



**Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project**

Environmental Review Document

Supplement

February 2025

Prepared by:

Stantec Consulting Services Inc  
6110 Frost Place  
Laurel, MD 20702

Prepared for:

PSEG Renewable Transmission LLC  
80 Park Pl  
Newark, NJ 07101

This page intentionally left blank.

<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION DETAILS.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1 General Project Site Location and Description .....	3
3.2 Route-Specific Description.....	3
3.3 Biophysical Environment.....	7
3.3.1 Climate and Air Quality .....	7
3.3.2 Impact Analysis – Climate and Air Quality .....	7
3.3.3 Physiographic Setting, Geology, and Geohydrology .....	7
3.3.4 Impact Analysis – Physiographic Setting, Geology, and Geohydrology .....	7
3.3.5 Soils .....	8
3.3.6 Impact Analysis – Soils.....	15
3.3.7 Surface Water .....	16
3.3.8 Impact Analysis – Surface Waters.....	17
3.3.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers .....	20
3.3.10 Impact Analysis – Wild and Scenic Rivers .....	20
3.3.11 Maryland Coastal Zone Management .....	20
3.3.12 Impact Analysis – Maryland Coastal Zone Management Program .....	20
3.3.13 Water Quality .....	21
3.3.14 Impact Analysis – Water Quality .....	21
3.3.15 Floodplains.....	22
3.3.16 Impact Analysis – Floodplains .....	22
3.3.17 Aquatic Species and Habitat .....	23
3.3.18 Impact Analysis – Aquatic Species and Habitat .....	23
3.3.19 Vegetation.....	23
3.3.20 Impact Analysis – Vegetation .....	24
3.3.21 Special Management Areas.....	24
3.3.22 Impact Analysis – Special Management Areas .....	25
3.3.23 Terrestrial Wildlife .....	26
3.3.24 Impact Analysis – Terrestrial Wildlife.....	26
3.3.25 Avian Wildlife .....	26
3.3.26 Impact Analysis – Avian Wildlife .....	26
3.3.27 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species .....	26
3.3.28 Impact Analysis – Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species .....	27
3.3.29 Environmental Site Hazard Assessment .....	29
3.3.30 Impacts Analysis – Environmental Site Hazard Assessment.....	29
3.3.31 Existing Acoustical Environment .....	29
3.3.32 Impact Analysis – Existing Acoustical Environment.....	29
3.4 Cultural Resources.....	29
3.4.1 Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties .....	29
3.4.2 National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks.....	31
3.4.3 Maryland Heritage Areas and Scenic Byways .....	31
3.4.4 Cemeteries.....	32
3.4.5 Historic Preservation Easements .....	32
3.4.6 Impact Analysis – Historic Built Environment .....	32
3.4.7 ArchaeologicAI Sites .....	32
3.4.8 Impact Analysis – Archaeological Sites .....	33
3.4.9 Section 106 Consultation.....	34
3.5 Land Use and Aesthetics .....	34
3.5.1 Land use/Land Cover .....	34
3.5.2 Impact Analysis – Land Use/Land Cover .....	35
3.5.3 Priority Funding Areas and Enterprise Zones .....	35
3.5.4 Impact Analysis – Priority Funding Areas and Enterprise Zones .....	36
3.5.5 Maryland State Protected Lands .....	36

3.5.6	Impact Analysis – Maryland State and Local Protected Lands .....	37
3.5.7	Impact Analysis – Comprehensive Land Use Planning .....	38
3.5.8	Priority Preservation Areas .....	38
3.5.9	Impact Analysis – Priority Preservation Areas .....	38
3.5.10	Visual Quality .....	39
3.5.11	Impact Analysis – Visual Quality .....	39
3.6	Socioeconomics .....	47
3.7	Transportation Infrastructure.....	47
<b>4.0</b>	<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>49</b>

## List of Tables

Table 10a. GIS Desktop Analysis – Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	3
Table 14a. Soil Map Units in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	8
Table 15a. Summary of Surface Waters within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads.....	16
Table 16a. Summary of Mapped NHD Streams and Other Waters within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads.....	17
Table 17a. Summary of Potential Permanent Wetland and Waterway Impacts due to the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads.....	18
Table 18a. Wetland and Stream Mitigation Ratios .....	19
Table 19a. Preliminary Wetland and Stream Mitigation Needs for the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	19
Table 21a. Tier II Catchments and Stream Segments in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	21
Table 23a. Land Coverage within Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	23
Table 24a. Hub, Corridor, and Gap Habitats according to the Maryland Habitat Connectivity Network within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	25
Table 27a. Federally Listed Species with the potential to occur within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	27
Table 33a. MIHP-Listed Properties within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads.....	30
Table 34a. MIHP Properties within One Mile of the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	31
Table 39a. Known Archaeological Sites within the MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	33
Table 40a. Land Use Classifications within 1 Mile of the MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	34
Table 41a. Summary of Easements and Other Protected Lands within MPRP off-ROW Access Roads .....	37
Table 47. Visually Sensitive Receptors with Anticipated Major Visual Effects .....	41

## List of Appendices

A1. Agency Correspondence
B. Environmental Mapping (Updated)
F. Visual Impact Assessment
G. Access Road Details

## LIST OF ACRONYMS/ABBREVIATIONS

A&M	Avoidance and Minimization
BIBI	Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity
BMP	Best Management Practice
CPCN	Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity
CWA	<i>Clean Water Act</i>
EM	Environmental Monitor
ERD	Environmental Review Document
ESA	<i>Endangered Species Act</i>
ESC	Erosion and Sediment Control
FCA	<i>Forest Conservation Act</i>
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
ILF	In-Lieu Fee
IPaC	Information for Planning and Consultation
JPA	Joint Permit Application
LCA	Landscape Character Types
LOD	Limits of Disturbance
MALPF	Maryland Agriculture Land Preservation Foundation
MDNR	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
MERLIN	Maryland's Environmental Resources and Land Information Network
MET	Maryland Environmental Trust
MHT	Maryland Historical Trust
MIHP	Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties
MPRP	Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project
NHD	National Hydrography Dataset
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NOI	Notice of Intent
NRCS	National Resources Conservation Services
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWI	National Wetland Inventory
PPA	Priority Preservation Area
PSEG	PSEG Renewable Transmission LLC
RLA	Rural Legacy Area
ROW	Right-of-Way
RTE	rare, threatened, and endangered
SPCC	Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
TEA	Targeted Ecological Area
TOYR	Time-of-Year Restriction
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
VIA	Visual Impact Assessment
VSA	Visual Study Area
VSR	Visually Sensitive Resources
WHS	Wildlife and Heritage Service

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

The following supplement analyzes the impacts associated with the proposed access roads off the Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project (MPRP) right-of-way (ROW) and the Project Visual Impact Assessment. For additional project data, reference the Environmental Review Document (ERD) in the Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (CPCN) filing dated December 31, 2024.

## 2.0 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

Access road construction was discussed in Section 2.1.2 of the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024. Potential access has been identified in accordance with the process outlined in the ERD. Existing access, including access lanes and farm roads, was prioritized, particularly within the proposed ROW, to the extent practicable. Site constraints, such as steep slopes or wetlands, or the use of existing roads to avoid farm fields, are reasons that proposed access may occur outside of the ROW. Since access will be coordinated with property owners and subject to refinement, preferred and alternative access routes were identified for many locations. Existing roads may need some widening and placement of gravel to support construction access. Where new access routes need to be constructed, matting will be used in sensitive areas such as wetlands and agricultural fields if needed depending on field conditions to protect the soil. Where possible, streams will be bridged bank to bank to avoid impacts to the stream channel. It is expected that most of the access routes necessary for construction will be temporary and these areas restored to pre-construction conditions. However, further detailed design may identify access routes that would need to be permanent. Typical details for access road construction are provided in **Appendix G**.

For the purposes of this ERD Supplement, only the proposed off-ROW access roads are included in the impact assessment, since the entire ROW was considered impacted in the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024. Additionally, since it is not known whether the preferred or alternative access roads may be used, the footprint of both is included in the impact assessment as a conservative, worst-case approach. Finally, while most of the access routes are existing roads and their use as construction access would have less impact to resources such as farmlands, wetlands, and forest, among others, the entire footprint of the existing road is conservatively considered an impact in this submission.

There are an estimated 303 access roads on and off the MPRP ROW inclusive of preferred and alternative options. The access roads average 16 feet to 25 feet wide so large equipment including a drill, crane, concrete trucks and structure sections can be delivered to the site. The impact analysis associated with the access roads is discussed in **Section 3** of this Supplement.

## 3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND IMPACTS

This section of the ERD describes the existing environmental, historical, and social settings in the vicinity of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads and was developed from information and data collected from literature and other publicly available sources. Each subsection includes a description of the identified resource, an assessment of potential impacts, identification of avoidance and minimization (A&M) measures, and an impacts determination. Potential impacts were quantified, when possible, using publicly available GIS data. Other potential impacts are qualitatively addressed, as necessary.

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024

### 3.1 General Project Site Location and Description

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.2 Route-Specific Description

Publicly available Maryland GIS data was reviewed to determine the potential for environmental resources within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Maryland's Environmental Resources and Land Information Network (MERLIN) (MDNR 2024f) was the primary source of existing data. MERLIN is an electronic database maintained by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) that allows users to access various publicly available data sets throughout the State of Maryland. Specific details about the resources within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are discussed in the sections that follow, while **Table 10a. GIS Desktop Analysis – Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads	Acres	Baltimore County: 10.7 Carroll County: 28.4 Frederick County: 42.7
	Miles	Baltimore County: 3.7 Carroll County: 9.6 Frederick County: 14.8
<b>Soils</b>		
Hydric Soils	Acres	4.2 (includes hydric soil inclusions)
Prime Farmland Soils	Acres	Prime Farmlands: 28.1 Farmlands of Statewide Importance: 36.6
<b>Surface Water, Scenic and Wild Rivers, Coastal Zone, Water Quality, Floodplains</b>		
8 Digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) Watersheds	Number	6
	List	Deer Creek (#02120202), Loch Raven Reservoir (#02130805), Prettyboy Reservoir (#02130806), Double Pipe Creek (#02140304), Lower Monocacy (#02140302), Potomac River Frederick County (#02140301)

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
12 Digit HUC Watersheds	Number	25
	List	21202020332, 21308050311, 21308050312, 21308060316, 21308060317, 21403040287, 21403040286, 21403040284, 21403040282, 21403040281, 21403040277, 21403040271, 21403040276, 21403040275, 21403040268, 21403020238, 21403020235, 21403020234, 21403020229, 21403020228, 21403020227, 21403010211, 21403020224, 21403010210, 21403020222
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Wetlands	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 6, Frederick: 8
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.58, Frederick: 0.61
Wetlands of Special State Concern	Number	0
National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Wetlands	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 14, Frederick: 21
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.04, Carroll: 0.5, Frederick 1.8
Waterways (National Hydrography Dataset [NHD])	Number	22
	Linear Feet	Baltimore: Little Falls (25), Unnamed Tributaries (33) Carroll: South Branch Gunpowder Falls (27), Five Daughters Run (35), Bear Branch (25), Unnamed Tributaries (300) Frederick: Locust Run (26), Tuscarora Creek (26), Weldon Creek (25), Unnamed Tributaries (1,045)
Scenic and Wild Rivers	List	Federal: 0, State: 0
Maryland Coastal Zone	Acres	Baltimore County
Tier II Watersheds	Number	Baltimore: 5, Carroll: 2, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: Deer Creek 2/4/5 (1.9), Gunpowder Falls 1 (0.6), Little Falls 1 (3.6) Carroll: Gunpowder Falls 1 (5.6), S Branch Gunpowder Falls UT 1 (0.0009) Frederick: Weldon Creek (3.4), Talbot Branch UT 1 (0.19)
Tier II Stream Segments	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, and Frederick: 0
	Linear Feet	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: 0 Frederick: 0
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 4
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.3, Carroll: 0.5, Frederick: 0.6
<b>Aquatic Species and Habitat, Special Management Areas, Avian Wildlife</b>		
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Number	0
Oyster Beds	Number	0
Anadromous Fish Spawning Areas	Number	0
Forest Interior Dwelling Species Areas	Acres	Baltimore: 3.9, Carroll: 5.2, Frederick: 11.1

