.6-20
7.6.8	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.6-21
7.6.9	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.6-23
7.6.10	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.6-23
7.7	GEOLOGIC RESOURCES	7.7-1
7.7.1	Introduction.....	7.7-1
7.7.2	Resource Overview.....	7.7-1
7.7.3	Affected Environment	7.7-2

7.7.4	Environmental Consequences	7.7-2
7.7.5	Stations.....	7.7-4
7.7.6	Context Area.....	7.7-5
7.7.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.7-5
7.7.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.7-6
7.7.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.7-6
7.8	HAZARDOUS WASTE AND CONTAMINATED MATERIAL	7.8-1
7.8.1	Introduction.....	7.8-1
7.8.2	Resource Overview.....	7.8-2
7.8.3	Affected Environment	7.8-2
7.8.4	Environmental Consequences	7.8-5
7.8.5	Stations.....	7.8-8
7.8.6	Context Area.....	7.8-8
7.8.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.8-9
7.8.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.8-9
7.8.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.8-9
7.9	CULTURAL RESOURCES AND HISTORIC PROPERTIES	7.9-1
7.9.1	Introduction.....	7.9-1
7.9.2	Resource Overview.....	7.9-3
7.9.3	Affected Environment	7.9-4
7.9.4	Environmental Consequences	7.9-6
7.9.5	Stations.....	7.9-15
7.9.6	Context Area.....	7.9-15
7.9.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.9-17
7.9.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.9-17
7.9.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.9-18
7.10	VISUAL AND AESTHETIC RESOURCES	7.10-1
7.10.1	Introduction.....	7.10-1
7.10.2	Resource Overview.....	7.10-1
7.10.3	Affected Environment	7.10-2
7.10.4	Environmental Consequences	7.10-3
7.10.5	Stations.....	7.10-6
7.10.6	Context Area.....	7.10-8
7.10.7	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.10-8
7.10.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.10-9
7.10.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.10-9
7.11	ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE	7.11-1
7.11.1	Introduction.....	7.11-1
7.11.2	Resource Overview.....	7.11-2
7.11.3	Affected Environment	7.11-3
7.11.4	Environmental Consequences	7.11-5
7.11.5	Context Area.....	7.11-10
7.11.6	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.11-11
7.11.7	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.11-11
7.11.8	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.11-12
7.12	NOISE AND VIBRATION	7.12-1
7.12.1	Introduction.....	7.12-1
7.12.2	Resource Overview.....	7.12-1
7.12.3	Affected Environment	7.12-2
7.12.4	Environmental Consequences	7.12-5
7.12.5	Context Area.....	7.12-9
7.12.6	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.12-9
7.12.7	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.12-10

7.12.8	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis	7.12-10
7.13	AIR QUALITY	7.13-1
7.13.1	Introduction.....	7.13-1
7.13.2	Resource Overview.....	7.13-1
7.13.3	Criteria Pollutants.....	7.13-2
7.13.4	Mobile-Source Air Toxics.....	7.13-10
7.13.5	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	7.13-10
7.13.6	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.13-13
7.13.7	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.13-13
7.13.8	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.13-14
7.14	ENERGY.....	7.14-1
7.14.1	Introduction.....	7.14-1
7.14.2	Resource Overview.....	7.14-1
7.14.3	Affected Environment	7.14-1
7.14.4	Environmental Consequences	7.14-6
7.14.5	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.14-7
7.14.6	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.14-7
7.14.7	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.14-7
7.15	CLIMATE CHANGE AND ADAPTATION.....	7.15-1
7.15.1	Introduction.....	7.15-1
7.15.2	Resource Overview.....	7.15-3
7.15.3	Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	7.15-4
7.15.4	Inundation Risks to Rail Infrastructure	7.15-4
7.15.5	Stations at Risk	7.15-16
7.15.6	Context Area.....	7.15-17
7.15.7	Extreme Temperature Effects on Rail Infrastructure	7.15-18
7.15.8	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.15-21
7.15.9	Conclusions.....	7.15-22
7.15.10	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.15-23
7.15.11	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.15-29
7.16	SECTION 4(F) AND SECTION 6(F) RESOURCES	7.16-1
7.16.1	Section 4(f) Resources	7.16-1
7.16.2	Section 6(f) Resources	7.16-17
7.17	ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS AND ELECTROMAGNETIC INTERFERENCE ASSESSMENT.....	7.17-1
7.17.1	Introduction.....	7.17-1
7.17.2	Resource Overview.....	7.17-1
7.17.3	Affected Environment	7.17-2
7.17.4	Environmental Consequences	7.17-2
7.17.5	Stations.....	7.17-5
7.17.6	Human Exposure Limits.....	7.17-5
7.17.7	Context Area.....	7.17-6
7.17.8	Comparison to the Action Alternatives	7.17-6
7.17.9	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.17-7
7.17.10	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.17-7
7.18	SAFETY.....	7.18-1
7.18.1	Introduction.....	7.18-1
7.18.2	Resource Overview.....	7.18-1
7.18.3	Affected Environment	7.18-1
7.18.4	Environmental Consequences	7.18-2
7.18.5	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.18-5
7.18.6	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.18-5
7.19	SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEALTH EFFECTS	7.19-1
7.20	CUMULATIVE EFFECTS	7.20-1

