

Chesapeake BAY CROSSING STUDY

TIER 2 NEPA

COMBINED FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT and RECORD OF DECISION

OCTOBER 2026

MDTA Maryland Transportation Authority

U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration

Chesapeake BAY CROSSING STUDY

TIER 2 NEPA

COMBINED
FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT and RECORD OF DECISION

Volume 1 – Final Environmental Impact Statement

Maryland Transportation Authority

MDTA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

October 2026

CHESAPEAKE BAY CROSSING STUDY: TIER 2 NEPA

Maryland

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Submitted Pursuant to:
42 USC §4332(2)(c)

By:
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
and
MARYLAND TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

In Cooperation with:
US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency,
US Coast Guard, National Marine Fisheries Service, US Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service,
Maryland Department of the Environment, Maryland Department of Natural Resources,
and the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration

10/23/2026
Date of Approval

Bruce Gartner, Executive Director
Maryland Transportation Authority

10/23/2026
Date of Approval

Valeriya Remezova, Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Heather Lowe
Maryland Transportation Authority
Point Breeze
2310 Broening Highway
Baltimore MD 21224
410-537-5665

Alexander Bienko
Federal Highway Administration
George H. Fallon Building
31 Hopkins Plaza, Suite 1520
Baltimore, Maryland 21201
410-779-7152

The purpose of the Chesapeake Bay Crossing Study: Tier 2 NEPA (Tier 2 Study) is to address existing and future transportation capacity needs and access across the Chesapeake Bay and at the Chesapeake Bay Bridge approaches along the U.S. 50/301 corridor. The Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) prepared this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to evaluate measures to reduce congestion; improve travel times and reliability, mobility, and roadway deficiencies; and accommodate maintenance activities and navigation, while minimizing impacts to local communities and the environment. This Tier 2 Final EIS includes responses to public and agency comments received during the comment period for the Tier 2 Draft EIS (January 23, 2026, through March 9, 2026). This Final EIS also provides additional information concerning analysis of the alternatives, further refinements to Alternative C, and anticipated environmental effects based on public and agency input. Based on all of this information, and the entire study administrative record, the Preferred Alternative (Refined Alternative C) detailed in the Final EIS has been identified as the Selected Alternative in the Record of Decision (ROD).

FHWA may publish a notice in the Federal Register, pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 139(l), indicating that FHWA and one or more other Federal agencies have taken final action on permits, licenses, or approvals for this project. If such notice is published, claims seeking judicial review of those Federal agency actions will be barred unless such claims are filed within 150 days after the date of publication of the notice, or within such shorter time period as is specified in the Federal laws pursuant to which judicial review of the Federal agency action is allowed. If no notice is published, then the periods of time that otherwise are provided by the Federal laws governing such claims will apply.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Substantive changes that have been made to this Final EIS since the publication of the Draft EIS are indicated with underlined text.

1 INTRODUCTION 1-1
1.1 Importance of a Chesapeake Bay Crossing 1-1
1.2 Previous Actions and Studies 1-1
1.3 The Tiered NEPA Process 1-2
1.3.1 Tier 1 1-3
1.3.2 Tier 2 1-4
1.3.3 Tier 2 Study Limits 1-5
1.4 Planning and Fiscal Constraints 1-5
2 PURPOSE AND NEED 2-1
2.1 Purpose of the Tier 2 Study 2-1
2.2 Needs 2-1
2.2.1 Adequate Capacity and Reliable Travel Times 2-1
2.2.2 Mobility 2-5
2.2.3 Roadway Deficiencies 2-6
2.2.4 Existing and Future Maintenance Needs 2-7
2.2.5 Navigation 2-8
2.3 Additional Objectives 2-10
2.3.1 Environmental Responsibility 2-10
2.3.2 Financial Responsibility 2-11
3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED 3-1
3.1 Development of Alternative Key Elements and Screening Process 3-1
3.1.1 Study Limits 3-1
3.1.2 Key Elements 3-2
3.2 Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) 3-7
3.2.1 Design Considerations 3-7
3.2.2 Alternative A: 6-5-6 (No-Build) 3-8
3.2.3 Alternative B: 6-8-6 North 3-8
3.2.4 Alternative C: 6-8-6 South 3-9
3.2.5 Alternative D: 8-8-8 North 3-10
3.2.6 Alternative E: 8-8-8 South 3-10
3.2.7 Alternative F: 8-10-8 North 3-11
3.2.8 Alternative G: 8-10-8 South 3-12
3.3 Other Components of the Build Alternatives 3-17
3.3.1 Optional Pedestrian and Bicycle Shared-Use Path (SUP) 3-17

