



# Oregon Passenger Rail

## Eugene - Portland

CHOOSING A PATH FORWARD

## Appendix C

### Public and Agency Comments and Responses

April 2021



# Contents

Section	Page
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>C-1</b>
<b>Attachments</b>	
<b>Attachment C1 Comment and Response Matrix</b>	
<b>Attachment C2 Comments Received During Public Comment Period</b>	



# Introduction

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) released the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Oregon Passenger Rail Project (Project) in October 2018. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) published a Notice of Availability in the Federal Register (FR) on October 19, 2018 (83 FR 53053). Stakeholders were encouraged to provide comments on the Tier 1 DEIS through various opportunities from October 18 through December 19, 2018.

During the public comment period, ODOT and FRA received a total of 212 comments from members of the public and agency/organization representatives at five (5) public events, through the Project website, and by email and letter.

This appendix includes two attachments:

- Attachment 1: A matrix containing agency and public comments with responses from ODOT. The comments are organized in groups: agency, organization, and individual comments.
- Attachment 2: The original comment submittals. Each comment has an index number which is reflected in the comment matrix and marked on the original comments.

Tables C-1, C-2 and C-3 list the commenters along with the index number to find the comments with responses and the original format comments and in attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Table C-1 lists comments received from agencies, Table C-2 lists comments received from organizations, and Table C-3 lists comments received from individuals (or anonymously).

**Table C-1: Commenter Index: Agencies**

Comment Number	Name
A-1	Jill A. Nogi Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
A-2	Allison O'Brien Regional Environmental Officer U.S. Department of the Interior (USDOI)
A-3	Jeremy Borrego, AICP Transportation Program Specialist Federal Transit Administration Region 10 - Seattle, WA
A-4	Russ Klassen Aquatic Resource Coordinator, Department of State Lands
A-5	Sara Morrissey, Travel Oregon
A-6	Kirk Fredrickson, Passenger Rail Services Manager, WSDOT
A-7	Paul E. Thompson Program Manager, LCOG/Central Lane MPO Lane Council of Governments
A-8	Joe Recker Environmental Permits Coordinator TriMet Project Development and Permitting

Comment Number	Name
A-9	Rob Inerfeld, AICP Transportation Planning Manager City of Eugene – Public Works Engineering
A-10	Georgia Edwards City Manager, City of Tangent
A-11	Alex Polikoff Director, Corvallis Rural Fire Protection District

Table C-2: Commenter Index: Organizations

Comment Number	Name
O-1	Jon Nuxoll, AORTA
O-2	Donald Leap, AORTA
O-3	J. Michael Morrison, Board of Directors, AORTA
O-4	Chris Hagerbaumer, Deputy Director Oregon Environmental Council
O-5	Betsy Boyd, Associate VP, Federal Affairs University of Oregon
O-6	Michael H. Schill University of Oregon President and Professor of Law
O-7	David Aschenbrenner Chair, Hector Campbell Neighborhood Assn. Milwaukie OR
O-8	Garlynn Woodsong Land Use Chair, Concordia Neighborhood Association

Table C-3: Commenter Index: Individuals and Anonymous Comments

Comment Number	Name
I-1	Jim Adams
I-2	Douglas Allen
I-125	Dr. Patrick Ardron-Hudson
I-3	Justus Armstrong
I-4	Bob Bailey
I-5	Holly Balcom
I-6	David Ballard
I-7	Chase Ballew
I-8	Reddit user: u/Reggie_Barclay
I-9	Larry Bardell
I-10	Beverly Barr

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name</b>
I-11	Bonny Barr
I-12	Chris Bates
I-13	William Becherer
I-14	Chris Bell
I-15	Megan Berry
I-16	Aaron Blanton
I-17	Timothy Blood
I-18a	Nathan Bofto
I-18b	Nathan Bofto
I-19	Heather Bogaro
I-20	Debra Borton
I-21	Tab Boschetti
I-22	Dana Botkin
I-23	Christy Brekken
I-24	Frannie Brindle
I-25a	Debra Brush
I-25b	Debra Brush
I-26	Ray Bryan
I-27	Ted Buehler
I-28	Janet Calvert
I-29	Jeramy Card
I-30	Les Castle
I-31	Julie Chapman
I-32	Richard E Chizinski
I-33	Nick Christensen
I-34	Bill Clingman
I-35	Eliot Cole
I-36	Heidi Coleman, RN, Legacy Health
I-37	Matthew Conner
I-196	Philip Constant
I-38	Isaiah Cornutt
I-39	David Crout
I-40	Peter Dane

Comment Number	Name
I-41	Jerod Davidson
I-42	Ron Davis
I-43	Steve Dickey
I-44	Victor Dodier
I-45	Sarah Douglas
I-46	Joseph Edge
I-47	Georgia Edwards
I-48	Lou Favreau
I-49	James Feldmann
I-50	Gary Ferrington
I-51	Brynn FitzClemen
I-52	Glenda Fleming
I-53	Reddit user: u/Flyer770
I-54	Gerald Fox
I-55	Brian Fuller
I-56	Li Fuxin, Assistant Professor, Oregon State University
I-57	Greg Gardner
I-58	Steven Gibson
I-59	William Gifford
I-60	Al Good, Consultant at Oregon Fire Equip Dist.
I-61	Marci Gordon
I-62	Elizabeth Graser Lindsey
I-63	Reddit user: u/GraytoGreen
I-64	Ron Green
I-65	Bob Greenwade
I-66	Dean Hale
I-67	Brian Hall
I-68	Joshua Kane Halsted
I-69	Jonathan Harnish, Harnish Properties
I-70	Michael Hashizume
I-71	Tim Hayden
I-72	Douglas Hayner
I-73	Norbert Heins



Comment Number	Name
I-74	Kelly Hoell
I-75	Dan Hoffman
I-76	Darcey Howard, Dir. Marketing, Coconut Bliss
I-77	Nick Howland
I-78	Kent Hutchens
I-79	Ed Immel
I-80	Vicki Jean, Train Mechanic, Hitachi
I-81	Kay B. Johnson, Norman Patrick Johnson
I-82	Noel Johnson
I-83	David Jorling
I-84	Harvey Kahler
I-85	Kristen Kalbrener MS. MA. CMM, Program Manager, Global Education Oregon
I-86	Tracy Kane
I-87	Megan Kemple
I-88	Wonkak Kim
I-89	Michael Koivula
I-90	Michael Koivula
I-91	Bob Krebs, Retired ODOT Passenger Rail Coordinator
I-92	Russ Lathrop
I-93	Matt Laubach
I-94	Zachary Lauritzen
I-95	Blaine Lee
I-96	Dr. Burton Levenson
I-97	Art Lewellan, Rail system designer, The LOTi project
I-98	Walt Lierman, PhD, OHA, Health Analytics
I-99	Kathy Lincoln
I-100	Joan Lloyd
I-101	Mike James Long
I-102	Moises Lucero
I-103	Matt Lutter
I-104	Mary-Kate Mackey
I-105a	Karl MacNair
I-105b	Karl MacNair

Comment Number	Name
I-106	Josh Mars
I-107	Cindy Massaro
I-108	Geoffrey McCarth
I-109	Ben McCune
I-110	Kay McEwen
I-111	Don McFarling
I-112	Chris McLaughlin
I-113	Seaton McLennan, Former Mayor of Tangent
I-114	Vicky Mello
I-115	JR Merrick
I-116	Cecilia Mihaylo
I-117	Mary Sharon Moore
I-118	Mike Morrison
I-119	Deborah Neel
I-120	Cynthia Noblitt, business owner/operator, Deep Woods Distillery
I-121	Jennene Norblad, Umpqua Bank
I-122	Phillip Norman, Owner, Attic Access
I-123	Sigh O'Nara
I-124	Pat <i>[no last name provided]</i>
I-125	Dr. Patrick Ardrion-Hudson
I-126	Kenneth Peters
I-127	Madeline Phillips
I-128	Leslie Polson
I-129	Julia Pommert
I-130	Sharon Posner
I-131	Robert Poulsen
I-132	Douglas Quirke
I-133	Carleen Reily
I-134	Marilyn Ripley
I-135	Mark Robinowitz
I-136	Robert Rose
I-137	Mark Ross
I-138	Rob Roy

Comment Number	Name
I-139	Robert Roy
I-140	Rob Roy
I-141	Paul Sachet
I-142	Eric Sandoval
I-143	Meredith Schreiber
I-144	Richard Scott
I-145	Brenda Scotton
I-146	Elaine Sedlack
I-147	Roberta Sesso
I-148a	Elise Shearer
I-148b	Elise Shearer
I-149	Mark Siddall
I-150	Mark Siddall
I-151	Robert Siegwarth
I-152	Lin Sime
I-153	Ellen Singer
I-154	James Smith
I-155	Randall Smith
I-156	Kayla Smith
I-157	David Sonnichsen
I-158	Pamela Spettel
I-159	Jessie Spillers
I-160	Tina Springer
I-161	Adam Stallsworth, District Operations Coordinator
I-162	Andrew Stephenson
I-163	Ted Stonecliffe
I-164	Shawna Stovall
I-165	David Strubhar
I-166	Brenda StVincent
I-167a	Reddit user: u/suffusion
I-167b	Reddit user: u/Suffusion
I-168	Reddit user: u/swarmingblackcats
I-169	Emily Taussig

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name</b>
I-170	Blake Thompson
I-171	Tom <i>[no last name provided]</i>
I-172	Greg Tompkins
I-173	Randal Toth
I-174	Matthew Trecha
I-175	William Van Vliet
I-176	Karrie Walters
I-177	Sharon Way
I-178	Mark Weinrott
I-179	Darise Weller
I-180	Jeff Wells
I-181	Gabriel Wihtol
I-182	Telly Wirth, owner/operator, Wirth Farms
I-183	Peggy Woolsey
I-184	David Wortman
I-185	[No Name Provided]
I-186	[No Name Provided]
I-187	[No Name Provided]
I-188	[No Name Provided]
I-189	[No Name Provided]
I-190	[No Name Provided]
I-191	[No Name Provided]
I-192	[No Name Provided]
I-193	[No Name Provided]
I-194	[No Name Provided]
I-195	[No Name Provided]

Attachment C1  
Comment and Response Matrix



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	<p>Dear Ms. Kachadoorian and Ms. Sellers,</p> <p>The US Environmental Protection Agency has reviewed the Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Oregon Passenger Rail - Eugene to Portland Project (CEQ Number 20180245; Region 10 EPA project number 12-0043-FRA) pursuant to Section 309 of the Clean Air act and the National Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p>The Federal Railroad Administration and Oregon Department of Transportation propose to improve Amtrak Cascades intercity passenger rail service for the 125-mile segment of the federally-designated Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor from Eugene-Springfield to Portland, Oregon. In addition to a No Action Alternative, three action options (two alternatives) are proposed. The alternatives include infrastructure improvements to existing rail corridors as well as building new sections, to meet future demand, improve facilities, reduce journey times and improve connections with regional public transit services. Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, would be constructed within and parallel to the existing Union Pacific Railroad alignment and would continue use of existing stations. Alternative 2 would parallel I-5 and I-205, requiring new track along the full alignment and four new stations. Alternative 2 with Central Albany Option would use the existing Albany station.</p> <p>We have the following comments for your consideration in preparing the Final Tier 1 EIS:</p> <p>Preferred alternative We support the selection of Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative because it would maximize the use of existing infrastructure and stations, as well as avoid "greenfield" development that would result from constructing a new rail corridor with four new stations. While the scale of analysis for the Tier 1 EIS does not provide an exact assessment of resource impacts, it does indicate that fewer direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts within the defined study areas would be expected with Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would</p>	Thank you for your comments and support for the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		have fewer potential impacts to wetlands, waterways, floodplains, and biological resources.	
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, USEPA	<p>Water quality</p> <p>We appreciate that the DEIS lists all Clean Water Act section 303 (d) impaired waterbodies that would be affected by the project. We recommend that all potential impacts to waterbodies within the project areas be identified and analyzed in the EIS, including those waterbodies that are not currently water quality impaired. This will help with analyzing potential mitigation measures. We note that the antidegradation provisions of the Clean Water Act apply to waterbodies within the project area that meet water quality standards.</p>	ODOT and FRA have added the total number of stream crossings for the Build Alternatives (Table 3-2 in the FEIS/ROD).
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, USEPA	<p>Wetlands</p> <p>The DEIS estimated that, based on the Oregon Department of State Lands typical compensatory mitigation ratios ranging from 1:1 for restoration to 3:1 for enhancement, the impacted wetland acres requiring mitigation could span from 16 (Alternative 1) to 618 acres (Alternative 2 with Central Albany Option).</p> <p>We note that the state is currently finalizing a new approach to compensatory mitigation, call the Aquatic Resources Mitigation Framework. This new approach will revise mitigation standards in Oregon to move from acreage to function-based mitigation, through the replacement of lost wetland and stream functions and values. Function-based wetland mitigation has been shown to create more successful and sustainable results. The new approach supports implementation of, and aim to align with, the federal rule (2008 Mitigation Rule) on compensatory mitigation and provide sustainable environmental benefits. The new approach to compensating for wetland and stream losses will be collaboratively implemented by the ODSL, US Army Corps of Engineers-Portland District and the EPA, possibly as early as February 2019. Future projects requiring permits from the ODSL or the Corps will be expected to conform to the state's new mitigation standards.</p>	ODOT and FRA updated Section 4.15.6 of the FEIS to reflect the Aquatic Resources Mitigation Framework, specifically referring to the new approach to determining mitigation requirements. The revised text is highlighted in Appendix A and noted in the errata sheet (Table 3-2 in the FEIS/ROD).



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, USEPA	<p>Wildlife linkages</p> <p>We agree, as stated on page 4-125, that a helpful strategy to avoid direct impacts to biological resources would be to build stream crossings as full-span bridges. We recommend that this strategy be considered and applied within wildlife linkage areas and other locations where sensitive aquatic or terrestrial resources are crossed. We also recommend consideration of existing rail corridor infrastructure that could be retrofitted to provide hydrological and ecological connectivity, i.e., using oversized bottomless culverts, underpasses, overpasses, or specific smaller structures allowing for connectivity and species passage.</p>	<p>ODOT and FRA updated Section 4.12.6 of the DEIS to reflect the suggestion to retrofit existing rail infrastructure where feasible. The revised text is highlighted in Appendix A and noted in the errata sheet (Table 3-2 in the FEIS/ROD).</p>
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, USEPA	<p>Climate Adaptation</p> <p>The EPA recommends that the Final EIS include a discussion of reasonably foreseeable effects that changes in the climate may have on the proposed project and the project area, including its long-term infrastructure. This could help inform the development of measures to improve the resilience of the proposed project. If projects changes could notably exacerbate the environmental impacts of the project, the EPA recommends these impacts also be considered as part of the NEPA analysis.</p>	<p>ODOT and FRA updated the Energy/Climate Change discussion in the cumulative effects analysis (Section 4.18.5) of the DEIS to include a discussion of this topic. The text used was initially presented in Section 4.17 of the DEIS, as follows, and was added to Section 4.18.5 in the amended DEIS (see Appendix A):</p> <p><i>The OPR Project could be vulnerable to future effects related to climate change based on projections of increased storm intensity and duration, increased flood risks, and increased risk of landslides. FRA and ODOT acknowledge that the future climate change effects could alter the function, sizing, and operations of proposed OPR Project infrastructure. For the proposed facilities to function as intended for their planned lifespans, ODOT would design the proposed facilities to perform under the variable conditions expected as a result of climate change. For example, drainage culverts might need to be sized larger than warranted by existing conditions to accommodate more intense rainfall events and increased seasonal flows of surface water. Subsequent Tier 2 environmental studies would consider and</i></p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p><i>implement climate change adaptation strategies, as appropriate.</i></p> <p>The revised text is highlighted in Appendix A and noted in the errata sheet (Table 3-2 in the FEIS/ROD).</p>
A-1	Jill A. Nogi, Manager, Environmental Review and Sediment Management Unit, USEPA	<p>Tier 2 NEPA process</p> <p>Because any build alternative would likely be implemented incrementally (p. 4-144), we request that the FRA and ODOT send the subsequent Tier 2 NEPA analyses to the EPA Region 10 Office to ensure opportunity for review and comment.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to review the Draft EIS for the Oregon Passenger Rail Project. Please note that, effective October 22, 2018, the EPA no longer includes rating in our comment letters. Information about this change and the EPA's continued roles and responsibilities in the review of federal actions can be found on our website at: <a href="https://www.epa.gov/nepa/epa-review-process-under-section-309-clean-air-act">https://www.epa.gov/nepa/epa-review-process-under-section-309-clean-air-act</a>.</p> <p>If you have questions regarding our comments, please contact Elaine Somers of my staff at 206-553-2966 or at <a href="mailto:somers.elaine@epa.gov">somers.elaine@epa.gov</a>, or you may contact me at 206-553-1841 or at <a href="mailto:nogi.jill@epa.gov">nogi.jill@epa.gov</a></p>	Thank you for your continued interest and engagement with this Project. Where appropriate, ODOT and FRA will continue to engage the USEPA and other Federal and state agencies in the Project.
A-2	Allison O'Brien Regional Environmental Officer U.S. Department of the Interior (USDOI) Office phone: (503) 326-2489	<p>Subject: Tier 1 Draft EIS for Oregon Passenger Rail, Eugene to Portland, Oregon</p> <p>Dear Ms. Sellers,</p> <p>The U.S. Department of the Interior (Department) has reviewed the subject draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The Department</p>	Thank you for your comment. ODOT and FRA will consult with the Service, as required by the ESA, as Project development and permitting proceed. ODOT and FRA will consider if the Project requires consultation based on survey conducted by professional biologists. If mitigation is required, FRA (or appropriate lead