7.20.1	Introduction.....	7.20-1
7.20.2	Resource Overview.....	7.20-1
7.20.3	Geographic Boundaries and Time Period.....	7.20-1
7.20.4	Key Resources.....	7.20-3
7.20.5	Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions.....	7.20-3
7.20.6	Trends for Considering Cumulative Effects on Key Resources.....	7.20-5
7.20.7	Cumulative Effects.....	7.20-6
7.20.8	Potential Mitigation Strategies.....	7.20-10
7.20.9	Subsequent Tier 2 Analysis.....	7.20-10
7.21	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES.....	7.21-1
8. Construction Effects		
8.1	INTRODUCTION.....	8-1
8.2	CONSTRUCTION OVERVIEW.....	8-1
8.2.1	Construction Types.....	8-1
8.2.2	Construction Impacts on Train Operations.....	8-2
8.3	STATION CONSTRUCTION.....	8-4
8.4	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT.....	8-5
8.5	TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCING.....	8-5
8.6	CONSTRUCTION STAGING AREAS.....	8-5
8.7	TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EFFECTS.....	8-5
8.8	POTENTIAL MITIGATION.....	8-6
8.9	SUBSEQUENT TIER 2 ANALYSIS.....	8-6
9. Evaluation of the Preferred Alternative		
9.1	EVALUATION OF THE PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE.....	9-1
9.1.1	Need-Based Factors.....	9-2
9.1.2	Other Factors.....	9-18
9.2	SUMMARY OF BENEFITS AND EFFECTS.....	9-22
9.2.1	Benefits.....	9-22
9.2.2	Effects.....	9-24
10. Phasing and Implementation		
10.1	INTRODUCTION.....	10-1
10.2	PRINCIPLES FOR PHASING AND PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.....	10-2
10.3	STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION.....	10-4
10.4	INITIAL PHASE NEXT STEPS.....	10-5
10.4.1	Initial Phase Objectives and Scope.....	10-6
10.4.2	Institutional and Legal Issues.....	10-6
10.4.3	Construction Staging and Planning Strategies.....	10-7
10.5	THE TIER 1 DECISION AND TRANSITIONING TO TIER 2 STUDIES.....	10-8
10.6	ROLE OF THE FRA.....	10-10
11. Agency and Public Involvement		
11.1	INTRODUCTION.....	11-1
11.2	TIER 1 DRAFT EIS PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND PUBLIC HEARINGS.....	11-2
11.2.1	Distribution and Publicity for the Tier 1 Draft EIS.....	11-2
11.2.2	Opportunities to Comment.....	11-4
11.2.3	Public Hearings.....	11-5
11.2.4	Outreach to Environmental Justice Populations.....	11-5
11.2.5	Stakeholder Outreach.....	11-6
11.3	TIER 1 DRAFT EIS COMMENTS.....	11-6
11.3.1	Number and Source of Comments.....	11-6

- 11.3.2 Comment Themes 11-7
- 11.3.3 Documentation of Comments and Responses 11-9
- 11.4 STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH FOLLOWING THE TIER 1 DRAFT EIS COMMENT PERIOD..... 11-10
 - 11.4.1 Lead and Cooperating Agencies 11-10
 - 11.4.2 Northeast Corridor Commission..... 11-10
 - 11.4.3 State Transportation Agencies and Railroad Operators..... 11-10
 - 11.4.4 Metropolitan Planning Organizations 11-11
 - 11.4.5 Environmental Resource and Regulatory Agencies..... 11-11
 - 11.4.6 Section 106 11-12
 - 11.4.7 Other Meetings 11-12
- 12. References**
- 13. Glossary**
- 14. List of Preparers**
- 15. Index**

