

**SOUTHEAST ARKANSAS REGIONAL INTERMODAL FACILITY
SITE ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON**

CATEGORY	ALTERNATIVE			COMMENTS
	A	B	C	
Initial Development Costs	2	2	2	Similar initial development costs for all alternatives
Accessibility				
Access Costs	2	2	3	Alt. C provides lower overall access and access improvement costs
Class I Railroad	3	3	3	Similar Class I Railroad access for all alternatives
Short-Line Railroad	3	3	3	Similar Short-Line Railroad access for all alternatives
U.S. 278 and I-69 Connector Access	3	3	3	Direct access to U.S. 279 and to I-69 Connector via U.S. 278 interchange would be provided for all alternatives
Indirect Highway Access	3	3	3	Similar indirect highway access for all alternatives
ICTF Security and Productivity				
ICTF Security	3	3	3	Similar security provided by all alternatives, as proposed
Non-interruption of Traffic	2	2	3	Alt. C placement allows track to be cleared quickly, Alt.'s A & B would interrupt local traffic flow
Storage/Support Tracks	2	2	3	Alt. C provides length and growth to accommodate the least interruptive loading/unloading operations
Runaround vs. Pull-through track	2	2	3	Alt. C runaround track makes more efficient use of existing mainline track than Alt A & B pull-through
Fast Turnaround within the ICTF	3	3	3	Similar turn around times for all alternatives
Site Expandability				
Ability to Accommodate Future Throughput	2	2	3	Alt. C provides more opportunity for expansion of rail and storage
Ability for Phased Development	2	2	3	Alt. C provides less cost during Phase I planning due to use of existing track
Ability to support Synergistic Development	2	2	3	Alt. C provides direct access to U.S. 278 and does not need a rail overpass from industrial complex
Environmental Considerations				
Farmland Soils Impacts	3	3	3	All impacts similar for Alt. A, B, or C
Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species Impacts	3	3	3	No known species or identified habitat located in Alt. A, B, or C
Wetland Impacts	3	3	3	No wetland impacts in Alt. A, B, or C
Floodplain Impacts	3	3	3	No floodplain impacts in Alt. A, B, or C
Stream Impacts	3	3	3	No perennial stream impacts in Alt. A, B, or C
Known Historical Structure Impacts	3	3	3	No impacts in Alt. A, B, or C
Known Archaeological Site Impacts	3	3	3	No impacts in Alt. A, B, or C
Socioeconomic Issues				
Residential Displacements	3	3	3*	*One resident is located in Alt. C, but would be avoided as specific site plans are developed
Noise Impacts	2	1	2	Similar noise impacts for Alt.'s A & C
Air Quality Impacts	3	3	3	All impacts similar for Alt. A, B, or C
Visual Impacts	2	2	2	All alternatives would have similar visual impacts
Compatibility with Area Economic Goals	2	2	3	Location of Alt. C is the most compatible with community plans to promote and develop business and industry along U.S. 278
TOTALS	67	66	75	

1= Least effective at addressing issue, greatest impact to resource

2= Moderately effective at addressing issue, moderate impact to resource

3= Most effective at addressing issue, least impact or no impact to resource