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
	Mobile phone: (503) 720-1212	<p>provides the following comments for use in the development of the final EIS for this project. These comments are preliminary and can be more closely focused and expanded upon once a final route is selected for analysis.</p> <p>Threatened and Endangered Species</p> <p>The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and Oregon Department of Transportation have proposed a 125-mile segment of a high speed rail route between Eugene/Springfield, Oregon, and Portland, Oregon. The two proposed routes have the potential to affect several species of plants, invertebrates, fish and birds listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). These species include the bull trout (<i>Salvelinus confluentus</i>), yellow-billed cuckoo (<i>Coccyzus americanus</i>), streaked-horned lark (<i>Eremophila alpestris strigata</i>), Taylor's checkerspot butterfly (<i>Euphydryas editha taylori</i>), Fender's blue butterfly (<i>Icaricia icarioides fenderi</i>), Willamette daisy (<i>Erigeron decumbens</i> var. <i>decumbens</i>), Kincaid's lupine (<i>Lupinus sulphureus</i> ssp. <i>Kincaidii</i>), Bradshaw's desert parsley (<i>Lomatium bradshawii</i>), Nelson's checker-mallow (<i>Sidalcea nelsoniana</i>), Golden paintbrush (<i>Castilleja levisecta</i>), Water howellia (<i>Howellia aquatilis</i>) and their designated critical habitat. Both proposed routes and their construction may also affect migratory bird habitat and require the filling of wetland habitats.</p> <p>Section 7 of the ESA requires that all Federal agencies consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) to ensure that the actions authorized, funded, or carried out by such agencies do not jeopardize the continued existence of any threatened or endangered species or adversely modify or destroy designated critical habitat of such species. To determine the need for future consultation and, if necessary, to conduct the consultation, the Department recommends that:</p> <p>1) the final route for the Project be surveyed by qualified biologists for listed species and TRS to determine occupancy of habitats being affected by construction and future maintenance of the infrastructure; and</p>	federal agency) will, in cooperation with the Service, develop measures to avoid, minimize and, as appropriate, mitigate unavoidable effects to listed/TRS species and their habitats.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		2) measures to avoid, minimize and, as appropriate, mitigate unavoidable effects to listed/TRS species and their habitats be developed by FRA in cooperation with the Service.	
A-2	Allison O'Brien, Regional Environmental Officer, USDO	<p>Land and Water Conservation Fund</p> <p>This project has the potential to impact parks that have been funded with the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) state and local assistance program, Public Law 88-578; currently codified at 54 U.S.C. §2003 et seq. These parks cannot be converted to other than public outdoor recreation use unless approved by the Secretary of the Interior, delegated to the National Park Service (NPS) as further explained in 36 C.F.R. 59. The Department notes that table 4.6-1 contains incorrect information on which parks have/have not received LWCF funding. For example, Armitage Park has received four LWCF grants, but it is listed as having received zero. Washington/Jefferson Park, Fish Eddy Landing (aka Willamette Wayside Natural Area), and Eastmoreland Golf Course, were also funded with LWCF. The Department recommends that ODOT consult with the Oregon Department of Parks and Recreation, who administers the LWCF program in Oregon. Further, the Department recommends that ODOT consult with NPS until an alternative has been selected and it can be determined conclusively by NPS whether or not there will be impacts to parks that fall within NPS regulatory jurisdiction. At that point, NPS may request to serve as a cooperating agency in an attempt to avoid duplicative processes in complying with the National Environmental Policy Act.</p> <p>Any questions regarding ESA listed species may be directed to Mr. Kevin Maurice at (503) 231-6974 or kevin_maurice@fws.gov. Please contact Ms. Heather Ramsay at (206) 220-4123 or Heather.Ramsay@nps.gov with questions related to LWCF issues. If you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (503) 326-2489.</p> <p>We appreciate the opportunity to comment.</p>	Thank you for these comments and corrections. ODOT and FRA updated Table 4-6.1 in the DEIS (see Appendix A) and listed the changes in the errata table in the FEIS/ROD.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
A-3	Jeremy Borrego, AICP Transportation Program Specialist Federal Transit Administration Region 10 - Seattle, WA Phone: 206.220.7956	<p>Jennifer,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Oregon Passenger Rail DEIS.</p> <p>Our office has worked with ODOT to determine that FTA has investments along the Cascade Passenger Rail Corridor. Generally speaking, FTA funding was used by ODOT to purchase Cascade Corridor train cars and to improve the Salem Depot station. As this project develops, please keep FTA apprised of potential impacts to these and other FTA-funded improvements.</p> <p>If you would like to discuss the project with FTA in the future, please contact me directly.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. ODOT will coordinate with FTA regarding future projects on the Cascades route in Oregon. The selection of Alternative 1 will result in continued use of the Salem Station, and will not preclude use of the existing fleet of Talgo 8 trainsets in operation on the corridor. Since the publication of the DEIS, ODOT and WSDOT are in discussion regarding the retirement of the Talgo 6 trains currently part of the vehicle fleet.</p>
A-4	Russ Klassen Aquatic Resource Coordinator, Department of State Lands	<p>Department of State Lands comments: During project planning and development and prior to the beginning of construction wetlands and waterways should be delineated and evaluated. Impacts to waters of the state should be avoided and minimized as much as possible, especially any rare resources or resources with high functions and values. Mitigation should occur where impacts cannot be avoided.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Any physical improvements made to support future Project development will fully comply with applicable environmental review requirements, including the avoidance and minimization of resources to the extent practical.</p>
A-5	Sara Morrissey, Travel Oregon	<p>Comments from Travel Oregon:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Visitors expect reliable train service. We urge ODOT/Amtrak to invest in improvements that improve reliable and on-time service.</li> <li>2. We defer to ODOT and the local communities regarding the preferred alternative.</li> <li>3. We support all car-free travel alternatives for residents and travelers. We encourage continued investment in these transportation projects!</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Improved reliability was identified as a goal of the Project. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
A-6	Kirk Fredrickson, Passenger Rail Services Manager, WSDOT	<p>Comment from the Washington State Department of Transportation Rail, Freight, and Ports Division:</p> <p>WSDOT recommends that the DEIS include discussion of a potential passenger rail equipment maintenance facility in Eugene, Oregon. This facility could serve as a location where many of the various equipment maintenance activities that occur in Seattle could also be performed, providing more equipment maintenance options that are currently unavailable on the Amtrak Cascades route.</p> <p>This potential maintenance facility could also give the state of Oregon more flexibility developing train schedules between Portland and Eugene, support better on-time performance in Oregon, create more equipment maintenance jobs in Oregon, and give decision-makers more flexibility selecting types of passenger rail equipment that best meet the needs of the state.</p> <p>Kirk Fredrickson Passenger Rail Services Manager WSDOT Rail, Freight and Ports Division 310 Maple Park Ave SE, Box 47407 Olympia, WA 98504-7407 W: 360.705.7939 C: 360.890.9210</p>	Thank you for your comment. ODOT is working with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Amtrak on the construction of stub tracks or track configuration at the Eugene Station which would facilitate overnight storage, fueling, and light maintenance of the trains during layover time. While not incorporated into the Tier 1 DEIS Preferred Alternative, ODOT may further explore potential benefits and costs of an additional maintenance facility in the future.
A-7	Paul E. Thompson Program Manager, LCOG/Central Lane MPO Lane Council of Governments 859 Willamette, Suite 500 Eugene, OR 97401-2910 pthompson@lcog.org 541.682.4405	<p>Hello -</p> <p>I am reaching out on behalf of the Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Policy Board. The MPO Board is very interested in the Passenger Rail DEIS, having kept up to date on the process throughout its entirety, especially since a former member of the Board was Mayor Piercy, and the MPO area serves as the southern terminus.</p> <p>We have noted that there will be an Open House and Public Hearing on the DEIS on December 6th in Eugene. That very day also happens to be the regular monthly meeting date of the MPO Policy Board, gathering elected and appointed leaders, staff, interested parties, and</p>	Thank you for your comment. As a result, ODOT coordinated directly with you and the LCOG/Central Lane Council of Governments regarding presentations to your group. While the meeting on December 6, 2018 was canceled, ODOT expressed willingness to present to the MPO Board at a future meeting.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>others, from the cities of Eugene, Springfield, and Coburg, Lane County, Lane Transit District, and ODOT.</p> <p>The MPO Policy Board is wondering if it would be possible to schedule a presentation and discussion on the DEIS at the MPO meeting. The meeting is scheduled for 11:30 AM - 1:30 PM on December 6th in the Springfield Justice Center. The elected and appointed officials on the MPO Policy Board would very much appreciate the opportunity to engage with the DEIS staff in-depth at this meeting. It presents an excellent opportunity to engage, and the meeting is also broadcast live on public access TV and the internet (and available for replay), furthering the reach that this opportunity presents.</p> <p>Please let me know if this is possible, and, if so, how I can assist with any questions or arrangements.</p> <p>Paul</p>	
A-8	<p>Joe Recker Environmental Permits Coordinator TriMet Project Development and Permitting p: 503.962.2893 f: 503.962.2281</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>On behalf of TriMet I have a couple initial questions about the OPR project DEIS that I'm hoping you can clarify.</p> <p>1. Appendix B, Section 3.2.2 ROW Assumptions per Alignment – a 30' wide acquisition is assumed along the existing UPRR mainline, except central eastside where a ½ block is assumed. Do these assumptions require modifications to both an existing and proposed overcrossing at both SE Lafayette St and SE 14th to Gideon, respectively? Or is there enough room in the existing RR ROW to accommodate the additional passenger rail track? This is important because the second of those two bridges is currently being designed and intended for construction later this year. Are there anticipated ROW acquisition maps available?</p> <p>2. I didn't see any mention of the Southwest Corridor Light Rail Project which would extend from downtown Portland to Bridgeport Village in Tualatin, roughly in the I-5 corridor. The project has been adopted into the fiscally constrained RTP as of last month. Is that because it's not anticipated to impact inter-city travel along either alternative route in</p>	<p>1a. <i>[Do these assumptions require modifications to both an existing and proposed overcrossing at both SE Lafayette St and SE 14th to Gideon, respectively?]</i> For this Tier 1 EIS, the Project impacts were not focused on individual buildings and structures. General ROW cost estimates were applied for urban and rural land acquisitions. For the portion of the existing Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Alternative 1 alignment at the SE Lafayette St. and SE 14th to Gideon bridge locations, the additional 30' of ROW would overlap with bridges and many other structures adjacent to the existing UPRR ROW.</p> <p>1b. <i>[...is there enough room in the existing RR ROW to accommodate the additional passenger rail track?]</i> Additional design would be needed beyond the Tier 1 level to make this determination, and any improvements would need to be developed in coordination with UPRR</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>the Portland Metro area?</p> <p>I look forward to hearing back. Please feel free to give me a call to discuss further.</p> <p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>Joe Recker</p>	<p>and other affected parties.</p> <p>1c. <i>[Are there anticipated ROW acquisition maps available?]</i> The purpose of this Tier 1 EIS is to determine a recommended route, service, and general station locations; thus, no specific ROW acquisition maps were developed for the Tier 1 EIS. More detailed ROW impacts would be determined at later stages of project development.</p> <p>2. On p. 4-161 under the Cumulative Impacts Section 4.18.4, the DEIS identifies the SW Corridor LRT Project as a “reasonably foreseeable action.” The FEIS will further clarify that this project has been adopted in the fiscally constrained RTP (Section 4.18.4 has been updated).</p>
A-9	<p>Rob Inerfeld, AICP Transportation Planning Manager City of Eugene – Public Works Engineering 99 E. Broadway, Suite 400 desk: (541) 682-5343 cell: (541) 556-6124</p>	<p>Dear Jennifer,</p> <p>As you are aware, the City of Eugene has been actively engaged in the Oregon Passenger Rail Study since its inception. Providing frequent, more reliable and higher speed passenger rail in the Willamette Valley is an important tool in reducing the amount of intercity driving in our region. There are numerous City of Eugene polices that support better passenger rail along the Cascades corridor including Rail Policy #4 from the Eugene 2035 Transportation System Plan: “Support higher-speed and higher frequency passenger rail service and use of the historic Eugene Depot in downtown Eugene as a passenger rail station.”</p> <p>I am writing to express the City of Eugene’s strong support for Alternative 1 in the DEIS. Oregon has historically not invested large amounts of funding in passenger rail capital projects. We support Alternative 1 because it has the potential to be constructed incrementally over time, because it is more affordable to our state, has a more realistic chance of being implemented and promises to deliver real benefits to rail passengers.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment and thank you for your support of the Eugene Stub Tracks project. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>The City of Eugene of Eugene stands ready to help implement Alternative 1. We have worked with ODOT Rail and Amtrak to develop plans, environmental documentation and construction documents for the Eugene Depot, the southern terminus of the existing Cascades service and the proposed southern end of Alternative 1. This project is listed as #MM-23 in our TSP: "Improve passenger platform and construct new rail sidings to enhance passenger rail service and separate passenger rail from freight rail at the Eugene Depot."</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the City of Eugene's position on this important project.</p> <p>Rob</p>	
A-10	Georgia Edwards City Manager, City of Tangent	<p>These remarks are from the City Council. They do not feel high speed train will solve the issue of congestion on I-5. They feel money would be better spent on adding a lane on I-5. They are concerned that technology is changing so fast that this idea doesn't keep up with the new technology. If high speed train is to go forward, they feel the I-5, or alternative 2 makes more sense. They question how this will be paid for? How are they going to attract people to the train, as unless it is convenient people will not use it. They question how people are going to get to the train and then what do they do once they reach their designation, how will they get around? How will this be self sustaining? Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Regarding congestion on I-5, the Project would provide an enhanced intercity passenger rail option to driving on I-5 for many people to travel between Eugene, Albany, Salem, Oregon City, and Portland, but ODOT and FRA acknowledge that it would not measurably reduce congestion on I-5. Adding a lane on I-5 would not support the agreed upon Project Purpose and Need. While technology is changing, the Project would support operation of proven intercity passenger rail technology that FRA and ODOT anticipate will be available for use over the next 20 years and will be compatible with the technology used in other states. Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet performance attributes outlined in the goals and objectives and corresponding evaluation measures. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors. While no funding to</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			implement the Project has been secured, the Preferred Alternative could be implemented incrementally over time. Compared to Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative has stations located in the central core areas of Eugene, Albany, Salem, Oregon City, and Portland that are conveniently located to attract more people to use the service. The Preferred Alternative is compatible with regional and local transportation systems and plans for enhancing access and connections to the stations for people who walk, bicycle, use transit, and drive.
A-11	Alex Polikoff Director, Corvallis Rural Fire Protection District	I support Alternative 2 with the Albany Option. This plan is the most forward thinking in providing efficient rail service to the Willamette Valley and takes into account the population centers of Corvallis and Albany while minimizing disruption to existing services.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's performance attributes outlined in the goals and objectives. Alternative 1, like Alternative 2 with the Albany Option, would use the existing Albany Station. While Alternative 2 (including with the Albany Option) has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
O-1	Jon Nuxoll, AORTA	I very much endorse Alternative 1, as does AORTA - higher speed rail in much more feasible and realistic before we go for high speed rail, if ever.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
O-2	Donald Leap, AORTA	Verbal testimony:  My name is Donald Leap, L-E-A-P. I'm the Government Affairs Director for the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates. I've been obliquely involved and interested in this project for a long time. And I'm pleased to have this moment to make a couple of remarks. The preferred alternative continuing on the existing route of the Cascade service, owned by the Union Pacific Railroad is, I think, of particular importance, and we need to proceed on this as quickly, and	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>continuingly as quickly as possible. This route is well established. It services station stops that are known to the public. It is understood and it serves a wide portion of the Willamette Valley.</p> <p>There are other parts of the western Willamette Valley that may be perhaps better accessible through other means, and I think that we need to be just considering expanding our service at some point, and not trying to choose one or the other. The population growth and congestion on primarily I-5, but also 99E and 99W, has reached the point where we have to be providing alternative means, plural, of north/south transportation through the valley. And the ultimate development of the existing rail service that we have now, plus other service possibilities in the future, I think will begin to make this possible.</p> <p>The Governor has issued a budget which includes maintaining the service that we have now. This came out yesterday, I believe. And I think that it is fine, but we need to consider that there needs to be money in there for growth and expansion, and ways to be exploring expansion, not only to the south but also to the east. But for the time being, I know that this meeting here is to pick and support the choice of the line that runs essentially on the Union Pacific. And as a result, I wanted to, through my voice personally, and also it is the opinion of the board of directors and the membership of the Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates, AORTA, to maintain this service where it is now.</p> <p>Thank you very much. Brevity is the soul of wit.</p>	
O-3	J. Michael Morrison, Board of Directors, AORTA	Alternative 1 offers a reasonable and attainable path toward improved passenger rail transportation in the Willamette Valley. The ability to use existing center-city stations along with the economic development possibilities which these stations represent are among the most compelling features of Alternative 1. The Union Pacific right of way is mostly wide enough to permit adding a second track without extensive land acquisition costs. Longer term, if a dedicated high-speed corridor is someday achieved, the Union Pacific line will still be necessary to serve smaller, more closely spaced stations.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative which is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a potentially enhanced future rail network.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
O-4	Chris Hagerbaumer, Deputy Director Oregon Environmental Council 222 NW Davis Street, Suite 309   Portland, OR 97209-3900 503.222.1963 x102	<p>December 16, 2018</p> <p>Comments submitted by the Oregon Environmental Council regarding Oregon Passenger Rail DRAFT Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement Friends,</p> <p>Oregon Environmental Council (OEC) agrees with the conclusions of the Draft EIS. We support Alternative 1 as the preferred alternative for advancing Oregon’s passenger rail initiative.</p> <p>OEC has followed ODOT’s passenger rail program for many years and believes that robust passenger rail is an essential part of Oregon’s intercity transportation system. The preferred alternative appears to best address the need to improve train service in a reasonable, realistic and achievable manner.</p> <p>Climate change is no longer a theory: the ramifications are happening before our eyes. Transportation is a key contributor of greenhouse gas emissions, so it is imperative that Oregon put serious effort in providing viable alternatives to highway driving. Passenger rail in the Willamette Valley must be a part of that effort.</p> <p>We know from surveys, as well as actual ridership, that rail passengers want convenient and frequent trains, reliable service, and a travel time competitive with highway travel. Alternative 1 meets these criteria.</p> <p>OEC supports the preferred Alternative 1 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. By maintaining the current alignment on the UPRR and BNSF railroads, the improvements and additional trains will have little environmental impact. This is a rail corridor that has existed for 100 years with few current environmental consequences. We know that if passenger trains were to operate on a new alignment, the current alignment would still continue to exist as a corridor for freight rail.</li> <li>2. Alternative 1 preserves existing stations in Eugene, Albany, Salem, Oregon City and Portland. One of the advantages of passenger rail in Oregon is that stations are within city centers. Moving stations to 1-5 locations could exacerbate already challenging traffic problems. In the</li> </ol>	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>future, it is important for local transit systems to better incorporate the train stations into their schedules.</p> <p>3. The current alignment allows ODOT to add trains incrementally. It is obvious that the current schedule of trains, excluding buses, is hurting ridership. At least one round trip should be added as soon as feasible.</p> <p>In conclusion, OEC supports the conclusions of the DEIS and encourages ODOT to be more assertive in developing Oregon's passenger rail system</p>	
O-5	Betsy Boyd, Associate VP, Federal Affairs University of Oregon	<p>Greetings –</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of University of Oregon President Michael H. Schill to submit the university's comments about the DEIS on passenger rail service in Oregon. The comments are also being sent by regular mail.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. –Betsy</p>	Comments were received and are included below.
O-6	Michael H. Schill University of Oregon President and Professor of Law	<p>Dear Ms. Sellers,</p> <p>On behalf of the University of Oregon, I am writing to express the university's strong support for improved passenger rail service along the Cascadia corridor, especially between the Portland metropolitan area and the Eugene Springfield area. We applaud the planning now underway and support the track, signal, and communication improvements in Alternative 1.</p> <p>Passenger rail service through this corridor helps to connect the state's research universities in the southern Willamette Valley with our economic and population hubs in Portland-Vancouver, WA. Better passenger rail service will also support the success of the new Knight Campus for Accelerating Scientific Impact and the scientific innovations that will occur there. The UO's growing partnership with Oregon Health and Science University requires faster and more reliable access between Eugene and Portland for both researchers and</p>	Thank you for your comment. Improved reliability was identified as a goal of the Project. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>students. Passenger rail provides a vital mode of transportation to the UOs more than 30,000 students, faculty, and staff as well as many visitors.</p> <p>Passenger rail service has been important to the UO since our founding, but the designation of the Cascadia corridor in 1992 for high-speed rail and improved passenger rail service is an opportunity that must be realized. With more than 5,000 UO students from the Portland area and numerous graduate program offering at UO Portland, students, faculty, and visitors frequently travel to and from the Portland region to do business on campus or with UO affiliated companies and research institutions including OHSU and the new Knight Campus as well as the Oregon State University and Portland State University. The popularity of Amtrak service with the UO community is illustrated by the frequently used Amtrak bus service that originates on the UO campus as well as the ridership on the Cascades.</p> <p>The University of Oregon supports efforts to ensure reliable and frequent service along the designated high-speed rail corridor, even if the approach is incremental, with an ultimate goal of achieving high-speed service. The continued sharing of rail lines by freight and passenger rail leads to unpredictable delays that prove costly to riders and discourage passenger rail use. The preferred alternative will result in faster times, the construction of sidings, and plans to ease freight and passenger rail line competition. The improved passenger rail will provide an efficient, safe, equitable, and affordable travel alternative for UO affiliates and the greater Oregon community. It will support the efforts of research universities throughout the corridor to spur economic activity through our innovation and outreach efforts.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important development. Please let me know if I can provide any additional information that will be of help. We look forward to working with you as ODOT's passenger rail project moves forward.</p>	
O-7	David Aschenbrenner Chair	Will there be a sound or retaining wall along the stretch of Railroad Ave in Milwaukie?	Site-specific Project mitigation improvements (e.g., sound walls) were not identified in this