Appendices

Appendix AA: Mapping Atlas of the Preferred Alternative

Appendix BB: Technical Analysis on the Preferred Alternative

Appendix CC: Transportation Effects of the Preferred Alternative

Appendix DD: Economics Effects of the Preferred Alternative

Appendix EE: Environmental Resource Documentation for the Preferred Alternative

Appendix FF: Agency and Public Involvement

Appendix GG: Section 106 Documentation

Appendix HH: Preliminary Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources

Appendix II: Endangered Species Act Correspondence

Appendix JJ: Comments and Responses

Tables

Table S-1:	Limits of Affected Environment by Resource	S-13
Table S-2:	Capital Costs – Preferred Alternative (\$2014 billions)	S-16
Table S-3:	Summary of Alternatives – Characteristics and Evaluation Factors	S-19
Table 4-1:	NEC FUTURE Evaluation Factors	4-3
Table 4-2:	Summary of NEC FUTURE Alternatives	4-35
Table 4-3:	Trains per Peak Hour, Existing and 2040 Peak-Hour Peak Direction at Select Screenlines (No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative)	4-46
Table 4-4:	Fastest Intercity-Express Travel Times between Key City-Pairs Rounded to the nearest 5 Minutes (hour:minutes)	4-48
Table 4-5:	Average Intercity Travel Times between Selected Major Hub/Hub Stations in the Preferred Alternative Rounded to Nearest Five Minutes (hour:minutes)	4-49
Table 4-6:	Decrease in Intercity Travel Times between Selected Major Hub/Hub Stations in the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative Rounded to Nearest Five Minutes (hour:minutes)	4-50
Table 4-7:	Rail Service and Practical Capacity at Select Screenlines (Peak Hour, Peak Direction)	4-52
Table 4-8:	Station Types for Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative	4-53
Table 4-9:	Stations in the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative	4-56
Table 4-10:	Rolling Stock Assumptions Used for Service Planning Purposes	4-62
Table 4-11:	Potential Intercity Rail Storage and Maintenance Facilities	4-68
Table 4-12:	Preferred Alternative Infrastructure Elements by State	4-76
Table 4-13:	Grade Crossings of the NEC and Hartford/Springfield Line	4-78
Table 4-14:	Preferred Alternative – Footprint Width of New Segments	4-80
Table 4-15:	Mapping Atlas Reference Guide	4-81
Table 4-16:	New Segments of the Preferred Alternative	4-82
Table 4-17:	Capital Costs – Preferred Alternative (\$2014 billions)	4-97
Table 5-1:	Representative Stations and Existing Station Type	5-3
Table 5-2:	Representative Station-Pairs	5-4
Table 5-3:	Annual Trips (1,000s) by Mode for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-7
Table 5-4:	Annual Percentage of Mode Share for Intercity Travel between Representative Metropolitan-Area Pairs for No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-8
Table 5-5:	Annual Intercity Ridership by Selected Metropolitan-Area Pair for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-8
Table 5-6:	Changes in Total Bi-Directional Intercity Trains Per Day by Representative Stations for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-11
Table 5-7:	Changes in Regional Passenger Rail Trains Per Day for Representative Stations	5-11
Table 5-8:	Average Intercity Travel Time (Hours:Minutes) by Representative Station-Pair Rounded to the Nearest Five Minutes (2040)	5-14
Table 5-9:	Average Number of Intercity Trains Per Day (One-Way) by Representative Station- Pair for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-15
Table 5-10:	Annual One-Way Intercity Trips by Representative Station-Pairs for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-17
Table 5-11:	Annual Regional Rail Trips by Selected Metropolitan Areas for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-18