3.3.2 Tolling 3-18
3.3.3 Transit-related Improvements 3-18
3.3.4 TSM/TDM Considerations 3-19
3.3.5 Stormwater Management (SWM) 3-19
3.3.6 Utilities 3-21
3.3.7 Truck Weigh and Inspection Stations (TWIS) 3-22
3.3.8 Limits of Disturbance (LOD) 3-22
3.3.9 Construction 3-23
3.4 Cost Analysis 3-23
3.5 Traffic Analysis for the Alternatives 3-25
3.5.1 Existing Traffic Volumes and Development of Future Forecasts 3-25
3.5.2 Traffic Analysis Methodologies 3-26
3.5.3 Traffic Analysis Results 3-28
3.5.4 Summary of Traffic Results 3-50
4 PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE 4-1
4.1 Alternative C: Preferred Alternative 4-2
4.1.1 Environmental Impacts 4-3
4.1.2 Traffic Analysis for Alternative C 4-5
4.2 Alternatives Not Preferred 4-7
4.3 Refinements to the Preferred Alternative 4-9
4.3.1 Traffic Analysis for the Preferred Alternative 4-12
4.3.2 Stormwater Management (SWM) 4-13
4.3.3 Summary of Environmental Impacts 4-13
5 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND MITIGATION 5-1
5.1 Socioeconomics 5-2
5.1.1 Population and Demographics 5-2
5.1.2 Housing 5-6
5.1.3 Businesses, Economics, and Employment 5-6
5.1.4 Community Facilities 5-9
5.2 Land Use 5-12
5.2.1 Land Use and Planning 5-12
5.2.2 Right-of-Way and Property 5-21
5.2.3 Communities 5-23
5.3 Visual Resources 5-27
5.3.1 Affected Environment 5-28
5.3.2 Environmental Consequences 5-28
5.3.3 Mitigation 5-33
5.4 Cultural Resources 5-34

5.4.1 Affected Environment 5-34
5.4.2 Environmental Consequences 5-36
5.4.3 Cemeteries 5-40
5.4.4 Mitigation 5-40
5.5 Natural Resources 5-41
5.5.1 Soils and Farmland Soils 5-41
5.5.2 Groundwater 5-46
5.5.3 Floodplains 5-51
5.5.4 Surface Water Resources 5-59
5.5.5 Waters of the U.S., Including Wetlands 5-68
5.5.6 Chesapeake Bay Critical Area 5-86
5.5.7 Aquatic Habitat and Biota 5-95
5.5.8 Terrestrial Habitat and Biota 5-127
5.5.9 Rare, Threatened, and Endangered (RTE) Species 5-137
5.5.10 Unique and Sensitive Areas 5-150
5.6 Hazardous Materials 5-156
5.6.1 Affected Environment 5-156
5.6.2 Environmental Consequences 5-157
5.6.3 Mitigation 5-158
5.7 Air Quality 5-159
5.7.1 Affected Environment 5-159
5.7.2 Environmental Consequences 5-161
5.7.3 Mitigation 5-161
5.8 Noise 5-162
5.8.1 Affected Environment 5-162
5.8.2 Environmental Consequences 5-162
5.8.3 Mitigation 5-168
5.9 Summary 5-169
6 SECTION 4(F) AND 6(F) PROPERTIES 6-1
6.1 Use of Section 4(f) Properties 6-1
6.2 Minimization and Mitigation of Harm 6-3
7 COORDINATION 7-1
7.1 Public Engagement 7-1
7.1.1 September 2022 Public Open Houses 7-1
7.1.2 Transit and Bicycle / Pedestrian Listening Meeting 7-2
7.1.3 September 2023 Public Open Houses 7-2
7.1.4 December 2024 Public Open Houses 7-3
7.1.5 February 2026 Public Hearings 7-4