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Class (1,2,3)		Baltimore: Class 1 (0.77), Class 2 (0), Class 3 (3.13) Carroll: Class 1 (0.006), Class 2 (2.42), Class 3 (2.74) Frederick: Class 1 (0), Class 2 (9.9), Class 3 (1.16)
Maryland Habitat Connectivity Network	Number	Hubs: 22, Gaps: 13, Corridors: 7
	Acres	Hubs: 3.05, Gaps: 2.02, Corridors: 0.37
Hubs	Number	Baltimore: 5, Carroll: 5, Frederick: 13
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.24, Carroll: 0.77, Frederick: 2.04
Gaps	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 4, Frederick: 7
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.46, Carroll: 0.76, Frederick: 0.79
Corridors	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 5
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.02, Carroll: 0.06, Frederick: 0.29
Sensitive Species Project Review Areas	Number	Baltimore: 4, Carroll: 6, Frederick: 2
Group (1,2,3,4)	Acres	Baltimore: Group 1 (2.9), Group 2 (0), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0) Carroll: Group 1 (7.8), Group 2 (0), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0) Frederick: Group 1 (0), Group 2 (1.6), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0)
Targeted Ecological Areas	Acres	Baltimore: 3.8, Carroll: 7.5, Frederick: 0.2
Natural Heritage Areas	Number	0
Waterfowl Areas	Number	0
Colonial Nesting Bird Areas	Number	0
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Sites in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads	Number	None
NRHP Sites (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 13, Frederick: 7
Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) Sites in the proposed Access Roads off the ROW	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 9
MIHP Sites (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 39, Carroll: 183, Frederick: 133
Scenic Byways	List	Old National Pike (Federal), Mason and Dixon (State), Old Main Streets (State), Antietam Campaign (State)
Maryland Heritage Areas	List	Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area
Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) Historic Preservation Easements in the proposed Access Roads Off the ROW	Number	None
MHT Historic Preservation Easements within 1 mile	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
Archaeological Sites (known) in the proposed Access Roads off the ROW	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 1

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
<b>Land Use/Land Cover, Planning, Protected Lands</b>		
Land Use Classifications	Acres	Barren Land: 0, Cultivated Crops: 33.63, Deciduous Forest: 13.37, Developed, High Intensity: 0.03, Developed, Low Intensity: 1.66, Developed, Medium Intensity: 0.64, Developed, Open Space: 4.68, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands: 0, Evergreen Forest: 0.14, Hay/Pasture: 21.11, Mixed Forest: 2.40, Open Water: 0.01, Shrub/Scrub: 1.01, Woody Wetlands: 1.81
Priority Funding Areas	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 3
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.28, Frederick: 1.03
Enterprise Zones	Number	0
Rural Legacy Areas (RLAs)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 2, Frederick: 1
	Acres	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: Upper Patapsco RLA (5.6), Little Pipe Creek RLA (10.6) Frederick: Carrollton Manor RLA (15.02)
Rural Legacy Properties	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 0 Note: The outlines of publicly available data for Rural Legacy Properties did not match the parcel boundaries dataset from the State of Maryland. The Proposed Route ROW avoids parcels that are indicated as Rural Legacy Properties and therefore avoids Rural Legacy Properties.
	List	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: One property within Little Pipe Creek RLA (see note above) Frederick: 0
MDNR-Protected Land	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Maryland Environmental Trust Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.04, Frederick: 0.55
Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 10, Carroll: 7, Frederick: 3
	Acres	Baltimore: 3.06, Carroll: 2.04, Frederick: 3.14
Forest Conservation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.0005, Frederick: 0
Chesapeake Bay Critical Area	Acres	0
Local Protected Lands	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Private Conservation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Priority Preservation Areas	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: White Hall & Monkton PPA (2.6), Freeland & Maryland Line PPA (3.1) Carroll: Unnamed PPA (11.2) Frederick: Eastern PPA (8.9), Carrollton Manor PPA (10.7)

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Schools (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 3
	List	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: Montessori School of Westminster, Carroll Lutheran School, Ebb Valley Elementary Frederick: Sugarloaf Elementary, New Market Elementary, New Market Middle School
Hospitals (within 1 mile)	Number	0
Parks (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 7
	List	Baltimore: Gunpowder Falls State Park (State) Carroll: Browns Station Park (County), Gunpowder Falls State Park, Sulpher Springs Park (Local) Frederick: Calico Rocks Regional Park (County), Monocacy National Battlefield (Federal), New Market Community Park (Local), Old National Pike Park (County), Buckeystown Community Park (Local), Sugarloaf Mountain (Local), Urbana Community Park (Local)

a summarizes the findings for the access roads.

**Table 10a. GIS Desktop Analysis – Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads	Acres	Baltimore County: 10.7 Carroll County: 28.4 Frederick County: 42.7
	Miles	Baltimore County: 3.7 Carroll County: 9.6 Frederick County: 14.8
<b>Soils</b>		
Hydric Soils	Acres	4.2 (includes hydric soil inclusions)
Prime Farmland Soils	Acres	Prime Farmlands: 28.1 Farmlands of Statewide Importance: 36.6
<b>Surface Water, Scenic and Wild Rivers, Coastal Zone, Water Quality, Floodplains</b>		
8 Digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) Watersheds	Number	6
	List	Deer Creek (#02120202), Loch Raven Reservoir (#02130805), Prettyboy Reservoir (#02130806), Double Pipe Creek (#02140304), Lower Monocacy (#02140302), Potomac River Frederick County (#02140301)
12 Digit HUC Watersheds	Number	25
	List	21202020332, 21308050311, 21308050312, 21308060316, 21308060317, 21403040287, 21403040286, 21403040284, 21403040282, 21403040281, 21403040277, 21403040271, 21403040276, 21403040275, 21403040268, 21403020238, 21403020235, 21403020234, 21403020229, 21403020228, 21403020227, 21403010211, 21403020224, 21403010210, 21403020222
Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Wetlands	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 6, Frederick: 8
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.58, Frederick: 0.61
Wetlands of Special State Concern	Number	0

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Wetlands	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 14, Frederick: 21
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.04, Carroll: 0.5, Frederick 1.8
Waterways (National Hydrography Dataset [NHD])	Number	22
	Linear Feet	Baltimore: Little Falls (25), Unnamed Tributaries (33) Carroll: South Branch Gunpowder Falls (27), Five Daughters Run (35), Bear Branch (25), Unnamed Tributaries (300) Frederick: Locust Run (26), Tuscarora Creek (26), Weldon Creek (25), Unnamed Tributaries (1,045)
Scenic and Wild Rivers	List	Federal: 0, State: 0
Maryland Coastal Zone	Acres	Baltimore County
Tier II Watersheds	Number	Baltimore: 5, Carroll: 2, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: Deer Creek 2/4/5 (1.9), Gunpowder Falls 1 (0.6), Little Falls 1 (3.6) Carroll: Gunpowder Falls 1 (5.6), S Branch Gunpowder Falls UT 1 (0.0009) Frederick: Weldon Creek (3.4), Talbot Branch UT 1 (0.19)
Tier II Stream Segments	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, and Frederick: 0
	Linear Feet	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: 0 Frederick: 0
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Floodplain	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 4
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.3, Carroll: 0.5, Frederick: 0.6
<b>Aquatic Species and Habitat, Special Management Areas, Avian Wildlife</b>		
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	Number	0
Oyster Beds	Number	0
Anadromous Fish Spawning Areas	Number	0
Forest Interior Dwelling Species Areas	Acres	Baltimore: 3.9, Carroll: 5.2, Frederick: 11.1
Class (1,2,3)		Baltimore: Class 1 (0.77), Class 2 (0), Class 3 (3.13) Carroll: Class 1 (0.006), Class 2 (2.42), Class 3 (2.74) Frederick: Class 1 (0), Class 2 (9.9), Class 3 (1.16)
Maryland Habitat Connectivity Network	Number	Hubs: 22, Gaps: 13, Corridors: 7
	Acres	Hubs: 3.05, Gaps: 2.02, Corridors: 0.37
Hubs	Number	Baltimore: 5, Carroll: 5, Frederick: 13
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.24, Carroll: 0.77, Frederick: 2.04
Gaps	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 4, Frederick: 7
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.46, Carroll: 0.76, Frederick: 0.79
Corridors	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 5
	Acres	Baltimore: 0.02, Carroll: 0.06, Frederick: 0.29
Sensitive Species Project Review Areas	Number	Baltimore: 4, Carroll: 6, Frederick: 2

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Group (1,2,3,4)	Acres	Baltimore: Group 1 (2.9), Group 2 (0), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0) Carroll: Group 1 (7.8), Group 2 (0), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0) Frederick: Group 1 (0), Group 2 (1.6), Group 3 (0), Group 4 (0)
Targeted Ecological Areas	Acres	Baltimore: 3.8, Carroll: 7.5, Frederick: 0.2
Natural Heritage Areas	Number	0
Waterfowl Areas	Number	0
Colonial Nesting Bird Areas	Number	0
<b>Cultural Resources</b>		
National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Sites in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads	Number	None
NRHP Sites (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 13, Frederick: 7
Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) Sites in the proposed Access Roads off the ROW	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 9
MIHP Sites (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 39, Carroll: 183, Frederick: 133
Scenic Byways	List	Old National Pike (Federal), Mason and Dixon (State), Old Main Streets (State), Antietam Campaign (State)
Maryland Heritage Areas	List	Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area
Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) Historic Preservation Easements in the proposed Access Roads Off the ROW	Number	None
MHT Historic Preservation Easements within 1 mile	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
Archaeological Sites (known) in the proposed Access Roads off the ROW	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 1
<b>Land Use/Land Cover, Planning, Protected Lands</b>		
Land Use Classifications	Acres	Barren Land: 0, Cultivated Crops: 33.63, Deciduous Forest: 13.37, Developed, High Intensity: 0.03, Developed, Low Intensity: 1.66, Developed, Medium Intensity: 0.64, Developed, Open Space: 4.68, Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands: 0, Evergreen Forest: 0.14, Hay/Pasture: 21.11, Mixed Forest: 2.40, Open Water: 0.01, Shrub/Scrub: 1.01, Woody Wetlands: 1.81
Priority Funding Areas	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 3
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.28, Frederick: 1.03
Enterprise Zones	Number	0
Rural Legacy Areas (RLAs)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 2, Frederick: 1
	Acres	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: Upper Patapsco RLA (5.6), Little Pipe Creek RLA (10.6) Frederick: Carrollton Manor RLA (15.02)
Rural Legacy Properties	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 0 Note: The outlines of publicly available data for Rural Legacy Properties did not match the parcel boundaries dataset from the State of Maryland. The Proposed Route ROW avoids parcels that are indicated as Rural Legacy Properties and therefore avoids Rural Legacy Properties.

Resource Categories	Unit	Measurement within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
	List	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: One property within Little Pipe Creek RLA (see note above) Frederick: 0
MDNR-Protected Land	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Maryland Environmental Trust Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.04, Frederick: 0.55
Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 10, Carroll: 7, Frederick: 3
	Acres	Baltimore: 3.06, Carroll: 2.04, Frederick: 3.14
Forest Conservation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0.0005, Frederick: 0
Chesapeake Bay Critical Area	Acres	0
Local Protected Lands	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Private Conservation Easements	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
	Acres	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 0, Frederick: 0
Priority Preservation Areas	Number	Baltimore: 2, Carroll: 1, Frederick: 2
	Acres	Baltimore: White Hall & Monkton PPA (2.6), Freeland & Maryland Line PPA (3.1) Carroll: Unnamed PPA (11.2) Frederick: Eastern PPA (8.9), Carrollton Manor PPA (10.7)
Schools (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 0, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 3
	List	Baltimore: 0 Carroll: Montessori School of Westminster, Carroll Lutheran School, Ebb Valley Elementary Frederick: Sugarloaf Elementary, New Market Elementary, New Market Middle School
Hospitals (within 1 mile)	Number	0
Parks (within 1 mile)	Number	Baltimore: 1, Carroll: 3, Frederick: 7
	List	Baltimore: Gunpowder Falls State Park (State) Carroll: Browns Station Park (County), Gunpowder Falls State Park, Sulpher Springs Park (Local) Frederick: Calico Rocks Regional Park (County), Monocacy National Battlefield (Federal), New Market Community Park (Local), Old National Pike Park (County), Buckeystown Community Park (Local), Sugarloaf Mountain (Local), Urbana Community Park (Local)

Notes:

FEMA = Federal Emergency Management Agency; HUC = Hydrologic Unit Code; MDNR = Maryland Department of Natural Resources; MHT = Maryland Historical Trust; MIHP = Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties; MPRP = Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project; NHD = National Hydrography Dataset; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places; NWI = National Wetland Inventory; RLA = Rural Legacy Areas; ROW = right-of-way;

## 3.3 Biophysical Environment

The purpose of this section is to assess the potential impacts of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads and to identify A&M measures that would be implemented to reduce impacts. The identification of A&M measures will be further informed through compliance with the permitting process and by additional analysis once any required field surveys are conducted in accordance with the permitting process. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.1 CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS – CLIMATE AND AIR QUALITY

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.3 PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING, GEOLOGY, AND GEOHYDROLOGY

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.4 IMPACT ANALYSIS – PHYSIOGRAPHIC SETTING, GEOLOGY, AND GEOHYDROLOGY

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.5 SOILS

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

Soils underlying the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads were determined using the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey. The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads consist of 98 soil map units, listed in **Table a** by county, along with their general properties. The most abundant soil types within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads is the Mt. Airy channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes (MeC), which accounts for approximately 7 percent of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. The next most abundant soil map units are the Brinklow channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes (BrC); and Glenelg-Mt. Airy channery loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes (GmB), each accounting for approximately 6 to 7 percent of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads ROW. The approximate location of the soil map units in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads is presented on the Soils Maps in the updated **Appendix B**.

