

TABLE 3

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE IMPACTS COMPARISON MATRIX

Decision Determinant	Decision Factor/Value (1)			
	Preferred North to South Alternative (2) (3)	North Alternative (4)	South Alternative (5)	South to North Alternative (6)
Congressional Mandates Met	Best (Pikeville < 1 mi)	Best (Pikeville < 1 mi)	Worst (Pikeville 8 mi)	Worst (Pikeville 8 mi)
Population Accessibility	35,750	35,750	33,950	34,350
Communities Served	10	7	6	8
Government/Emergency Services	< 2 mi.	< 2 mi.	8 mi.	8 mi.
Recreational Resources	< 8 mi avg	< 8 mi avg	< 3 mi avg	< 3 mi avg
Tourism Resources	1.3 - 20 mi	1.3 - 20 mi	1.0 - 20 mi	1.0 - 20 mi
Potential Development Sites	9	7	9	7
Total Project Cost (7)	\$42M/mi	\$52M/mi	\$58M/mi	\$63M/mi
Mineral Value	\$18.8M	\$15.6M	\$20.0M	\$17.1M
Air Quality Impacts	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal
Highway Noise Impacts	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal
Terrestrial Ecosystem Impacts	3225 ac.	3136 ac.	3960 ac.	3758 ac.
Aquatic Ecosystem/Water Quality	5.9 stream mi.	9.3 stream mi	5.8 stream mi	8.3 stream mi.
Residential Relocations	109	257	152	295
Business Relocations	11	13	8	10
Mining Operation Impacts	8	6	9	7
Wetland Impacts	2 (<0.5 ac. est. avg.)	1 (<0.5 ac. est. avg.)	4 (1.4 ac. est. avg.)	3 (0.9 ac. est. avg.)
Historic Sites Affected	0	0	0	0
Archaeological Sites Affected	0	0	0	0
Potential UST/Waste Sites	2	5	4	7
Community Services Affected	0	1	0	1
Cemeteries Affected	2	5	5	9
Prime Farmland Affected	17 ac.	9 ac.	17 ac.	10 ac.
Environmental Justice Impacts	None	None	None	None
Floodplain Impacts	None	None	None	None
Threatened/Endangered Species	No Likely Adverse Effects	No Likely Adverse Effects	No Likely Adverse Effects	No Likely Adverse Effects
Recreation/Wildlife Refuge Impacts	None	None	None	None
Visual/Aesthetic Impacts	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal
Construction Impacts	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal	Minimal

(1) Decision Factors/Values are derived from the data provided in Table 2 preceding, and from information developed in the Technical Studies prepared to assess the environmental consequences of the proposed project.

(2) Data corresponds to the three highlighted columns, in combination, in Table 2 preceding.

(3) Preferred North to South Alternative is comprised of segments A-E-H-I-L-K'-O-Q-R-T as shown on Exhibit 7 in the DEIS and is represented in the FEIS on Exhibit 3 by the North+North to South Connector+South corridors. The currently available, best level of detail for the Preferred North to South Alternative is shown on Exhibit 4a - 4k.

(4) North Alternative is comprised of segments A-E-H-G-K-R-T as shown on Exhibit 7 in the DEIS and is represented in the FEIS on Exhibit 3 by the North corridor.

(5) South Alternative is comprised of segments B-D-F-I-L-K'-O-Q-R-T as shown on Exhibit 7 in the DEIS and is represented in the FEIS on Exhibit 3 by the South corridor.

(6) South to North Alternative is comprised of segments B-D-F-I-G-K-R-T as shown on Exhibit 7 in the DEIS and is represented in the FEIS on Exhibit 3 by the South+South to North Connector+North corridors.

(7) Cost estimates are based on the most recent available project engineering, right-of-way, utilities, and construction information and have been updated from the preliminary estimates represented in Table 2. Cost estimates will continue to be updated as the project evolves over the coming years.