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
	Hector Campbell Neighborhood Assn. Milwaukie OR	<p>How much present north side right of way is needed and will it affect the present Railroad Ave. street layout? What will be the affect on the current Quiet Zone in Milwaukie? What are the impacts to the rail crossing at 37th Ave. in Milwaukie?</p> <p>Thank You David</p>	<p>DEIS; any future investments with federal funding would be developed and supported by additional NEPA review and in compliance with environmental permitting. The design criteria determined for the Project specified an average of 30 feet of ROW adjacent to the route. Effects on Railroad Avenue and the crossing at 37th Avenue would be determined through more detailed engineering and noise and vibration analysis. All passenger trains would adhere to established Quiet Zones.</p>
O-8	Garlynn Woodsong Land Use Chair Concordia Neighborhood Association	<p>These two alignments represent a huge missed opportunity. Oregon should be seeking to connect Portland to Salem, Corvallis, Eugene and the Rogue Valley via dedicated HSR tracks. The old Oregon Electric alignment represents one way to do so, but new alignments could also be created using condemnation. It would be a huge mistake to attempt to battle UP for control of their tracks, or to seek to place the alignment along the freeway. HSR should be seen as an economic development tool, and a way to help battle climate change by providing a realistic alternative to driving for as many trips as possible in this corridor. The current two alternatives will not maximize either opportunity, and represent a short-sighted attempt at compromise that will not meet our common goals for this corridor.</p> <p>Further, it's alarming that this process has taken so long to produce so little.</p>	<p>ODOT developed a high-speed rail concept vision as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC). The Rogue Valley is not within the PNWRC and outside the Project study area. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress, including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 can serve as an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a rail network. ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as a result of the increased travel time. However, this decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Future stations would be considered in accordance with the ODOT and WSDOT Station Stop Policy. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add stations beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.</p> <p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p>
I-1	Jim Adams	Alternative 1 sounds best	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-2	Douglas Allen	<p>Alternative 1 is the obvious choice due to cost-effectiveness, ability to scale and implement incrementally, and it doesn't leave a standard asset if we eventually build a true high speed rail in the Willamette Valley.</p> <p>Please add the following to the FEIS: What are costs and what is possible once we reach the 6+1 level? (In terms of even greater service)</p>	The EIS presents costs for the Preferred Alternative full buildout to "6+1" round trip passenger rail service, from capital costs (Table 3-11) and Operation and Maintenance costs.
I-125	Dr. Patrick Ardron-Hudson	I am writing to support the fastest option for rail transport between Portland and Eugene. Having lived in both places, fast rail is essential for our region's future. Having traveled more throughout the US and	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because it



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		Europe, efficient rail is needed to secure a future that is economical rich and ecological sound.	best balances the Project need and the environmental and social constraints.
I-3	Justus Armstrong	<p>One of the stated goals of the passenger rail project is to implement a cost- effective project, but so far Amtrak has been less than cost effective. In fact, in a 2017 legislative report on passenger rail and performance, ODOT reported that "The gap between revenue and cost continues to increase. It is likely the cost to operate the service will increase in the coming years."</p> <p>So based on ODOT's own testimony, it appears that Amtrak is becoming less cost effective, not more cost effective. Oregon has already been subsidizing each one-way Amtrak ride to the tune of about \$118. And the proposed passenger rail plan is likely to only raise these costs. Currently, ODOT pays Amtrak about \$17.75 million annually to support the existing service. In comparison, the EIS estimates that the recommended preferred alternative, Alternative 1, would cost around \$48 million in operations and maintenance costs. The EIS also admits that this is a conservative estimation based on the assumption that Amtrak payments will triple as the number of round-trips triples.</p> <p>The next stage for the EIS for this project should include more thorough data on actual cost effectivity, and specifically lay out how much Oregon taxpayers would be expected to provide per passenger rail rider under this plan. The ridership projections seem to be based on the hope that the population increase in the Willamette Valley will allow for a tripling of Amtrak ridership. But unless fare recovery is also significantly improved, ODOT may have to foot an even greater percentage of the annual bill for rail passengers.</p> <p>What Oregonians need more than costly rail projects are solutions to highway congestion. However, the EIS for the passenger rail project admits that neither build alternative would alleviate this problem. And that the potential reduction in the number of vehicles on I-5 between Eugene and Portland would not be significant enough to affect or improve congestion on I-5. In fact, the EIS states that the project may actually exacerbate congestion by increasing vehicle activity on</p>	<p>Intercity passenger rail is a fundamental component of Oregon's and the Pacific Northwest region's transportation infrastructure, is a component of state plans, and is compatible with state, regional, and local plans and policies. As with highways, rail requires public expenditures and subsidies to construct, operate, and maintain. In addition to providing a safe, reliable, and affordable intercity travel option for many people, including those without access to a personal vehicle, passenger rail provides direct and indirect benefits to the built and natural environment. While Amtrak Cascades intercity passenger rail ridership has fluctuated in recent years, Amtrak forecasts a substantial increase in future ridership that correlates with more frequent and reliable train service. Future work on Project development beyond the Tier 1 EIS will use the most relevant and current data available, including applicable costs and potential funding sources.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>surface streets near Amtrak stations. Spending this much money on a project that will not improve congestion is not what Oregon needs.</p> <p>Investing taxpayer resources in a project that would cost around a billion dollars to build and upwards of \$48 million dollars to operate and maintain, ODOT could plan on gradually increasing the frequency of thruway bus service over the next 20 years. The no-action alternative already includes plans to increase bus service between Eugene and Portland to seven round trips per day. So why not focus on further increasing bus service frequency rather than investing in what amounts to an exorbitantly priced mode shift. That way transportation service can be more flexibly adjusted to the actual demand of the Willamette Valley as the population increases without demanding the same level of capital investment and heavy subsidies that expanding passenger rail would require.</p>	
I-4	Bob Bailey	<p>Build for the future! Don't try to squeeze more rail traffic onto the freight system. Unplug passenger rail from the constraints of freight traffic which will only increase. Oregon will double population in 30 years, which means more freight traffic as well as more demand for passenger rail to move between cities in the corridor. Engineer the system, including connecting transit to get people to stations on I-5. So I am sure I will not live to see this built, but my kids and grand kids will.</p> <p>Not sure I agree with assumptions about ridership and service to central cities vs. new stations on I-5. People still have to drive or bus to the station.</p>	<p>FRA and ODOT concurred with using 2035 which is consistent with land use and transportation plans of the urban regions and smaller communities within the Project study area. These community plans support intercity passenger rail stations in the urban core areas that have relatively high concentrations of population, employment, and other services and attractions, plus existing and planned multimodal transportation networks and transit services connecting to the stations. The combination of these attributes in the urban cores contributes to higher forecast ridership for the Preferred Alternative compared to Alternative 2.</p>
I-5	Holly Balcom	<p>I like Alternative 2! I'd like further information on reliability as the current situation where freight takes priority makes it hard to plan on your train being on time.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors. Reliability is expected to increase with the improvements in infrastructure planned under Alternative 1.</p> <p>While freight rail service and operations have variable effects upon passenger rail reliability as measured by on-time performance, the host railroad for the existing route, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR), is obligated under federal law to accommodate and minimize disruption to Amtrak's scheduled service. That is, priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.</p>
I-6	David Ballard	<p>For the projected increase in ridership going forward, Alternative 2 disrupts too much infrastructure including farmland, and costs too much to implement.</p> <p>Under the existing rail system, the cost of transporting a family of three by Amtrak is prohibitive even compared to driving the family vehicle getting 15mpg.</p> <p>The cost is too great!</p>	<p>Intercity passenger rail is a fundamental component of Oregon's and the Pacific Northwest region's transportation infrastructure, and is compatible with state, regional and local plans and policies. As with highways, rail requires public expenditures and subsidies to construct, operate, and maintain. In addition to providing a safe, reliable, and affordable intercity travel option for many people, including those without access to a personal vehicle, passenger rail provides direct and indirect benefits to the built and natural environment.</p>
I-7	Chase Ballew	<p>Regarding the Oregon Passenger Rail DEIS, I'm somewhat disappointed not to see any obvious mention of joint operations with intercity and commuter rail as a strategic path forward. This was done quite successfully with the Point Defiance bypass, with commuter rail services implementing in phases that at full build-out also facilitate intercity rail. Given the congestion issues plaguing the Portland metropolitan area, and given the numerous rail-side towns along the valley, a joint phased approach would have seemed quite logical and cost-effective; installing additional tracks in Woodburn and Canby, for</p>	<p>This FRA and ODOT-led Tier 1 EIS focused on intercity passenger rail service with consideration of its contribution to the broader multimodal transportation system, but did not incorporate joint operations with other rail transit systems which would have required a formal agreement with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and would not have changed the FRA and ODOT recommendation</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>example, would be easy to justify if simultaneously installing commuter rail stations, and could open additional funding opportunities (e.g. FTA new starts). Similarly, I was disappointed not to see any real analysis of 'express' and 'local' services.</p> <p>Also, now that Washington is again studying HSR from Seattle to Portland, should HSR be added back into the Oregon study? The reason Oregon eliminated it from consideration was because it didn't match what Washington was planning, but if that's no longer a relevant concern, should that decision be revisited? Could Alternative 2 be designed to support HSR speeds and be easily upgraded?</p> <p>Further, I'm concerned that most of the improvements with Alternative 1 seem focused on train frequency, not speed, as the end-to-end travel time doesn't appear to change much. That's going to make it difficult to gather support for investment in the corridor. Finally, the lack of a Downtown Salem station on Alternative 2 is a serious flaw that should be revisited, as this significantly impacts ridership. Much like the Central Albany option, there needs to be an option for Alternative 2 to divert from I-5 into downtown Salem.</p>	<p>for intercity passenger rail service. Beyond this Tier 1 phase, ODOT will likely consider more formal integration of intercity passenger rail with other public transit systems in the State's future planning and Project development for enhanced intercity passenger rail service. Additional analysis of service variations, including consideration of express service with fewer stations served, could be explored in future planning and Project development. However, with a relatively short end-to-end route and six daily round-trips, efficiencies in service and cost from reducing the number of stops could be insignificant.</p> <p>Work beyond Tier 1 will also continue to integrate with Washington-supported service north of Portland, including any new service plans that Washington decision makers formally adopt.</p> <p>FRA and ODOT considered many variables and tradeoffs in reaching their decision on the Preferred Alternative, and the most reasonable alternative that would increase speed (Alternative 2) would result in more environmental impacts and substantially higher cost with lower ridership than the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Early in the planning process, FRA and ODOT explored a higher speed alignment with a connection to the downtown Salem station, but this concept was eliminated from further consideration due to impacts that were not acceptable to the Salem community, including impacts that would have disproportionately affected Environmental Justice populations.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-8	Reddit user: u/Reggie_Barclay	<p>From r/Eugene</p> <p>Trains on Pacific Coast are a joke. Ever try to book a train to Sacramento? 13 hours! 7 hours in a car. And it only leaves at 5pm, so you're in for an overnigher and need to find someone to pick you up at the crack of dawn the next day.</p> <p>2.5 hours to Portland is a bit more reasonable until a freight train makes you sit on the tracks for an hour while it passes...</p>	<p>The scope of the OPR Project was limited to the Oregon portion of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC), including the Amtrak Cascades service that operates between Eugene, Oregon, and Vancouver, BC. Oregon continues to monitor and work with the host freight railroad, Union Pacific, to minimize schedule disruption to Cascades trains from freight train operations.</p>
I-9	Larry Bardell	<p>I'm glad this finally being explored. There has long been a need for reducing traffic and improving safety on the congested I-5 corridor between Portland and Eugene. Additional rail service could help a great deal. How will it be determined if the cost/benefit ratio is sufficient to move forward?</p>	<p>With the selection of Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative, ODOT and FRA have the ability to create a phased program for the Project. As funds become available, ODOT will work with Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to increase service on the existing route.</p> <p>ODOT and FRA have prepared a Service Development Plan concurrently with the FEIS. The Service Development Plan addresses the question of phasing and the cost/benefit of the project.</p>
I-10	Beverly Barr	<p>I support Alternative 1 because I think it can be built sooner rather than later. I'm excited that passenger rail service can be improved in increments during the process - every bit keeps. I hope that the building process will result in improved relationships between passenger and freight service. We must be good friends!</p>	<p>Oregon supports sustained growth and success of both passenger and freight rail and continues to work with freight and passenger rail providers on mutually beneficial solutions.</p>
I-11	Bonny Barr	<p>I like the lower cost alternative, even though it would be nice to have a wider choice of stations/cities. As a Cascades rider, any and all improvements to efficiency and service are supported</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative would use the five existing stations served by the current Amtrak Cascades passenger rail service in Oregon, which are located in or near Central Business Districts. Alternative 2 would also use five stations and proposes multiple new station locations that would be located near I-5 and generally away from downtown city cores. In the Tier 1 EIS, potential new station locations are identified in general terms only to allow analysis of potential</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>impacts. Final decisions on any new stations and specific locations would be made in association with future Tier 2 studies. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add stations beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.</p> <p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and</p> <p><a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p>
I-12	Chris Bates	The OPR DEIS supports that Alternative 1 is the preferred social, environmental, and economical option.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-13	William Becherer	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I work in Eugene and I'm able to witness the outbound train and inbound train. The trains are virtually empty. To spend one Billion dollars on a system that is not working is pouring taxpayers money down the drain.</p> <p>I've done some research on the budgets of local mass transit and Amtrak as well. As tax payers, we aren't impressed as how our money is being spent.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, William</p>	<p>While Amtrak Cascades intercity passenger rail ridership has fluctuated in recent years, Amtrak forecasts a substantial increase in future ridership that correlates with more frequent and reliable train service. Intercity passenger rail is a fundamental component of Oregon's and the Pacific Northwest region's transportation infrastructure, and is compatible with state, regional, and local plans and policies. As with highways, rail requires public expenditures and subsidies to construct, operate and maintain. In addition to providing a safe, reliable, and affordable intercity travel option for many</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			people, including those without access to a personal vehicle, passenger rail provides direct and indirect benefits to the built and natural environment.
I-14	Chris Bell	<p>Lots of great study and evaluation to date.</p> <p>I ride and really love the train, as a commuter.</p> <p>However, I posit a few ideas for consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We should really consider whether or not this Alt 1 will really make the dent it supposedly will. With a shared freight line, it is hard to imagine it could really ever get much better.</li> <li>2. As such, if we are going to invest heavily, we should really be pushing for something that could make a difference, much like the Interstate, in transportation. When we evaluated the Interstate in the 1950s, we considered/tried to think about improving/changing Highway 99. The ideas were the same. Keep transportation in the communities and not pull them away. However, as we know, it would unlikely have done much for traffic, and the change as we see is amazing.</li> <li>3. If we are open to really high-speeds, and changing the patterns in a sense like the Interstate in people's living and commuting, we need to consider Alt 2. If we allow ourselves to be mired in the same route -- we won't really garner the ridership or speeds that would flip the script, as they say, on transportation choices.</li> </ol> <p>In sum, I really REALLY suggest we revisit our choice of the least change/low cost route. I recognize it is notable cheaper -- but if the outcome is relatively similar, than we have wasted a lot of money on something that hasn't done much to shift the paradigm. I recognize the more expensive route may not have the initial numbers to seemingly justify the expense. They talk about how the Interstate was a ghost town for many, many years after construction. But I don't think anyone would argue that is hasn't fulfilled its utility over time,</p>	<p>1. While more detailed engineering work is needed and will be conducted in future Project development, FRA and ODOT developed the Preferred Alternative to operate with more frequency, higher speed, and greater reliability than the existing Cascades service, and it will attract more riders as described in the DEIS. The operational analysis for the Preferred Alternative resulted in additional track infrastructure and technology enhancements to increase passenger rail reliability measured as on-time performance.</p> <p>2. While the level of investment and associated effect upon the transportation system as a whole is very modest compared to the Interstate highway system, the Preferred Alternative would attract substantially more riders and result in other social and economic benefits to the communities when compared to the No Action Alternative. The investment for Alternative 2 would be multiple times that needed for Alternative 1 and is forecast to attract fewer riders.</p> <p>3. FRA and ODOT carefully considered many factors and tradeoffs between the alternatives, and the Preferred Alternative would best meet the Project purpose and need, as well as goals and objectives.</p> <p>Advancing the Preferred Alternative would not preclude investment in a higher speed ground transportation service in the future. One benefit</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		and that is my feeling, as an historian, of a new route that allows for the current and future speeds that would make this form of transportation widely appealing. Such is my heartfelt appeal.	of the Preferred Alternative is that it would help foster a stronger market through a higher frequency and more reliable intercity passenger service. A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands ( <i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i> , ODOT, September 2014).
I-15	Megan Berry	I think we should definitely improve this railway! I am glad these options are being considered. I prefer Alternative 2 because it will result in faster service but I think both options are better than what we have now.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's performance attributes outlined in the goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-16	Aaron Blanton	My name is Aaron Blanton, I'm 27 and a business owner. I support option 2– building a dedicated Amtrak track. Having spent many of the past 5 years in the Northeast Corridor, I have to say that convenient rail travel is one of the only things the Northeast does substantially better than the Northwest, and I believe it has a significant positive impact not only on environmental friendliness, but also on business. I can say that whether Oregon dramatically improves its rail system will be a large factor on whether I ultimately bring my company back to the Pacific Northwest.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's performance attributes outlined in the goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-17	Timothy Blood	We need more frequent passenger train service between Eugene and Portland. The 9am weekday train Eugene to Portland was a good alternative to driving.	The Preferred Alternative would increase intercity passenger rail trips between Eugene and Portland. While a specific schedule would be developed in subsequent planning and Project