#### 3.3.5.1 Hydric Soils

According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey, there are 24 soil map units within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads that are considered hydric or that have hydric inclusions (NRCS 2024). Hydric soils are soils that are saturated or inundated for a long enough period to support the growth of hydrophytic vegetation.

These soils are formed when the soil is saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough to develop anaerobic conditions. The hydric soil rating for each soil map unit within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads is identified in **Table a**. Hydric soils are identified on the Soils Maps in the updated **Appendix B**.

### 3.3.5.2 Soil Erodibility

The NRCS Web Soil Survey was used to determine the susceptibility of soils within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads to erosion. The NRCS uses erosion factor “K” to predict soil loss from sheet and rill erosion by water. The K Factor of each soil map unit is based on the soil’s structure, composition, and saturated hydraulic conductivity. K Factors range from 0.02 to 0.69, with higher values indicating a greater susceptibility to water erosion. A K Factor over 0.40 is considered highly erodible. As shown in **Table a**, K Factors range from 0.17 to 0.49, while a few soil map units do not have a K Factor (NRCS 2024).

In addition to the K Factor, soil erodibility within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads was determined using the NRCS Wind Erodibility Index. This index indicates the tons per acre of soil that can be expected to be lost to wind erosion per year (NRCS 2024). The Wind Erodibility Index for the soils within the proposed access roads is included in **Table a**.

**Table 14a. Soil Map Units in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

#### Baltimore County

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
BhB	Brinklow channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.20	0.1
BhD	Brinklow channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.20	1.6
CfA	Codorus silt loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	15	48	0.32	0.8
GdA	Glenelg loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.4
GdB	Glenelg loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.9
GdC	Glenelg loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	1.2
GeB	Glenelg channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.20	1.1
GeC	Glenelg channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.24	1.2
GhB	Glenville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	10	56	0.37	1.8

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
GhC	Glenville silt loam, somewhat poorly drained, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	5	56	0.37	0.5
MdE	Manor-Brinklow complex, 25 to 45 percent slopes, very rocky	Not prime farmland	0	56	0.28	0.3
UcF	Udorthents, highway, 0 to 65 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	--	--	0.1

**Carroll County**

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
BaA	Baile silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	85	48	0.37	0.8
BaB	Baile silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	85	48	0.37	1.1
BcA	Benevola silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	0.4
BcB	Benevola silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	3.1
BcC	Benevola silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	0.5
BrB	Brinklow channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.20	0.9
BrC	Brinklow channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.20	4.6
BrD	Brinklow channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.20	1.3
CaC	Catoctin channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.20	1.2
CaD	Catoctin channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.20	0.2

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
CdA	Codorus silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Prime farmland if protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season	15	48	0.32	0.1
DeB	Delanco silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	0.2
EsB	Elsinboro silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.49	0.02
GbB	Gaila channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.32	0.2
GbC	Gaila channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.32	0.1
GbD	Gaila channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.32	0.1
GdB	Glenelg loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.6
GeA	Glenelg channery loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.20	0.2
GeB	Glenelg channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.20	3.3
GeC	Glenelg channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.24	2.1
GhA	Glenville silt loam, somewhat poorly drained, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	10	56	0.37	0.03
GhB	Glenville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	10	56	0.37	1.6
GhC	Glenville silt loam, somewhat poorly drained, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	5	56	0.37	0.2
HaA	Hatboro silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	85	56	0.43	0.3
LfA	Linside silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Prime farmland if protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during the growing season	5	56	0.37	0.1

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
MtB	Mt. Zion gravelly silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	5	48	0.20	0.1
MyB	Myersville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.32	1.0
MyC	Myersville silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	56	0.32	0.2
QM	Quarries, marble, 3 to 65 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	--	--	1.1
RhA	Rohrersville silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slope	Farmland of statewide importance	10	56	0.37	0.2
RhB	Rohrersville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slope	Farmland of statewide importance	5	56	0.37	0.01
SoB	Spoolsville loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.32	0.3
SoC	Spoolsville loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	56	0.32	1.4
UcE	Udorthents, ore mine, 3 to 45 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	--	--	0.3
WhB	Wheaton-Glenelg complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	56	0.37	0.01
WtA	Wiltshire silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.37	0.4

**Frederick County**

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
AdA	Adamstown silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	0.1
AfB	Adamstown-Funkstown complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	1.2
BcB	Baile-Glenville silt loams, 0 to 8 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	55	48	0.37	0.03
BhE	Blocktown gravelly loam, 25 to 45 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	38	0.24	1.1

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
BkD	Brinklow-Blocktown channery loams, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.2	3.8
CaD	Cardiff channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.3
CbF	Cardiff channery loam, 25 to 65 percent slopes, rocky	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.02
CcE	Catoctin channery loam, 25 to 45 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.03
CeB	Catoctin-Spoolsville complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	0.5
CeC	Catoctin-Spoolsville complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	0.7
CeD	Catoctin-Spoolsville complex, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.24	0.1
CgA	Codorus and Hatboro silt loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	40	48	0.32	0.2
CnA	Combs silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	5	56	0.43	0.1
CoB	Conestoga and Letort silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.32	0.3
CrB	Croton-Abbottstown silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	45	56	0.37	0.01
DtB	Duffield-Ryder silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.37	2.2
DtC	Duffield-Ryder silt loams, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.37	0.9
ErC	Edgemont-Rock outcrop complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.17	0.3
GgB	Glenelg channery loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.2	1.5
GhC	Glenelg-Blocktown gravelly loams, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.17	1.1
GmB	Glenelg-Mt. Airy channery loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.24	5.3

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
GoB	Glenville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	10	56	0.37	1.3
GoC	Glenville silt loam, somewhat poorly drained, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	5	56	0.37	0.2
GuB	Glenville-Baile silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	40	56	0.37	0.6
GvB	Glenville-Codorus complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.37	0.03
HbB	Hagerstown silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.43	0.8
HcB	Hagerstown-Opequon silty clay loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes, rocky	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.37	0.03
HdA	Hatboro-Codorus silt loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	60	56	0.43	0.5
HtF	Hyattstown very channery loam, 25 to 65 percent slopes, rocky	Not prime farmland	0	0	0.17	0.01
HyD	Hyattstown-Linganore channery silt loams, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	38	0.24	0.6
KeC	Klinesville very channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.2	0.3
KeD	Klinesville very channery loam, 15 to 25 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	48	0.2	0.2
KnC	Klinesville channery silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	0.6
LnB	Legore-Montalto gravelly silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes, bouldery	Not prime farmland	0	38	0.28	0.2
LyB	Linganore-Hyattstown channery silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	1.9
LyC	Linganore-Hyattstown channery silt loams, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.24	1.6
MaA	Melvin-Linside silt loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	55	56	0.37	0.1

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Farmland Status	Hydric Rating/ Inclusion	Wind Erodibility Index (Tons/Yr)	Water Erodibility (K-Value Whole Soil)	Acres in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
MbA	Morven loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.17	0.3
MeC	Mt. Airy channery loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.17	7.2
MnB	Mt. Zion-Rohrersville complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	48	0.2	0.1
MuC	Myersville gravelly silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	56	0.49	0.5
MvA	Myersville silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.32	0.8
MvB	Myersville silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.32	0.1
PaB	Penn loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	56	0.32	1.6
PrB	Penn-Reaville silt loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	56	0.32	0.1
RgA	Readington silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	5	56	0.43	0.5
RoB	Rohrersville-Lantz silt loams, 0 to 8 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	30	56	0.37	0.5
RwA	Rowland silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	10	56	0.37	0.2
SpA	Springwood gravelly loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	38	0.24	0.3
SqB	Springwood-Rock outcrop complex, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Not prime farmland	0	38	0.2	1.2
WrB	Whiteford-Cardiff channery loams, 3 to 8 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.2	0.5
WrC	Whiteford-Cardiff channery loams, 8 to 15 percent slopes	Farmland of statewide importance	0	38	0.2	0.1
WtB	Wiltshire-Funkstown complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes	All areas are prime farmland	0	48	0.43	0.3

### 3.3.5.3 Prime Farmland Soils

Passed in 1981, the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* sought to minimize the impact of federal actions on converting farmland to nonagricultural use. Prime farmland soils are soils that have the best combination of characteristics for producing crops such as food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops and that is available for these uses. Soils can be listed as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of state or local importance. According to the NRCS Web Soil Survey, 37 of the 98 soils mapped in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are considered prime farmland, and 29 soil map units are considered farmland of statewide importance (NRCS 2024). Prime farmland soils are identified on the Soils Maps in the updated **Appendix B**.

## 3.3.6 IMPACT ANALYSIS – SOILS

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.6.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

In total, approximately 11.8 acres of the 81.8-acre proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads contain hydric soils or soils with hydric inclusions. There are approximately 28.1 acres considered prime farmland and 36.6 acres considered farmland of statewide importance, although it is assumed that some of these soils are not actively used for agricultural purposes. The K Factor of 8 soil map units within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are above 0.40, totaling approximately 2.7 acres. The soil map units with the greatest susceptibility to water erosion within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads include Combs silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (CnA); Hatboro silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (HaA); Hagerstown silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes (HbB); Hatboro-Codorus silt loams, 0 to 3 percent slopes (HdA); Readington silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes (RgA); Wiltshire-Funkstown complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes (WtB), which each have a K Factor of 0.43 (NRCS 2024). Elsinboro silt loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes (EsB) and Myersville gravelly silt loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes (MuC) each have a K Factor of 0.49 (NRCS 2024). Additionally, all but one soil map unit (Hyattstown very channery loam, 25 to 65 percent slopes, rocky) within the access roads off the MPRP ROW are susceptible to wind erosion, with a Wind Erodibility Index ranging from 38 to 56 tons per year (NRCS 2024).

The proposed access roads for MPRP would result in ground-disturbing activities from grading for access roads where necessary, tree removal where access does not currently exist, and soil compaction. These construction activities could disturb intact, previously undisturbed soils and hydric soils, lead to potential soil erosion, and reduce the area of prime farmlands that can be used for agricultural purposes. Impacts are conservative as both preferred and alternative routes are included and the use of existing roads would minimize additional impact to the soil.

### 3.3.6.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

The use of existing roads minimizes impacts to the soil since soils are likely already compacted and additional grading would likely only be needed where the roads need widening. An Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC) Plan would be required to minimize impacts to water quality within and surrounding the proposed MPRP ROW and access roads by preventing soil erosion that may cause sediment transport off the construction site and into receiving waterbodies. The ESC Plan is required by state and county regulations and would be reviewed and approved by the Baltimore County Soil Conservation District, Carroll County Soil Conservation District, and Frederick County Soil Conservation District staff. The ESC Plan would include the use of silt fence, silt socks, stabilized construction entrances, temporary matting, temporary bridge crossings, erosion matting, sediment traps and/or basins, revegetation of

exposed soils, and other Best Management Practices (BMPs) based on site conditions and the specific activities proposed during construction. In addition, if dewatering during construction is required, discharges would be directed to filter bags used in accordance with the MDE standard detail for dewatering implemented as part of an ESC Plan approved by the applicable Soil Conservation District. Since the limits of disturbance (LOD) would be greater than 1 acre, PSEG Renewable Transmission LLC (PSEG) would submit a Notice of Intent (NOI) as required for the Maryland General Permit for Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity. Once construction is complete, any exposed soils would be stabilized with vegetation to prevent wind and water erosion.

