Federal Railroad Issues Awards
On November 6, 2015, the Federal Railroad Administration “awarded a $27.8 million grant to the State of Maryland for pre-construction and planning costs for the potential development of a magnetic levitation (maglev) train between Washington, DC, and Baltimore, Md. The funding may be applied to preconstruction planning, engineering analysis, and other capital costs for fixed guideway infrastructure.” The press release at that stated: “Maglev trains operating in Japan routinely travel at speeds in excess of 300 miles per hour and have been tested at speeds approaching 400 miles per hour. FRA will evaluate the viability of this maglev project to achieve its high safety standards while assessing the potential of this technology to address future intercity travel needs. In 2005, Congress authorized $90 million for maglev transportation projects that would be capable of safely transporting passengers faster than 240 miles per hour.”

This grant is part of a larger Maglev Deployment Program under the Federal Railroad Administration’s Rail Network Development. Network development is part of the broader mission of the FRA, which issues and implements safety regulations, research and development and invests in new development. Particularly, their focus “is on maintaining current rail services and infrastructure, strategically expanding and improving the rail network to accommodate growing travel and freight demand, and providing leadership in national and regional system planning and development.”

The FRA Rail Network Development Program under the “environment” process to evaluate “hazardous materials safety, noise, invasive species, climate change, and community livability” issued a Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for Maglev in 2001. This report defines Maglev as follows: “Magnetic levitation (Maglev) is an advanced transportation technology in which magnetic forces lift, propel, and guide a vehicle over a specially designed guideway.” The Maglev Deployment Program “was established in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) with the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of maglev technology. Through a nation-wide competition, FRA selected seven states or state designated authorities, from a pool of eleven, to receive grants for pre-construction planning. The projects proposed by those seven participants listed below were considered the action alternative in the PEIS. The Maryland and Pennsylvania projects were selected for continued evaluation and initial project development, including engineering design and analysis.”

This PEIS record of decision, which was issued on June 29, 2001, specifically spelled out that the “action alternative” would have short term and long term impacts. Based on funding availability (released in 2005), the “Maglev project would be constructed and operated to serve airport

---
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access and other trips in a metropolitan area, either between Washington, D.C. and Baltimore, Maryland or in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania area.” The decision goes on to state that “in the PEIS, FRA found that there would be no adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction of the seven competing projects that could not be mitigated...” but that “no project would be constructed with Federal funds unit FRA completed a separate site-specific environmental impact statement in the future.” Further, the FRA found that “these benefits include a number of favorable environmental impacts compared to the consequences of continued reliance on air and automobile modes of transportation in the intercity corridor(s) where it would be built. These include: high-speed, rapid acceleration rate, high capacity, safety, energy efficiency, minimum pollution, and minimized right-of-way requirements.” The Record of Decision continues that the associated benefits “could include: regional economic development, joint development at stations, support of comprehensive land use planning, improved air quality, reduced consumption of non-renewable resources, increased productivity of business travelers.” In this document, all but one program chose the “German-developed Transrapid International (TRI) TR08 system.” This is NOT the system that is proposed by the current process, but has significant similarities. This “action alternative” is considered, in the Record of Decision, as the preferred alternative. This position is made based on travel demand for both automobiles and air flight, energy savings (particularly fossil fuels), improved air and climate, increased safety, decreased noise (“maglev vehicles emit much lower noise levels at any given speed than roadway traffic or conventional trains”), improved land use, topography/flood hazards (“maglev has the advantage of a relatively small foot print on the land and would have fewer impacts than the highway, rail, and airport infrastructure expansion which would be required without Maglev”), natural ecosystems, and water quality. The Record does list a few negative points – “socioeconomic impacts such as property acquisition and displacement of residential and business populations, community cohesion disturbance, and stresses on locally provided services;” impacts to land use and historic archaeological and cultural resources (the record suggests that this will be minimized by using “existing transportation and utility rights-of-way”); and visual and aesthetic impacts (again, the record notes that “maglev has the potential to impact visual and aesthetic resources to a lesser extent than airport or highway expansion projects”).