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			development, it is likely that one of the six daily Cascades trips would depart Eugene at a morning time that would provide access to a relatively large number of passengers.
I-18a	Nathan Bofto	<p>I'm so glad and relieved to see this finally out and moving. Oregon desperately needs some tangible, concrete plans now in order to secure federal funds and to keep Cascades service in Oregon moving. I haven't seen every page yet, but skipped ahead to what the actual plans are, and I'm wondering if some questions can be answered here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What speed increases will we see? I know 79mph is the max Union Pacific will allow in this area, but there are only stretches between Eugene and Albany where this takes place. Are there any other speed increases along the route?</li> <li>2. How much track will be added, and for what purpose? I've seen maps where track would be added, but is there a more detailed breakdown somewhere? I know more sidings, but roughly how long? Is there any double main sections of track?</li> <li>3. If funds can be secured and approved, when realistically would we see the project begin and how long would the duration be?</li> <li>4. How and when would additional equipment purchases be made? And from whom? Would more talgo sets be made? Or would ODOT look for another manufacturer like Siemens?</li> <li>5. Are there any talks or plans about ODOT or Amtrak adding any stations? For instance, a platform in Junction City and Canby would be great additions to get more ridership along the route without much investment in staffing or infrastructure.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for your time. I will be looking forward to the Eugene open house coming up! Nathan Bofto</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Operational analysis of the Preferred Alternative assumed a maximum speed of 79 mph, but proposed rail infrastructure upgrades incorporated into the Project would allow trains to travel faster than they currently travel throughout more of the route. The improvements would result in travel time reduction of 10 minutes or more between Eugene and Portland.</li> <li>2. DEIS Section 3.2.1, Rail Route Improvements, describes sections where new track would be added or where siding track would be upgraded to mainline track on the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) alignment. This would facilitate four more passenger rail round-trips per day while maintaining freight rail carrying capability between Eugene and Portland. Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, would include approximately 395,200 feet (74.8 miles) of new or upgraded track. More than 372,500 feet of this total length would be mainline track.</li> <li>3. ODOT and FRA do not have an anticipated schedule to initiate construction, but the Project is planned to be implemented within the next 15–20 years.</li> <li>4. Additional train equipment purchases would be dependent on available funding likely through State and Federal sources. ODOT and FRA have not determined what train equipment manufacturer would provide additional equipment.</li> </ol>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>5. The Preferred Alternative would use the five existing stations served by the current Amtrak Cascades passenger rail service in Oregon, which are located in or near Central Business Districts. Final decisions on any new stations and specific locations would be made in association with future Tier 2 studies. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add stations beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.</p> <p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p>
I-18b	Nathan Bofto	<p>Alternative 1 is the most tangible solution. Speed and reliability both have to be improved in order for ridership to truly grow. Too often there are 30-45 mph speed limits in towns like Jefferson, Woodburn, etc. that need to be improved. I would like to see bottlenecks south of Portland to Oregon City to be improved as well. We need more trains and higher speeds now. Thank you for all your work and I look forward to the future!</p>	<p>DEIS Section 3.2.1 Rail Route Improvements describes sections where new track would be added or where siding track would be upgraded to mainline track on the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) alignment. This would facilitate four more passenger rail round trips per day while maintaining freight rail carrying capability between Eugene and Portland. The Preferred Alternative would include approximately 75 miles of new or upgraded track. Two miles north of the Oregon City Station, Alternative 1 would add a new mainline track west of the existing</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>UPRR mainline. This new mainline track would shift over to the east of the UPRR mainline near Milwaukie and run north to the Steel Bridge in Portland, adding almost 12.5 miles of new mainline track in this area. Just east of where the UPRR mainline goes under SE 82nd Avenue as it leaves Clackamas, Alternative 1 would add a new crossover to facilitate access to the industries south of I-205. A connection to local industries south of Milwaukie would be connected to the new mainline. In Milwaukie, the new mainline track that started north of the Oregon City Station would turn north, continuing to parallel the existing mainline track, and travel under several existing bridges—the Springwater Trail, SE Tacoma Street, and Bybee Boulevard. The new mainline track would cross over Johnson Creek. Several new crossovers would be added in this area to facilitate movement in and out of existing industries and the UPRR Brooklyn Yard. The new mainline track would run along the east side of the UPRR Brooklyn Yard, crossing under Holgate Boulevard, and at the same time reconnecting to the existing industry tracks on the east. A new pair of crossovers would facilitate yard access and train positioning. The new main track would continue north toward central Portland, running on the east side of the existing UPRR mainline and ending just south of the Steel Bridge that crosses the Willamette River.</p> <p>In addition, ODOT through its State Rail Planning efforts, has worked with the railroads to identify areas for targeted investments to alleviate existing bottlenecks as funding becomes available. For state transportation plans, see</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx</a> .
I-19	Heather Bogaro	I support expansion of Amtrak service between Eugene and Portland. Increased commuter rail options make our area more attractive for economic growth. Mass transit is imperative in the battle against climate change. We are already behind the curve--lets do it!	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-20	Debra Borton	Please put a stop in at Oakridge. Many bicyclists travel here from Portland. Many locals need an avenue to ride to and from Oakridge and the valley	Thank you for your comment. Oakridge is beyond the Amtrak Cascades corridor and study area that is the focus of the Oregon Passenger Rail Project, but this comment has been shared with the Passenger Rail Program Manager and Amtrak.
I-21	Tab Boschetti	Stations closer to town centers (where it's more possible to walk places from the station) are far more practical and attractive than far-flung stations where you need a car, and then you might as well drive the long trip.	The Preferred Alternative would use the five existing stations served by the current Amtrak Cascades passenger rail service in Oregon, which are located in or near Central Business Districts.
I-22	Dana Botkin	<p>Good morning.</p> <p>I was excited at the beginning of your project that I would be able to ride up to Portland or down to Eugene by rail, until I learned you were just going to go from Eugene to Portland with no stops in between, with maybe a stop at Albany.</p> <p>To us who live in small communities along that corridor, is this is unacceptable. Why not introduce an interurban service that existed before the tracks were ripped up and the freeway built? If you had a stop in Halsey, even a whistle stop with rolling stock similar to the old galloping goose trains, more people would get out of their cars and use the train to go shopping or commute to work.</p> <p>I am a senior citizen in my late 70s and I no longer own a car. I have to walk or ride a bicycle wherever I go. Longer distances I have to hitch a ride with friends. I can't afford Uber nor do I want to use that service. But the train! Ahh, that would be nice but not if the nearest station will be in Eugene-Springfield!</p>	The Preferred Alternative includes stations in the central core areas of Eugene, Albany, Salem, Oregon City, and Portland. Final decisions on any new stations and specific locations would be made in association with future Tier 2 studies. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add stations beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>I cannot see why my idea is unfeasible. If we had left the infrastructure alone in the first place back in the 50s, we would be miles ahead today.</p> <p>Thank you for hearing me out.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Dana R. Botkin Brownsville, Oregon</p>	<p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p>
I-23	Christy Brekken	<p>Alternative 1 seems to be the most sensible plan, carrying more riders, having a lower impact in environmental footprint and dollars. I did not see a timeline for each alternative, but I suspect that Alternative 1 will be done sooner. With the short timeline to mitigate GHG emissions and get more cars off the road, sooner is better than later.</p> <p>However, if Alternative 2 is a stronger long-term investment considering opportunities to expand the network and if population density can be increased along the corridor, then it is a viable alternative also.</p> <p>No Action is not a viable alternative. Oregon needs this route.</p>	<p>The timeline for implementing the Preferred Alternative is contingent upon the commitment of sufficient funding to advance the Project beyond the Federal approval of the Tier 1 EIS. No additional funding to further develop the Project is currently available, but completion of this EIS is the first needed step toward positioning the Project for future funding.</p>
I-24	Frannie Brindle ODOT Area Manager ODOT	<p>The passenger train should include compartments for bicycles to be stored so that passengers can roll on and roll their bicycles off of the train to use to ride to their destination from their departure city.</p>	<p>The existing Amtrak Cascades intercity passenger rail service accommodates bicycles, and ODOT plans to continue this service.</p>
I-25a	Debra Brush	<p>What about connectivity? - To neighboring cities (from Albany, and to adequate parking (Albany)</p> <p>What about crossings in the small towns between Albany and Eugene? - Tangent Dr and 99 E, Tangent is a main connector between Lebanon and Corvallis and is also an important farm equipment road to serve farms on east and west sides of 99E. - More importantly - fire department is on east side of the railroad/99 E and must have ingress/egress at all crossings in Tangent!</p>	<p>ODOT is committed to working with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), cities, and local transit providers in the Project area to support enhanced transit connections to intercity passenger rail.</p> <p>ODOT made several assumptions about road crossings in areas where track improvements would be made: 1) No new at-grade road crossings or grade separation of existing</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>at-grade road crossings would be constructed; 2) If an existing crossing has lights and gates, it would be upgraded to include lights and gates to accommodate the additional track; 3) If an existing crossing does not have lights and gates, the recommendation to upgrade, close, or retain the crossing was primarily based on the roadway type and use; and 4) In locations with an existing grade separation (the road goes over or under the railroad), the grade separation would be retained and modified as needed.</p> <p>ODOT and the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) are not proposing to close any crossings under this Tier 1 NEPA process but could decide to close some crossings during future Tier 2 Federal environmental review processes. ORS 824.206 - Alteration or Closure of Existing Grade Crossing, provides ODOT the authority to close crossings as needed for public safety, necessity, convenience and general welfare.</p> <p>ODOT is preparing a Service Development Plan that will be completed concurrently with the FEIS. The SDP will provide more information about station access and parking needs to be addressed in Tier 2 Project development work.</p>
I-25b	Debra Brush Tangent, OR	<p>Dear Ms. Pearson,</p> <p>I understand that the window is closed for public comment on the DEIS. Nevertheless, I will offer my comment for ODOT's consideration. Who knows, perhaps another window for public comment may open!</p> <p>Since this entire project is tantamount to shooting for the sky, I propose ODOT SERIOUSLY consider the practicality and needfulness of including a pedestrian/bicycle pathway along the entire line from Eugene/Springfield to Portland with exits at every currently existing crossing.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This Tier 1 Project, including the Project Purpose stated on p. 1-9 of the DEIS (see Appendix A), is focused on Intercity Passenger Rail and determining the optimal route location, service type and frequency, and general station areas. Oregon has a statewide Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, including an Advisory Committee, <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/odot/programs/pages/bikeped.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/odot/programs/pages/bikeped.aspx</a>, and it may be beneficial to offer your suggestion through this group.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>I can see how the pathway could open doors for increased commerce and connectivity of the small communities along the entire line, which would be served well by such a pathway, not to mention the potential of attracting tourists. What an epic ride: by rail, bicycle, on foot.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted,</p> <p>Debra Brush</p>	
I-26	Ray Bryan	<p>Comment routed from commenter to City of Milwaukie staff and forwarded to ODOT:</p> <p>From: Ray Bryan &lt;<a href="mailto:ray1bryan2@gmail.com">ray1bryan2@gmail.com</a>&gt;  Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 9:31 PM  To: Ann Ober &lt;<a href="mailto:OberA@milwaukieoregon.gov">OberA@milwaukieoregon.gov</a>&gt;  Cc: Lisa Batey &lt;<a href="mailto:lisabatey@msn.com">lisabatey@msn.com</a>&gt;  Subject: Two Tracks</p> <p>Hi Ann,</p> <p>Thank you for coming to the NDA leadership meeting tonight. As Lisa mentioned this issue has been quiet for a few years but it is still moving forward. I have attached a flyer from our November 2018 meeting. I reached out to Russ Stoll who briefed us on higher speed rail several months ago. He is the one who informed me that double tracks through Milwaukie were included in the preferred alternative.</p> <p>I spent some time tonight rummaging through the DEIS, which is very detailed. I am very sure that alternative 1 is the preferred alternative. I copied the words below from the DEIS. This really all the time I have tonight. I you need any further information please let me know.</p> <p>I would like to know if you can confirm that 2 tracks through Milwaukie is included in the preferred alternative. It seems</p>	<p>The original response to comment provided via email in February 2019, is refined as below:  Thank you for your comment. The DEIS evaluates a range of improvements that would support additional passenger traffic.</p> <p>Alternative 1 includes two main tracks through Milwaukie, all the way to the present south end of Clackamas siding. This improvement has been identified for the past 15 years as one of the desired Portland Triangle bottleneck solutions. Several of the desired projects identified in the capacity study have been brought to fruition but not this one. The second main track could be built south from Willsburg Jct. to Clackamas, and that will make just over 11 miles of two main tracks from East Portland southward. From the description below it sounds like someone was contemplating a third main track in the vicinity of Brooklyn yard, as the narrative describes adding a new main track east of the yard. There already are two main tracks between East Portland and Willsburg Jct.</p> <p>For decades there was a second track in Milwaukie, a siding 5,473 feet long on the north side of the main track that began just northwest of Oak Street and extended southeasterly along Railroad Avenue, ending before reaching the Harmony Road crossing. That portion of the</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>very relevant considering the current single track's proximity to our public safety building and at least two opportunity sites identified in the moving forward process.</p> <p>Thank you, Ray</p>	<p>ROW that used to be occupied by the siding could host the second main track when built.</p> <p>Note that this is a Tier 1 DEIS, and Tier 2 environmental reviews would evaluate more detailed, site-specific proposals implementing the Preferred Alternative selected in the Tier 1 EIS. Coordination with the host railroad will be required.</p>
I-27	Ted Buehler	<p>I support alternative 1.</p> <p>Please prioritize the addition of new train equipment and basic track improvements to bring us up to three round trips per day and to allow for enough trains for a Eugene to Vancouver BC through train.</p> <p>Please add additional bicycle storage on new train equipment.</p> <p>Thanks for advancing passenger rail in Oregon. I prefer riding the train over driving, but often it doesn't work with my schedule. So run more trains!</p>	<p>ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains while also exploring ways to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p>
I-28	Janet Calvert	<p>Train is the preferred mode of transportation as my husband and I visit our Seattle sons and Portland son. If the train ran more frequently, we would increase our ridership. Although I would favor building a separate line for passenger trains, the cost at this time is prohibitive. Improving and existing line AND adding more departure and return trips would be a great leap forward. IS there a way to reduce the number of times the passenger train must pull over to accommodate freight? Is there a way to finance a new route along I5 without taking it to the legislature? That should be the goal.,</p>	<p>Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established Federal law. The incremental improvements planned to increase the roundtrips would help reduce the freight train interference. A new route along I-5 would need to be planned and developed as part of a separate future project and would require State government approval that includes support from the Legislature.</p>
I-29	Jeramy Card	<p>Full Disclosure – I'm a transit planner with LTD in Eugene. My feeling is that Alternative 2 is a far better option than the "preferred"</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>alternative for a variety of reasons. Primarily, the idea of induced demand and exclusivity. In the same way that we “improve” highways by adding lanes, you simply make a busy highway even busier by inviting more users to utilize it. The same would happen with freight. If you make improvements to the existing line, via speed, crossing, etc., freight will opt to increase its own traffic and passenger rail is back to sharing an even busier line with more traffic. A new line, exclusive to “passenger only” rail, is far preferred over mixed use or shared rail. Here in Eugene, our BRT ridership continues to grow – not because it’s prettier – but because we have exclusivity in our BRT lanes, even with our BAT lanes. These exclusive lanes, with farther stop spacing, out of mixed traffic, allow high frequency as needed for demand. This same exclusivity allows us to add more frequency at the same speed. It seems to me that it would be the same with rail. You’re only as fast as the slowest freight line in a mixed use situation. I’ve watched many an Amtrak leave Eugene, only to stop ½ mile down the track to wait for a freight line SLOWLY move through town. Having an exclusive and faster passenger only line would allow for more frequency and faster service in the future. I also have some doubts regarding your minimal 18 minutes of travel saving between the two options for the above reasons. I don’t use rail now because the schedule is inconvenient and it is painfully slow and expensive. People will pay a premium for faster service – I know I would. Yes, it’s expensive – but a worthy investment.</p>	<p>Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors. The proposed rail infrastructure improvements incorporated into the Preferred Alternative are needed to accommodate the proposed increased number of intercity passenger trains, and the operational analysis that informed the Project also factored an increased number of freight trains based on regional economic and commodity flow forecasts.</p>
I-30	Les Castle	<p>Not having to share with freight traffic.</p> <p>A fast track.</p> <p>Someday a super fast train (preferably up the middle of I-5 at 200mph so all the cars can see).</p> <p>If Alternative 1, make sure we have priority over freight.</p>	<p>Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.</p>
I-31	Julie Chapman	<p>It would be great to have half-hourly trains traveling north and south, allowing for more flexible transportation/commuting up and down the I-5 corridor.</p>	<p>With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include with further study, incremental improvements of</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			service on the existing route and the ability to add frequency.
I-32	Richard E Chizinski	<p>I regularly ride Amtrak between Eugene and points north. Two-four roundtrips per year.</p> <p>I support Alternative 1. Track capacity improvements would improve reliability of both passenger and freight trains.</p> <p>My preference is for addition of another round trip, perhaps additional trips as ridership grows.</p> <p>Reduced travel time would be a plus, but current travel time is acceptable to me.</p>	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.
I-33	Nick Christensen	<p>If HSR doesn't provide access to downtown Salem, don't even bother. We need to address congestion on the Boone Bridge and that won't happen by building a HSR station in East Salem (Alt 2).</p> <p>The Portland Eastside tunnel is not ambitious enough. Given all of the congestion because of the rail lines at SE 12th and Division, grade separation there should also be a priority.</p> <p>I think this proposal is not ambitious enough. Oregon should be aspiring for 90-minute one-way trips from Portland to Eugene.</p>	The Preferred Alternative does not include grade separation of the frequently congested SE Division/SE 12th Avenue intersection because the purpose and scope of that action would be primarily oriented to travel on the surface streets with secondary benefit to intercity passenger rail which (along with freight rail and light rail) has priority for movement through that intersection.
I-34	Bill Clingman	<p>I favor Alternative 1, but with two additional features:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. extend the route to Springfield, while still including Eugene Station</li> <li>2. facilitate an arrangement between TriMet, LTD, and other transit districts to honor each other's bus passes on days when the bus rider has taken the train, or is between train trips taken within the same week, and has Amtrak ticket receipts to prove it.</li> </ol>	1. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add stations beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Policy.  <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and  <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p> <p>2. Your suggestion on fare-sharing has been provided to ODOT Rail Division. ODOT can explore this concept with local transit districts.</p>
I-35	Eliot Cole	<p>As someone who often travels between Portland and Eugene and who does not own a car, I cannot stress enough how much a new rail line is needed between the closely connected communities. I generally take the bus between the two cities because my experience with the train in the past has been that it is incredibly slow, over-priced, unreliable and does not run often enough. Building a new, modern, affordable rail link would be a life line for people throughout the Willamette Valley and provide a viable faster and cleaner alternative to car/bus travel on the congested I-5 corridor. An electric high-speed rail line that wouldn't have to compete with freight traffic could even provide a convenient and less polluting alternative to air travel when extended along the entire route to Vancouver, BC. I fully support the Cascadia HSR corridor concept because it would greatly improve mobility, making the trip faster, greener and more pleasant while bringing the entire region even closer together.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a rail network. A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment, the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014).</p> <p>Early in the OPR Project, the screening process, conducted in winter 2012 through spring 2013, assessed a range of corridor concepts identified during the scoping period against elements of the OPR Project’s Purpose and Need statement. Corridor concepts were assessed using nine screening criteria and best available data. Concepts were eliminated if they did not pass screening using one or more of these criteria. Corridor concepts, including alignments and potential station locations, that passed the screening were subsequently developed into preliminary alternatives; corridor concepts that</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			failed the screening process were eliminated from further consideration. Based on this screening process, all of the partial corridor concepts and the Cascadia HSR corridor concept were eliminated from further study as part of the Tier 1 EIS process.
I-36	Heidi Coleman, RN, Legacy Health	I lived in Salem and commuted to NW Portland for one year using Amtrak. I appreciated the comfortable seating, free wi-fi, kind staff and reduction of environmental impact. However, I had to stop using Amtrak as the delays became increasingly worse. When commuting home, it could take anywhere from 1 to 2 additional hours due to stops and slow downs in response to passing freight trains. Also, I was unable to attend morning meetings at work as the train arrived at 0800 in Portland leaving me with a 20 to 30 minute walk to my office. The commute times were not accommodating for my work schedule and forced me to move closer to Portland. I am now commuting in one of the busiest areas of I-5. If I had better commuting options I would move back to Salem and take advantage of rail services. Please improve rail services through alternative 1 so that people can reduce environmental impacts, improve community health and increase economic growth through reduced car commuting. Thank you for your consideration, Heidi Coleman, RN	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route.
I-37	Matthew Conner 113 Southwind Cir. St. Augustine, FL 32080	Dear Matthew Garrett,  You should announce to have the new high-speed Amtrak Siemens jet-powered single level passenger trains coming and in out of Eugene station because the future is coming. Siemens jet-powered single level passenger trainsets would be the only technology to be used. The only train would be the Pacific Northwest Express. This state-of-the-art high-speed rail network would link Vancouver. The Pacific Northwest Corridor or the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC) is one of eleven federally designated high-speed rail corridors in the United States. The 466-mile (750) km corridor extends from Eugene,	Thank you for your comment. As additional trainsets are required, ODOT will consider different types and makers of equipment. Section 3.2.5 of the EIS discusses the potential types of passenger train technology considered for the Oregon service as part of this analysis.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Oregon to Vancouver, British Columbia via Portland, Oregon and Seattle, Washington. It was designated a high-speed rail on October 20, 1992, as the fifth of five corridors called for in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA). The corridor is owned by BNSF Railway in Washington and British Columbia, and by Union Pacific Railroad (UP) in Oregon, and is used by a mix of freight and passenger trains operated by BNSF, UP, and Amtrak. If improvements to the corridor are completed as proposed in Washington State's long-range plan, passenger trains operating at a maximum speed of 110 miles per hour (180 km/h) would travel between Portland and Seattle, in 2 hours and 30 minutes, and between Seattle and Vancouver in 2 hours and 37 minutes by 2023. The Pacific Northwest Corridor is a proposed railway that would run from Eugene, Oregon to Vancouver, British Columbia and connect those cities along with Salem/Portland, Vancouver WA/Olympia/Tacoma/Seattle/Everett, and Bellingham, Washington. But I will mail this to you and let me know about it.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matthew Conner</p> <p><i>[Note: Comment included map and image of Siemens train. These pages are included in the record of original comments.]</i></p>	
I-196	Philip Constant	<p>If ridership projections hold a replacement station in Salem would be necessary; the 12th street station could not handle the increase in vehicle traffic. I like the added stations in both alternatives and could support either A1 or A2 going forward.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route. With the forecast increase in ridership and associated increase in passenger boardings and</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			demand for access to the station in Salem and other cities along the propose route, additional planning in coordination with the City of Salem (and other cities with stations) will be needed as part of the Project planning and development beyond the current Tier 1 EIS stage.
I-38	Isaiah Cornutt	I believe that rail is a very good investment for our area. I've lived in Germany and see the difference is their rail travel and ours is astounding. The Willamette Valley is supposed to grow a lot within the coming decades and more people will travel between cities. Improving the rail network will make people more likely to take that option instead of driving themselves.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-39	David Crout	I prefer Alternative 1. A service planning and market analysis should be undertaken to determine optimum frequency and span that can improve ridership in the corridor. Additional stations may help as well.	The Tier 1 EIS is being completed as the major component of the FRA and ODOT-led Oregon Passenger Rail Corridor Investment Plan. A Service Development Plan will also be completed to determine the incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative including scheduling additional intercity passenger rail trains to support optimal ridership. ODOT and WSDOT published a station stop policy that addresses the process for adding stops on existing routes. <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a>
I-40	Peter Dane	Verbal testimony:  Looking at the maps and reading the official commentary, Alternative 1 seems more practical for the next few years. But as population and infrastructure increases, Alternative 2 might be more practical in the future. Also there was talk about a freight junction at Brooks, and that would help facilitate the shipping of agriculture products to Seattle, because Portland harbor and rail lines are too congested. So they	Alternative 1, the Preferred Alternative, is recommended to be implemented for service over the next 15-20years. The Preferred Alternative would not preclude future planning and development of high-speed rail. As travel demand warrants, potential funding could be