7.1.6 Community Engagement Events 7-4
7.2 Comments on the Draft EIS 7-4
7.2.1 Summary of Public Comments on the Draft EIS 7-5
7.2.2 Public Comment Response Summary 7-5
7.3 Agency Coordination and Comments 7-6
7.3.1 Cooperating and Participating Agencies 7-8
7.3.2 Interagency Coordination Meetings 7-9
7.3.3 Agency Comments on the Draft EIS 7-10
7.3.4 Agency Coordination Since the Draft EIS 7-10
7.4 One Federal Document 7-10
8 AUTHORIZATIONS, PERMITS, AND APPROVALS 8-1
9 DISTRIBUTION LIST 9-1
10 LIST OF PREPARERS 10-1
11 REFERENCES 11-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Tier 1 Study Selected Corridor Alternative 1-4
Figure 2-1: Annual Crossings of the Bay Bridge 2-2
Figure 2-2: Shipping Channels and Vertical Clearances to the Port of Baltimore 2-9
Figure 3-1: Study Limits 3-2
Figure 3-2: Key Elements of Alternatives 3-2
Figure 3-3: Alternatives B and C (6-8-6) Typical Sections for U.S. 50/301 3-9
Figure 3-4: Alternatives D and E (8-8-8) Typical Sections for U.S. 50/301 3-11
Figure 3-5: Alternatives F and G (8-10-8) Typical Sections for U.S. 50/301 3-13
Figure 3-6: Alternatives B and C 3-14
Figure 3-7: Alternatives D and E 3-15
Figure 3-8: Alternatives F and G 3-16
Figure 3-9: Segments of U.S. 50/301 Used for Travel Time Analyses 3-29
Figure 3-10: Bottleneck Diagram for Existing Conditions (2022) during NSWD, Peak Hour of Queuing (Eastbound PM, Westbound AM) 3-31
Figure 3-11: Bottleneck Diagram for Existing Conditions (2022) During SWED, Peak Hour of Queueing (Eastbound Friday, Westbound Sunday) 3-32
Figure 3-12: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternative A: No-Build during 2045 NSWD, Peak Hour of Queuing (Eastbound PM, Westbound AM) 3-35
Figure 3-13: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternative A: No-Build during 2045 SWED, Peak Hour of Queuing (Eastbound Friday, Westbound Sunday) 3-36
Figure 3-14: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternatives B/C (6-8-6) during 2045 NSWD, Peak Hour of Queuing (Eastbound PM, Westbound AM): 3-39
Figure 3-15: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternatives B/C (6-8-6) during 2045 SWED (Eastbound Friday, Westbound Sunday) 3-40
Figure 3-16: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternatives D/E (8-8-8) during 2045 NSWD (Eastbound PM, Westbound AM) 3-43
Figure 3-17: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternatives D/E (8-8-8) during 2045 SWED (Eastbound Friday, Westbound Sunday) 3-44