### 3.3.6.3 Project Impacts Determination

Construction activities would require ground-disturbing activities that could result in soil erosion, particularly in areas where soils have a high K Factor and/or Wind Erodibility Index. Implementation of an ESC Plan approved by the Soil Conservation Districts would confirm that erosion is minimized and sediments are prevented from being transported off the construction site. Since construction-related ground disturbance would only occur at localized areas for grading for access roads, impacts to soil, including hydric soils and prime farmlands soils, would be relatively minor.

## 3.3.7 SURFACE WATER

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.7.1 Wetlands

PSEG identified potential wetlands within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads through a desktop review of publicly available data, primarily MDNR wetland data available on MERLIN and the National Wetland Inventory (NWI). MDNR and NWI wetlands identified and calculated within the MPRP off-ROW access roads are provided in **Table a**. Discrepancies between the two data sources may result from differences in MDNR and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) analysis processes and data sources used to determine wetland presence. MDNR and NWI wetlands are presented on the Water Resources Maps in the updated **Appendix B**.

**Table 15a. Summary of Surface Waters within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Wetland/Watercourse	MDNR Wetlands (Acres)	NWI Wetlands (Acres)	Waterway Crossings	Waterway Length (Linear Feet)
Palustrine Aquatic Bed (PAB)	0	0	–	–
Palustrine Emergent (PEM)	0	1.1	–	–
Palustrine Farmed (Pf)	0	0	–	–
Palustrine Forested (PFO)	1.2	0.2	–	–
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS)	0	0.1	–	–
Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom (PUB)	0	0.1	–	–
Waterways	–	–	22	1,503

### 3.3.7.2 Waterways

PSEG identified potential waterways within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads using publicly available stream data from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), USGS Topographic maps, and the NWI and MDNR. **Table 16a** identifies each mapped waterway

and county of location and provides the stream use classification where mapped within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads.

**Table 16a. Summary of Mapped NHD Streams and Other Waters within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Stream/Waters Name	County	Stream Use Classification
Unnamed tributaries	Frederick	I
Unnamed tributaries	Frederick	III

### 3.3.7.3 Wetlands of Special State Concern

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads do not cross Wetlands of Special State Concern.

## 3.3.8 IMPACT ANALYSIS – SURFACE WATERS

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.8.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would require several wetlands and waterways to be crossed to facilitate construction access. Impacts have been calculated assuming all MDNR and NWI wetlands, as well as waterways identified in the USGS NHD, would be impacted by construction within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Impacts are assumed to be caused primarily by ground disturbance from installation of the access roads and woody vegetation removal, including wetland conversion (e.g., forested to emergent due to tree removal). PSEG anticipates 35 proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would be constructed in wetlands (14 MDNR wetlands and 37 NWI wetlands; some proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are in MDNR and NWI wetlands that overlap).

A summary of potential permanent MDNR and NWI wetland impacts from the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads is provided in **For additional** Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

Table 17a to support permitting and mitigation coordination efforts. These estimates are conservative since they include both preferred and alternative access, and many access routes are existing roads, which would minimize impact to wetlands. Refined impacts to wetlands, including distinguishing between temporary and permanent, would be determined after the Project design is sufficiently progressed and field studies have been completed in accordance with the permitting process. Similarly, impacts to waterways will also be evaluated; however, in-stream work to construct the proposed access roads is not anticipated.

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

**Table 17a. Summary of Potential Permanent Wetland and Waterway Impacts due to the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Wetland/Watercourse	MDNR Wetlands (Acres)	NWI Wetlands (Acres)
Palustrine Emergent (PEM)	0	1.1
Palustrine Farmed (Pf)	0	0
Palustrine Forested (PFO)	1.2	0.2
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS)	0	0.1

Wetland/Watercourse	MDNR Wetlands (Acres)	NWI Wetlands (Acres)
Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom (PUB)	0	0.1
PSS Conversion to PEM	0	0.1
PFO Conversion to PEM	1.2	0.2
<b>Total Impacts</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>

### 3.3.8.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

PSEG avoided surface waters during design and construction by siting access roads outside of wetlands and waterways to the extent possible. PSEG would use matting when it is necessary for construction vehicles and equipment to enter or traverse wetlands and wetland buffers for temporary access and work areas. Temporary bridges would be used, when feasible, to avoid disturbance by spanning waterways. Erosion and sedimentation would be controlled by implementing an ESC Plan with appropriate BMPs, in accordance with state and local regulations, to protect surface waters. A Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan would also be prepared prior to construction and implemented by the construction contractor, and spill response materials would be available to guard against the release of undesirable materials into area surface waters. Vehicles and equipment would use existing roads and farm lanes as much as possible to reach the MPRP ROW and would not travel outside the LOD to avoid unnecessary impacts to wetlands and waterways.

Temporary matting (composite or timber) would be used for vehicle and equipment access in wetlands, regulated buffers, and to prevent ruts and limit soil compaction. Where necessary, multiple layers of temporary matting would be utilized in wetlands and other areas to provide a stable working area for large equipment. See **Appendix G** for typical access road construction details.

Temporary bridges may be required in areas of the ROW that cross waterways that cannot be crossed via existing culverts or limitations to available access. This method prevents construction equipment from damaging the waterway, blocking fish passage, and tracking sediment and other pollutants into the waterway. When possible, temporary waterway crossings span the entire stream at or above stream bank elevation and do not require any in-stream work. In the case of a large crossing, like the Monocacy River, PSEG does not plan to have any access traversing the river and will instead access either side of the river from separate access points to complete its work.

Wetland areas temporarily impacted by the installation of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would be returned to preconstruction conditions, using agreed upon methods, to the extent possible, once work in the area has been completed. Compensation for unavoidable permanent impacts to surface waters, including streams and wetlands, would be achieved through creation, restoration, enhancement, and/or preservation of streams and wetlands.

The preferred hierarchy of mitigation established in the United States Environmental Protection Agency /USACE Mitigation Rule would be followed:

- Purchase credits from an approved mitigation bank;
- Purchase credits from an approved In-Lieu Fee (ILF) Program (MDE ILF is not approved by USACE and can only be used for MDE-only required mitigation);
- Permittee-responsible mitigation under a watershed approach;
- Permittee-responsible mitigation through on-site and in-kind mitigation; or
- Permittee-responsible mitigation through off-site and/or out-of-kind mitigation.

If MDE requires mitigation more than the USACE mitigation requirements, then payment into the MDE ILF Program would be considered. USACE would utilize the Maryland Stream Mitigation Framework Version 1 to develop stream mitigation requirements if they determine the proposed MPRP incurs greater than minimal stream impacts. As of August 1, 2024, USACE uses the Maryland Wetland Assessment Methodology to evaluate impacts to federally jurisdictional wetlands and for the review of mitigation proposals. MDE and USACE routinely apply the ratios presented in **Table 18** when determining how much wetland mitigation is required. PSEG will comply with any mitigation ratios that are determined during the JPA review process.

**Table 18. Wetland and Stream Mitigation Ratios**

Wetland Type	Replacement Ratio for Permanent Impacts
Palustrine Farmed (Pf)	1:1
Palustrine Emergent (PEM)	1:1
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS)	2:1
Palustrine Forested (PFO)	2:1
PSS to PEM Conversion	1:1
PFO to PEM Conversion	1:1
PFO to PSS	1:1
PEM of Special State Concern	2:1
PSS of Special State Concern	3:1
PFO of Special State Concern	3:1

PSEG developed preliminary mitigation needs for the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads based on the anticipated permanent impacts to MDNR and NWI wetlands in **For additional** Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

Table 17a and the mitigation ratios in **Table 18**. The estimated mitigation needs are provided in **Table a**. The extent of required wetland and waterway mitigation can also be informed after field studies are completed in accordance with the permitting process. Similarly, the extent of mitigation for waterway impacts can be further informed after field studies are completed in accordance with the permitting process and the Maryland Wetland Assessment Methodology is applied.

**Table 19a. Preliminary Wetland and Stream Mitigation Needs for the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Wetland/Waterway Type	Replacement Ratio	Mitigation Acreage Requirement (MDNR Wetlands)	Mitigation Acreage Requirement (NWI Wetlands)
Palustrine Farmed (Pf)	1:1	0	0
Palustrine Emergent (PEM)	1:1	0	1.1
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub (PSS)	2:1	0	0.2
Palustrine Forested (PFO)	2:1	2.4	0.4
PSS to PEM Conversion	1:1	0	0.1
PFO to PEM Conversion	1:1	1.2	0.2
<b>Preliminary Wetland Mitigation Requirements*</b>		1.2 - 2.4	0.3 - 1.7
Waterways	Varies	To be determined	To be determined

\*Preliminary wetland mitigation requirements vary depending on whether the impact is wetland removal or wetland conversion.

### **3.3.8.3 Final Impact Determination**

Potential permanent and temporary impacts to surface waters, including streams, wetlands, and wetland buffers, have been minimized to the extent possible. Access roads have been located outside of wetlands to the extent practicable. PSEG would continue to refine the design and the proposed impacts as the wetland delineations are completed.

BMPs would be implemented during construction in temporarily impacted wetlands and waterways to minimize disturbance, and unavoidable temporary disturbances would be restored to preconstruction conditions. PSEG would obtain authorization for temporary and permanent impacts to surface waters through Maryland's JPA process and would provide compensatory mitigation for permanent unavoidable impacts in accordance with a mitigation plan approved by MDE and the USACE. The successful implementation of compensatory mitigation, if required, would result in a no net loss of wetlands.

### **3.3.9 WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.10 IMPACT ANALYSIS – WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.11 MARYLAND COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.12 IMPACT ANALYSIS – MARYLAND COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.13 WATER QUALITY**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.14 IMPACT ANALYSIS – WATER QUALITY**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.14.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

The access routes for the proposed MPRP would result in ground-disturbing activities from grading for access roads and from tree removal. Additionally, it is anticipated that stream impacts would be required to install temporary access roads. These construction activities would disturb ground vegetation and soils and potentially lead to erosion and sediment transport into receiving waterbodies.

According to MDE's Designated Use Classes for Maryland's Surface Waters (MDE 2023), streams along the proposed access roads off the MPRP ROW are designated Use I, Use III, or Use IV. In general, Use III streams are located within the Baltimore County and northeastern Carroll County portions of the proposed access roads off the MPRP ROW, Use IV streams are in the remaining portion of Carroll County and into eastern Frederick County, and Use I streams occur along the remaining portions of the corridor within south and southwestern Frederick County. There are currently 8 Use III, cold water streams totaling 218.2 linear feet within the proposed access roads off the MPRP ROW where there may be potential thermal impacts due to the removal of riparian vegetation.

Additionally, the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross seven Tier II catchments and no Tier II stream segments listed in **Table 21a**.

A Tier II watershed approval is a multijurisdictional evaluation process, which can include federal, state and local partners and is coordinated by the MDE Water Quality Program during review of the JPA and Stormwater Management and ESC Plans. If a project cannot avoid impacts in a Tier II watershed, minimization alternatives must be developed and approved by MDE. The overall goal of this process is to reduce water quality degradation.

**Table 21a. Tier II Catchments and Stream Segments in the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Tier II Catchment	County	Acreage of Catchment in Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Deer Creek 2/4/5	Baltimore	1.9
Little Falls 1	Baltimore	3.6
Gunpowder Falls 1	Baltimore	0.6
Gunpowder Falls 1	Carroll	5.6
South Branch Gunpowder Falls UT 1	Carroll	0.0009
Talbot Branch UT 1	Frederick	0.2
Weldon Creek	Frederick	3.4
Tier II Stream Segment	County	Linear Feet of Stream in Proposed Access Roads off the MPRP ROW
S Branch Gunpowder Falls UT 1	Carroll	0
Talbot Branch UT 1	Frederick	0

Notes:

ROW = right-of-way

### 3.3.14.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

PSEG prioritizes minimizing disturbance to streams and prefers to avoid stream crossings for access roads wherever possible. If stream impacts cannot be avoided, including impacts to Tier II streams, PSEG would restrict the contractor from conducting in-stream work during the applicable Use I, Use III, and Use IV stream closure periods to minimize impacts to aquatic habitats caused by water quality

degradation from construction, unless a waiver is obtained from MDE. PSEG would minimize the need for stream crossings along both temporary and permanent access roads as much as possible. When stream crossings are unavoidable for construction access, temporary bridges would be used to span streams, where feasible, to prevent in-stream disturbance. When permanent stream crossings are required, PSEG would install culverts in accordance with MDE waterway construction standards and would adhere to the applicable closure period depending on the use designation of the stream.

