

Summary of Alternatives Evaluation

Criteria	EC-1	EC-2	EC-3	No Action
Improve cross-river transportation of people and goods while accommodating standard-width river navigation				
Vehicle miles traveled	L/M	L	L	L
Travel time (Vehicle-hours)	L	L/M	L/M	M/H
Delay Time (Vehicle-hours)	L	L/M	L/M	M/H
Ramp Queuing onto Interstate 84	L	L	L	H
Compliance with navigation channel guidelines (Y/N)	L	L	L	H
Commercial goods mobility (proximity to truck routes, truck trip generators, river navigation) - VMT & travel time	M	L	L	H
Bicycle and pedestrian mobility & connectivity	M	L	L	H
Impacts to the natural, built, and aesthetic environment				
Fish & Wildlife	M	M	M	L
Vegetation & Wetlands	L	L	L/M	L
Air Quality	L	L	L	L
Energy	L	L	L	L
Hazardous Materials	H	M	L	L
Visual	H	M	M	L
Noise	L	L	L	M
Land Use	H	M	L	L
Soils & Geology	M	L	L	L
Water quality	M/H	M	M	L
Social & Economic (excluding recreation)	M	M	M	M
Environmental Justice	M	M	M	L
Impacts to Recreation				
Water-based recreation - windsurfing, boating	L	L	L	L
Land-based recreation - bird watching,	L	L	L	M

Criteria	EC-1	EC-2	EC-3	No Action
picnicking, concerts, etc.				
Park lands	L	L	L	L
Impacts to cultural and historic resources				
Archaeological resources	M	M	M/H	N/A
Historic resources	H	H	H	N/A
In-lieu fishing sites	L	L	L	N/A
Financially acceptable and supports local economic development				
Cost range without mitigation (Additional costs could include environmental mitigation, ROW acquisition, etc.) in millions of dollars.	165 - 181	155 - 174	155 - 174	N/A
Operating and maintenance costs	M	L	L	H
Impacts to local business, economy and economic development	M	M	M	H
Home/business displacements	H	M	L	N/A
Construction Impacts				
Land side Oregon	M	M	M	N/A
Land side Washington	H	L	L	N/A
In water	H	M/H	M/H	N/A
PRELIMINARY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE				
Management Team Recommendation April 2003	NO	YES	NO	NO
Advisory Committee Recommendation April 2003	NO	YES	NO	NO

Level of Impact: L= Low, M= Medium, H= High

Management Team's Rationale for Preliminary Preferred Alternative Recommendation

EC-1 was not recommended due to:

- Higher impacts to commercial goods and bicycle/pedestrian mobility and connectivity when compared to EC-2 and EC-3

- Higher impacts to hazardous materials, visual resources, land use, water quality than EC-2 and EC-3, which is mostly associated with Dock Grade Road improvements
- Greater residential and business displacements than EC-2 and EC-3.

EC-2 was recommended because:

- Overall, EC-2 has lower impacts than EC-1.
- EC-2 would have similar impacts as EC-3, however the EC-2 alignment has slightly better construction access for river vessels, locates the new bridge further from The Marketplace office/commercial building, and would have lower mitigation costs when considering the hazardous material and partial right of way acquisition on EC-2 and the archaeological site on EC-3.
- EC-2 meets the purpose and need, whereas the No Action Alternative does not.

EC-3 was not recommended due to:

- Slightly higher impacts to vegetation on the Washington shore, including an old oak tree, when compared to EC-2
- Higher impacts to archaeological resources than EC-2, which may be a Section 4(f) resource. This impact may require more extensive mitigation than the hazardous materials and partial property acquisition that are associated with EC-2.
- Location of new bridge and access road would be directly behind a commercial office building on the Oregon shore, which could involve higher levels of noise.
- Barges and other vessels would have more obstacles to navigate among during construction than EC-1 or EC-2.

No Action was not recommended due to:

- No Action does not meet the purpose and need for the project
- Overall, No Action has higher transportation impacts when compared to EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3
- No Action would have adverse effects on the local economic development of the area when compared to EC-1, EC-2 and EC-3.