Figure 3-18: Bottleneck Diagram for Alternatives F/G (8-10-8) during 2045 NSWD (Eastbound PM, Westbound AM) 3-47
Figure 3-19: Bottleneck Diagram: Alternative F/G (8-10-8) during 2045 SWED (Eastbound Friday, Westbound Sunday) 3-48
Figure 3-20: Summary of Bottleneck Diagrams for Eastbound NSWD Conditions 3-55
Figure 3-21: Summary of Bottleneck Diagrams for Westbound NSWD Condition 3-56
Figure 3-22: Summary of Bottleneck Diagrams for Eastbound SWED Conditions 3-57
Figure 3-23: Summary of Bottleneck Diagrams for Westbound SWED Conditions 3-58
Figure 4-1: Preferred Alternative Impacts Mapping 4-55
Figure 5-1: Analysis Area Communities and Block Groups 5-4
Figure 5-2: Population Density by Block Group (Individuals per Square Mile) 5-5
Figure 5-3: Land Use - Anne Arundel County 5-14
Figure 5-4: Land Use - Queen Anne's County 5-15
Figure 5-5: Anne Arundel County Priority Funding Areas and Growth Areas 5-16
Figure 5-6: Queen Anne's County Priority Funding Areas and Growth Areas 5-17
Figure 5-7: Motorists View of U.S. 50/301 on the Western Shore 5-28
Figure 5-8: Aerial Photo of the Bay Bridge (Facing East) 5-30
Figure 5-9: Existing Bay Bridge and Proposed Bridge Profile (from Sandy Point State Park) 5-31
Figure 5-10: Motorists View of U.S. 50/301 on the Eastern Shore 5-32
Figure 5-11: Farmland Soils – Anne Arundel County 5-44
Figure 5-12: Farmland Soils – Queen Anne's County 5-45
Figure 5-13: Aquifers 5-49
Figure 5-14: Groundwater Monitoring Wells 5-50
Figure 5-15: FEMA Floodplain – Anne Arundel County 5-57
Figure 5-16: FEMA Floodplain – Queen Anne's County 5-58
Figure 5-17: Watershed Boundaries 5-62
Figure 5-18: Water Quality Monitoring Sites 5-66
Figure 5-19: Chesapeake Bay Bathymetry 5-76
Figure 5-20: Navigation Channels 5-83
Figure 5-21: Critical Areas – Anne Arundel County 5-87
Figure 5-22: Critical Areas – Queen Anne's County 5-88
Figure 5-23: FIDS Habitat – Anne Arundel County 5-93
Figure 5-24: FIDS Habitat – Queen Anne's County 5-94
Figure 5-25: Submerged Aquatic Vegetation 5-98
Figure 5-26: Waterfowl Areas and Colonial Waterbird Nesting Areas 5-99
Figure 5-27: Horseshoe Crab Habitat 5-109
Figure 5-28: Oyster Beds/Habitat 5-110
Figure 5-29: NOAA Fisheries Fish Disturbance Isopleths for Pile Driving Associated with the Proposed Eastbound Bridge 5-115
Figure 5-30: Zone of Influence from Vibratory Pile Driving for High Frequency Cetaceans 5-119
Figure 5-31: NOAA Fisheries Marine Mammal Disturbance Isopleths for Pile Driving Associated with the Proposed Eastbound Bridge 5-120
Figure 5-32: Forest Cover – Anne Arundel County 5-129
Figure 5-33: Forest Cover – Queen Anne's County 5-130
Figure 5-34: NOAA Fisheries Sea Turtle Disturbance Isopleths for Pile Driving Associated with the Proposed Eastbound Bridge 5-147
Figure 5-35: HCN Corridors and Hubs 5-152
Figure 5-36: SSPRA 5-153
Figure 6-1: Section 4(f) Property Overview (Map 1 of 2) 6-9
Figure 6-2: Section 4(f) Property Overview (Map 2 of 2) 6-10