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		might consider Brooks as an alternative rail/shipping location. And as for Alternative 1 going through Salem, there's a safety factor. And those are my comments.	secured for a new dedicated alignment that could support high-speed rail.  The Tier 1 EIS considered projects, including freight rail infrastructure investments, that have funding committed to implement. These projects were listed in ODOT's 2015-2018 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP; ODOT, 2017). A freight junction at Brooks may be planned, but does not have funding committed to implement it.  The Preferred Alternative will include safety enhancements in Salem and throughout the Project alignment. Safety enhancements include upgrading crossings where people who walk, bicycle, drive, or use transit must cross the rail line.
I-41	Jerod Davidson	Alternative 2 looks like the easiest and best way to increase ridership. The money will to be invested in this and in widening I-5 to accommodate more and more people. This will also be perfect if Portland truly does get a MLB team, look at what happened with Caltrain in San Francisco after the Giants setup their stadium.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-42	Ron Davis	I support this. I cannot fly and driving is tough. Rail is the right option for me and I would be thrilled with additional Eugene Portland service. I'm Moving to Eugene within 6 months. THANKS!!!	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-43	Steve Dickey	Although Alternative 2 is intriguing, based on the ridership to cost ratio and only gaining 18 minutes, Alternative 1 seems to be the better choice. It also has the advantage of being phased, which potentially could start bringing benefit sooner.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-44	Victor Dodier	The preferred alternative selected by ODOT and FRA is a sound basis for improvements going forward. It is feasible and cost effective.  Alternative 2, while providing a newly publicly owned alignment, is	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>simply too expensive.</p> <p>Let's move forward with Alternative 1 to improve passenger rail service.</p>	
I-45	Sarah Douglas	<p>I am supporting Alternative 1 because of overall lower cost and maintenance of existing stations. I am very sorry that this alternative will NOT provide higher speed train service. I simply do not understand why the Willamette Valley could not develop a high speed "bullet" train such as are available in Japan and Europe. Why all the investment in driver-less cars when we should be developing mass transit? I-5 is going to be totally jammed in just a few years!</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a rail network.</p>
I-46	Joseph Edge	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corvallis should be included on the final alternative. Corvallis is too important to bypass.</li> <li>2. To the degree it may be significant in the final EIS, the I-205 alignment should contemplate a multimodal transportation corridor that includes intercity passenger rail, space for double track light rail, a bicycle/pedestrian path, and not more than six general purpose motor vehicle highway lanes (three in each direction) between Oregon City and Wilsonville/Tualatin, consistent with regional plans.</li> <li>3. Serving central cities is important and valuable, but seeding the infrastructure needed for eventual high speed rail operations is critically important with the coming migrations likely to occur as a result of climate change related impacts in other regions. Alternative 2 should be selected as the preferred alternative.</li> <li>4. Station areas outside central cities should be planned and zoned to facilitate development of pedestrian oriented neighborhoods that can benefit from serving rail passengers who will be arriving without their own private motor vehicles.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the OPR decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.</li> <li>2. Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative, and unlike Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative alignment does not follow I-205.</li> <li>3. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route and could support future high-speed rail, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular,</li> </ol>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		5. Stations should be well connected to cities' public transit and active transportation networks.	<p>environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>4 and 5. The Preferred Alternative would use the five existing stations served by the current Amtrak Cascades passenger rail service in Oregon; they are located in or near Central Business Districts and are well connected to cities' public transit and active transportation networks.</p>
I-47	Georgia Edwards	<p>The I-5 alternative seems to solve the most issues, though it is more expensive. It would have been nice to have a question and answer period during the presentation. Questions I have include, how do you get the ridership numbers? How do you attract people to ride the rails? How do you plan to do the spots where buildings are close to the tracks? How will you get more trains on the same tracks, or will you build more? If you build more, what will you do with at grade crossings? Will you close any crossings. How do you get accurate cost estimates if you haven't evaluated how much impact going on the same route will have on cities and towns in the area? In our city we have three main crossings. Two of which have the fire department on one side of the highway,; so it is important to be able to keep these area's open for fire and life safety. How will people get from the train to their final designation?</p>	<p>Amtrak forecasted ridership for the project. In their forecast, Amtrak used the service characteristics (e.g., number of trains per day, stations served) outlined in Chapter 3 of the EIS (see Sections 3.1.4 and 3.2.4, and additional narrative in Section 4.2.5.1).</p> <p>Ridership is expected to increase as more service (trips) is added, the reliability increases, and the travel time is shortened.</p> <p>The design of the improvements is preliminary and conceptual at this stage. Throughout the corridor, new tracks and associated track infrastructure will be required; Alternative 1 would include strategic improvements in areas with bottlenecks or known deficiencies. In areas where buildings are close to the existing tracks, ODOT will consider if rail related improvements in those locations are needed, and if there are no avoidance options, then the buildings would be acquired as per the Uniform Act.</p> <p>Any future design and Project development would require better definition and additional analysis of Project impacts and the development of specific mitigation measures. The analyses would consider avoidance and minimization of impacts on sensitive environmental resources,</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			the built environment, and factors including provision of emergency services.
I-48	Lou Favreau	<i>Note: Comment form was blank; Mr. Favreau reported that he heard about the open house and public hearing from a friend.</i>	Thank you for participating in the public hearing for the Project.
I-49	James Feldmann	<p>Table ES-1, Goal 1: Include comparison of on-time performance. Alt 1 &amp; 2 have a shorter trip time, but the equally, if not more important, measure is the presumed improvement for on-time performance/reliability. The \$1B-5B cost should reflect the significant improvements to reliability, which is key to improving passenger rail mobility, especially when considering that the alternative (driving) has increasingly variable travel times (low on-time performance/reliability). Driving from Portland-Eugene may have a shorter trip time now, but reliability continues to decline--something that Alt 1 &amp; 2 avoids.</p> <p>Table ES-1, Goal 1: Include trips per day--another important consideration for improved passenger rail mobility/accessibility. Page 3-1 indicates Alt 1 &amp; 2 both have 6+1 trips/day.</p> <p>Table ES-1, Goal 3: Include net cost/benefits, not just capital cost (positives, not just negatives). For example, the action alternatives include running fewer buses, which lowers expenses. Traffic congestion also has a cost. Include the savings of shorter trip times and arriving sooner under each action alternative.</p> <p>3.2.3 (page 3-23): Document doesn't clearly explain why Alternative 2 is limited to 6+1 trips/day. Given the amount of new track without freight conflicts, it would appear that the max trips/day would be higher for Alternative 2.</p>	<p>Reliability is discussed in Section 4.2.5.1 of the DEIS; reliability would be expected to improve under either Build Alternative, and would reasonably be expected to be better on Alternative 2 between Springfield and Oregon City (north of Oregon City, Alternative 2 would follow the same alignment as Alternative 2).</p> <p>The scoping process assumed that each corridor concept would operate six daily passenger rail round trips between Eugene/Springfield and Portland, Oregon, which would make the Oregon service consistent with Washington's current service between Portland and Seattle. The commenter is correct, it is possible that additional trips on the planned Alternative 2 infrastructure could be accommodated. These would require additional equipment investments (more trains) and an increased investment in operations and maintenance.</p> <p>A full cost-benefit analysis was not developed for this Tier 1 EIS. ODOT and FRA have prepared a Service Development Plan concurrently with the FEIS. The Service Development Plan addresses the cost/benefit of the project.</p>
I-50	Gary Ferrington	I prefer alternative 1 that keeps stations central to the cities served. Saving a few minutes with alternative 2 is not cost effective and I believe fewer people would use it.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-51	Brynn FitzClemen	With either train service improvement, I would like to see access to Corvallis. I am currently a commuting student from Eugene and will likely continue to do so for the next 5-6 years. Train service would	ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		allow students from other areas to access Oregon State University and reduce parking and traffic issues.	travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the Tier 1 decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.
I-52	Glenda Fleming	<p>I appreciate the effort ODOT has put into this project, and for making the draft EIS, alternatives, maps, and comparison charts available online. The information was clear and easily understandable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please continue to include the Albany station in the plan.</li> <li>2. I agree that Alternative 1 would provide the most impact for the least cost and environmental damage.</li> <li>3. My concern is that continuing to share the rails with freight will continue to cause trains to run late, discouraging riders. Has ODOT considered ways to mitigate this problem? (Even if not, I still support Alternative 1 because it seems more likely to be implemented and would impact the environment less severely.)</li> </ol> <p>Thank you again,</p> <p>Glenda</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative and includes plans to service the five stations currently on the Amtrak Cascades route (Eugene, Albany, Salem, Oregon City and Portland). One of the objectives of this Project is to improve reliability of the passenger service. Reliability will be improved when rail infrastructure is added to the system, removing bottlenecks, conflicts with freight rail traffic and reducing the potential for delay. While more detailed engineering work is needed and will be conducted in future project development, FRA and ODOT developed the Preferred Alternative to operate with more frequency, higher speed, and greater reliability than the existing Cascades service; these improvements will attract more riders as described in the DEIS. The Preferred Alternative would share track with freight trains, and the operational analysis resulted in additional track and technology enhancements to increase passenger rail reliability measured as on-time performance.</p>
I-53	Reddit user: u/Flyer770	<p>From r/Eugene</p> <p>The Alternate Two route is the old Oregon Electric, now operated by the Portland and Western. They don't have nearly the traffic levels that the Union Pacific has and would appreciate the upgrades to their line. They also have an agreement with Trimet to allow commute rail service into Portland, so it wouldn't be much of a stretch for them. The UP would also like to get Amtrak off their lines as well.</p>	<p>Only a portion of the Alternative 2 alignment—between Keizer and Wilsonville—would use the former Oregon Electric line. The agreement between PNWR and TriMet covers the portion of PNWR that TriMet's Westside Express Service (WES) commuter rail service operates upon—between Wilsonville and Tigard (WES trains begin and end their runs at the Beaverton</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			Transit Center). Alternative 2 would require a new operating agreement with associated financial commitments between ODOT and PNWR.
I-54	Gerald Fox	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this important study.</p> <p>Firstly I have been very disappointed in how long (10 years?) this issue has been studied, and such cost (10 million?). Washington State was able to do their studies in a couple years, and are now well along with implementing it. A lot of the time and budget was spent studying impractical options that suggests very poor scoping at the start of your work.</p> <p>Fortunately the DEIS recommends the only practical solution for upgrading passenger service by working with Union Pacific to incrementally upgrade their railroad to increase capacity and provide paths for more passenger trains.</p> <p>This is the only way to "grow the business" which is the only way to reach a point where further improvements in passenger rail will ever become feasible.</p> <p>The north end of Alternative 2 is really weird. It makes no sense to build a new passenger rail line where curvature restricts speed to about 80 mph, and is out of direction to boot. Fortunately you are recommending against this foolish concept.</p> <p>There are some important ideas which have far reaching consequences:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Work with UP to upgrade their line incrementally as funds become available, to increase capacity and speed for passenger and freight. This is already in process in Washington State. A long term prospect is that a new high speed rail line may be built that will remove many passenger trains from UP, leaving UP with an upgraded line, to their great benefit.</li> </ol>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p> <p>The EIS process was developed to take a wide, careful look at options, from scoping to alternatives development, to the identification of the Preferred Alternative in the DEIS. ODOT and FRA have worked diligently to develop a path forward that will allow the state to make phased investments in passenger rail, subject to funding availability.</p> <p>Chapter 6 of the DEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.</p> <p>Regarding the three numbered points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ODOT, through its State Rail Planning efforts, has worked with the railroads to identify areas for targeted investments to alleviate existing bottlenecks as funding becomes available. For state transportation plans, see <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx</a></li> <li>2. Prosper Portland, in partnership with ODOT, is proposing to modernize Portland's Union Station to meet current code standards, as well as to meet future (year 2035) passenger rail demand based on the Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) Long Range Plan for</li> </ol>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>2. The DEIS recommends Union Station continues as Portland's main rail station. There have been suggestions to move this station function to their Airport, or the Rose Quarter, which in my opinion are seriously flawed. Why build a rail line that could get to Seattle in 1.5 hours, and impose a transfer and a half hour ride to downtown. Not to mention the cost and impracticality of phasing this into the existing operation. Union Station is in exactly the right place, and serious planning is needed to make sure that by the time it needs to expand, not all the space is consumed by high rises. Regrettably the DEIS does not look at future Union Station needs. For instance, there probably needs to be a large passenger concourse above the tracks, with elevators and escalators to each platform. There probably needs to be an alternative access to the station from Naito Blvd, for auto and taxi access. Connection in the concourse. Etc. This is what we ought to have got out of this study!</p> <p>3. There needs to be a long range plan for the upgrading the tracks along the east side of the river. As train traffic grows, and the area develops, friction will increase. It appears feasible to put the tracks below grade, as was done in Reno, but the geometry is tight, and new development is fast closing in on this option. But this is also the kind of issue this study should be addressing. What a disappointment.</p> <p>All in all, the conclusions are fine, but the cost and delays reaching them is scandalous.</p> <p>Let's hope the next stage goes faster, before climate change overwhelms all of us.</p>	<p>Amtrak Cascades and the Amtrak ridership forecasting developed for the Oregon Corridor Investment Plan. Preliminary design work for the proposed station project is receiving federal grant funds from the FRA for NEPA analysis and preliminary engineering; construction of the proposed improvements is currently unfunded. Prosper Portland and ODOT are preparing an evaluation of the proposed changes to the building and tracks to assess the potential impacts of the proposed project to the human and natural environment.</p> <p>3. Alternative 2 considered a tunnel on the central eastside of Portland. The tunnel was conceptualized to be used exclusively for passenger rail, due to the grades necessary to cross the river and reach Union Station. The grades to tunnel through east Portland and come to grade to cross the Willamette River and meet Union Station are too steep for freight rail.</p>
I-55	Brian Fuller	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I support the preferred alternative or alternative 1. Using the existing right of way would lessen potential environmental impacts. With congestion on I-5 increasing daily the need for a rail alternative is becoming paramount. Expanding rail service from Eugene to Portland will lessen highway traffic and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		Thanks	
I-56	Li Fuxin Assistant Professor Oregon State University	<p>Dear ODOT,</p> <p>I appreciate the prudence and thoroughness in the draft EIS for the corridor. It is true that the ridership potentials won't support high-speed rail, and hence usually maintaining the sharing of the right-of-way with freight line is usually a prudent approach. However, the problem of the preferred Alternative 1 is that it is a bit too slow: 2:20 is not faster at all than BoltBus, and significantly slower than driving. This would likely not gain the amount of ridership as predicted in the draft EIS. I would like to inquire about 2 options that involve minimal additional cost and may be potentially significantly beneficial in reducing the time to traverse this corridor to 1:55, which is what I believe a more competitive speed.</p> <p>1) What are the chances to negotiate, and chime in some funds with UP to upgrade the existing tracks to class 5/class 6? Upgrading existing tracks to class 5 (90 mph) would likely shave about 15 minutes of trip time which would make alternative 1 perform closer to alternative 2. Now I know that there is research that doing so alone as a freight railroad company is not cost effective in general, but what if ODOT can chime in half of the funding for this upgrade? How much would it cost? Can we make this a goal?</p> <p>2) Although in general I agree improving the current alignment will be cheaper than alternative 2, I was wondering whether we can just take alternative 2 in the small segment between south Salem (where the 2 alignments start to differ) and Millersburg (where the 2 alignments meet again). Building the roughly 13-14 miles of track at this area according to alignment 2 at a maximal 110mph speed can shave 4-5 minutes on the trip time, and it's the part of alignment 2 that I find the most cost effective (no new stations, minimal new crossings). What would the price tag for just building this 13-14 miles of track according to Alignment 2 instead of making those track improvements in Alignment 1?</p>	<p>The ridership forecasts for the Preferred Alternative account for BoltBus and other intercity travel services and modes.</p> <p>In response to the commenter's numbered comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Preferred Alternative incorporates track upgrades that would accommodate intercity passenger trains traveling 90 mph or higher. The maximum 79 mph operating speed is required by the host freight railroad, Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). While the proposed Project would result in rail infrastructure improvements that would support and benefit freight railroad operations and service, the current Project sponsors are federal and state agencies (Federal Railroad Administration [FRA] and Oregon Department of Transportation [ODOT]), and funding for Project implementation would come from public funding sources.</li> <li>2. The suggested alignment would parallel present-day I-5 from south of the Salem airport to where I-5 and the UPRR intersect north of Millersburg. This concept was assessed during alternatives development. Grades would be a significant challenge as I-5 is approximately 5 percent on the southern side of the Salem Hills. To maintain a reasonable grade, tunneling would be needed in this section, and would bring significant cost to the project compared to an above-grade route.</li> </ol> <p>Regarding the track to bypass Junction City; that concept could be carried forward as ODOT</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>My point is, although in general we should focus on the cost effective approach of Alignment 1, we probably could also achieve the performance of alignment 2 with a relatively small increase of cost. I believe the aforementioned changes would be the most cost effective way to achieve the 2-hour trip time and I wonder what ODOT thinks about it.</p> <p>On a similar note, I would also like to suggest a roughly 4 miles of track that would bypass Junction City (a straight route that starts from the Willamette river (after Harrisburg bridge) to Alpine Lumber Yard , which could be the similar kind of small improvement that has major benefits (such as eliminating 7-8 at-grade crossings). I think with these improvements on Alignment 1 Oregon can have passenger rail competitive with driving without paying the price tag of Alignment 2.</p> <p>Love to see what you think about it. Thanks.</p>	<p>considers phased investments in the passenger rail system.</p>
I-57	Greg Gardner	<p>I support the Oregon Passenger Rail project and would prefer to see option 2 utilized to free up freight rail lines and to help create a new path for modern transportation. I would also support an all electric rail system with solar installations along the entire route.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p>
I-58	Steven Gibson	<p>I love the idea that we are trying to take cars off of I-5 and put people on trains. Imagine a UofO special for game days. I don't know that we need to spend what it takes to get a high speed rail up and going, but having priority over freight would be a good start if the existing rails can be used.</p>	<p>ODOT and Amtrak have explored promoting the Amtrak Cascades for travel to and from University of Oregon home games. The challenge faced is that the kick-off time is not announced in time sufficient to make adjustments to the schedule.</p> <p>Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.
I-59	William Gifford	<p>Verbal testimony:</p> <p>I live in Oregon City. I'm deeply involved in the community, Government Economic Affairs Committee for the Chamber of Commerce. I'm a founding director for the Oregon City Business Alliance, and very concerned about the economic conditions of our community.</p> <p>I know that our train station is under- utilized. I attended a meeting last summer and I think there were some representatives from ODOT there, and I was pretty distressed that the direction that they had been given by the legislature, apparently, was that more priority should be given to tourism travel, to the detriment of commuter travel. That doesn't sit well with me because people need to be able to get to their jobs. Employers need their employees to be able to move around easily.</p> <p>The other important part of commuter traffic is that it's a steady stream. If people are using rail service to commute, it's likely that they'll be doing it every day, every workday. Whereas, to put the emphasis on tourism travel, that's occasional traffic. You don't go from Portland to Salem every day as a tourist. But if you were living in Salem working in Portland, you could very well be taking the train every day. And that's to me just a skewed priority that so much focus should be given -- and I contend that a lot of what's being needed to improve rail service could be accomplished by better scheduling, by more frequent trains. Not necessarily faster trains, just have something reliable and frequent. Even more important than fast.</p> <p>Of course, people don't want to waste their time, but frankly, time spent on the train, you can be doing a lot of other things that you can't do in your car or other means of transportation.</p> <p>So I would encourage two things. One is refocus on commuter traffic</p>	<p>In addition to providing a viable intercity travel choice for visitors to Oregon and the Pacific Northwest, the OPR Project Purpose and Need Statement also addresses travel for local and regional residents, including people who could use intercity passenger rail for business travel. Increasing the frequency will help people travel to and from work.</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		with an emphasis on reliability and frequency. What's the other thing? I think that's about it. Was that clear?	
I-60	Al Good Consultant at Oregon Fire Equip Dist.	Amtrak Cascades. With the upcoming move of Greyhound from Eugene to the LTD Park & Ride in Springfield I suggest a study of using that area as the terminus of the south end of the Cascades Route. There is a wye right in that area to allow turnarounds and sidings for overnight trains.	The Project considered a rail terminus in Springfield as part of Alternative 2, but the Eugene station is currently located in a downtown core that is more convenient and accessible to more people and would attract more passengers. Currently, local transit services provide connections between the Eugene train station and destinations in Eugene and Springfield.
I-61	Marci Gordon	I have long advocated for an alternative like the Alternative #2 which would have a dedicated passenger rail line between Eugene and Portland. I understand the greater environmental impact and hugely greater cost of a "new" build. For future generations this seems like a good investment, though finding the funds in our current political climate might be difficult. I don't believe that the new stations would be a disservice to the "central" cities. In the cities listed, we are small geographically and the distances to a new station would be only a few miles. Of course, it helps to have good public transit connections to the Amtrak stations wherever they are located. I would support Alternative 1 as a "better than nothing" choice. I very much miss the extra Cascades trains that used to run between Eugene and Portland and made day trips feasible. I'm glad the Amtrak buses exist and give greater flexibility, but it would be great to someday have a fast train between Oregon's two main cities (and Salem).	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-62	Elizabeth Graser Lindsey	I am concerned that the lack of full double raiiling will restrict Alternative 1 from having full desired amounts of Amtrak/passenger rail in terms of frequency (so it is not restricted by freight). Many more trips are needed to assist commutes and travel which is often time sensitive for arrival and departures. I am supportive of Alternative 1 otherwise.	The OPR Project considered a preliminary alternative that would have double-tracked the existing Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) and Amtrak alignment (added an additional mainline track for the entire route). Operational analysis showed that double-tracking would not be necessary to maintain performance levels. Thus, ODOT refined this preliminary alternative into Alternative 1, adding track in select areas to accommodate four additional intercity