The Record of Decision notes that “the potential for adverse environmental impacts exists” and “mitigation strategies were proposed that could be implemented and adopted.” These strategies include alignment alternatives (“tunneling and other alignment shifts as a mitigation strategy to minimize noise and vibration, visual, historic, archaeological, and cultural, socioeconomic, and other impacts”); noise and vibration strategies (“upgrading guideway support columns, increasing the elevation of guideway, increasing mass of guideway supports, increasing mass of guideway foundation, and use of noise barriers...”); electromagnetic field
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(“careful siting of electric power distribution and conditioning facilities, EMF field reduction, refinement of power and propulsion of electromagnet levitation and guidance designs, and third rail power conditioning and supply systems, the use of buffer zones to minimize user and worker exposure, and focused worker training…”); safety; performance tests; financial analysis and ridership; land use, farmland, and 4(f) resources; and natural ecosystems and wetlands.

In conclusion, the FRA determined “which of the participating projects offered the most promising opportunity to achieve an operating Maglev system. After considering the strengths and weaknesses of each of the seven projects, FRA concludes that the Maryland project and the Pennsylvania project provide the highest probability of securing the non-federal resources and of establishing and maintaining the organization needed to construct and operate a project of the magnitude required to provide a good demonstration of the technology. In reaching this decision, the agency has considered the limited financial resources available to the program and the clear statutory intent that the program result in the timely deployment of Maglev technology. This factor requires the Department to focus its efforts on a very limited number of projects. The Maryland Project and the Pennsylvania Project both presented proposals that included strong service characteristics, a strong financing plan, and appeared well on their way to putting together an effective public/private partnership that included substantial financial commitments from state sources.”

Maryland Department of Transportation Takes Over
The Baltimore-Washington Superconducting Maglev Project is therefore a current environmental review under the FRA. The FRA Environmental Protection Specialist is Brandon Bratcher (Brandon.bratcher@dot.gov). However, the project has been handed off to the Maryland Department of Transportation and the project partners. In November of 2015, Governor Hogan and MDOT issued a press release related to the award of the $27.8 million for the project. “The Maryland application for the federal grant was submitted in April with the understanding that the Japanese government will be a source of significant financial backing for the project, along with private-sector support from Baltimore-Washington Rapid Rail LLC.” Governor Hogan traveled to Japan and met with the Japanese Prime Minister. “During his trade mission to Asia that began May 26, Governor Hogan and Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe agreed on a Memorandum of Cooperation between the State of Maryland and the Government of Japan. Specific areas of cooperation outlined in the Memorandum of Cooperation included: high-speed rail, specifically SCMaglev; liquefied natural gas (LNG); life sciences; trade and investment; and academics.” The applicant was MDOT, but was being led by Baltimore-Washington Rapid Rail. “Because the application needed to come through a public agency, the Maryland Department of Transportation and the Maryland Economic Development Corporation applied as co-applicants on behalf of Baltimore-Washington Rapid Rail. Pursuing Federal Railroad Administration funding did not require state funds or matching state funds from the Maryland Transportation Trust Fund, nor does it come at the expense of other planned projects in the Maryland Department of Transportation’s six-year capital program.”
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The project manager for Maryland Department of Transportation is Bradley Smith in the Office of Freight and Multimodalism (bsmith5@mdot.state.md.us).

As a side note, there seems to be some confusion about which portion of government can give the go-ahead for allowing the project to proceed. Several Maryland General Assembly bills from 2004 to 2006 specifically refused to fund, or minimally fund, the project. Delegates and Senators both have said they did not have communication from the Governor on the project. Delegate Pamela Beidle of Linthicum has been pressing the issue in her area (http://www.capitalgazette.com/opinion/ac-ce-column-beidle-20171022-story.html) and Senator Doug Peters had MDOT take the Bowie routes off the table. In January 2018, Senator Benson issued a bill at the State General Assembly to bar any project like this from coming through Prince George’s County without the District Council (County Council) providing their approval.
CURRENT PROPOSAL
Currently, the project is being led by the Baltimore Washington Rapid Rail (BWRR) and Japan Central Rail as the builder and operator. Japan Bank of International Cooperation has agreed to loan $5,000,000,000 (or 50% of the estimated build cost). This project is proposed as the first leg of a project that would travel all the way to New York City with stops at airports along the routes. Details of the organization can be found at http://bwrapidrail.com.