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.14.3 Project Impacts Determination**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.3.15 FLOODPLAINS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.3.16 IMPACT ANALYSIS – FLOODPLAINS**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.16.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would cross 0.3 acres of regulated 100-year floodplain in Baltimore County, 0.5 acres of floodplain in Carroll County, and 0.6 acres of floodplain in Frederick County, totaling approximately 1.4 acres. PSEG anticipates there would be floodplain impacts associated with construction of the MPRP. Impacts would be caused primarily by vegetation clearing but may also be caused by ground disturbance from installation of temporary and permanent access roads. Temporary and permanent floodplain disturbances from construction will be further informed as the design of the access roads is completed.

### **3.3.16.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

While tree removal within the floodplain would be unavoidable, PSEG attempted to minimize floodplain impacts by placing structures outside the floodplain as much as possible, which limits the need for access roads within the floodplain. Construction BMPs would be applied, such as use of temporary mats, to minimize ground disturbance when access through floodplains cannot be avoided. Also, weather would be monitored prior to the start of construction each day. Equipment and materials will not be stored or stockpiled in a mapped floodplain to avoid impacts during storm events. Temporary ground disturbance within the floodplain would be stabilized with an approved seed mix in accordance with the approved ESC Plans.

### **3.3.16.3 Project Impacts Determination**

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross approximately 1.4 acres of regulated 100-year floodplains. PSEG would place access roads outside the floodplain as much as possible and would apply appropriate BMPs during construction within floodplains to minimize impacts. PSEG would obtain prior authorization from MDE for floodplain disturbance, as well as permits from the applicable County Floodplain Administrators.

### **3.3.17 AQUATIC SPECIES AND HABITAT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.18 IMPACT ANALYSIS – AQUATIC SPECIES AND HABITAT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.19 VEGETATION**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

Based on publicly available land coverage data, approximately 18.7 acres of the proposed 81.8-acre MPRP off-ROW access roads consist of natural communities of shrub/scrub and forest vegetation. Additionally, approximately 35 acres consist of vegetation on cultivated croplands and hay/pasturelands. Much of the proposed construction access utilizes existing farm roads, which are not identified as a separate land coverage. The complete list of land coverages within the proposed access roads off the MPRP ROW is in Error! Reference source not found.a.

**Table 23a. Land Coverage within Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Land Use	Acreage of MPRP off-ROW Access roads	Percent of MPRP off-ROW Access Roads
Cultivated Crops	33.63	42.31%
Deciduous Forest	13.37	17.11%
Hay/Pasture	21.11	25.68%
Mixed Forest	2.40	3.07%
Developed, Open Space	4.68	5.95%
Woody Wetlands	1.81	2.30%
Developed, Low Intensity	1.66	2.12%
Open Water	0.01	0.01%
Evergreen Forest	0.14	0.18%
Shrub/Scrub	1.01	0.41%
Developed, Medium Intensity	0.64	0.82%
Developed, High Intensity	0.03	0.04%

### **3.3.20 IMPACT ANALYSIS – VEGETATION**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

#### **3.3.20.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

Some tree clearing may be required to establish the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads where either roads are not existing or road widening needs to occur. Based on the land coverages, the proposed access roads may require 2.4 acres of forest clearing in Baltimore County, 5.7 acres in Carroll County, and 9.6 acres in Frederick County, totaling approximately 17.7 acres of forest clearing. These estimates are conservative as they include both preferred and alternative access, as well as existing roads that may

currently show as forested in the data. If disturbance is required to a roadside tree, including pruning or trimming, a Roadside Tree Permit will need to be applied for. PSEG plans to conduct forest stand and wetlands delineation and individual tree surveys within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads to inform the accounting of required tree clearing, as well as potential conversion of forested wetlands. Additionally, localized disturbance to herbaceous and shrub/scrub vegetation may potentially result from installation of access roads.

### **3.3.20.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

PSEG would adhere to the Maryland *Forest Conservation Act* (FCA) regulations, and MDNR's Roadside Tree Law Forest Conservation Plans would be prepared and submitted to MDNR for review and approval. PSEG would coordinate with the State to determine reforestation and afforestation requirements. This may include fee-in lieu, reforestation, tree plantings, and other methods. Additionally, construction BMPs, such as temporary matting, would be used in selected areas to minimize disturbance to vegetation in wetlands and floodplains, and temporarily impacted areas would be stabilized with vegetation upon completion of construction.

### **3.3.20.3 Project Impacts Determination**

Impacts to vegetation would occur from construction, primarily through the removal of up to 17.7 acres of forest within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. For temporary roads, vegetation would be restored to pre-construction conditions, including the planting of forested areas with trees as appropriate. PSEG would mitigate for permanent forest impacts through reforestation and/or tree plantings coordinated with each county as part of Forest Conservation Plan review and approval.

## **3.3.21 SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.3.22 IMPACT ANALYSIS – SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.22.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

There are approximately 3.9 acres of FIDS habitat within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Baltimore County, 5.2 acres in Carroll County, and 11.1 acres in Frederick County. As such, PSEG anticipates the tree clearing associated with the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads may impact FIDS habitat. While the proposed permanent MPRP access roads may result in a loss of FIDS habitat, they will not create a barrier to wildlife movement, as the roads are fairly narrow, facilitating movement by forest dwelling birds.

According to Habitat Connectivity Network data available on MERLIN, there are 3.05 acres of wildlife hubs, 2.01 acres of habitat gaps, and 0.37 acres of wildlife corridors within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. A breakdown for the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads by county is provided in Error! Reference source not found.a. Impacts to the Habitat Connectivity Network would be unavoidable; however, reforestation to comply with the Maryland FCA regulations may compensate partially for the loss of hub and corridor habitats.

**Table 24a. Hub, Corridor, and Gap Habitats according to the Maryland Habitat Connectivity Network within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

County	Hub (Acres)	Gap (Acres)	Corridor (Acres)
Baltimore	0.24	0.46	0.02
Carroll	0.77	0.76	0.06
Frederick	2.04	0.79	0.29

There are 2.9 acres of Group 1 SSPRAs within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Baltimore County and 7.8 acres within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Carroll County. There are no Group 1 SSPRAs within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Frederick County. The Group 1 SSPRAs are likely for the presence of the federally listed threatened bog turtle (*Glyptemys muhlenbergii*), the federally listed endangered northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) and Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), and the proposed threatened monarch butterfly (*Danus plexippus*). In addition, there are 1.6 acres of Group 2 SSPRAs within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Frederick County associated with one or more state-listed species, but none in Baltimore County or Carroll County. There are no Group 3 or 4 SSPRAs within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads.

Multiple targeted ecological areas (TEAs) totaling 11.5 acres were identified within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Of the 11.48 acres, 3.8 acres are in Baltimore County, 7.5 acres are in Carroll County, and 0.2 acres are in Frederick County. Most of the TEAs are located along the northern Baltimore County and northeastern Carroll County. Portions of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are in areas where bog turtles are likely to be present, while smaller, more localized TEAs are generally associated with riparian areas of small streams within the corridor.

### **3.3.22.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

While impacts within Special Management Areas would generally be unavoidable, PSEG has minimized the impacts by designing access roads that use existing roads and avoid wetlands, forests and other sensitive habitat where possible. Field survey data will be used to inform the selection of preferred access roads or alternate access roads, particularly where Special Management Areas are identified. PSEG would identify minimization measures through coordination with MDNR and USFWS.

### **3.3.22.3 Project Impacts Determination**

PSEG anticipates impacts to a variety of Special Management Areas related to habitat and federal- and state-listed species of concern. PSEG would conduct habitat assessments, presence/absence surveys, and/or construction monitoring for the protection of species and coordinate with USFWS and MDNR to identify additional measures to minimize impacts to habitat.

## **3.3.23 TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.3.24 IMPACT ANALYSIS – TERRESTRIAL WILDLIFE**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.25 AVIAN WILDLIFE

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.26 IMPACT ANALYSIS – AVIAN WILDLIFE

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.27 RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

This section describes the rare, threatened, and endangered (RTE) species potentially present within or adjacent to the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Potential impacts were assessed through coordination with USFWS and MDNR. Agency correspondence concerning RTE species is included in **Appendix A1**.

#### 3.3.27.1 Federally Listed Species

The USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) web service was used to determine the potential for federally listed RTE species to occur within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads that are afforded protection under the *Endangered Species Act* (ESA). An official species list was obtained from IPaC on January 17, 2025, that identified the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), the proposed endangered tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*), the federally listed threatened bog turtle (*Glyptemys muhlenbergii*), and the proposed threatened green floater (*Iasmigona subviridis*) and monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) as potentially occurring within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. On December 12, 2024, the USFWS officially proposed in the Federal Register to list the monarch butterfly as threatened and to designate critical overwintering habitat in portions of coastal California. PSEG anticipates future IPaC species list and future coordination meetings with USFWS to reflect this updated status.

Federally listed species with the potential to occur within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are identified in **Table Table a**. There are no Federally listed species within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads that have not already been identified as potentially being present in the MPRP ROW. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

USFWS defines critical habitat as the specific areas within and outside the geographical area occupied by the species at the time it is listed that are essential to the conservation of the species and may require special management considerations or protections (USFWS 2024b). No critical habitats were identified within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. A copy of the official IPaC species lists obtained for the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads is included in **Appendix A1**.

**Table 27a. Federally Listed Species with the potential to occur within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status
<i>Myotis sodalis</i>	Indiana Bat	Endangered
<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	Northern Long-eared Bat	Endangered
<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>	Tricolored Bat	Proposed Endangered

<i>Glyptemys muhlenbergii</i>	Bog Turtle	Threatened
<i>Lasmigona subviridis</i>	Green Floater	Proposed Threatened
<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Monarch Butterfly	Proposed Threatened

### 3.3.27.2 State Protected Species

Additional coordination with Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage was submitted on February 13, 2025. A response is pending.

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## 3.3.28 IMPACT ANALYSIS – RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.28.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

Based on available land cover data (see Error! Reference source not found.a), up to 17.7 acres of deciduous, evergreen, mixed forest, and woody wetlands habitat may need to be cleared for the MPRP off-ROW access roads. These existing forests have the potential to provide suitable habitat for the tricolored bat, Indiana bat, and northern long-eared bat since they most often use forests for roosting and foraging. Additionally, pasturelands and existing croplands adjacent to forests provide prime fall swarming habitat for bats. Therefore, PSEG anticipates the proposed access roads off the MPRP may have impacts to suitable bat habitat and may impact individual bats if A&M measures are not implemented.

As shown in **Table a**, there is approximately 1.4 acres of PFO and 1.1 acres of PEM according to MDNR and NWI, and more wetlands may be identified during field studies to be conducted in accordance with the permitting process. These wetlands may provide suitable bog turtle habitat, as according to USFWS, bog turtles prefer open, shallow, wet areas with deep, mucky soils that are fed by underground springs. Wetlands suitable as bog turtle habitat are dominated by grasses and tussock sedge used for basking and nesting and have a low volume of standing or slow-moving water (USFWS 2024a). Temporary habitat impacts would be limited to matting used for construction access. PSEG would work with MDNR to apply appropriate BMPs to avoid permanent impacts to individual bog turtles to the maximum extent practicable.

Coordination with MDNR Wildlife and Heritage Service (WHS) is pending to obtain an updated species list based on the proposed MPRP access roads. It is anticipated that the list of species will decrease since the area of the proposed MPRP access roads is substantially smaller than the MPRP Routing Study Area.

Since it is not known whether the preferred or alternative access routes may be used, the footprint of both is included in the impact assessment as a conservative approach. While most of the access routes are existing roads and their use as construction access would have less impact to resources such as wetlands and forests, the entire footprint of the existing road is conservatively considered an impact. Avoidance and Minimization Measures

Where access roads are located in forested areas PSEG would implement a time-of-year restriction (TOYR) on tree clearing during the summer bat occupancy period, which in Maryland is April 1 to

September 30, or as coordinated with USFWS. Implementing this TOYR would address incidental take of any tricolored bat, northern long-eared bat, or Indiana bat. Reforestation to comply with the Maryland FCA requirements would partially mitigate the loss of potentially suitable bat habitat over the long term.

PSEG proposes to avoid access roads in potential bog turtle habitat. PSEG would conduct a Phase 1 bog turtle survey to determine whether PEM and PSS wetlands within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads provide suitable bog turtle habitat. Presence/absence surveys would then be conducted by certified bog turtle surveyors where impacts to suitable habitat cannot be avoided, or PSEG may instead commit to monitoring ground-disturbing activities during construction so that bog turtles, if present, can be found and relocated without being harmed. Construction access would minimize and avoid temporary impacts to potential bog turtle habitat, where practicable. PSEG would coordinate with USFWS and MDNR on the most effective strategies to avoid adverse effects to bog turtles.