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: 2022 and Anticipated 2045 No-Build Max. Queue Lengths and Durations with Two-Way Operations 2-3
Table 2-2: Number of Crashes and Crash Rates at the Bay Bridge (2017-2022) 2-4
Table 2-3: Planning Time Index on U.S. 50/301 in Study Area 2-4
Table 3-1: Summary of Options for the Key Elements[1] 3-6
Table 3-2: Required and Proposed Environmental Site Design (ESDv) per Build Alternative 3-21
Table 3-3: Required and Proposed Impervious Areas Requiring Treatment (IART) per Build Alternative 3-21
Table 3-4: Alternative Cost Estimates 3-24
Table 3-5: Daily Trips Across the Bay Bridge (vehicles per day) 3-26
Table 3-6: Initial Evaluation of Alternatives without Consideration of External Factors 3-27
Table 3-7: Summary of Traffic Results for Existing Conditions (2022) 3-30
Table 3-8: Travel Time Results for Existing Conditions (2022) during NSWD and SWED 3-30
Table 3-9: Summary of Traffic Results for Alternative A (No-Build) in 2045 3-33
Table 3-10: Travel Time Results for Alternative A (No-Build) during 2045 NSWD and SWED 3-34
Table 3-11: Summary of 2045 Traffic Results for Alternative B/C (6-8-6) 3-37
Table 3-12: Travel Time Results for Alternatives B and C: 6-8-6 during NSWD and SWED 3-38
Table 3-13: Summary of 2045 Traffic Results for Alternative D/E (8-8-8) 3-41
Table 3-14: Travel Time Results for Alternatives D and E: 8-8-8 during NSWD and SWED 3-42
Table 3-15: Summary of 2045 Traffic Results for Alternative F/G (8-10-8) 3-45
Table 3-16: 2045 Travel Time Results for Alternatives F and G: 8-10-8 during NSWD and SWED 3-46
Table 3-17: Summary of NSWD Travel Times per Alternative 3-59
Table 3-18: Summary of SWED Travel Times per Alternative 3-59
Table 4-1: Preferred Alternative Cost Breakdown 4-3
Table 4-2: Comparison of Potential Impacts between Alternative C and the Preferred Alternative (Refined Alternative C) 4-11
Table 4-3: Summary of Revised 2045 Traffic Results for the Preferred Alternative* 4-12
Table 4-4: Potential Environmental Consequences of the Preferred Alternative and Mitigation Measures 4-14
Table 5-1: 2022 Population, Population Density, and Projected Population Change 5-2
Table 5-2: Total Households and Occupancy Status 5-3
Table 5-3: Median Annual Household Income and Persons Living Below the Poverty Level 5-3
Table 5-4: Impacts to Businesses 5-8
Table 5-5: Net Effects of Capital Expenditure of Alternatives Capital Costs 5-9
Table 5-6: Net Effects of Capital Expenditure of Alternatives O&M Costs 5-9
Table 5-7: Community Facilities in the Analysis Area 5-10
Table 5-8: Property Impacts to Community Facilities 5-10
Table 5-9: Land Use Converted to Transportation Right-of-Way 5-18
Table 5-10: Protected Lands Converted to Transportation Right-of-Way 5-19
Table 5-11: Generalized Zoning Along U.S. 50/301 Within the Study Limits 5-22
Table 5-12: Property Impacts of the Build Alternatives 5-23
Table 5-13: Summary of Impacts on Analysis Area Communities 5-24
Table 5-14: Architectural Historic Properties within the APE 5-35
Table 5-15: Archaeological Historic Properties within the LOD for Alternatives D through G 5-35
Table 5-16: Architectural Historic Properties Adversely Affected 5-36
Table 5-17: Summary of Effects on Historic Architectural Properties by Build Alternative 5-38
Table 5-18: Archaeological Historic Properties with an Adverse Effect 5-40
Table 5-19: Hydric Soil Impacts (Acres) 5-42
Table 5-20: SUP Hydric Soil Impacts (Acres) 5-42
Table 5-21: Farmland Soil Impacts (Acres) 5-43
Table 5-22: SUP Farmland Soil Impacts (Acres) 5-43

