



Comment Errata Sheet

Social and Environmental Justification, August 18, 2021

<u>ID</u>	<u>MDE Comment ID</u>	<u>MDE Comment</u>	<u>BWRR Response Approach</u>
C1	P4 SEJ 1	The information provided is either vague or should be further refined the state of Maryland, county affected, or local jurisdictions.	Information in this resubmission was refined to State, County, and Watershed levels as much as possible. Please see the following sections 2.1.1 Reduction in VMT 2.1.2 Temporary Jobs 2.2.1 Transportation Improvements Project Wide 2.2.1.2 Roadway Network – Tier II 2.2.1.4 Rail Network – Tier II 2.3.1 Improved Air Quality
C2	P4 SEJ 2	The applicant must be able to definitively demonstrate that the benefits attributed to the SCMAGLEV project can be applied to those areas and communities within the affected Tier II watersheds in order to justify the impacts to the Tier II watershed	See the following sections for economic benefits: 2.1.3 BC2 – Permanent O & M Jobs 2.1.4 BC2 – Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan See the following for social benefits: 2.2.1.2 - Roadway Network – Tier II 2.2.1.4 Rail Network – Tier II 2.3.2 - Reduction in Pollutants from Obsolete BARC Buildings 2.3.3 - Property Value (BC2)
C3	P4 SEJ 3	The relative impacts to Beaverdam Creek 1 are significantly greater than those to Patuxent River 1. Special attention should be paid to the justification narratives for the smaller watershed	While TMF impacts are greater in BC2, significant job creation (temporary and permanent) will occur in BC2 as part of construction of a TMF in the watershed. The benefits to the watershed also include significant social and transportation. These are detailed in comment C1 and C2.
C4	P5 SEJ 4	In the event that there are little to no reforestation opportunities in either Tier II watershed, you must include a thorough narrative, with supporting analysis, detailing why reforestation is not possible	See the Minimization Alternatives Analysis Report
C5	P5 SEJ 5	In the event that 2:1 conservation to net forest loss is not feasible in either Tier II watershed, you must include a thorough narrative, with supporting analysis, detailing why	See the Minimization Alternatives Analysis Report
E1		An appropriate summary of impacts the applicant is unable to mitigate within each Tier II watershed, presented as a worst-case scenario.	See 1.2 Impacts - Table 1. Summary of Impacts
E2		Social and economic benefits must be applicable directly to the local watersheds affected.	See Comment C2 of this sheet.
E3		While the applicant can present general overall benefits of the project, values must be presented at a scale applicable to the Tier II review. Values refined to the both the state and county scale are necessary, but any further refinements are encouraged.	See Comment C1 and C2 of this sheet.

<u>ID</u>	<u>MDE Comment ID</u>	<u>MDE Comment</u>	<u>BWRR Response Approach</u>
E4		Averages may vary widely across a region, and the applicant must demonstrate that those benefits identified in the Tier II report reflect the economic and social uplift attributed to the project within the affected Tier II watersheds.	See Comment C2 of this sheet.