The project is going through the “NEPA” process – National Environmental Policy Act. This process has federal and state agencies analyze potential impacts from projects on the environment and cultural resources. It is also used to engage the public and document comments. This process leads to an Environmental Impact Statement for public review and will be the basis for approving the project on to the next stage. Public meetings began in November of 2016 with the Notice of Intent. This started with scoping meetings in December 2016, followed by “purpose and need” meetings in April 2017. The Preliminary Alternatives Scoping meetings were held in October 2017. We are current in that process. The results of those alternatives will occur in April 2018 with a completion of the project sometime in late 2018.

The BWRR website indicates that ticket prices will be “competitive with those of express rail services for similar trips on the corridor.” Currently an Acela train (one way, single traveler) is $46 for a business class and $82 for a first-class seat. However, in meetings the BWRR representatives have indicated that the cost is more comparable with the cost of a flight between those locations. These prices are not comparable because no such flight exists on a regular basis.

As outlined on the project website, the project now has utilized the Japanese design for the trains. The website states that “rather than riding directly on standard steel railroad tracks, SCMAGLEV trains levitate between the walls of a unique concrete structure known as a guideway. The U-shaped guideway has walls surrounding the trains on both sides, making the system free from derailment. The keys to the SCMAGLEV system’s high speed and acceleration are the magnetic forces acting between powerful superconducting magnets located on board the trains and two sets of coils that are installed in the walls of the guideway. Strong magnets [are] installed into bogies of each train car...powerful magnetic forces are generated between the Superconducting Magnets and the guideway coils.”11 (See diagram below.)

The proposal is that the trains would run between Washington, D.C. and Baltimore with 15 minute “headways” (departure times) representing eight trains an hour, with speeds of up to 311 miles per hour. (The LGAC notes that while not specified, participants in our meetings pointed out that for trains to reach this speed they need an acceleration time and that they would only be reaching this speed at about the point where trains reach Greenbelt.) These trains will be 16 car trains holding 1000 people running between 5 am and 11pm. This calculation would be 72,000 people a day. Members at the LGAC meeting noted that a Texas based project is being investigated for potentially inflating numbers related to users.

11 http://baltimorewashingtonscmaglevproject.com/index.php/overview/what-is-scmaglev
Figure 2 - Guideway and Tunnel Design (from http://baltimorewashingtonscmaglevproject.com/images/document_library/maps/Alternative_Alignments_Station_Zones_Sheet_7.pdf)
The proposed corridor has been established between Washington, D.C. and Baltimore with a stop at Baltimore/Washington International Airport. This corridor includes most of Northern Prince George’s County, including the City of Greenbelt. From this corridor, several routes have been laid out. As of late 2016, there were six routes but these were reduced to three routes as of October 2017. (See maps below.) These alignments include one that roughly follows the Amtrak route through Bowie and Lanham and two routes that follow the Baltimore/Washington Parkway on the east and west sides. These are known as the “J” and “J1” routes, respectfully. The “J” alignment (east side of the Parkway) would stay as a tunnel all the way to Laurel. The “J1” route (west side of the Parkway) would come above ground at a point approximately between Hamilton Place and Northway. The route would transition to an above ground guideway from tunnel and run on a guideway.
• Three Stations:
  • Baltimore City
  • BWI Airport
  • Washington DC

• Speeds of up to 311 mph

• Approx. 15 minute travel time between Baltimore City and Washington DC

• Improved reliability and mobility options for train travel in the Northeast Corridor