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			passenger train round trips. This refinement resulted in substantially less impacts to the built and natural environment and at a much lower cost. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by UPRR (the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.
I-63	Reddit user: u/GraytoGreen	From r/SALEM  This would be a fantastic investment in the valley infrastructure and city.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-64	Ron Green	Alternative 1 is the obvious choice because of the phase-ability and affordability. However, getting Union Pacific to cooperate on dispatch would require acquisition of the infrastructure, which would itself require a large public relations campaign.	Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.
I-65	Bob Greenwade	Of these possibilities, I agree fully with the recommendation to use Alternative 1. It's the ideal service plan all around.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-66	Dean Hale	Alternative 2 is clearly preferred. We need to improve rail infrastructure locally and nationally. I-5 is getting clogged as is metro Eugene. Travel times between Eugene and Portland by vehicle are climbing and often unreliable. This is a golden opportunity for improvement.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project' goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-67	Brian Hall	What I see lacking in the current plan is decreasing the current trip time. I was a frequent user of the service until the morning departure south time change made commuting to work not viable. While I	While more detailed engineering work is needed and will be conducted in future Project development, FRA and ODOT developed the

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>recognize that there is not enough money available to upgrade the entire line to 110 mph standards with the current budget. However it is enough to double track it along the entirety of the route. The current line could then be upgraded on shorter segments Canby to Woodburn, Woodburn to Keizer to 110 mph standards because there are fewer road crossings. This could also be done in comparable areas between Salem and Eugene. The bottom line is even with the worsening traffic on interstate 5 people won't ride the train because it doesn't run frequently enough and is usually faster to drive. Decreasing the trip time and increasing the trip frequency is the only way to get cars off the road.</p>	<p>Preferred Alternative to operate with more frequency, higher speed, and greater reliability than the existing Cascades service; therefore, the Preferred Alternative will attract more riders as described in the DEIS. The Preferred Alternative would continue share track with freight trains, and the operational analysis resulted in additional track, track infrastructure and technology enhancements to increase passenger rail reliability measured as on-time performance.</p> <p>As noted in the EIS, passenger train speeds over the route between Portland and Eugene currently only average 42 mph. However, recent improvements have increased the miles of track where passenger trains can operate at speeds of up to 79 mph from 7 miles to almost 34 miles between Eugene and Albany, which may result in an increase in average speeds. Alternative 1 would make further improvements to increase allowed speeds. Reasons for the current slow average speed include, but are not limited to, track condition and geometry, speed restrictions through heavily populated areas, the type of grade crossing protection, the amount of single-track segments and accommodation for freight traffic.</p>
I-68	Joshua Kane Halsted	Yet, no plan to connect Corvallis. AGAIN.	<p>Thank you for your comment. During the initial scoping, screening, and evaluation of the concepts and alternatives, routes that included rail line to Corvallis were eliminated from further consideration as part of the OPR Project, because they reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time, along with impact on cost. However, future connections to Corvallis are not precluded.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-69	Jonathan Harnish, Harnish Properties	Please don't waste public funds (taxpayer money) on a project which would not find its way into the top 100 of priorities for the State of Oregon or anyone one of its struggling communities. A state which cannot pay its debt, fund its public employee pensions, house its homeless, feed the hungry or adequately educate its children should not spend a single cent on studying or implementing this wasteful and dreadfully wrong use of public funds.	With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route. Funding for the improvements will need to compete with other projects for priority.
I-70	Michael Hashizume	Alternative 2 looks much more preferable to me. We need to invest in passenger rail in this state to keep up with other west coast states and as a weapon to fight against climate change.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-71	Tim Hayden	I believe that option #1 is the most cost effective way to increase ridership on the segment between Eugene and Portland.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-72	Douglas Hayner	My approach from mere overview of this project. My bias toward common sense, considering mainly cost and efficiency. Alternative 1 appears to be a more practical choice since its cost is 1/4th that of Alternative 2. The slightly faster trip time of Alternative 2 Portland to Eugene of 18 minutes seems trivial to the substantial deficiency in cost. Also, the lower cost of Alternative 1 would therefore very likely include a lower passenger fare compared to Alternative 2, thereby encouraging more ridership.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-73	Norbert Heins	what about using the Oregon electric line	The Oregon Electric Line was considered during the screening and evaluation phase of the Project. It was part of the "Purple" corridor concept described in Section 2.2.1 of the EIS. The Purple concept would generally consist of new mainline track parallel to the existing freight rail line historically known as the Oregon Electric Railway (OER), which is currently