Report Comments

ID	MDE Report Comment	Completed (Y/N)	BWRR Ref	BWRR Response
1.2 IMPACTS				
1	Remove wetland impacts from table.	Y	1.2	Revised. See Table 1. Summary of Impacts to Tier II Watersheds
2	Include a summary table of Tier II Mitigation.	Y	1.2	
1.4 DOCUMENT PURPOSE				
1	When is the FEIS expected to be completed, and will this time coincide with receipt of potential permit? If it is expected to be completed after a nontidal wetlands permit is potentially issued, will the process be finalized prior to construction?	Y	1.1	
2	Since many values in this section will not be available, include a basic narrative and table to summarize project budget and allocations.	Y	2.1.5	<p>This section has been updated to include construction costs by watershed</p> <p>The civil construction costs within Tier II watersheds for BWRR's preferred alternative, J-03, are estimated (using DEIS Appendix G9 Capital and Construction Costs Memorandum) at \$1,070,555,955 and are split between the two watersheds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beaverdam Creek 2 at \$834, 843, 545 Patuxent River 1 at \$235,712,410 <p>In addition, the following two tables were added for more detail: Table 12: SCMAGLEV Source and Use Matrix Table 11: Categorized Project Costs</p>
1.4.2.1 Economic Growth and Job Creation				
1	Move this section to 1.4.1, Economic Importance and Benefits.	Y	2.1.	
2	Approximate number of temporary jobs generated by the project within the affected areas. Temporary jobs would include anything related to construction, short-term monitoring, one-time positions, etc.	Y	2.1.2-2.1.4	Temporary permanent jobs by county and permanent jobs by watershed were added. See breakdowns in tables: Table 1: Prince George's and Anne Arundel Expected Temporary Economic Impact. Table 9: Beaverdam Creek 2 Watershed Economic Impact Projections. Source IMPLAN Modeling.
3	Classify temporary jobs in a table. Include an approximate salary for each category.	Y	2.1.2	Estimates are provided for salaries and the type of temporary jobs expected at the county level. See Tables 6 and 7. Table 2: Prince George's and Anne Arundel Expected Temporary Economic Impact. Table 3: Employment and Wages by Industry – Source: Quarterly Census of employment and Wages - Annual Averages 2019
4	Classify the permanent jobs in a table. Include an approximate salary for each category.	Y	2.1.3	See Table 8.
5	Include details such as tax revenue for State and County, and direct and indirect financial benefits for the affected areas, or at the county level such. For example, total value of salaries over life of project, approximation of the total monetary value of business generated to acquire construction material, etc.	Y	2.1.1 2.1.2 2.3.1	Tax revenues have been added to the following tables. Table 4: Prince George's and Anne Arundel Expected Temporary Economic Impact. Table 9: Beaverdam Creek 2 Watershed Economic Impact Projections. Source IMPLAN Modeling. <i>For other indirect financial benefits see the following:</i> Table 5: Summary of Reduction in VMT Economic Benefits Table 13: Emission Reduction Economics from VMT Reductions
6	Include current average income for affected area, or at least the county, and how the project will affect these values.	Y	2.1.2	Table 7: Employment and Wages by Industry – Source: Quarterly Census of employment and Wages - Annual Averages 2019
1.4.2.3 Not Bisecting EJ Communities				
1	Summarize cost to avoid EJ communities in at the least state, or county if that value can be generated.	Y	2.2.2	See 2.2.2 - Preserving Communities (Project-Wide and BC2) and Appendix 3. \$1,487,700,000 is the estimated amount forecasted for avoiding EJ communities.
2	Provide estimated of number homes avoided within the affected Tier II watershed.	Y	2.2.2	See 2.2.2 PRESERVING COMMUNITIES (PROJECT-WIDE AND IN BC2): Paragraph #4 → 125 homes
2.0 SOCIOECONOMIC BENEFITS OF HIGH-QUALITY WATERS (IF APPLICABLE)				

1	Include 1.4.2.2 Environmental Gains and 1.4.2.3 Not Bisecting EJ Communities in this section.	N/A		
2	Clarify how the affected communities, especially those classified as environmental justice (EJ) relevant communities, will benefit from the project beyond direct, permanent job creation.	Y	-->	See the following sections: 2.1.4 BC2 – Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan 2.2.1.2 - Roadway Network – Tier II 2.2.1.4 Rail Network – Tier II 2.3.2 - Reduction in Pollutants from Obsolete BARC Buildings 2.3.3 - Property Value (BC2)
3	Include a narrative to address any other kind of social uplift anticipated as a result of the project.	Y		See Section #4: Conclusion
4	While local businesses are used for jobs and staffing, explain the financial feasibility of the affected communities to use the SCMAGLEV service.	Y	2.2.1.4 & 2.1.5.1	Section 2.2.1.4 RAIL NETWORK-TIER II discusses the indirect benefit of SCMAGLEV maintaining the MARC service levels within the affected communities. 2.1.5.1 FAREBOX REVENUE
2.1.1 Property Value				
1	Refine values in this section to at least the county level.	Y	2.3.3	
2.2.1				
1	Provide a robust narrative detailing why impacts to Tier II resources are necessary, rather than referencing the DEIS.	Y	1.1 & 2	