Table 5-12:	Daily Two-Way Trips at Select Station Screenlines for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040)	5-18
Table 5-13:	Annual Two-Way Ridership by Station-Pair Including Selected Connecting Corridor Stations (2040).....	5-19
Table 6-1:	Potential Construction Employment Impacts.....	6-5
Table 6-2:	2040 Potential O&M Employment Impacts.....	6-7
Table 6-3:	2040 Potential O&M Earnings Impacts	6-8
Table 6-4:	Net Change in Value of Travel-Time and Travel-Cost Savings by Mode for Diverted Users	6-10
Table 6-5:	2040 Annual Intercity Value of Travel-Time Savings	6-11
Table 6-6:	Annual Hours and Auto Diversions to Regional Rail Resulting in User Benefits.....	6-12
Table 6-7:	2040 Potential Intercity Travel-Cost Impacts by Mode	6-14
Table 6-8:	Safety Benefits for VMT Diverted to Intercity and Regional Rail Service in 2040	6-14
Table 6-9:	Total Value of 2040 Potential Emissions Impacts.....	6-15
Table 6-10:	Summary of Planning by Market	6-22
Table 6-11:	Range of Pricing/Service Type Options Serving Metropolitan Areas Daily	6-23
Table 6-12:	Daily Trains Serving Metropolitan Area (Number of Daily Trains at a Hub Station within Metropolitan Area).....	6-24
Table 6-13:	Number of Destinations Accessible via Direct Connections.....	6-26
Table 6-14:	Frequency of Direct Connections	6-27
Table 6-15:	Shortest Travel Time to Penn Station New York	6-29
Table 6-16:	Average Number of Daily Trains to New York City per Station	6-29
Table 6-17:	Jobs Accessible in a 45-Minute Train Travel Time (based on 2040 employment data)	6-31
Table 6-18:	Population Accessible in a 45-Minute Train Travel Time (based on 2040 population data).....	6-31
Table 7-1:	Limits of Affected Environment by Resource	7-iv
Table 7-2:	Chapter Number/Resource Area Considered.....	7-x
Table 7.1-1:	Summary of Effects.....	7.1-5
Table 7.1-2:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations.....	7.1-13
Table 7.2-1:	Affected Environment: Land Cover	7.2-3
Table 7.2-2:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Potential Conversions of Developed and Undeveloped Land Cover	7.2-4
Table 7.2-3:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Representative Route – Potential Acquisitions of Land Cover.....	7.2-7
Table 7.2-4:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Potential Conversions of Undeveloped Land Cover	7.2-9
Table 7.3-1:	Affected Environment: Prime Farmland Acreage.....	7.3-2
Table 7.3-2:	Affected Environment: Prime Timberland Acreage.....	7.3-2
Table 7.3-3:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Prime Farmland.....	7.3-3
Table 7.3-4:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Prime Timberland	7.3-4
Table 7.3-5:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Prime Farmland	7.3-5
Table 7.3-6:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Prime Timberland	7.3-6
Table 7.4-1:	Affected Environment: Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers.....	7.4-3
Table 7.4-2:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	7.4-5

Table 7.4-3:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	7.4-7
Table 7.4-4:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – National Historic and Scenic Trails	7.4-13
Table 7.4-5:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	7.4-15
Table 7.5-1:	Summary of Water Resources within the Affected Environment	7.5-3
Table 7.5-2:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Quantitative Impacts to Water Resources	7.5-5
Table 7.5-3:	Environmental Consequences: Water Resources with Greatest Combined Impact within the Preferred Alternative	7.5-8
Table 7.5-4:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Hydrologic/Water Resources.....	7.5-9
Table 7.5-5:	Quantitative Comparison of Water Resources between Alternatives	7.5-10
Table 7.5-6:	Interstate and State Commission Authorities Associated with Water Resources.....	7.5-13
Table 7.6-1:	Affected Environment: Ecologically Sensitive Habitats	7.6-3
Table 7.6-2:	Affected Environment: List of Threatened and Endangered Species	7.6-4
Table 7.6-3:	Affected Environment: Threatened and Endangered Species	7.6-5
Table 7.6-4:	Affected Environment: Federally Managed Species’ Essential Fish Habitats.....	7.6-7
Table 7.6-5:	Affected Environment: Federally Managed Fish Species	7.6-8
Table 7.6-6:	National Marine Fisheries Service “Species of Concern”	7.6-10
Table 7.6-7:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Ecologically Sensitive Habitat ...	7.6-11
Table 7.6-8:	Environmental Consequences: Ecologically Sensitive Habitats Impacts 10 Percent or Greater	7.6-12
Table 7.6-9:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Federally Managed Fish Species	7.6-14
Table 7.6-10:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route Crossing Impact – Essential Fish Habitat.....	7.6-15
Table 7.6-11:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Ecologically Sensitive Habitats.....	7.6-18
Table 7.6-12:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Threatened and Endangered Species	7.6-18
Table 7.6-13:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Essential Fish Habitat.....	7.6-19
Table 7.7-1:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Geologic Resources.....	7.7-5
Table 7.8-1:	Affected Environment: Total Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Material.....	7.8-3
Table 7.8-2:	Affected Environment: National Priority List Superfund and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Corrective Actions Sites.....	7.8-3
Table 7.8-3:	High-Probability Areas: Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Material Sites.....	7.8-4
Table 7.8-4:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Material Sites.....	7.8-6
Table 7.8-5:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Hazardous Waste and Contaminated Material	7.8-8
Table 7.9-1:	Affected Environment: Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.9-5
Table 7.9-2:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.9-8
Table 7.9-3:	Counties of Interest to Federally Recognized Tribes	7.9-14