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>operated by Portland and Western Railroad (PNWR).</p> <p>The northern portion of the OER from Salem to Wilsonville was incorporated into Alternative 2. The Eugene-Salem segment of the OER was screened out based on the route and condition of the track and because the OER line would have required bypassing existing stations in Salem and Albany. Significant improvements would have been necessary to upgrade track and signals to attain operating speeds and capacities already in place on the Preferred Alternative.</p>
I-74	Kelly Hoell	<p>As shown on the previous page, I support Alternative 1. With higher ridership expected and significantly lower cost it seems to make more sense. I ride the train and I support passenger rail travel and would love to see a high-speed train but the 15 min or so of travel time savings associated with Alternative 2 doesn't seem to justify the 3 fold increase in cost. As someone concerned about climate change, I think we need to increase ridership, and reliability. I'm concerned about the amount of new construction in Alternative 2 and the loss of Eugene Station.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
I-75	Dan Hoffman	<p>I was interested in this project until I saw how long it was taking. It is really disappointing how long it took for this Draft EIS to be prepared. I understand there is bureaucracy with the FRA, but due to the delay, the Draft EIS is riddled with outdated data that makes the comparison of alternatives rather useless. For example, the Purpose and Need uses data from 2011 and 2012! Why was this not updated? ODOT could easily access this information, including its own ridership data.</p> <p>I would also like to note that the official name is BNSF Railway, it is NOT Burlington Northern Santa Fe. It is officially BNSF Railway. The fact that ODOT Rail Division does not know this is disturbing.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment. The underlying data and trends identified in the DEIS are still valid and thus retained in the FEIS. With the identification of the Preferred Alternative and the completion of the Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to pursue improvements on the existing alignment to support new service.</p> <p>ODOT was aware of the name change but made an error in the document. The DEIS has been corrected on pages ES-1 and 1-1 to reflect the current name of the BNSF Railway. This error has been recorded in the FEIS/ROD in Table 2-2.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-76	Darcey Howard Dir. Marketing Coconut Bliss	Having moved back here from the East coast where train service to other cities, states, etc. is the norm for commuting and travel it calls to question; "just how environmentally aware are we here in Oregon?" The reduction overall to roads, congestion, financial feasibility on families to not own a car, and environmental impacts make having access to increased schedules and routes a significant benefit. Option 2 would be my preference but any increase in frequency from Eugene/Springfield to Portland would be ideal. At this point it's either 5:30 am or 2:30 pm if I'm not mistaken.	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route.
I-77	Nick Howland	I agree with the choice of Alternative 1.  I will be looking for information on economic development near stations (as we hear in discussion of major transit projects).  Also interested in the impact of aging population on traffic.	Thank you for your comment. Economic development near stations is addressed in the DEIS in Section 4.5.5. Regarding research of the aging population on traffic, that topic is outside of the scope of the EIS. Research on aging and transportation is supported by ODOT; for example, see work completed by the Institute on Aging and the Center for Transportation Studies at Portland State University. <a href="https://www.pdx.edu/ioa/home">https://www.pdx.edu/ioa/home</a>
I-78	Kent Hutchens	I attended last nights' DEIS meeting in Eugene and I fully agree with the Alternative 1 proposal. Spending more than 4 billion to construct a new line and save only a few minutes' travel time makes no sense to me. If existing track is improved, more sidings constructed, and possibly some existing sidings connected, passenger/freight interference could be greatly lessened. All stations along the existing route have been upgraded/refurbished in the last few years and abandoning them to build others on a new line is wasteful. I think getting Union Pacific to agree will be very difficult, as well as finding funding for the project. This, however, should be pursued as traffic on I-5 is worsening exponentially and will continue to do so. Another issue that will need to be addressed is how to convince residents of Central and Eastern Oregon that this is necessary, despite them not having close access to the corridor; plus those over here who don't believe in the Amtrak subsidy. Please press on and continue your efforts!	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Among its other advantages, the Preferred Alternative will benefit from previous investments in the existing stations and station areas.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-79	Ed Immel	<p>I'm Bob's predecessor. I'm a state rail planner. So I've been through three passenger rail plans, six freight rail plans, three commuter rails plans.</p> <p>Some of these things -- there were some studies that were not -- I didn't see in the CD. But some of these other studies that we did, we eliminated the Oregon Electric Alignment which took probably took 10 years to do that. We had done it in 1994 already. The double track inside -- the incremental one, we came up with 1.3 billion. The other thing is the capacity analysis in the Portland area as part of the Columbia River crossing, we did rail from Eugene to Tacoma and from Portland to Pasco, plus the commuter rail study.</p> <p>Now, what's going to happen is everybody that was involved in the commuter rail study, there's only three of us that still survive. And so somebody is going to come in and we will do another commuter rail study. They explained to us kind of why there's lower ridership. Also there's nothing in here about impacts of positive train control, PTC, which is just being implemented, can have some major impacts on how we operate trains, spacing trains, equipment that's available.</p> <p>Also we're looking at nitrogen fuel cell powered trains, cutting edge technology whose only by-product is water. So there's no fumes. They just installed one in regular service in Germany. So it's coming. This takes a while. The other technology is batteries. Siemens Company is the nitrogen Bombardier with the battery.</p> <p>We also did an alignment study, like up here, was done by the Australians. I never saw any mention of that. It's a little bit different but it -- it was technology at that time that was not available, probably 20 years ago. Washington has studied -- a high-speed rail study is leading to another one. The difference being at least the original one, Portland airport is the terminus, not Union station. Because Union -- PDX has got parking, rental cars, public transit. I don't know where it's going to go, the Washington one. So this is critical that we don't end up going to Portland and Washington goes to the airport.</p> <p>This other one -- the improvements negotiating with Union Pacific, we</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and valuable context from earlier state rail planning efforts. The Project team worked to evaluate previous options and concepts, with special focus on that effort during Project scoping.</p> <p>The PNWRC has been the subject of intercity passenger rail planning, development, and operation for more than 30 years. The PNWRC is one of 11 Federally designated high-speed rail corridors in the United States. FRA designated this passenger rail corridor on October 20, 1992, as one of five original corridors called for in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991.</p> <p>ODOT applied for funding for rail planning through the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program, which the USDOT selected to receive funding through a cooperative agreement to develop a Passenger Rail Corridor Investment Plan (CIP) for the Oregon segment of the PNWRC. Together, the Tier 1 EIS and SDP complete the CIP. This CIP is the foundation for future Project development, including engineering design, project-level environmental reviews, environmental permitting, and construction. The intent of the OPR CIP is to provide sufficient information to support future FRA, State of Oregon, local government, and private sector decisions to fund investments in the Oregon segment of the PNWRC.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>did that with Pacific, that's how we got the trains we have now. They need to start now. Time is contentious. The other one is the positive train control that we need to follow that. As an example, Trimet Portland, the commuter rail project, already has the PTC. It's one of the few that's been improved, and because of that, we can probably use noncompliant vehicles. Right now they're massive. They're huge. The new ones -- they've tacked on an order for stude (ph) cars.</p> <p>They're diesel multiple unit, DMU. And also -- there's also -- any state laws prohibit ODOT from getting federal, state, and local funds. Some of the Connect Oregon money was not applicable to ODOT. And for the rail freight studies that they did, they actually had to go to legislature and change the law. So this is one of those things, is there something hiding out there that they're going to say, oh, we can't -- we can't do this. It's an Oregon state law.</p> <p>The other one is there any mode of power that might be more appropriate for Oregon. We have looked at this with DMUs, diesel multiple units. And the nice thing about that we can come out of Portland with three cars, get to Albany and have the last car go to Corvallis, which the rest of the train goes to Eugene. In fact, we had a Danish train here which is exactly -- it's exactly what we did was drop the car at Albany and went over -- this isn't just -- we really did it and people really rode on it. So you can have this outline.</p>	
I-80	Vicki Jean, Train Mechanic, Hitachi	I am currently working as a mechanic in production of the Honolulu Mass Transit trains in San Francisco Bay area site. I will be relocating to the Salem Oregon area and would like to know of any available jobs in your Rail project. Resume upon request. Thank you ,Vicki	This comment is beyond the scope of the DEIS. Please see the state's job listing page <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/jobs/Pages/index.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/jobs/Pages/index.aspx</a> for employment opportunities.
I-81	Kay B. Johnson Norman Patrick Johnson	<p>The purpose of this e-mail is to comment on the Oregon Passenger Rail proposals for DEIS Alternatives.</p> <p>We respectfully recommend that the Commission follow Alternative One (1) in order to fully utilize and improve the existing Amtrak Cascades rail system. It is the more efficient of the two systems proposed. Improving this existing system will capitalize on the considerable investments already made by both private enterprise and</p>	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>the federal government and will, as a result, save valuable Oregon resources and improve transportation for everyone in the West and Northwest, not only passengers, but also freight clients.</p> <p>As ordinary taxpayers and citizens, we appreciate your efforts to improve the quality of life for Oregonians, and especially for rail clients and customers, and we thank you very much for your attention to this letter.</p>	
I-82	Noel Johnson	<p>Please aim higher! It is tough to get the public excited about (let alone interested in funding) a system that will continue to take 2 hours to get to Eugene. Please just copy the many cities and nations who show us that if you build high-speed systems that are way faster than car-alternatives, you can induce demand and realize lower carbon, more vibrant cities and towns via smart-growth land use and development practices. This project is the backbone to such a future vision, but it needs to be truly fast!</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a rail network.</p>
I-83	David Jorling	<p>I am a high speed rail advocate, but have long realized that Americans "don't get it" when it comes to high speed rail, and probably never will. Alternatives 1 and 2 are not High Speed Rail. Nor are they even "Higher Speed Rail" in any meaningful sense. In 1950, Southern Pacific's Shasta Daylight too 2 hours and 25 minutes to go between Portland and Eugene. In Alternative 1, which I understand to be the preferred alternative, will only beat that time by 5 minutes at a cost of anywhere from 870 million to over 1 billion. This is a colossal waste of money. If this money "needs to be spent" it would be better to use it to build an exclusive high speed rail line between Portland and Vancouver as part of a true high speed rail line between Portland and Seattle. Mark me down as advocating for the no-build alternative.</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail —generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-84	Harvey Kahler	<p>An 18-unit Talgo 8 train would have 438 seats (396c/42b) in a "Cascade" configuration for through service to Seattle or Vancouver and still be capable of 110 mph speeds with a single Siemes Charger locomotive based on estimates of weights. A commuter configuration for Portland is possible with 546 seats without business class, food service, or baggage.</p> <p>Half-hour rush-hour frequencies would represent a half-lane of capacity on I-5; and more frequent service would divert more demand, improve safety and air quality, and provide more affordable commuting. AAA estimated the average cost of commuting by auto to be \$0.608 a mile in 2013. Rail fares are much lower than that; and public support avoids the cost of adding often disruptive highway capacity in urban and environmentally sensitive areas.</p> <p>I am a retired transportation planner with a career in Illinois and Indiana and interested in rail passenger services but with no affiliation with Talgo. Talgos are suitable for Cascade service; and it makes some sense to me that compatible equipment would be acquired for expanded fast, if not high-speed, service in Oregon. Should Washington build a dedicated high-speed line, Talgos would offer interoperability for extended service through Oregon. More Talgos would be "off-the-shelf" and not require a waiver under revised regulations. Choosing the current Amtrak route seems to be the more pragmatic alternative since there seems to be no practical solution to rejoin the tracks at Oregon City from I-5. Little improvement in alignment for higher-speed service would be gained; but this may be offset by public crossing improvement costs that were substantial for the Chicago-Saint Louis corridor. The current alignment curvature is mitigated by Talgo passive tilt-suspension trains.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Regarding train technology, ODOT will consider different types and makers of equipment as the need for new and replacement equipment occurs. Section 3.2.5 of the DEIS discusses the potential types of passenger train technology for the Oregon service analyzed in the Tier 1 EIS.</p> <p>Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. The OPR Project Tier 1 EIS is the first of two potential environmental review tiers. If a Build Alternative is selected in the Tier 1 Record of Decision (ROD), subsequent Tier 2 environmental reviews would evaluate more detailed, site-specific proposals implementing the alternative selected in the Tier 1 ROD. Chapter 6 of the FEIS describes next steps for the State in supporting and expanding passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.</p>
I-85	Kristen Kalbrener MS. MA. CMM Program Manager, Global Education Oregon Academy Coach, NAFSA Region I	<p>Thank you for requesting comments!</p> <p>Your materials are very nicely assembled and organized in a way that makes it really feasible for those of us in the public to review, comprehend and comment. Kudos for that!</p> <p>I am a regular Amtrak user between Eugene and Tacoma – at least</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. ODOT and Amtrak continuously strive for providing intercity passenger rail service that meets customer needs and expectations, and value your comments on problems you have experienced. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>several times per year. I have an interest in the infrastructure as well as in the quality of service.</p> <p>First on service because I think that is especially critical to maintaining a positive image and public support for maintaining/upgrading rail service in the US. Your people are friendly and personable, both in the stations and on the trains. Maintenance is sorely lacking – often I find on the trains non-working restrooms, unclean restrooms etc. The website and interface with frequent traveler site are antiquated and often frustrating in trying to use. (I recently tried to change a one-way to a roundtrip and it would neither give me the opportunity to change, add-to or even easily start an additional reservation because of having one in the system already. Great waste of time and goodwill of the passenger.) Delayed trains/cancellations are handled poorly in terms of facilitating backup plans via bus etc. Last time it happened to me, one portion was supposedly no backup plan ----- just not acceptable.</p> <p>Back to track planning: I vote for Alternative One. I like the emphasis on track and safety upgrades. Going through central cities to facilitate higher ridership (remember to provide easy linkage to city buses in each!) Using existing stations not only saves money but rejuvenates what in many cases are historic building with great character. The environmental impact is minimized and I like that there are no right-of-way issues with alternative one. (How unfortunate when upgrades require moving people off their land/out of their homes!)</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. (from Peter DeFazio's district 4 in Oregon)</p>	
I-86	Tracy Kane	<p>Yes, I do.</p> <p>When Oregon looks to the future, we need to have MUCH better services to greater outreach of cities. Presently, we have no service to coastal areas or central and Eastern Oregon.</p> <p>Keeping the original hubs are great, but allowing easy access to rail service, faster trains in areas that connect and creating true people movers. The Eastern corridor of the United States is a good example.</p>	<p>The Oregon Passenger Rail Project is focused on the Oregon portion of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC), which extends between Eugene and Portland and does not include areas and communities on the coast or in central or eastern Oregon that are situated outside of the Willamette Valley.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-87	Megan Kemple	<p>I'm satisfied with the recommended Alternative 1 which follows the existing Amtrak Cascades passenger rail route with improvements in track, signals and communications. I'm a regular Amtrak rider between Portland and Eugene. It is very common that my trains are late because of conflicts with freight trains.</p> <p>Benefits of Alternative 1: I'll be happy to have these improvements and hopefully have them sooner than with Alternative 2. I'm happy to have stations based in cities. It is important to me at conflicts with freight trains are minimized. I hope these improvements can be a priority.</p> <p>Concerns about Alternative 2: I believe the environmental impacts associated with Alternative 2 would be significant. I am especially concerned about agricultural lands that would be impacted, and the environmental impact of raw materials needed for new stations and other infrastructure in Alternative 2.</p> <p>In Summary, I agree with the recommendation to go with Alternative 1, but hope that conflicts with freight can be adequately addressed with this priority.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to include rail infrastructure enhancements that would reduce delay associated with competing demand between freight and passenger trains, and that would improve reliability.</p>
I-88	Wonkak Kim	<p>It would be great if we could utilize the existing truck and route, improve the system, and increase the number of train and running frequency.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1, which would use the existing Cascades alignment, has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p>
I-89	Michael Koivula Springfield, OR	<p>To project managers:</p> <p>I am more in support of alternative 2 for the future of passenger rail in Oregon. The alternative 1 concept keeps the conflicting uses of freight and passenger that we are currently dealing with. As we are expecting increases in both freight and passenger traffic, the conflicting situations, though mitigated somewhat, would be expected to return in the future. Dedicated passenger rail is the only way to alleviate these conflicts.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>This being said, I am not in favor of the Albany side trip being added. It would cause time delay and increase car/ ped/etc conflicts and danger. Albany has great access to the I-5 corridor as is.</p> <p>The beginning of the route in Springfield is not a good concept, either. The addition of the 2 bridges (Main St/South A St south of Island Park and a new bridge crossing the Willamette at I-5 and subsequent passage through the Eastgate Woodlands) could both easily be avoided by locating the origin of the route in North Springfield in the new Urban Growth Boundary addition east of I-5 north of the current development area used for the Royal Caribbean call center. This area is well served by mass transit with the bus rapid transit line, so location in downtown Springfield is not needed and cost savings of deleting 2 bridges would be significant.</p> <p>I also prefer the route getting to Portland area by following 205. Avoiding the west hills of Portland is another significant cost savings.</p> <p>Although the EIS clearly shows more impacts for route 2, I believe that mitigation and environmental improvements and cleanup to habitat could be part of route 2 such as to make the long term route 2 project much lesser in impact and an actual environmental gain.</p> <p>Dedicated rail alongside I-5 to me is the way to go. Please do not go with the “band aid” approach that is route 2, it is sure to run into the same problems that impede this transportation mode today. Let’s let freight have its right of way to itself.</p> <p>We really need this project. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	
I-90	Michael Koivula Springfield, OR	<p>Again, thanks for the opportunity to comment on passenger rail options.</p> <p>Again, I support option 2, the I-5 route.</p> <p>I forgot to include one additional recommendation that I believe would cost significantly less, make the route safer and improve speed.</p>	Thank you for your comment. Tunnels were considered during the scoping and screening process. Tunnels were considered where grades did not accommodate rail (e.g., through the south Salem hills and in the Portland area). The screening of the Portland options is described in the EIS in Chapter 2. As you noted, trains passing