On December 12, 2024, the USFWS officially proposed in the Federal Register to list the monarch butterfly as threatened and to designate critical overwintering habitat in portions of coastal California. PSEG would coordinate with USFWS to implement the appropriate A&M measures for this species.

PSEG consulted with MDNR WHS on February 13, 2025, for an updated list of state-listed RTE species and other unique and/or important natural areas within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. A response is pending.

### **3.3.28.2 Project Impacts Determination**

According to the USFWS IPaC database, the federally listed bog turtle, northern long-eared bat, Indiana bat, and green floater; the tricolored bat, which is proposed for listing; and the monarch butterfly, a newly listed proposed threatened species may occur in the vicinity of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Coordination with MDNR WHS has also identified numerous state-listed species within the Study Area used for the routing alternatives. PSEG would implement a variety of A&M measures to promote protection of these species, including TOYR on tree clearing to minimize incidental take of tricolored bats, northern long-eared bats, and Indiana bats; avoidance of impacts to wetlands where practicable; Phase 1 habitat assessments, Phase 2 presence/absence surveys, and/or Phase 3 construction monitoring to limit adverse effects to bog turtles. No impact to green floaters are anticipated as the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads do not cross any streams with potential habitat.

### **3.3.29 ENVIRONMENTAL SITE HAZARD ASSESSMENT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.30 IMPACTS ANALYSIS – ENVIRONMENTAL SITE HAZARD ASSESSMENT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.3.31 EXISTING ACOUSTICAL ENVIRONMENT**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.3.32 IMPACT ANALYSIS – EXISTING ACOUSTICAL ENVIRONMENT

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## 3.4 Cultural Resources

This section identifies and evaluates potential impacts to known cultural resources within and in the vicinity of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Resources reviewed for this section include previously documented historic architectural and archaeological sites cataloged by Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) using the MEDUSA online cultural resource database. This includes resources listed in the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), previously recorded archaeological sites, National Historic Landmarks (NHL), and other historical overlays, including Maryland Heritage Areas and MHT Historic Preservation Easements. Resources considered in this study include above ground historic properties, archaeological sites and architectural resources within 1-mile of the MPRP off-ROW access roads. The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads may have indirect effects to historic properties within view of the access roads by impacting their historic viewsheds but the impacts are expected to be minimal as the access roads will primarily be preexisting and temporary.

Field surveys and investigations may identify additional cultural resources that have not been previously documented by MHT and that are not evaluated in this section. In accordance with the permitting process, PSEG will complete field surveys as required.

### 3.4.1 MARYLAND INVENTORY OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

MHT's MEDUSA online cultural resource database identifies 12 previously documented above-ground historic properties within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. These resources are listed in **Table 33a**. These include 3 properties in Carroll County and 9 in Frederick County.

**Table 33a. MIHP-Listed Properties within the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

MIHP ID	Name	County	NRHP Status
CARR-1676	Sellers Farm	Carroll	Not Evaluated
CARR-1720	Charles Repp Farm	Carroll	Not Eligible
CARR-1721	Ephraim Stouffer Farm	Carroll	Eligible
F-1-87	Henry S. Michael Farm	Frederick	Not Eligible
F-1-133	Washington Run Rural Area	Frederick	Not Eligible
F-1-134	Carrollton Manor Rural Historic District	Frederick	Eligible
F-1-193	Richard P.T. Dutrow Farmstead	Frederick	Not Evaluated
F-3-224	Frederick-Baltimore Transportation Corridor	Frederick	Not Eligible
F-7-94	William Horman Farmstead	Frederick	Not Evaluated
F-7-120	Sugarloaf Mountain Historic District	Frederick	Eligible
F-7-155	Turnbull House	Frederick	Not Eligible
F-7-156	Lowe-McGruder Farm	Frederick	Not Eligible

Notes:

DOE = Determination of Eligibility; MIHP = Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

Three resources are located in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Carroll County. The access roads cross the Sellers Farm (CARR-1676) north of Tracey Mill Road and the Charles Repp Farm (CARR-1720) east of the intersection of Wakefield Valley Road and Route 31. The access roads cross the Ephraim Stouffer Farm (CARR-1721) east of the intersection of Old New Windsor Road and New Windsor Road. The Charles Repp Farm has been evaluated and determined not eligible for listing and the Ephraim Stouffer Farm has been evaluated and determined eligible for listing. The Sellers Farm has not been evaluated for NRHP listing and may require formal Determination of Eligibility as part of this undertaking.

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads intersect nine MIHP resources in Frederick County. The Frederick-Baltimore Transportation Corridor (F-3-224) crosses the access roads south of Old National Pike southeast of its intersection with Detrick Road. The Lowe-McGruder Farm (F-7-156) is located on either side of Ganley Lane near the Bush Creek Estates. The access roads skirts through the very northernmost edge of the Turnbull House (F-7-155) south of Ganley Lane and the western edge of the William Horman Farmstead (F-7-94) northwest of Park Mills Road. The access roads enter the Sugarloaf Mountain Historic District (F-7-120) along the northwestern extent west of Park Mills Road. There is a cluster of resources near Adamstown at the western terminus of the access roads: the Carrollton Manor Rural District (F-1-134), the Richard P.T. Dutrow Farmstead (F-1-193), the Washington Run Rural Area (F-1-133), and the Henry S. Michael Farm (F-1-87). The Frederick-Baltimore Transportation Corridor, the Washington Run Rural Area, the Turnbull House, the Henry S. Michael Farm, and Lowe-McGruder Farm have been determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP by MHT. The Carrollton Manor Rural Historic District and the Sugarloaf Mountain Historic District have been determined eligible for listing. The William Horman Farmstead and the Richard P.T. Dutrow Farmstead have not been evaluated for listing in the NRHP by MHT and may require formal Determination of Eligibility as part of this undertaking.

MIHP properties within 1 mile of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads were considered for potential indirect visual effects. In all, there are 355 MIHP properties entirely or partially within 1 mile of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. There are 39 properties in Baltimore County, 183 in Carroll County, and 133 in Frederick County (**Table 34a**).

**Table 34a. MIHP Properties within One Mile of the Proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

County	Town/Municipality	Number NRHP Listed	Number NRHP Eligible	Number NRHP Not Eligible	Number not Evaluated	Total MIHP Properties
Baltimore	Freeland	0	0	2	10	<b>12</b>
Baltimore	Manchester	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
Baltimore	Maryland Line	0	0	0	19	<b>19</b>
Baltimore	Parkton	0	0	1	5	<b>6</b>
Carroll	Lineboro	0	0	0	8	<b>8</b>
Carroll	Manchester	0	4	10	50	<b>64</b>
Carroll	Millers	0	0	0	3	<b>3</b>
Carroll	Westminster	1	14	17	37	<b>69</b>
Carroll	New Windsor	0	2	8	32	<b>42</b>
Frederick	Adamstown	0	3	9	36	<b>48</b>
Frederick	Buckeystown	0	0	1	0	<b>1</b>

County	Town/Municipality	Number NRHP Listed	Number NRHP Eligible	Number NRHP Not Eligible	Number not Evaluated	Total MIHP Properties
Frederick	Dickerson	0	1	0	0	1
Frederick	Frederick	0	2	3	10	15
Frederick	Ijamsville	0	5	2	11	18
Frederick	Monrovia	0	0	16	7	23
Frederick	Mount Airy	0	3	2	10	15
Frederick	New Market	0	1	1	3	5
Frederick	Point of Rocks	0	0	2	1	3
Frederick	Urbana	0	1	1	0	2
<b>Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>355</b>

Notes:

MIHP = Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties; NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

### **3.4.2 NATIONAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES AND NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARKS**

There are no NRHP-listed or NHL properties within the proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads and there are no additional NRHP-listed or NHL properties within 1 mile of the proposed MPRP off-ROW Access Roads that have not been already identified for the MPRP ROW. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.4.3 MARYLAND HERITAGE AREAS AND SCENIC BYWAYS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.4.4 CEMETERIES**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.4.5 HISTORIC PRESERVATION EASEMENTS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.4.6 IMPACT ANALYSIS – HISTORIC BUILT ENVIRONMENT**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

#### **3.4.6.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads may have indirect effects to historic properties within view of the access roads by impacting their historic viewsheds, but the impacts are expected to be minimal as the

access roads will primarily be preexisting and temporary. No direct impacts are anticipated to cemeteries or historic preservation easements near the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads.

Approximately 9.1 acres of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are in the Carroll County portion of the Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area, while 26.5 acres of the MPRP off-ROW access roads are in the Frederick County portion. The historically significant portions of the Heritage Area and the MIHP resources within its boundaries have been discussed above.

### 3.4.6.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

During design of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads, PSEG avoided the direct impact of known historic architectural structures. Visual impacts from the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are expected to be minimal as the access roads are primarily preexisting and temporary. PSEG would consult with MHT to identify opportunities to minimize effects, and to determine appropriate mitigation, if necessary, for both direct and indirect effects to historic properties.

### 3.4.6.3 Project Impacts Determination

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross 2 NRHP-eligible properties and there are 20 NRHP-listed properties within 1 mile of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross The Heart of the Civil War Heritage Area and four scenic byways. There are also 22 formally documented cemeteries and 3 historic preservation easements within 1 mile of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Visual impacts from the proposed access roads MPRP off-ROW access roads are expected to be minimal as the access roads are primarily preexisting and temporary. Consultation with MHT will determine any additional survey and reporting requirements.

## 3.4.7 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

**Table 39a** lists one previously documented archaeological sites intersected by or abutting the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. The document site is the Monrovia Mill Site (18FR1168) in Frederick County between Bush Creek and the Monocacy River. Per Section 304 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* of 1966, as amended, archaeological site locations will not be disclosed to the public to better protect sites from unauthorized excavations.

**Table 39a. Known Archaeological Sites within the MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Site	County	Site Name	Type	NRHP Status
18FR1168	Frederick	Monrovia Mill Site	19th Century Mill	Not Evaluated

Notes:

NRHP = National Register of Historic Places

18FR1168 contains remains of a nineteenth-century mill, including a mill race feature, and is located north of the Bush Creek Estates. The site has not been extensively studied and has not been formally evaluated for listing in the NRHP. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.4.8 IMPACT ANALYSIS – ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

The following section describes potential adverse effects to previously documented archaeological sites in the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Section 106 of the *National Historic Preservation Act* of 1966, as amended, defines an adverse effect as any action which alters, directly or indirectly, any of the

characteristics of a historic property that qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP. In the case of archaeological sites, this would include any ground disturbance to subsurface deposits or destruction of cultural features, such as above-ground ruins, burial mounds, or other above-ground indications of archaeological sites.

Through consultation with MHT archaeological surveys may be conducted along MPRP off-ROW access roads. If additional archaeological sites are identified during preconstruction archaeological surveys, impact assessment, avoidance and minimization measures, and Project impacts determinations will be made in the same manner as described below.

#### **3.4.8.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

There is one known archaeological site within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. Direct adverse effects are most likely to occur if access road installation occurs within the boundaries of archaeological sites. Adverse effects can also occur from soil compaction and other ground disturbance when construction staging, and vehicle and equipment movements, occur within archaeological sites.

Field studies would occur in accordance with the permitting process. Investigations would be focused in the areas that have been identified as potential locations for archaeological resources to be present. Field documentation and artifact collection would be completed according to MHT guidelines.

#### **3.4.8.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

Access roads would attempt to avoid disturbance to archaeological sites. Sites determined to be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP during consultation with MHT, and which cannot be avoided by access roads, may require additional test excavations. These test excavations are for the purpose of evaluating the sites for listing as well as data recovery. Matting can be used to protect below ground deposits and ground disturbance would not need to occur.

#### **3.4.8.3 Project Impacts Determination**

It is unknown at this time if archaeological sites would be disturbed by the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads; however, PSEG would attempt to avoid archaeological sites to the extent possible. PSEG will consult with MHT regarding the completion of any archaeological surveys, as required by MHT through consultation.