Table 7.9-4:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.9-15
Table 7.9-5:	Context Area: National Historic Landmarks and National Register of Historic Places (Number of Properties)	7.9-16
Table 7.10-1:	Environmental Consequences: Visual and Aesthetic Resources	7.10-4
Table 7.10-2:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Visual and Aesthetic Resources	7.10-7
Table 7.11-1:	Effects-Assessment Methodology Summary: Environmental Justice Populations	7.11-2
Table 7.11-2:	Affected Environment (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line): Total Population and Total Minority/Low-Income Populations by Geography	7.11-4
Table 7.11-3:	Affected Environment (Preferred Alternative): Total Population and Total Minority/Low-Income Populations by Geography	7.11-4
Table 7.11-4:	Affected Environments: Environmental Justice Census Tracts by Geography	7.11-4
Table 7.11-5:	Resources Considered for Environmental Justice Assessment	7.11-6
Table 7.11-6:	Preferred Alternative – Summary of Potential Effects by County.....	7.11-7
Table 7.11-7:	Context Area: Total Environmental Justice Census Tracts by Geography	7.11-11
Table 7.12-1:	Affected Environment: Noise and Vibration – Land Use	7.12-3
Table 7.12-2:	Affected Environment: Noise and Vibration – Existing Levels.....	7.12-4
Table 7.12-3:	Environmental Consequences: Noise and Vibration – No Action Alternative.....	7.12-5
Table 7.12-4:	Environmental Consequences: Noise Residential Impacts – No Action Alternative (Hartford/Springfield Line)	7.12-6
Table 7.12-5:	Environmental Consequences: Noise and Vibration – Preferred Alternative	7.12-7
Table 7.12-6:	Environmental Consequences: Noise Residential Impacts – Preferred Alternative.....	7.12-8
Table 7.13-1:	National Ambient Air Quality Standards	7.13-3
Table 7.13-2:	Affected Environment: Air Quality Attainment Status (2016).....	7.13-4
Table 7.13-3:	Affected Environment: Primary Source of Air Pollutants (2011).....	7.13-5
Table 7.13-4:	2040 Changes in Criteria Pollutant Burdens (tons/year) – Existing Energy Profile	7.13-7
Table 7.13-5:	Renewable Energy Targets by Geography.....	7.13-7
Table 7.13-6:	Changes in Criteria Pollutant Burdens – Preferred Alternative – Future Energy Profile (2040)	7.13-8
Table 7.13-7:	Greenhouse Gas Emissions by Geography (2013).....	7.13-11
Table 7.13-8:	2040 Changes in CO ₂ e – Preferred Alternative – Existing Energy Profile	7.13-12
Table 7.13-9:	2040 Changes in CO ₂ e – Preferred Alternative – Future Energy Profile.....	7.13-12
Table 7.14-1:	Energy Consumption per Capita (2013)	7.14-2
Table 7.14-2:	U.S. Transportation Energy Use by Mode (2013).....	7.14-2
Table 7.14-3:	2040 Changes in Energy Use – Preferred Alternative	7.14-6
Table 7.14-4:	Energy Intensities by Mode (2013).....	7.14-7
Table 7.14-5:	Energy Intensities by Train Type.....	7.14-7
Table 7.15-1:	Affected Environment (Current, Mid-Century, and End-of-Century Climate Conditions): Stations at Risk of Inundation from One or More Flood Hazards for Preferred Alternative.....	7.15-17
Table 7.15-2:	Current Climate Conditions: Counties with Largest Number of Acres at Risk of Inundation along the Representative Routes of the Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line, Preferred Alternative, and Action Alternatives.....	7.15-22
Table 7.15-3:	Summary of Potential Climate Change Adaptation Actions for the NEC	7.15-25
Table 7.15-4:	Overview of the Federal Highway Administration’s Virtual Framework for Vulnerability Assessments Modules and Their Application to Tier 2 Analysis	7.15-30