Figure 4 - Showing the six routes (BWRR) - 2016
Figure 4A - Showing the three routes (BWRR) - 2018

Baltimore to Washington in 15 minutes at 311 MPH

BWI Airport

MDOT is working closely with the FRA to eliminate this alignment outright
Figure 5 - Portion of Section 7 Map – 2017
(http://baltimorewashingtonscmaglevproject.com/images/document_library/maps/Alternative_Alignments_Station_Zones_Sheet_7.pdf)
COMPARING ISSUES

Community Impact
One of the first discussions within the LGAC was the impact of the maglev on the community with construction and operation. Looking at maps of the routes, the group first noticed that emergency exits, ventilation plants, and power substations would be required at various stages along the route (representing nearly 1.5 acres in total size). Many of these requirements seem to correspond with the 12-mile distance between Washington and Greenbelt. Exits and ventilation are every 3-4 miles (thus 12 miles represents a good place to put these facilities). Power substations are every 12 to 25 miles, thus Greenbelt represents a good location for these facilities. Additionally, a rolling stock depot is proposed for an area close to Greenbelt (as an exit point from the tunnel system in route J1), necessitating more guideway and infrastructure development. A tunnel portal, such as used on the J1 alignment, would be anywhere from 330 to 1600 feet in length. The transition would be from close to 170 feet below ground to 18 feet above ground (a total rise upwards of 188 feet). If the 12-mile idea is utilized for any of the components, this would bring the project out at a point approximately between GHI’s management facility and Northway field. Existing facilities in this location would likely have to be removed – the observatory, fields, mulch piles – plus a portion of the forest preserve. Accessing these facilities would either be done by an access route from the BW Parkway, Northway (which would need improvement), Hamilton (which would need improvement), or via the USDA farmland (which would require cutting for a new road).

BWRR Response:

- “NEPA is the process that federal agencies follow to analyze the potential consequences of proposed projects on the environment, engage the public and document the analysis to ensure informed decision-making. It is an umbrella law that includes the EIS that will be made public by the Maryland Transit Administration for review and comment. As part of the EIS process, the range of impacts, including train noise, vibration, and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act are evaluated.”
- “A requirement of the grant is that the project must be financially feasible. The higher the percentage of tunnel – which is about twice as expensive as elevated viaduct – the less financially viable. A balance of tunnel and viaduct will best ensure financial viability.”

12 These discussions were taken from the open meeting of the LGAC on November 21, 2017.
13 http://bwrapidrail.com/facts/ (All BWRR Responses are from this page.)
Right of Way
The J1 alignment (the most impactful to GHI) would come up before wetlands in the Forest preserve but somewhere behind the GHI management offices on Hamilton Street. This exists within a “vibration zone.” The Right of Way would be at least 46 feet wide for the guideway, but close to 72 feet wide for construction. Research from those that attended the LGAC meeting shows that to keep trees away from the guideway, Japan keeps their right of way open to about 100-200 feet. In some cases, the right of way can be upwards of 500 feet.

However, the larger discussion related to right-of-way was that the BWRR has received permission to operate as a “utility” or “public service.” This means they are allowed, by right, to use eminent domain to acquire land, even though they are not a government entity A famous case in Connecticut (Keloe vs. New London) heard before the Supreme Court set an unfavorable precedent for our purposes in that the Court allowed the city to take private property through condemnation for a private development company. The Court held it was permissible “public use” and not a constitutional violation since it would further the greater public good. (Ironically, the seized land remains undeveloped today.) Maryland did not reform its laws and therefore the private rail company can use this system. They can take land and use it for other purposes beyond the guideways – such as housing or other development. The LGAC recognized this as a major concern, as we were unsure how they may or may not use this power.

