



The project team has recently completed an initial analysis of how the alternatives would affect a variety of community and environmental resources. Engineering requirements, transportation impacts, cost, and potential benefits associated with each alternative were also reviewed. Based on this assessment, the project team is recommending that Alternative 1 be carried forward as the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS. The recommended Preferred Alternative is not a final decision – all alternatives will be fully studied in the DEIS.

- Better
- No Substantial Difference
- Worse

The following matrix includes a summary of the initial findings.

Performance Evaluation Measures	No Action	Alternative 1 (Recommended Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 2
1. Improve passenger rail mobility and accessibility to communities in the Willamette Valley.			
A. Travel time	2:35	● 2:20	● 2:02
B. Capacity to serve 6 round trips/day	No	● Yes	● Yes
C. Multimodal connections	Good at existing stations	● Good at existing stations	● Fewer than No Action/Alt 1
D. Ability to serve higher speeds in the future	Maintains current maximum 79 mph speed	● Maintains current max 79 mph speed. Increased ridership strengthens market for future service enhancements.	● Supports max speeds of 120 mph on portions of new alignment
2. Protect freight-rail capacity and investments in the corridor, and maintain safety.			
A. At-grade (street level) crossings	140 existing at-grade crossings, no modifications	● 140 existing at-grade crossings, 64 crossings are modified for additional track and trains	● 49 existing at-grade crossings, 44 are modified, plus 1 new at-grade crossing
B. Ability to accommodate freight	Would get worse without investment	● Meets (by design)	● Meets (by design)
3. Plan, design, implement, maintain, and operate a cost-effective project.			
A1. Ability to phase improvements	N/A	● Could be constructed incrementally	● Limited to major sections of new alignment and upgrades to sections of existing track to accommodate
A2. Costs (capital cost)	N/A	● \$660-\$775 million	● \$3.65-\$4.47 billion (over 5 times higher than Alt 1); and does not account for upgrades to portions of track south of Oregon City that would later be abandoned
A2. Costs (operations and maintenance)	Ongoing based on railroad agreements	● ≈ \$25 million annually	● ≈ \$43 million annually New operations and maintenance responsibility for ODOT
B1. Population close to station areas	74,385	● 74,385	● 65,215
B2. Employment close to station areas	180,905	● 180,905	● 123,145
C. Projected Annual Ridership (2035)	390,000	● 739,000	● 723,000
4. Provide an affordable and equitable travel alternative.			
A. Availability of travel options	No change	● Improved train service	● Improved train service
B1. Proximity of low income populations to stations	8,929	● 8,929	● 10,724
B1. Proximity of minority populations to stations	27,994	● 27,994	● 32,595
B2. Low income populations impacted	14,540	● 14,540	● 16,664
B2. Minority populations impacted	44,024	● 44,024	● 43,313

Performance Evaluation Measures	No Action	Alternative 1 (Recommended Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 2
5. Be compatible with passenger rail investments planned in Washington State.			
A. Compatibility with WA State (assumed same for all alternatives)	<i>Requires intermodal transfer</i>	● Seamless intercity rail service	● Seamless intercity rail service
6. Promote community health and quality of life for communities along the corridor.			
A. Location Quotient Score (factor considering land use, employment, and social attributes, provides estimate of development potential)	1.1	● 1.1	● 0.8
B1. Community resources, commercial and residential parcels potentially impacted by rail	0	● 34	● 49
B2. Percent of adjacent land designated for residential use (noise sensitive)	9.6%	● 9.6%	● 9.9%
7. Protect and preserve the natural and built environment.*			
A1. Acres of farmland potentially impacted	0	● 399 acres	● 1,312 acres
A2. Assessment of consistency with adopted regional and local comprehensive plans	N/A	● Cities and Counties support or are neutral regarding development of passenger rail	● Cities and Counties support or are neutral regarding development of passenger rail
A3. Impacts to Willamette River Greenway	None	● None anticipated; No existing crossings of the Willamette River anticipated to be modified; no goal exception work would be required	● Up to three new crossings would require goal exception work
B. Qualitative assessment of greenhouse gas emissions from corridor options, based on anticipated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction due to mode shift and temporary construction-related emissions	Relatively low	● Long term: Mode shift from bus or car to train saves energy; Construction requirements would create GHG	● Long term: Mode shift from bus or car to train saves energy; Construction requirements would create greenhouse gas (GHG) [approx 3 times Alt 1]
C1. Qualitative assessment of impacts to habitat, populations, or individuals of threatened or endangered species and their critical habitat, as well as impacts to non-listed fish and wildlife	Minimal, same as current conditions	● Smaller construction footprint than Alt 2; higher train frequency than no action; one listed plant potentially affected	● Larger construction footprint; higher train frequency than no action; Alt 2 has a higher number of stream crossings with new or modified bridge/culverts at designated critical fish habitat than Alt 1.
C2. Percent of study area that is high value wetlands plus percent of all wetlands potentially impacted	None	● 4.4%	● 6.6%
C3. Construction adjacent to relatively high-risk slopes	None	● 4.4 miles	● 9.7 miles
C4. Number of known Section 4(f) resources within 100 feet of the alignment (construction areas only)	0	● More sites within 100 feet of alignment (122), but less unavoidable direct impacts (up to 3 parks)	● Less sites within 100 feet of alignment (64), but more unavoidable direct impacts (up to 5 parks)
C5. Known cultural resources (historic properties and archaeological resources) within 100 feet of the rail alignment (construction areas only)	0	● 381	● 392

*The environment MOEs are not equal in terms of relative importance. For example, if one alternative results in more severe 4(f) impacts, such a finding could more than counterbalance other measures where the other alternative scores worse.