### **3.4.9 SECTION 106 CONSULTATION**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.5 Land Use and Aesthetics**

This section evaluates the Project's consistency with applicable land use plans, goals, and policies, and addresses land use compatibility issues within the vicinity of the MPRP route corridor. Resources reviewed for this section included land use types both within and adjacent to the corridor, state and county land use and long-range plans and regulations, various types of easements and land restrictions, and other land management areas. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### 3.5.1 LAND USE/LAND COVER

Land use in the vicinity of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads was determined using GIS data compiled by the Maryland Department of Planning. Existing land use is primarily designated as agriculture, with cultivated crops accounting for 41.79 percent of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads and 28.07 percent of land use within 1 mile; and hay/pasture accounting for 26.23 percent of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads and 25.51 percent of land use within 1 mile. Forestland is another primary land use, with deciduous forest accounting for 16.61 percent of the MPRP off-ROW access roads and 25.74 percent of the total acreage within 1 mile; mixed forest accounting for 2.98 percent of the MPRP off-ROW access roads and 4.11 percent of the total acreage within 1 mile; and evergreen forest accounting for 0.17 percent of the MPRP off-ROW access roads and 0.35 percent of the total acreage within 1 mile. Additional land use designations include barren land; developed, high intensity; developed, low intensity; developed, medium intensity; developed, open space; emergent herbaceous wetlands; herbaceous; open water; shrub/scrub; and woody wetlands. Error! Reference source not found.a shows the approximate acreage of land use types within 1 mile of the MPRP off-ROW access roads. Existing land use is also presented on the Land Use/Land Cover Maps in the updated **Appendix B**.

**Table 40a. Land Use Classifications within 1 Mile of the MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Land Use Category	Acreage of Access Roads	Percentage of Access Roads	Acreage within 1 Mile of Access Roads	Percentage of Area within 1 Mile of Access Roads
Barren Land	0	0%	205.55	0.23%
Cultivated Crops	33.63	41.79%	24,880.55	28.07%
Deciduous Forest	13.37	16.61%	22,819.29	25.74%
Developed, High Intensity	0.03	0.04%	218.29	0.25%
Developed, Low Intensity	1.66	2.06%	2,827.16	3.19%
Developed, Medium Intensity	0.64	0.79%	1,191.89	1.34%
Developed, Open Space	4.68	5.82%	7,980.89	9.00%
Emergent Herbaceous Wetlands	0	0%	70.55	0.08%
Evergreen Forest	0.14	0.17%	312.91	0.35%
Hay/Pasture	21.11	26.23%	22,609.83	25.51%
Herbaceous	0	0%	197.73	0.22%
Mixed Forest	2.40	2.98%	3,642.55	4.11%
Open Water	0.01	0.01%	254.16	0.29%
Shrub/Scrub	1.01	1.25%	306.24	0.35%
Woody Wetlands	1.81	2.25%	1,129.26	1.27%

Notes:

ROW = right-of-way

### 3.5.2 IMPACT ANALYSIS – LAND USE/LAND COVER

#### 3.5.2.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross through multiple agricultural, natural, and developed areas. Temporary changes to land use would result from construction of the primarily temporary access roads.

### **3.5.2.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

To minimize permanent changes to land use/land cover, PSEG intends to use existing paved and/or gravel/dirt roads for temporary construction and long-term maintenance access for the MPRP ROW, where feasible. PSEG would also attempt to site construction work and equipment/materials laydown areas outside of sensitive environmental areas and minimize tree clearing to what would be required to establish the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. PSEG would coordinate with affected landowners prior to establishment of ROW easements and construction to negotiate measures to minimize impacts to the long-term viability of the use of the property.

### **3.5.2.3 Project Impacts Determination**

Construction of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would result in temporary changes to land use within the access roads by restricting the preconstruction use of areas. PSEG would attempt to site access roads outside environmentally sensitive areas, minimize tree clearing, and minimize the long-term effects on agricultural operations, to the extent possible.

## **3.5.3 PRIORITY FUNDING AREAS AND ENTERPRISE ZONES**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.5.4 IMPACT ANALYSIS – PRIORITY FUNDING AREAS AND ENTERPRISE ZONES**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## **3.5.5 MARYLAND STATE PROTECTED LANDS**

For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.5.5.1 Rural Legacy Areas**

Maryland's Rural Legacy Program was developed to protect large, contiguous areas of cultural and natural resource lands within the state. The program is administered by MDNR and protects these areas through land trusts and working with local governments and Rural Legacy Sponsors. Rural Legacy Areas (RLA) encompass enough area to protect multiple resources while being manageable enough to meet preservation objectives. The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads traverses three RLAs.

Approximately 5.6 acres of the Upper Patapsco RLA and 10.6 acres of the Little Pipe Creek RLA fall within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Carroll County, and approximately 15.02 acres of the Carrollton Manor RLA falls within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Frederick County.

The locations of the RLAs and Rural Legacy Properties along the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are presented on the Easements and Other Protected Lands mapping in the updated **Appendix B**.

### **3.5.5.2 Maryland Environmental Trust Easements**

The Maryland Environmental Trust (MET) is a state-wide land trust that works for landowners, local communities, and land trusts to protect Maryland's landscapes and natural resources. The proposed

MPRP off-ROW access roads cross three MET easements. Approximately 0.04 acres of one MET easement are within the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads in Carroll County and 0.55 acres of two MET easements are in Frederick County. There are no MET easements within Baltimore County. The locations of the MET easements along the proposed access roads are presented on the Easements and Other Protected Lands mapping in the updated **Appendix B**.

### **3.5.5.3 Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation Easements**

The Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF), under the Maryland Department of Agriculture, was established to permanently preserve prime farmland and woodland through agricultural preservation easements and restrict the development of these properties (MALPF 2024). The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross 10 MALPF easements in Baltimore County totaling approximately 3.06 acres, 7 MALPF easements in Carroll County totaling 2.04 acres, and 3 MALPF easements in Frederick County totaling 3.14 acres. The locations of the MALPF easements along the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are presented on the Easements and Other Protected Lands mapping in the updated **Appendix B**.

### **3.5.5.4 Forest Conservation Act Easements**

The Maryland FCA (Natural Resources Article Section 5-1601 through 5-1613) of 1991 was enacted to reduce the loss of Maryland's forests during land development by requiring forests and other sensitive areas to be identified and protected during the site planning process (MDNR 2024d). Baltimore County, Carroll County, and Frederick County each have forest conservation programs with regulations that are up to date with the latest FCA requirements. FCA easements are used to maximize the benefits of forests to slow the loss of forested land in the state and counties. The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads crosses approximately 0.0005 acres of one FCA easement in Carroll County. The proposed access roads do not cross any FCA easements in Baltimore County or Frederick County. The locations of the FCA easements along the proposed access roads are presented on the Easements and Other Protected Lands mapping in the updated **Appendix B**.

### **3.5.5.5 Chesapeake Bay Critical Area**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024

### **3.5.5.6 Local Protected Lands**

A review of MERLIN determined the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would not cross any locally protected areas.

### **3.5.5.7 Private Conservation Lands**

Private Conservation Lands are properties protected from development by various private conservation organizations through ownership or a conservation easement. A review of MERLIN determined the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would not cross any Private Conservation Land.

## 3.5.6 IMPACT ANALYSIS – MARYLAND STATE AND LOCAL PROTECTED LANDS

### 3.5.6.1 Potential Impacts Assessment

PSEG has determined the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross multiple protected lands and conservation easements as summarized in Error! Reference source not found.a. Coordination with the sponsoring agencies and organizations along with individual review of landowner records would be conducted to confirm any additional easements and the limiting conditions of those easements.

**Table 41a. Summary of Easements and Other Protected Lands within MPRP off-ROW Access Roads**

Land Protection Vehicle	Baltimore County	Carroll County	Frederick County
MDNR-Protected Land	None	None	None
Rural Legacy Areas	None	5.6 acres of Upper Patapsco RLA; 10.6 acres of Little Pipe Creek RLA	15.02 acres of Carrollton Manor RLA
Rural Legacy Area Properties	None	One property of the Little Pipe Creek RLA (see note below)	None
Maryland Environmental Trust Easements	None	0.04 acres on 1 easement	0.55 acres on 2 easements
Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation Easements	3.06 acres on 10 easements	2.04 acres on 7 easements	3.14 acres on 3 easements
<i>Forest Conservation Act</i> Easements	None	0.0005 acres on 1 easement	None
Chesapeake Bay Critical Area	None	None	None
Local Protected Lands	None	None	None
Private Conservation Lands	None	None	None

Notes:

The outlines of publicly available data for Rural Legacy Properties did not match the parcel boundaries dataset from the State of Maryland. The Proposed Route ROW avoids parcels that are indicated as Rural Legacy Properties and therefore avoids Rural Legacy Properties.

MDNR = Maryland Department of Natural Resources; NCR = Torrey C. Brown Rail Trail; RLA = Rural Legacy Area

### 3.5.6.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures

PSEG would develop a thorough understanding of the limiting conditions of impacted easements and agreements in place along the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. PSEG would then coordinate with sponsoring agencies and organizations, as well as affected landowners, to develop a plan to construct the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads regarding those easements. PSEG will address and comply with the processes required for all conservation easements.

### 3.5.6.3 Project Impacts Determination

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would cross multiple protected lands and conservation easements. PSEG would coordinate with sponsoring agencies, organizations, and affected landowners to develop a plan to construct the proposed MPRP within the easement requirements, or to identify alternative easement locations or other measures to compensate for impacts to existing or easement requirements.

### **3.5.7 IMPACT ANALYSIS – COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLANNING**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.5.8 PRIORITY PRESERVATION AREAS**

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

### **3.5.9 IMPACT ANALYSIS – PRIORITY PRESERVATION AREAS**

#### **3.5.9.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

In Baltimore County, 3.1 acres of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads are within the Freeland & Maryland Line PPA and 2.6 acres are within the White Hall & Monkton PPA. In Carroll County, 11.2 acres of the proposed access roads are within an unnamed PPA that generally surrounds Union Bridge, Taneytown, and New Windsor. In Frederick County, 8.9 acres of the proposed access roads are within the Eastern PPA and 10.7 acres are within the Carrollton Manor PPA. Construction of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads would not create a substantial impediment toward meeting the goals of the PPAs.

#### **3.5.9.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

PSEG would coordinate with affected landowners within the PPAs prior to establishment of access road easements and construction to negotiate measures to minimize impacts to preserved lands and the longterm viability of the use of the property.

#### **3.5.9.3 Project Impacts Determination**

The proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads cross through five PPAs that aim to preserve agriculture and forest resources. The proposed MPRP would result in forest conversion within the PPAs; however, it would not create a substantial impediment towards meeting the goals of the PPAs because agricultural lands would remain preserved and would be able to remain active. PSEG would coordinate with affected landowners within the PPAs prior to establishment of access road easements and construction to negotiate measures to minimize impacts to preserved lands and the long-term viability of the use of the property.

### **3.5.10 VISUAL QUALITY**

This section describes the visual quality characteristics and potential impacts of the MPRP. Potential impacts to visual quality were assessed by evaluating the proposed changes implemented by the Project and activities during construction. A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) has been prepared and is provided as Appendix F. The purposes of the VIA are as follows:

- Describe the appearance of the visible components of the proposed Project.
- Define the aesthetic character of the visual study area (VSA).
- Inventory existing visually sensitive resources (VSR), landscape character types (LCT), and viewer/user groups within the VSA.

- Evaluate potential Project visibility and visual impacts within the VSA.

The VSA defined for the MPRP includes all areas within the state of Maryland extending three miles out from the edges of the proposed MPRP ROW. The 3-mile radius VSA includes approximately 377.5 square miles within Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick, and Harford Counties.

### **3.5.11 IMPACT ANALYSIS – VISUAL QUALITY**

#### **3.5.11.1 Potential Impacts Assessment**

The VIA provided in **Appendix F** identified potential visual impacts of the MPRP in the VSA through development of a viewshed model and analysis of viewer/user groups, LCTs, distances zones and VSRs. VSRs included historic and potentially historic properties, designated scenic resources, public lands and recreational resources, locally identified resources and environmental justice areas within the VSA. Representative viewpoints of the MPRP were identified and 24 photo simulations were developed. Impact determinations were completed for the photosimulation viewpoints and VSRs and are summarized in the VIA in Appendix F.

Additionally, of particular concern are visual impacts at area parks and historic properties. These impacts are assessed in **Section 3.6.14** and **Section 3.4 of the ERD**, respectively. Final recommended assessments of adverse visual effects to these properties will be made to MHT when results of the historic resource survey investigations are submitted.