BWRR Response:
- “BWRR respects and values the private property rights of landowners. We are committed to a strategy that emphasizes the importance of identifying and using land in a manner that will minimize any negative impacts to landowners during both construction and operation. For operational purposes, much of the route will be in deep tunnels underground. Surface impacts, whether below ground or above ground, will be designed to minimize impacts. If the project necessitates the need for access to additional land, BWRR will work closely with landowners and communities on finding land use solutions that work for everyone.”
- “Some privately-created unofficial maps show the potential width of the path as 1000 feet. It is important to only refer to official maps created by the NEPA process. Other maps may have misleading and inaccurate information. In actuality, the width of the SCMAGLEV’s above ground viaduct structure is approximately 46 feet. During construction, the contractor’s temporary work zone will be 72 feet wide.”
- “At this stage of the study, a final preferred route has not been determined. As the study progresses, the routes will be narrowed down, and a detailed list of impacts will be identified. There are not tens of thousands of houses, schools or businesses along any of the routes being studied by MTA. An important part of studying potential routes is to minimize the community impacts, while maintaining an economically viable project.”
**Noise/Vibration**

One of the biggest discussions at the LGAC meeting was the noise and vibration concerns. As noted, GHI management offices would be in the vibration zone. Additionally, significant portions of GHI would be within noise and vibration zones – Northway, Plateau Place, and portions of Ridge Road. Some models show that homes as far as Hillside Road could be within a second zone. Wooden construction would be the most affected by these vibration – potentially representing an issue for the frame construction homes in that area. Additionally, noise types were discussed. Members at the LGAC meeting noted that even the project records show a “startle effect” – where those (people, animals) on the ground can be surprised by how fast the train will be traveling. Potentially there is a “sonic boom” that would occur. These booms occur when a train pushes air in front of it until it finds a way to punch through the air ball, such as reaching the opening of a tunnel. Potentially at least four, possibly as much as eight, trains an hour could cause such an effect. With the way that the area around Northway and Plateau Place is structured, there is concern that this sound would be amplified. One member noted that YouTube videos show a sound like “a 747 going past.”

Additionally, concerns were raised about the noise from traffic. While the trains themselves may present some noise concerns, members were concerned about the impact of Northway potentially being a tunnel access in the J1 alignment. This could bring several hundred workers through our community to access this portal, air handlers, emergency exits, etc. LGAC had no clear answers related to the light, noise, and vibration that may occur from those workers – potentially working after the train line closes at 11pm.

**BWRR Response:**

- “Unlike traditional trains, the SCMAGLEV does not use steel wheels and rails, catenaries, or diesel engines, three of the major factors that contribute to train noise. At high speeds, the SCMAGLEV levitates using electromagnetic forces, and has no contact with its guideway. These factors keep the SCMAGLEV’s noise impacts to a minimum. Elevated viaduct sections of the train will have sound walls to mitigate the air displacement sound resulting from the train’s high speed. Tunneled sections of the route produce no noise at ground level.”
- “The SCMAGLEV system does not generate perceptible ground vibration. According to measurements taken during a rigorous environmental study in Japan, ground vibration generated by the SCMAGLEV is so low that it is not perceptible to humans.”
- “SCMAGLEV has been approved as safe for humans and the environment, meeting strict magnetic field exposure guidelines recommended by World Health Organization (WHO). As part of the EIS process and the FRA’s review for safe train operation, magnetic fields and potential impacts will be evaluated in the EIS and by the FRA’s Office of Safety.”
OTHER ISSUES

Benefit to Communities/Elites

The LGAC is concerned that such a project will not serve Greenbelt directly. Potential riders will need to drive into Washington, D.C., to access the service — almost entirely negating the use of the system. Additionally, economic benefit will be minimized because the project will not serve any local services. Potentially, some residents might be able to avail themselves of training or jobs, the LGAC feels that the potential return on investment is not worth compromising on the other issues.

