



Proposed Routes Strengths & Weaknesses*

PROPOSED ROUTES	STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES
Mac West - Willow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires fewer number of new road crossings Requires smaller expenditure of train energy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crosses more incompatible land uses Has higher probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites Has greatest impacts to designated state refuges and recreation areas
Mac West - Houston North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires fewest number of new road crossings Impacts fewer developed parcels Has less probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crosses more incompatible land uses Has less suitable soil conditions Impacts more wetlands Impacts a designated refuge and fragments a state recreation area Crosses greater number of anadromous streams
Mac West - Houston South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires fewer number of new road crossings Impacts fewer developed parcels Has less probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crosses more incompatible land uses Impacts more wetlands Requires moderate expenditure of train energy, but less than the two Big Lake alternatives
Mac West - Big Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has more suitable soil conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involves greater number of new road crossings Impacts more developed parcels Crosses more incompatible land uses Requires greater expenditure of train energy Crosses greater number of mapped anadromous streams Has higher probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites
Mac East - Willow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts fewer developed parcels Crosses more compatible land uses Impacts less wetlands Crosses fewest number of mapped anadromous streams 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has higher probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites Fragmentes designated state recreation areas
Mac East - Houston North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crosses more compatible land uses Impacts fewer developed parcels Has less probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has less suitable soil conditions Fragmentes a designated state recreation area Requires moderate expenditure of train energy, but less than the two Big Lake alternatives
Mac East - Houston South	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts fewer developed parcels Crosses more compatible land uses Impacts less wetlands Has less probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites Avoids designated state refuges and recreation areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires moderate expenditure of train energy, but less than the Big Lake alternatives Involves moderate number of new road crossings, but less than the Big Lake alternatives Has less suitable soil conditions than the Big Lake alternatives, but better than the Houston North alternatives
Mac East - Big Lake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Avoids designated state refuges and state recreation areas Crosses more compatible land uses Has more suitable soil conditions Impacts less wetlands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts more developed parcels Involves greater number of new road crossings Requires greater expenditure of train energy Crosses greater number of mapped anadromous streams Has higher probability of impacting archeological and/or historical sites

***12-18-07 UPDATE:** As a result of a final quality control audit, train energy calculations have been corrected and reflect the most current alignment designs.