Table 5-23: FEMA 100-Year Floodplain Encroachments (Acres) 5-52
Table 5-24: SUP FEMA 100-Year Floodplain Encroachments (Acres) 5-53
Table 5-25: 303(d) Impairment Listings for Completed TMDLs and Category 5 5-59
Table 5-26: Overall Watershed Characteristics Summary 5-60
Table 5-27: Impacts to MD 12-Digit Watersheds (Acres) 5-61
Table 5-28: SUP Impacts to MD 12-Digit Watersheds (Acres) 5-61
Table 5-29: Increase in Impervious Surfaces (Acres) 5-63
Table 5-30: SUP Increase in Impervious Surfaces (Acres) 5-63
Table 5-31: Wetlands and Waterways within Limits of Field Delineation 5-70
Table 5-32: Waterway Impact Summary (Acres/Linear Feet) 5-71
Table 5-33: SUP Waterway Impact Summary (Acres/Linear Feet) 5-71
Table 5-34: Tidal and Nontidal Wetland Impact Summary (Acres) 5-72
Table 5-35: SUP Tidal and Nontidal Wetland Impact Summary (Acres) 5-72
Table 5-36: Nontidal Wetland Buffer Impact Summary (Acres) 5-73
Table 5-37: SUP Nontidal Wetland Buffer Impact Summary (Acres) 5-73
Table 5-38: Preferred Alternative Tidal and Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Requirements (Acres) 5-74
Table 5-39: Chesapeake Bay Tidal Water Impacts (Acres) from New Bridge Construction and Old Bridge Pier Removal 5-77
Table 5-40: Chesapeake Bay Substrate Impacts from Dredging (Acres and Cubic Yards) 5-79
Table 5-41: Preferred Alternative Tidal Waterway Mitigation Summary (Acres) 5-81
Table 5-42: Optional SUP Tidal Waterway Mitigation Summary (Acres) 5-81
Table 5-43: Navigation Channels Affected by Build Alternatives 5-84
Table 5-44: Chesapeake Bay Critical Area 5-86
Table 5-45: Impacts to Critical Area Land Use (Acres) 5-89
Table 5-46: SUP Impacts to Critical Area Land Use (Acres) 5-90
Table 5-47: Preferred Alternative Impacts to Forests and Woody Clusters within the Critical Area (Acres) 5-91
Table 5-48: Preferred Alternative Estimated Forest and Woody Cluster Mitigation Needs (Acres) 5-92
Table 5-49: Impacts to Aquatic Habitat and Biota 5-100
Table 5-50: Aquatic Habitat Impacts 5-101
Table 5-51: SUP Aquatic Habitat Impacts 5-102
Table 5-52: Forest Impacts 5-131
Table 5-53: SUP Forest Impacts 5-131
Table 5-54: USFWS Federally Listed and Proposed Species 5-138
Table 5-55: NOAA Fisheries Federally Listed Species 5-138
Table 5-56: State Listed Species 5-139
Table 5-57: Impacts to HCN Hubs and Corridors and SSPRA (Acres)* 5-154
Table 5-58: SUP Impacts to HCN Hubs and Corridors and SSPRA (Acres) 5-155
Table 5-59: Ranked Sites Located within 500 feet of Build Alternatives 5-158
Table 5-60: Impact Determination in Noise Study Section 1 5-163
Table 5-61: Impact Determination in Noise Study Section 2 5-164
Table 5-62: Impact Determination in Noise Study Section 3 5-165
Table 5-63: Impact Determination in Noise Study Section 4 5-166
Table 5-64: Summary of Preliminary Barrier System Mitigation Analysis 5-168
Table 5-65: Summary of Potential Impacts from the Alternatives without the Optional SUP 5-171
Table 5-66: Summary of Additional Potential Impacts from the Optional SUP 5-174
Table 6-1: Use of Section 4(f) Property 6-4
Table 7-1: Public Comment Methods 7-4
Table 7-2: Agency Concurrences Received 7-6
Table 7-3: Lead, Cooperating, and Participating Agencies 7-8
Table 8-1: Permits and Regulatory Approvals 8-2

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AABWPR	Anne Arundel County Bureau of Water Protection and Restoration
AADT	Annual Average Daily Traffic
AASHTO	American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials
ACFHP	Atlantic Coastal Fish Habitat Partnership
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ACS	American Community Survey
ALCS	Automated Lane Closure System
APE	Area of Potential Effects
APID	Additional Project Information Document
ARDS	Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study
ASMFC	Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission
AST	Aboveground storage tank
ASTM	American Society for Testing Materials
AVE	Area of Visual Effect
BCC	Birds of Conservation Concern
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit
BRTB	Baltimore Regional Transportation Board
C&D	Chesapeake And Delaware
CAA	Clean Air Act
CBCA	Chesapeake Bay Critical Area
CFR	Code Of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon monoxide
COMAR	Code of Maryland Regulations
Cpv	Channel Protection Volume
CWA	Clean Water Act
DMCF	Dredged material containment facility
DO	Dissolved oxygen
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
ERP	Environmental Review Program
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESC	Erosion and Sediment Control
ESD	Environmental Site Design
ESDv	ESD Treatment Volume
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIDS	Forest Interior Dwelling Species
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
GI	Green Infrastructure
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GPS	Global Positioning System
H&H	Hydraulic and Hydrologic
HAPC	Habitat Areas of Particular Concern
HCM	Highway Capacity Manual
HCN	Habitat Connectivity Network
HRT	Heavy Rapid Transit
IART	Impervious Area Requiring Treatment
IBI	Index of Biotic Integrity
ICM	Interagency Coordination Meeting
IDA	Intensely Developed Area
INA	Irreplaceable Natural Area
IPaC	Information for Planning and Consultation