Table 7.16-1:	Affected Environment: Section 4(f) Resources – Parks, Recreational Areas, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges.....	7.16-5
Table 7.16-2:	Affected Environment: Section 4(f) Resources – Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.16-6
Table 7.16-3:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Section 4(f) Resources – Parks, Recreational Areas, and Wildlife and Waterfowl Refuges.....	7.16-8
Table 7.16-4:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Section 4(f) Resources – Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.16-10
Table 7.16-5:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route (New or Upgraded Segments) – Section 4(f) Resources	7.16-11
Table 7.16-6:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Parklands and Wild and Scenic Rivers	7.16-12
Table 7.16-7:	Environmental Consequences: Preferred Alternative – Modified or New Stations – Cultural Resources and Historic Properties	7.16-12
Table 7.16-8:	Affected Environment: Section 6(f) Resources.....	7.16-18
Table 7.16-9:	Environmental Consequences: Representative Route – Section 6(f) Resources	7.16-19
Table 7.17-1:	Locations of Sample Sensitive Receptors to Electromagnetic Fields/Electromagnetic Interference (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative)	7.17-3
Table 7.17-2:	Environmental Consequences: Land Uses with Sample Sensitive Receptors to Electromagnetic Fields/Electromagnetic Interference (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative)	7.17-4
Table 7.17-3:	Maximum Permissible Values for Magnetic and Electric Fields (60 Hz) Attending to Usual Standards and Guides	7.17-6
Table 7.17-4:	Typical Maximum Electric and Magnetic Field Values at Fundamental Frequency from EN 50121-2	7.17-6
Table 7.18-1:	Anticipated Tripmaking by Mode (2040).....	7.18-3
Table 7.20-1:	Representative Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions.....	7.20-4
Table 7.20-2:	Cumulative Effects on Key Resources by New or Upgraded Segment	7.20-8
Table 7.20-3:	Summary of Total Potential Contributions of the Preferred Alternative to Cumulative Effects on Key Resources.....	7.20-9
Table 9-1:	Evaluation Factors and Metrics	9-2
Table 9-2:	Rail Service and Practical Capacity at Select Screenlines (Peak Hour, Peak Direction) for No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative	9-4
Table 9-3:	Passenger-Carrying Capacity at Select Screenlines (Peak Hour, Peak Direction) for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....	9-5
Table 9-4:	Passenger Rail Trips and Miles for the Preferred Alternative (% change over the No Action Alternative).....	9-6
Table 9-5:	Intercity Trips (in 1,000s of one-way trips) – Select Metropolitan Areas for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....	9-6
Table 9-6:	Annual Intercity Passenger Rail Trips (1,000s) Diverted from Other Modes for the Preferred Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative (2040)	9-7
Table 9-7:	Annual Regional Rail Passenger Rail Trips (1,000s) Diverted from Other Modes for the Preferred Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative (2040)	9-7
Table 9-8:	Annual Reduction in Vehicle-Miles Traveled (1,000s) for the Preferred Alternative Compared to the No Action Alternative (2040)	9-7
Table 9-9:	Daily Trains Serving Airport Stations	9-8
Table 9-10:	Air-to-Rail Diversions (Annual One-Way Trips) for the Preferred Alternative	9-9
Table 9-11:	Daily Station-to-Station Frequencies by Intercity Rail Service between Representative Station-Pairs for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative	9-9

Table 9-12: Intercity Daily Service Volumes between Representative Station-Pairs – Connecting Corridors for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative9-10

Table 9-13: Best Station-to-Station Travel Time (hours:minutes) for Representative Station-Pairs in the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....9-11

Table 9-14: Intercity-Corridor Travel-Time (hours:minutes) for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....9-12

Table 9-15: Current Climate Conditions (All Flooding Risks): Representative Route – Old Saybrook–Kenyon New Segment Percentage of Acreage of At-Grade and Trench Construction Types at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....9-13

Table 9-16: Current Climate Conditions (All Flooding Risks): Representative Route – Bayview–Newport New Segment Percentage of Acreage of At-Grade and Trench Construction Types at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....9-14