BWRR Response:

● “Studies have shown that all communities along the route — and all of Maryland — will reap economic benefits resulting from construction and permanent jobs associated with operations and spin-off industries. Investments in the local communities as well as partnerships between higher education institutions opens up opportunities in new ways. Improved mobility will also spur enhanced economic activity. The eventual extension to New York will provide access to over four million jobs in less than an hour commute. People won’t be forced to move to take a higher paying job and can continue to live in their neighborhood of choice. In addition, significantly diminished emissions resulting from fewer vehicle miles traveled, will result in cleaner air shared by all. While the SCMAGLEV stops may not be convenient for residents within the middle section of the route, the SCMAGLEV system will divert auto traffic between Baltimore and Washington, reducing congestion. [Italics added for emphasis by LGAC.] Over the next thirty years, traffic congestion in the corridor will continue to worsen, requiring more travel options.”

● “The need for high speed in the Northeast Corridor has been recognized for decades. We believe there is a pent-up demand for safe, reliable high-speed travel for all manner of trip purposes. Market research shows that the travel time savings offered by SCMAGLEV service are highly valued across all travel purposes and income segments, including current users of commuter rail in the corridor.”
Technology/Design
LGAC discussed the technologies of the project. A major concern was that the current Japanese system is not like the system being proposed. Additionally, examples were found of crashes and problems that have occurred on other systems. While we do agree that the new system would be a major technological advancement that would reduce fossil fuels, LGAC feels that the potential return on investment is not worth compromising on the other issues.

BWRR Response:
- “The SCMAGLEV is a fully proven system. It was developed over a period of more than 50 years and has undergone extensive reviews and evaluations by the Japanese government. The Japanese government completed its equivalent of an EIS for the system in 2014. The SCMAGLEV is currently operating and is being extended to connect Tokyo and Nagoya.”
- “When the Northeast Corridor was built over a hundred years ago, it was not built with high speed in mind. High operating speeds require wider curves, so upgrading the existing corridor to true high-speed rail would involve building new surface-level alignments, and will therefore still have impacts to communities along the alignment. We believe that if a significant investment should be made to our region’s rail service, it should with be the latest and fastest technology.”

Safety
LGAC had some discussion of safety, but could not make any recommendations related to the operation. However, the concern about safety was centered around the increased access on Northway or Hamilton by workers. In Japan, these work crews come out at 11pm and work overnight checking for issues. They come as a large swarm of workers. While this attention to safety is commendable, what does this mean for work trucks, lighting, access, noise, etc. for GHI? Additionally, what will the safety precautions be around the access tunnels and tunnel portals? Will access to Northway be cut off entirely to avoid having a child access the site?

BWRR Response:
- “The SCMAGLEV is one of the safest transportation systems in the world. The train travels in a completely dedicated guideway, thereby eliminating the possibility of collisions with freight or other types of passenger vehicles. Additionally, the U-shaped design of the guideway itself prevents derailments. The dedicated system approach is based upon the Tokaido Shinkansen “bullet train” operation in Japan, which has not experienced any passenger or crew fatalities or injuries due to train accidents such as derailments or collisions during its 50+ years of service.”
RESULTS & RECOMMENDATION

LGAC, after meeting in public, open meetings and reviewing information has a series of questions that remain unanswered. We remain concerned about the impact of eminent domain, despite assurances from the BWRR group. We are concerned about noise and vibration on the GHI homes – all of which are in a National Historic Landmark District. Additionally, we are concerned that there is no benefit to Greenbelt, either economic, natural resources, or other. Significant disruption to our community will be made. LGAC felt that considering issues beyond GHI was outside our scope, but the remainder of the City of Greenbelt could see serious undermining issues – such as at Eleanor Roosevelt High School.

On January 30, 2018, the LGAC met in a special extra meeting and voted 4-0 to recommend to the Board of Directors that they take the position of supporting the “No Build” option. The Board of Directors may want to poll the membership or hold a public meeting if they feel that more input is needed.