LDA	Limited Development Area
LEDPA	Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative
LOD	Limits Of Disturbance
LOS	Level Of Service
LRT	Light Rapid Transit
LRTP	Long Range Transportation Plan
LWCF	Land and Water Conservation Fund
MAFMC	Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
mcy	Million cubic yards
MD-DC BBA3	Maryland-DC Breeding Bird Atlas 3
MDE	Maryland Department of the Environment
MDNR	Maryland Department of Natural Resources
MDOT	Maryland Department of Transportation
MDP	Maryland Department of Planning
MDTA	Maryland Transportation Authority
MDTA-RPCA	MDTA Recommended Preferred Corridor Alternative
MEP	Maximum Extent Possible
MET	Maryland Environmental Trust
MHT	Maryland Historical Trust
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxic
MSTM	Maryland Statewide Transportation Model
MSWR	Maryland Scenic and Wild Rivers
MTA	Maryland Transit Administration
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCHRP	National Cooperative Highway Research Program
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NLEB	Northern long-eared bat
NO2	Nitrogen dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOB	Natural Oyster Bars
NOI	Notice Of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSA	Noise Sensitive Area
NSWD	Non-Summer Weekday
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
O3	Ozone
OWJ	Official with Jurisdiction
PA	Programmatic Agreement
Pb	Lead
PCB	Polychlorinated biphenyls
PFA	Priority Funding Area
PFAS	Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances
PM2.5 or PM10	Particulate matter
PNCD	Preliminary Navigational Clearance Determination
POI	Point of Investigation
PTI	Planning Time Index
PTSU	Part-Time Shoulder Use
Qp	Overbank Protection Volume or Quantity Management

RCA	Resource Conservation Area
RCP	Reinforced concrete pipe
Rev	Recharge Volume
ROD	Record Of Decision
RPA	Recommended Preferred Alternative
RTE	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered
SAV	Submerged aquatic vegetation
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SGCN	Species of Greatest Conservation Need
SHA	State Highway Administration
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SO2	Sulfur dioxide
SSA	Sole Source Aquifer
SSPRA	Sensitive Species Project Review Areas
SUP	Shared-Use Path
SWAP	State Wildlife Action Plan
SWED	Summer Weekend Day
SWM	Stormwater Management
TCB	Tricolored bat
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TEA	Targeted Ecological Areas
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
TSM	Transportation System Management
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
TWIS	Truck Weigh and Inspection Stations
UMCES	University of Maryland Center for Environmental Science
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USCG	United States Coast Guard
USDOI	United States Department of the Interior
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UST	Underground storage tank
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
WHS	Wildlife and Heritage Service
WOTUS	Waters of the United States
WQC	Water Quality Certification
WQv	Water Quality Volume
WSSC	Wetlands of Special State Concern
ZSFP	Zone of Safe Fish Passage

APPENDICES

Appendix A-1	Alternatives B-G Environmental Resource Impact Mapping
Appendix A-2	Preferred Alternative Environmental Resource Impact Mapping
Appendix B	Agency Coordination Plan
Appendix C	Agency Correspondence
Appendix D	Final Section 106 Programmatic Agreement
Appendix E	Final Section 4(f) Evaluation
Appendix F	Navigation Impact Report
Appendix G	Draft EIS Comments and Responses
Appendix H	Draft EIS Agency Comments and Responses

SUPPORTING TECHNICAL REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS

All supporting technical reports and documents are available at baycrossingstudy.com.

Air Quality Technical Report
Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study Concurrence Package
Biological Assessment, Northern Long-Eared and Tricolored Bat
Biological Assessment, Atlantic and Shortnose Sturgeon and Sea Turtles
Biological Opinion from National Marine Fisheries Service
Cultural Resources Technical Report
Essential Fish Habitat Assessment
Hazardous Materials Technical Report
Hydrodynamics Report
Natural Environment Technical Report
Natural Resources Conservation Service Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects
Noise Analysis Technical Report
Preferred Alternative and Conceptual Mitigation Concurrence Package
Section 106 Effects Assessment Report
Socioeconomic and Land Use Technical Report
Traffic Analysis Technical Report