Table 9-17: Employment Impacts for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative (2040).....9-16

Table 9-18: Annual Travel Market Savings (\$2014M) for the Preferred Alternative (2040)9-16

Table 9-19: Jobs Accessible in a 45-Minute Train Travel Time for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....9-17

Table 9-20: Summary of Selected Environmental Consequences for Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative (2040)9-19

Table 9-21: Capital Costs (\$2014 billions) for the No Action Alternative and Preferred Alternative.....9-21

Table 9-22: Percentage of Route Miles by Construction Type – Washington, D.C., to Boston, MA, for Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative9-21

Table 9-23: Summary of Alternatives – Characteristics and Evaluation Factors9-26

Table 11-1: Libraries Displaying the Tier 1 Draft EIS during the Public Comment Period11-3

Table 11-2: Placement of Legal Notices and Display Advertisements.....11-4

Table 11-3: Public Hearing Dates and Locations11-5

Table 11-4: Meetings with NEC Commission, Agencies, and MPOs during the Comment Period11-6

Table 11-5: Meetings with NEC Commission, State Transportation Agencies, and Railroad Operators.....11-11

Table 11-6: Meetings with Resource and Regulatory Agencies11-11

Table 11-7: Other Meetings.....11-12

Table 13-1: Frequently Used Terminology13-1

Table 13-2: Acronyms and Abbreviations.....13-20

Figures

Figure S-1:	Study Area Map	S-3
Figure 2-1:	Study Area Map	2-2
Figure 2-2:	Illustration of Representative Route, Affected Environment, and Context Area.....	2-4
Figure 4-1:	Decision-Making Framework.....	4-2
Figure 4-2:	Action Alternative Elements included in the Preferred Alternative.....	4-29
Figure 4-3:	Study Area Connecting Corridors	4-64
Figure 4-4:	Preferred Alternative (Chokepoint, New Track, and New Segment Locations)	4-75
Figure 4-5:	New Baltimore Tunnel – Baltimore, MD	4-83
Figure 4-6:	Wilmington Segment – Wilmington, DE.....	4-84
Figure 4-7:	Philadelphia Segments – Delaware and Philadelphia Counties, PA	4-86
Figure 4-8:	New Brunswick to Secaucus New Segment – Northern New Jersey.....	4-88
Figure 4-9:	Bergen/Secaucus Loop, Hudson River Tracks, East River Tracks – New York City Area	4-89
Figure 4-10:	Old Saybrook-Kenyon New Segment – Connecticut and Rhode Island.....	4-91
Figure 4-11:	Hartford/Springfield Line – Connecticut and Massachusetts.....	4-93
Figure 4-12:	Freight Operations on the Northeast Corridor and Connecting Corridors.....	4-95
Figure 6-1:	Number of Stations of Each Category in the NEC FUTURE Station Typology.....	6-19
Figure 7-1:	Representative Route, Affected Environment, and Context Area	7-iii
Figure 7.14-1:	Energy Consumption by Sector	7.14-3
Figure 7.15-1:	Current Climate Conditions, Sea Level Rise Flooding: Affected Environment – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....	7.15-6
Figure 7.15-2:	Current Climate Conditions, Storm Surge Flooding: Affected Environment – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....	7.15-7
Figure 7.15-3:	Current Climate Conditions, Riverine Flooding: Affected Environment – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative)	7.15-8
Figure 7.15-4:	Current Climate Conditions, Sea Level Rise Flooding: Representative Route – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....	7.15-11
Figure 7.15-5:	Current Climate Conditions, Storm Surge Flooding: Representative Route – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....	7.15-12
Figure 7.15-6:	Current Climate Conditions, Riverine Flooding: Representative Route – Percentage of Total County Acreage at Risk (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative)	7.15-13
Figure 7.15-7:	Example of Rail Buckle from Extreme Heat.....	7.15-18
Figure 7.15-8:	Average Annual Number of Days Equal to or Above 95°F, by Climate Scenario.....	7.15-20
Figure 7.20-1:	Affected Environment for Cumulative Effect	7.20-2
Figure 8-1:	Percentage of Route Miles by Construction Type (Existing NEC + Hartford/Springfield Line and Preferred Alternative).....	8-3
Figure 9-1:	Number of Stations of Each Category in the NEC FUTURE Station Typology.....	9-18
Figure 11-1:	Number of Submissions by State of Origin.....	11-7