LGAC recommends that the Board of Directors in communications with the membership and with state and Federal elected officials the Board of Directors reiterate that while the Board supports the use of innovative technologies to reduce greenhouse gases, pollution, and traffic, they do not support this project because of:

- potential use of eminent domain to acquire GHI owned properties, including the woodlands as well as acquiring City owned woodlands; (page 14)
- potential impact from noise and vibrations on a National Landmark Historic District, including from “sonic booms” when trains enter and exit the tunnels; (page 15)
- impact from construction and maintenance, including using Northway to access construction areas, ventilation shafts, nighttime maintenance, and fumes; (page 13)

This project is moving forward quickly. As early as the end of 2019 the project could be approved for construction. GHI’s Board of Directors must make members aware quickly and go on the record with their position. LGAC recommends that a letter detailing the position of the board be sent to all members, that information be provided in mailings and eblasts, and that information be provided at any community town halls. LGAC is willing to prepare communication materials, but would defer to the Communications Committee.

LGAC recommends that the Board communicate GHI’s position with state and Federal elected officials in a letter. LGAC would participate in the drafting of that letter if requested.

LGAC recommends that GHI become a consulting party or party of record for any Maryland Transportation Administration, Maryland Historical Trust, and/or Department of Natural Resources review of the project. This can be accomplished by reaching out to these agencies and requesting this status be made.

LGAC recommends the Board of Directors work with the City of Greenbelt, as well as groups such as the City of Bowie and the Glenn Dale Citizens Association on finding solutions to reach the “No Build” option. GHI should find out how these places had their elected officials get behind the project. Important elected officials from the Secretary of Transportation to the
Governor to members of the BWRR Board of Directors have all been very involved and may not respond to GHI as effectively as a coalition which includes our elected officials.

Finally, the LGAC recommends that the Board remain active and aware of this issue as it is likely to change quickly. Pressure must be put on all government levels to ensure GHI is not negatively impacted by this project. While LGAC will support the board in watching these issues, consideration may be made for a task force (such as the Zoning Task Force) to stay more aware of the issues in a timely fashion.

A Special Note
The Legislative and Government Affairs Committee thanks Molly Lester, Ben Fischler, Sabrina Baron, Kris White, and Dr. Laura Kressler for participating in the meetings we had on this topic. They provided valuable points of view from the membership.
RESOURCES & ARTICLES

Baltimore-Washington Superconducting Maglev Project Website (includes many project documents, maps, and FAQs)
http://baltimorewashingtonscmaglevproject.com/index.php

MAGLEV High Speed Train (Anne Arundel County)
http://www.aacounty.org/departments/transportation/maglev/

City of Bowie Maglev Resources
https://www.cityofbowie.org/2314/MAGLEV-High-Speed-Train

BW Rapid Rail Website
http://bwrapidrail.com

Stop this Train! (Bowie Based grassroots group opposed to the Maglev) -
http://www.stopthistrain.org

Bowie residents flock to Maglev presentation

Old Bowie residents urged to oppose maglev

BOWIE RESIDENTS NOT OKAY WITH PROPOSED MAGLEV TRAIN

Hogan hears Bowie’s maglev concerns

Proposed high-speed train routes affecting Bowie eliminated

Maryland Eyes Three Possible Routes For High-Speed Maglev Between D.C. And Baltimore
https://wamu.org/story/17/10/19/maryland-eyes-three-possible-routes-high-speed-maglev-d-c-baltimore/

Some residents skeptical of high-speed train from DC to Baltimore
https://wtop.com/dc-transit/2017/10/16097526/
BOWIE OFFICIALS, RESIDENTS WANT TO ‘KILL’ MAGLEV TRAIN PROJECT

7 On Your Side: Homes could be demolished in path of high speed train
http://wjla.com/features/7-on-your-side/7-on-your-side-homes-could-be-demolished-in-path-of-high-speed-train

Prince George’s County residents are worried about a Washington-Baltimore high-speed train

The idea for a maglev train from DC to Baltimore keeps...floating down the track
https://ggwash.org/view/61883/the-idea-for-a-dc-baltimore-maglev-train-keeps...floating-down-the-track

Potential Routes for High Speed Maglev Rail Line Unveiled
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