#### **3.5.11.2 Avoidance and Minimization Measures**

PSEG is proposing the use of H-frame structures to minimize the visual effects on the community. The H-Frame structures represent a horizontal configuration which requires a lower vertical height than would otherwise be required for monopole configurations. Considering near-foreground and foreground viewers, this configuration will reduce the perceived vertical scale of the structures. The material selected for the H-Frame structures is a weathering steel, which naturally oxidizes to a brownish-red patina. In many viewing circumstances, this color reads as negative space, reducing the perceived visual prominence of the structures in certain viewing circumstances. This is particularly true of elevated viewing positions from which the structures could be viewed against background hills. Weathering steel also minimizes the potential for reflected light trespass (commonly referred to as glint and/or glare) when compared to lighter colored materials, such as galvanized steel. Dark colors tend to have a high-absorption capacity, thus minimizing the degree of reflected light. The MPRP ROW parallels existing transmission lines to the extent possible to minimize viewshed impacts by consolidating transmission infrastructure. Approximately 4.4 miles of the proposed MPRP ROW would parallel existing transmission infrastructure in Baltimore County, 0.33 miles in Carroll County, and 4.4 miles in Frederick County.

Other options for mitigating the visual impacts of the MPRP are limited given the nature of the Project and its siting criteria. See Section 5.2 of the VIA in Appendix F for additional discussion of mitigation options.

#### **3.5.11.3 Project Impacts Determination**

Once in operation, the structures, wires, and cleared ROW would add new, permanent elements that would intrude on the landscape and have noticeable impacts to the viewshed. Viewshed analysis based on existing topography, vegetation and structures indicates that the proposed structures could be visible from approximately 17.5% (66.0 square miles) of the VSA (i.e., the proposed structures would be entirely screened from approximately 82.5% of the VSA). The limited extent of proposed structure visibility is due

to the rolling topography and screening provided by prominent landforms, the presence of dense woodlots and hedgerows, and the proposed route generally following lower elevations. The visual contrast evaluation concluded that the Project would result in the greatest degree of change to visual character and/or scenic quality in views within the near-foreground or foreground that provided an unobstructed view of multiple structures. Major visual impacts are anticipated to occur at 13 of the 24 viewpoints that were evaluated. In these views, distance to the Project ranged from 131 feet to 0.4 miles. Simulation from many of the views that received a visual impact rating of major included structures that were viewed against the sky, rather than against landscape features. In others the proposed structures were located on an open ridge or hill, which emphasized their scale contrast.

Major visual effects are anticipated for 103 of the identified 1,335 VSRs, which includes 35 VSRs within the near foreground distance zone with greater than 10% of the resource area occurring within the viewshed, see **Table 47**. Construction activities would cause temporary disruptions to viewsheds. Additional impacts are identified in the VIA in Appendix F.

**Table 47. Visually Sensitive Receptors with Anticipated Major Visual Effects**

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination			
		Locality	County					
Properties of Historic Significance								
National Historic Landmarks (NHL) <sup>5</sup>								
2	Whittaker Chambers Farm	Westminster	Carroll	88001824	Major			
Properties/Districts Listed on the National Registers of Historic Places (NRHP)								
22	Jacob F. Shaffer Farm	Manchester	Carroll	98001259	Major			
36	Robert and Phyllis Scott House	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1671	Major			
37	Rockland Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-342	Major			
Properties/Districts Eligible for Listing on the NRHP								
74	Andrew Dice Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1287	Major			
79	Bail-Repp Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1584	Major			
95	Benjamin Bowser Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1149	Major			
97	Benjamin Peterman Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1288	Major			
120	Bonner Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1708	Major			
175	Charles Repp Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1720	Major			
221	Ephraim Stouffer Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1721	Major			
230	Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1730	Major			
231	Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1731	Major			
232	Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1732	Major			
275	Good Chance	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-154	Major			
282	Grave Run Road Church	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-95	Major			
340	Jacob Rule House	Freeland	Baltimore	BA-1200	Major			
365	John Werner Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1303	Major			
373	Joseph Price Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1307	Major			
427	Masemore Farm House	Freeland	Baltimore	BA-1199	Major			
447	Mathias-Smeach Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1322	Major			
466	Miller-Warner Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1314	Major			
482	Myers Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1706	Major			
493	Oakland Methodist Episcopal Church	Freeland	Baltimore	BA-633	Major			
566	Sellers Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1676	Major			

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination
		Locality	County		
569	SHA Bridge No. 0604000	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1472	Major
586	Simon Murdock House	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1716	Major
621	Strawbridge U.M. Church	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1020	Major
624	Sunny Brook Farm	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-203	Major
632	Talbott Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1707	Major
634	Tenant House, site	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-85	Major
637	The Garage	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1146	Major
644	Tracey's Mill School	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1289	Major
655	Uriah B. Sullivan Farm	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1312	Major
665	Wantz-Lawyer Farm	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1697	Major
Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP)-Identified					
739	Anschuetz House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1136	Major
741	Araby Church Road Houses	Frederick	Frederick	F-7-132	Major
746	Archibald T. Snouffer Farmstead	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-165	Major
750	B. J. Snouffer Farm	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-143	Major
758	Ball Place	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-101	Major
767	Berwager House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1137	Major
768	Bixler's U.M. Church	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-1091	Major
805	Bush Creek Church of the Brethren	Monrovia	Frederick	F-7-79	Major
813	Cape Cod House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1131	Major
815	Careytown Survey District	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-140	Major
849	Daniel Engel Farm, site	New Windsor	Carroll	CARR-1332	Major
864	Dorsey House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1132	Major
873	E. Michael Farm	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-144	Major
890	Farrow Farm Complex	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1140	Major
891	Father's Care	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-263	Major
918	George F. Tabler Farm	Frederick	Frederick	F-7-134	Major
924	George Montgomery Tenant House	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-85	Major
943	Hampton School	Frederick	Frederick	F-7-36	Major
957	Henry S. Michael Farm	Adamstown, Point of Rocks	Frederick	F-1-87	Major
958	Henry Smith Farmstead	Monrovia	Frederick	F-5-118	Major

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination
		Locality	County		
963	Hollingsworth House	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-7	Major
968	House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1125	Major
979	Ijams House	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-21	Major
984	Innisfree	Westminster	Carroll	CARR-812	Major
994	Jacob Dutrow Farmstead	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-199	Major
1050	Lang House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1139	Major
1052	Leister House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-744	Major
1067	Lowe-McGruder Farm	Monrovia	Frederick	F-7-156	Major
1074	Marker House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1127	Major
1084	Maurice Wentz House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1134	Major
1101	Monrovia Survey District	Monrovia	Frederick	F-5-14	Major
1103	Moreland	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-164	Major
1144	Pennsylvania German House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1138	Major
1163	R. J. Snouffer Farm	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-166	Major
1173	Richard P.T. Dutrow Farmstead	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-193	Major
1178	Rine-Saunders Farmstead	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-88	Major
1194	Samuel Dutrow Farmstead	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-178	Major
1208	Simmons-Ordeman House	Adamstown	Frederick	F-7-44	Major
1210	Singleton Burgee House	Ijamsville	Frederick	F-7-6	Major
1217	Sotdorus House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1135	Major
1230	Sterner Bungalow	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1128	Major
1231	Sterner House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1126	Major
1237	Structure No. 10176X0	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-134-2	Major
1241	T. Harwood Farm	Adamstown	Frederick	F-1-167	Major
1255	Turnbull House	Monrovia	Frederick	F-7-155	Major
1265	Vernon T. Watkins Farm	Monrovia	Frederick	F-5-123	Major
1273	Wentz Bungalow	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1130	Major
1275	Wentz House	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1690	Major
1284	William Horman Farmstead	Frederick	Frederick	F-7-94	Major
1238	Sugarloaf Mountain Historic District	Dickerson, Frederick, Adamstown, Tuscarora	Frederick	F-7-120	Minor to Major

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination
		Locality	County		
1087	Melrose Historic District	Manchester	Carroll	CARR-1110	Moderate to Major
819	Carrollton Manor Rural Historic District	Dickerson, Frederick, Adamstown, Tuscarora	Frederick	F-1-134	No Impact to Major
903	Frederick-Baltimore Transportation Corridor	Mount Airy, Frederick, Ijamsville, Monrovia, New Market	Frederick	F-3-224	No Impact to Major
1271	Washington Run Rural Area	Adamstown, Jefferson, Point of Rocks, Tuscarora	Frederick	F-1-133	No Impact to Major
Designated Scenic Resources					
National or State Wild, Scenic, or Recreational Rivers					
1300	Monocacy River State Scenic and Wild River	Dickerson, Frederick, Adamstown, Tuscarora	Carroll, Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
National or State Scenic Byways					
1302	Antietam Campaign Byway	Dickerson, Clarksburg, Frederick, Adamstown, Ijamsville, Jefferson	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1304	Historic National Road	Mount Airy, Frederick, Ijamsville, New Market	Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1305	Journey Through Hallowed Ground	Frederick, Jefferson, Point of Rocks	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1306	Mason and Dixon Byway	Hampstead, Manchester, Parkton, White Hall, Westminster	Baltimore, Carroll, Harford	N/A	No Impact to Major
1307	Old Main Streets	Westminster, Mount Airy, New Windsor, Union Bridge, Frederick	Carroll, Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
State Scenic Areas/Overlooks					
	None Identified				
Public Lands and Recreational Resources					
National Parks, Recreation Areas, Seashores, and/or Forests					
	None Identified				
National Natural Landmarks					
	None Identified				
National Wildlife Refuges					
	None Identified				

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination
		Locality	County		
<b>Heritage Areas</b>					
1311	Heart of the Civil War State Heritage Area	Hampstead, Manchester, Westminster, Mount Airy, New Windsor, Union Bridge, Dickerson, Clarksburg, Frederick, Adamstown, Ijamsville, Jefferson, Knoxville, Monrovia, New Market, Point of Rocks, Tuscarora	Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1312	Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area	Hampstead, Manchester, Westminster, Mount Airy, New Windsor, Union Bridge, Dickerson, Clarksburg, Frederick, Adamstown, Ijamsville, Jefferson, Knoxville, Monrovia, New Market, Point of Rocks, Tuscarora	Baltimore, Carroll, Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
<b>National or State Trails<sup>6</sup></b>					
1314	Torrey C Brown Rail Trail	Freeland, Parkton, White Hall	Baltimore	N/A	No Impact to Major
<b>State Parks</b>					
	None Identified				
<b>State Nature/Historic Preservation Areas</b>					
	None Identified				
<b>State Wildlife Management Areas</b>					
	None Identified				
<b>State Forests</b>					
	None Identified				
<b>Other State Lands</b>					
	None Identified				
<b>Environmental Justice</b>					
<b>Federal Environmental Justice Areas</b>					
1323	240217521022	Dickerson, Clarksburg, Ijamsville, Monrovia	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1327	240217522051	Frederick, Ijamsville	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
1328	240217522061	Frederick, Ijamsville	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major

Resource ID Number	Visually Sensitive Resource	Location		State/National ID	Impact Determination
		Locality	County		
State Environmental Justice Areas					
1333	24021752205	Frederick, Ijamsville	Frederick	N/A	No Impact to Major
Disadvantaged Communities					
	None Identified				
Locally Identified Resources					
Locally Identified Resources					
1335	Gaver Farm	Mount Airy	Frederick	NA	Major

Notes:

- 1 The visually sensitive resource boundary, overlaid with the viewshed analysis results and viewpoint locations, is shown in these sheets of the Composite Overlay Map (Attachment A of the Visual Impact Assessment).
- 2 Identified viewpoints are within 1,000 feet of the visually sensitive resource boundary. If no viewpoint number is indicated, no photos were obtained near this resource during fieldwork.
- 3 Distance to transmission line is measured from the closest location within the resource boundary.
- 4 Count of the potential maximum number of transmission line structures visible within the resource boundary.
- 5 National Historic Landmarks are also S/NRHP-Listed. However, these resources are not included in this category to avoid duplication.
- 6 State trails that occur within state lands are not identified individually, and are evaluated as part of the overall resource.

## 3.6 Socioeconomics

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## 3.7 Transportation Infrastructure

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.

## 4.0 SUMMARY

To address COMAR Section 20.79.04 requirements, PSEG evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads on individual resources within and surrounding the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads by conducting an environmental impacts assessment. **Section 3.0** of this ERD supplement discusses the potential temporary and permanent impacts the proposed access roads off the MPRP ROW may have on biophysical, cultural, land use, socioeconomic, and transportation resources, as applicable. The impact assessment includes a potential impacts assessment, an A&M evaluation, and a Project impacts determination. The initial assessment for each resource involved the evaluation of potential impacts based on the proposed MPRP off-ROW access roads. PSEG then applied applicable construction BMPs and other A&M measures where feasible, after which an impacts determination was made.

In accordance with the permitting process, PSEG may complete field studies during subsequent Project phases as required. The information collected during field studies will be used to further define existing conditions, inform impact evaluations for the applicable permit, and identify additional opportunities to avoid and minimize impacts.

## 5.0 REFERENCES

There are no access road related updates to this section. For additional Project data, reference the ERD in the CPCN filing dated December 31, 2024.