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>That would be to try as much as possible to tunnel rather than span as many of the roadway crossings along I-5. If these crossings are either bored or cut and filled to accommodate the rail lines it would eliminate the need for multiple bridges and vertical curves in the profile of the rail line.</p> <p>Elimination of the bridges will bring a huge decrease in cost, would reduce the distance that sound would travel from the rail lines, perhaps allowing for noise elimination barriers to reduce noise from both I-5 and the rail lines.</p> <p>Elimination of the bridges will also bring greater safety to all users of the I-5 corridor.</p>	<p>through tunnels would create less noise than trains passing over bridges and could have safety benefits. The cost of tunnels, however, is substantially more than the cost of bridges. For example, the unit costs used for this Project indicated that per mile, the cost of tunnels is \$120 to 425 million per route mile compared to \$3 to 8 million per route mile for bridges.</p>
I-91	<p>Bob Krebs Retired ODOT Passenger Rail Coordinator 3435 Bluff Avenue SE Salem Or 97302</p> <p>503-375-2821</p>	<p>Alternative 1 is the best choice for the rail corridor. It provides for incremental improvements to existing infrastructure, does not require purchasing new right of way and allows for gradual service improvements. Alternative 1 provides the best return for the tax dollars invested in the corridor.</p> <p>The problem with the current track alignment between EUG and PDX is lack of capacity to handle more freight and passenger trains. This should be addressed by adding more PTC protected double track. The rural sections of the line would be fairly inexpensive to add track and eliminate some road crossing hazards. Alternative 1 addresses this need.</p> <p>To implement the plan a designated state funding source must be identified to pay for the infrastructure improvements. ODOT keeps waiting for the “fairy godmother” to bless the line with federal funding. This hasn’t happened in this century and there has been no serious investment in the corridor since before 2005. The restricted capacity has prevented any passenger service improvements since 2000.</p> <p>State investment in the passenger rail corridor could have several benefits.</p> <p>1. Provide a match for Federal dollars if they become available.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to include rail infrastructure enhancements such as additional track and PTC that would reduce delay associated with competing demand between freight and passenger trains, and improve reliability.</p> <p>A Federal Record of Decision on the Project will allow the State of Oregon to apply for additional funding to advance the Project through more detailed engineering and construction in incremental phases.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>2.Negotiate with the Union Pacific Railroad to apply some or all of the infrastructure investment to lower costs for passenger trains using the track.</p> <p>3.Rail improvements provide frequencies to supplement capacity restrictions on the I-5 Freeway at a lower cost.</p> <p>The Oregon Passenger Rail Service has been dormant for almost two decades with no additional train frequencies. Alternative 1. if funded, would provide the capacity to add more needed service, for both freight and passenger.</p> <p>Alternative 2 is a very costly alignment to raise train speeds. A new railroad would have to be built for 12 to 16 trains a day. Not cost effective.</p> <p>Ultra High Speed Trains is not what will attract patrons. They want:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Reasonable competitive run times between stations. Not high speed.</li> <li>2.Reliable on-time performance</li> <li>3.An attractive fare structure.</li> <li>4.Clean, modern, comfortable trains with service amenities like food and drinks.</li> </ol> <p>About 68% of all corridor trips travel through Portland and are more than 100 miles in length. To maximize ridership all trains should go beyond Portland or have a tight connection for a continuing journey.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the EIS which hopefully will end Oregon's Passenger Rail doldrums.</p>	
I-92	Russ Lathrop	<p>Alternative 2 looks to be a great option. It makes sense to have rail stops in cities that have population density. This is needed to keep up with population growth and to keep our roads from bring overused.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative is recommended because of its ability, in comparison to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. In particular, trip time, ridership and capital costs were the discriminating factors. Alternative 1 would serve the central cities while Alternative 2 would not.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-93	Matt Laubach	<p>I'm very happy to hear that you are increasing Amtrak service from Portland to Eugene. I enjoy riding to Portland on the train. It's not very scenic however because it goes into the industrial areas of towns used by freight trains. There are many delays waiting for other trains to use the tracks.</p> <p>My first choice would be building tracks to support high speed rail. Second choice would be to build along I5. Third choice would be to improve existing tracks shared by freight trains.</p> <p>Thanks for listening</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p>
I-94	Zachary Lauritzen	<p>Thank you for this important work. I utilize the train whenever possible, however, my biggest hang-up is when I have a deadline to make (airplane to catch, meeting to attend, etc.) and when I take the train, I always run the risk of a major delay. My understanding is that is because the passenger train always gives right of way to the freight service. Is this the case? If so, until that is addressed, it will be next to impossible for people like me who want to take the train for all trips from Eugene to the north (Salem, Portland, Seattle) but cannot risk multi-hour delays.</p> <p>Thank you for the work on this important effort!</p>	<p>Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.</p>
I-95	Blaine Lee	<p>For \$800-\$1B this investment Alternative 1 seems to be a waste of money for 15 min decrease in route time and additional capacity. I'd expect a massive decrease in trip time for that level of investment.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Alternative 2 didn't show any estimates on route time. This appears to be the more efficient route potentially capturing the largest ridership. I'm rather disappointed the leaders of the committee didn't recommend that one without explaining a reason why or why not. This might be the worst DEIS I've seen without much explanation. It appears that the committee's decision has already been made.</p>	<p>Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives.</p> <p>Travel time was one of the factors considered when identifying a Preferred Alternative. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. For example, because Alternative 1 serves central cities with supportive population, employment, and existing transportation networks, it was projected to capture higher ridership than Alternative 2. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>Additionally, Alternative 1 could be more easily phased than Alternative 2, lending itself to more feasible incremental investments.</p>
I-96	Dr. Burton Levenson	<p>It would be worth your energy if you go more progressive and just make the investment. This is a lot of money for not a lot of improvement.</p> <p>Invest in Surf Air- airline might be faster and a wiser investment. It's faster and convenient. Allows smaller airports and PDX stops.</p> <p>Higher speed rail would make more sense.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's Purpose and Need and goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>Investment in air travel would not address the Project's Purpose and Need.</p> <p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			including ridership and population demands ( <i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i> , ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a rail network.
I-97	Art Lewellan Rail system designer The LOTi project	<p>I support the Amtrak Cascades Line. It's diesel/electric locomotive is suitable for many Amtrak corridors, for instance, PDX to SLC to Denver, and, LA-LV-SLC. Higher speeds such as the Acela are simply too expensive to build nor necessary on many rail routes. TALGO manufactures a fine matching diesel/electric locomotive, the XXI, which can raise a pantograph and run all electric where feasible.</p> <p>Since planning started, I've supported directly serving Corvallis, which would attract more patrons than the route through Tangent, Halsey and Harrisburg combined, especially between Corvallis and Eugene. Reducing trip time between Albany and Eugene along I-5 is likewise unnecessary and unproductive.</p> <p>The other stretch of track I'm concerned about is Keiser to Wilsonville to Oregon City, which I prefer. However, Salem should have a station, and please consider the following: Portland is planning a MAX line to Tualatin. Oregon's main rail advocacy group AORTA does not support the Barbur Blvd route. I agree with them on that and on their proposal to convert the WES corridor to an extension of the MAX Red Line from Beaverton. WES trains would be decommissioned, but could run from Wilsonville to Salem on some complementary schedule.</p> <p>This combination of MAX Red Line at 15min service between Wilsonville and Beaverton should be considered: It affects ODOT plans for widening Hwy 217 and increases rail access for Washington County. Widening 217 may be necessary, but routing the MAX Red Line along the corridor provides motorists and Amtrak Cascades passengers with an ideal transit alternative sure to increase ridership on both rail systems. This MAX extension can have its planned stop at Bridgeport Village as long as from there, the line can further extend to</p>	Thank you for your comments. As part of this study, ODOT conducted extensive screening and evaluation of concepts you have proposed, with the exception of MAX light rail and the Columbia River Crossing (CRC), which are outside the scope of this study. The alternative that would serve Corvallis was eliminated from further consideration, as part of the OPR Project, because it reduced ridership as a result of the increased travel time, along with impact on cost. The route to serve Wilsonville is part of Alternative 2, but is not the Preferred Alternative. However, future connections to Corvallis or between Keiser and Wilsonville are not precluded from separate study efforts. The proposed and planned TriMet actions involving the MAX light rail transit and WES commuter rail systems are beyond the scope of the OPR Project that focuses on intercity passenger rail under oversight of the Federal Railroad Administration.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Tualatin 'proper' and ultimately to Wilsonville.</p> <p>I'm sure you are aware of these possible alternative routes. You may not know that the impacts MAX would impose on Barbur Blvd are absolutely deplorable, nor that the development potential along Barbur is exaggerated; Barbur Blvd will remain a 35-45mph highway which does not bode well for a walkable neighborhood and wider crosswalks. Metro and Portland City Hall are not informing the public about the terrible impacts nor dubious development potential. A Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line on Barbur Blvd is more suitable as well as impose less impact and cost. A BRT line may also generate more ridership than MAX on Barbur Blvd.</p> <p>At this point, I figure you're now thinking "We're only planning 2 possible routes with no variations." If so, I'm disappointed and must recommend you tabulate the increased ridership possible with the variation of routes proposed in this commentary.</p> <p>PS: I am also proposing a CRC I-5 Bridge replacement design that salvages most of the commission's work. And, I'm finishing a bridge design for replacing the Marquam Bridge. I'm certain the Marquam will not be replaced with any tunnel nonsense. Both these bridge designs are 'single-deck' instead of 'double-deck'. I have drafted a new and much safer design for Hayden Island Access which I call "Low-Level" and, a design for realigning I-5 on the eastbank of the Willamette between Burnside and the Morrison/Belmont viaduct which is also rebuilt. These designs have all been submitted to Metro in a 14-page 'pamphlet'. Finally, I support the Rose Quarter I-5 Rebuild. I do not believe it will worsen air pollution in the corridor as it should reduce the terribly stupid bottleneck between traffic exiting and entering I-5 South. Thanks ODOT for the fine work I've noted through the years.</p>	
I-98	Walt Lierman, PhD, OHA, Health Analytics	<p>I currently am a monthly rider on Cascades 511/508. I have been riding for almost 4 years. I leave from the Oregon City station and travel to Salem returning in the evening.</p> <p>If I understood the material, I would opt for Alternative 1. I am biased in a sense because I want service to Oregon City maintained. When</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative and includes service to Oregon City. Regarding transit service to Wilsonville, the route of Alternative 1 would not provide that service, and riders wanting to reach Wilsonville will have</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>the early morning Cascades schedule (~ 6:20 a.m. in OC) was dropped starting in 2017(? I believe) Oregon City was precluded from consideration of the bus from Union Station in the morning – because Portland passengers would be “put out” by stopping at OC before going to Salem and points beyond. Now the only morning rail service SB is the 10:10 a.m. – not really a working commuter’s schedule. (I know that the C word – commuter – is frowned upon. But that’s what I use it for!)</p> <p>So please treat OC as a full-fledged partner in any alternative that is ultimately decided upon.</p> <p>In summary, I would support Alternative 1 as it stands. The only change I would suggest is to somehow include Wilsonville in Alternative 1. It is increasingly becoming more used by DHS/OHA for meetings and conferences. But it is very inconvenient to get to. The Tri-Met WES is okay, but you have to go to Beaverton TC or some other intermediate point and once you are in Tualatin – why not drive the remaining couple miles? IMHO, Wilsonville is a perfect example of a poorly planned suburban area (I guess it is a suburb?? Or just a place with a bunch of people living in it, jacked up pickups speeding - perhaps the drivers think they are in eastern Oregon – Baker City maybe, and overall congestion) that was made expressly for cars. The cars are driven fast, pedestrians and bicyclists are put at risk. So maybe an Amtrak through there could begin to address some of the congestion and over-abundance of cars?</p> <p>VOTE: Alt 1</p>	<p>to use complementary transit services, as you've identified, for access. As ridership on the passenger rail system builds, supportive transit services will be more likely to gain interest and investment.</p>
I-99	Kathy Lincoln	<p>I definitely think Alternative 1 is the right choice. The cost is not so much that we won't be able to come up with it in a reasonable time.</p> <p>Station locations are set and can be integrated with other modes of travel.</p> <p>Good job and hope to see this come to fruition in the near future.</p> <p>Please keep in mind integrating train travel with all other modes,</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. One purpose of the Project is to “integrate with existing and planned transportation networks” which would include safe and convenient connections to active transportation. ODOT and Amtrak determine fares, and endeavor to price tickets that are affordable in comparison to intercity travel by other modes.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		including bicycles, and try to keep cost of use (train tickets) as reasonable as possible. Thank you!	
I-100	Joan Lloyd	I agree that Alternative 1 is the most cost effective but if there is a possibility of having high speed trains someday on that same line, I do not want that alternative. We fairly recently got a quiet zone in Salem and if there are high speed trains the horns would have to be reinstated.	Thank you for your comment. A future high-speed rail line would, in all likelihood, need to be constructed on a separate alignment from the Preferred Alternative route.
I-101	Mike James Long	<p>Alternative 1 is undoubtedly the most cost-effective. I wonder if the Hoover Dam was cost effective?</p> <p>I would really like to see high speed rail from Canada to Mexico, but it doesn't look like the government has the money and the states do not.</p> <p>Perhaps we should focus on a monorail option within growing metropolitan areas to lessen our carbon footprint or suffer the consequences.</p>	Thank you for your comment. A future high-speed rail line or monorail would, in all likelihood, need to be constructed on a separate alignment from the Preferred Alternative route.
I-102	Moises Lucero	I definitely like the idea of the "Cascadia high speed rail" that would follow the I-5 corridor. Would it be possible to consider the same system through the yellow area, Corvallis, McMinnville Newberg etc. Would frequency and departure times be affected by certain alternate routes?	ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the OPR decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.
I-103	Matt Lutter	<p>Either Alt #1 or Alt #2 seem to be better than no action. But it is not clear if either Alternatives would eliminate the frequent conflict between passenger and freight trains. Would passenger trains need to wait until freight trains pass, or would there be additional tracks to resolve that conflict?</p> <p>I like the faster travel times that Alt #2 provides, but I need to know more about the environmental impacts and how the higher cost will be paid (with higher taxes, or ticket fares?).</p>	Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-104	Mary-Kate Mackey	Why not get a real dedicated rail? I have ridden this corridor for 26 years. I have ridden Amtrak all across the country. I have also ridden on trains all over Europe. The experience in the EU was much superior to here. Ridership will build when the trains are easy to catch (convenient times) and on time.	A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands ( <i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i> , ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.
I-105a	Karl MacNair	<p>The DEIS Alternative 2 states that a 120 mph max speed was studied. The Shinkansen, which has been operating since the 1960's operates between 150 and 200 mph top speed. Based on this alone, I would argue that the analysis of Alt 2 is flawed and that the study had a bias toward Alt 1 from the start and begs the question, why isn't ODOT taking a serious look at true high speed rail (HSR)?</p> <p>The Transportation Planning Rule's purpose is to reduce VMT statewide. I believe the best way to do that is to provide attractive alternatives to driving. I don't believe shaving 15 minutes off current travel times is going to get anyone to leave their car at home in favor of the train. In order to get a mode shift, we need to make train travel faster and more reliable than a car. True HSR has a chance of doing that, but at this point we still don't have the data to tell us what it could do because the DEIS didn't study anything over 120mph. I realize that a ton of work went into this DEIS, which is why I'm so disappointed that it seems to have ignored the call for a true HSR study. I really think ODOT needs to take another look at it with a true</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network. The study can be found on the Project website:</p> <p><a href="http://www.oregonpassengerrail.org/files/meetings/leadership_council/12-15-14/hsr-concept-vision-report_121914-final_spreads.pdf">http://www.oregonpassengerrail.org/files/meetings/leadership_council/12-15-14/hsr-concept-vision-report_121914-final_spreads.pdf</a>.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>HSR system modeled after the HSR systems in other countries.</p> <p>Aside from that, I applaud the work of staff to identify potential improvements that can be made incrementally on the existing line. This is a good first step toward an eventual HSR line; it is not HSR.</p> <p>As for next steps, I'd like to see ODOT establish a funding plan for the incremental improvements AND start a new study that figures out how to build a true HSR system. Look at California's plan. It hasn't been smooth, but they are doing it.</p> <p>The only thing I'd like a response on is why was 120mph picked as the top speed when other countries and states are able to get 200mph?</p> <p>Thank you, Karl MacNair</p>	
I-105b	Karl MacNair	<p>The state of Oregon needs to look at passenger rail needs outside the Willamette Valley. In order to meet the state's planning goals of reducing VMT and building compact communities, a viable alternative to cars is needed. A serious state-wide investment in passenger rail is only logical.</p>	<p>This comment is beyond the scope of the DEIS, but please refer to ODOT's complementary work outlined on its passenger rail website:  <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/Pages/Passenger-Rail.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/Pages/Passenger-Rail.aspx</a>  <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Documents/OSRP.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Documents/OSRP.pdf</a></p>
I-106	Josh Mars	<p>I favor the no-build option in the DEIS. The present demand for passenger rail doesn't exist to justify the mammoth cost of this pet-project, regardless of where the funding is sourced. There is a greater demand for improved and expanded roadways for passenger vehicles which should be the focus of ODOT.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative as it meets the agreed-upon purpose and need per the federal NEPA process.</p>
I-107	Cindy Massaro	<p>I appreciate all the work that has been done, and will continue to be done, by ODOT.</p> <p>I fully support improvements to the Amtrak Cascades system.</p> <p>Of the 3 Alternatives offered I strongly support Alternative #2, a new route following I5.</p> <p>My second choice is Alternative #1, improvements to existing route.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		I do not support Alternative #3, no changes/improvements. Thank you!!	particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-108	Geoffrey McCarth	This is a huge investment for a minimal gain in travel time. At 120mph, only 30min faster than present Cascades? Why is there not an overt goal of <2h, or about 75mph average speed. 2nd world speeds, disappointing. Example: From London Kings Cross to Peterborough is about 90 miles, max speed 125, average speed non-stop 104mph, last time I rode. UK does not have true high speed, but engineers very good average speeds nonetheless. We need to emulate them!	A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership, frequency, reliability, and population demands ( <i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i> , ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.
I-109	Ben McCune	My family and I would love for service to continue and improve in Oregon City. We prefer Alternative 1 as it primarily serves us here in the downtown, thus preserving historic stations and giving an option (hopefully faster) for those of us who wish to travel in style. Thanks!	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-110	Kay McEwen	<p>I received two notices in the mail today re public hearings on this matter. I already responded to this in person the last time you had a public hearing on this matter...how long ago? I would have thought you'd be finished with the project by this time instead of continuing to study it and have more public hearings.</p> <p>As I said before--Route #2--the West Woodburn route. Woodburn is already so noisy that my granddaughter from Portland (3 years old) wakes up in the middle of the night crying that it is so noisy that she can't sleep!! I've complained about that too, having moved from Salem when ODOT "improved" the Market Street exit to a quieter neighborhood in Woodburn, but then the traffic "improvements" and the train are so loud that it assaults my elderly ears! I thought it was just because I was getting old, but when my 3-year-old granddaughter awakens, crying, and has to sleep with a pillow over her head, I know something is intrinsically wrong! Noise pollution!</p>	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative.



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>I also think you should run a commuter train on the Union Pacific tracks between Woodburn&gt;&gt;Mt. Angel&gt;&gt;Silverton, Does that line also go to Stayton and Scio? A Mt. Angel man told me that they've already spent \$50,000 conducting a study on that matter, but that Union Pacific blocked the implementation because "they run freight on that line," and they can't mix freight and commuters. Really???</p> <p>Please--get the job done! No more \$\$\$ spent on "studies." Get it done in my lifetime! We've been talking about this since I moved to Oregon in 1952!!! THANK YOU!!!</p>	
I-111	Don McFarling	<p>Alternative Won! (1)</p> <p>Now let's find and secure a reliable and adequate source of funding to increase frequency and reliability!</p> <p>We have spent far too much time and money with far too little progress.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.</p>
I-112	Chris McLaughlin	<p>Choose which ever track is financially feasible to upgrade to a high speed rail system. We need something to bring the Oregon and the U.S. into the modern times like other countries. A high speed rail would excite the public again into using train system as the current system we have is much slower than even traveling by car. This would allow for travel for both tourism and also for employment commutes. Look at the new Hong Kong high speed rail line as an example of the positive impacts it would have on the statewide economy and lowering the traffic congestion on I-5. We can't keep using our antiquated systems expecting to experience increases in ridership. We have to adapt and embrace the future if we want to move forward as a community and a nation. That's why I feel even out of all the options posted the most important is the one not mentioned. Please consider the great economic benefit of having the first high-speed rail line in the Pacific Northwest would have for us. We can't afford to be stuck in the last century.</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p>
I-113	Seaton McLennan Former Mayor of Tangent	<p>1. Using the current rail line along 99E for high speed rail will negatively impact the current communities: Tangent, Shedd, Halsey, Harrisburg, especially with any closures to achieve the higher speed</p>	<p>Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative; it provides greater improvements in ridership and minimized environmental impact.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>rating.</p> <p>2. Response time for the Tangent Rural Fire Dept. will be increased.</p> <p>3. Using the I-5 corridor will achieve a higher speed rating. Development of infrastructure, businesses and other financial improvements will be good for the state economy.</p>	<p>Future infrastructure investments will consider grade-separated crossings where practical and feasible. Very few at-grade crossings were identified for closure with the proposed Project. Grade-separations will have a positive effect on community mobility as passing trains will no longer interdict traffic. Grade separations can also allow for faster train speeds in some situations.</p>
I-114	Vicky Mello	<p>I support Alternative 1 to build new capacity along the existing passenger rail route. I am very opposed to Alternative 2 as proposed. I do not support building new bridges across rivers nor do I support routing rail lines through natural areas like Eastgate Woodlands in Springfield. The cost of Alternative 2 is excessive and I think limited resources can be used along the existing route. I look forward to seeing final designs for Alternative 1.</p>	<p>With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.</p>
I-115	JR Merrick	<p>For the short term option 1 makes sense as it serves existing centers and stations and improvements can be made incrementally. A double track for the entire length should be part of the plan and the ask for funding. The primary use of the second track would be for passenger service.</p> <p>We need to plan for a tunnel from the Brooklyn yard into Union station or work on a freight tunnel to bypass the central east side. Either way 10mph speed and the land use constraints in this area are unacceptable when looking to the future.</p>	<p>While more detailed engineering and environmental work is needed and will be conducted in future Project development, FRA and ODOT developed the Preferred Alternative to operate with more frequency, higher speed, and greater reliability than the existing Cascades service; the improvements will attract more riders as described in the DEIS. The Preferred Alternative would share track with freight trains, and the operational analysis resulted in additional track, associated track infrastructure and technology enhancements to increase passenger rail reliability measured as on-time performance.</p> <p>Multiple tunnel concepts under the Willamette River were considered early in the process as part of the corridor concept screening (see Section 2.2 of the DEIS). The tunnel concepts in the Portland area were screened out because they could not be constructed in a manner that</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			would avoid substantial regulatory hurdles and/or avoid or minimize substantial community and natural environmental impacts. A tunnel between the Brooklyn Yard and Union Station would need to pass beneath the river. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to obtain the needed depth of the tunnel and to increase the grade to serve Union Station at ground level.
I-116	Cecilia Mihaylo	Alternative 1 is the one that got my attention. I really would like that to become a reality. Driving from Albany to Portland is a veritable nightmare at certain times of the day. I have the dream that one day going to the Portland airport would be something as easy as it is to do it in San Francisco. I hope I will get to see it. Oregon truly needs a good alternative to driving I-5 between Eugene and Portland. Thank you for you efforts.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. One purpose of the Project is to “integrate with existing and planned transportation networks,” and ODOT will continue to explore ways to enhance connectivity with transit in Portland and other communities that the Project will serve.
I-117	Mary Sharon Moore	I depend on local transit - not car.  Corvallis not included - is there a demand for rail connection Corvallis with Eugene and Portland?  With Greyhound now moved from Eugene to Springfield, what does "multimodal" mean for the Eugene rail station?	One purpose of the Project is to “integrate with existing and planned transportation networks” which includes local and intercity transit within and between communities including between Albany and Corvallis and between Eugene and Springfield. Additionally, travel demand between Corvallis and Portland, and Corvallis and Eugene continue to grow. However, ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. The OPR decision does not preclude potential future enhanced transit connections to Corvallis and Springfield.
I-118	Mike Morrison	This is a worthy project. Alternative 1 offers the most realistic solution to Oregon's needs.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. One purpose of the Project is to “integrate with existing and planned transportation networks,”

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			and ODOT will continue to explore ways to enhance connectivity with transit in Portland and other communities that the Project will serve.
I-119	Deborah Neel	<p>Verbal testimony:</p> <p>I live in West Linn. So I used to commute from Salem to Portland in a van pool. And I decided after sitting in traffic for an hour and a half between Wilsonville and Portland, downtown Portland, each way, that it was not productive. There had to be a better alternative and it meant moving, so I moved from Salem to West Linn.</p> <p>Now that I'm in West Linn, I still have an issue with access to public transportation because there isn't any. I can take a bus. The No. 35 bus takes approximately an hour and a half and arrives in downtown Portland, and doesn't go across the river. I happen to work at the Lloyd Center so then I have to get on the MAX and take an additional leg. So my commute time each way is two hours, which I might as well have stayed in Salem for.</p> <p>So my question is if the City of Portland is looking at extending the MAX line from Portland down to Tualatin, and they think that's a feasible alternative, why is the railroad not looking at that same corridor? Why are they telling me that tunnels are too expensive or that politics are not in favor of it? I don't think either one of those arguments stands a chance if the MAX line obviously refutes both those arguments by saying that's going to be their new track line. So I find that there's insufficient study of that option.</p> <p>And the option to go down 205 and cross the river and go into the congested Oregon City rail line area could be the death of that option completely. Because, you know, it's a very tight corridor up on that side. It's just as tight as going from Tualatin north along route 5. So I would challenge the choice of Alternative 1, and say that it's not very far forward thinking.</p> <p>If you want to look at the future of transportation in this area decades</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As you've noted, Metro is leading a planning effort for the Southwest Corridor Project, which would bring light rail from Tualatin to central Portland. The light rail tracks that would be used in the Southwest Corridor cannot accommodate the Cascades service, which uses heavy rail and does not have overhead catenary.</p> <p>The Preferred Alternative would continue to share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Regarding the delays spent on sidings between Salem and Oregon City, additional infrastructure is planned in this section to alleviate crowding.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>from now, then you need to look at the most realistic achievable route, but also the most efficient route that's going to alleviate commuter traffic from the south of Portland through Portland going north. Because commuter traffic combined with shipping, freight traffic is the problem. And when you add local traffic to that, it's a nightmare. There's no way around it. There's no alternative. There's no relief.</p> <p>A train system that effectively worked from north to south would really make a difference on the route 5 corridor load that it's carrying for vehicle traffic. I have family that frequently come from Salem to Oregon City by train. They often wait 20 to 35 minutes for their turn at the tracks to come down to Oregon City because they're a passenger train and they don't have priority on the freight line. And I don't think adding a line in that corridor is going to completely change that issue. Especially if the freight -- if the railroad companies that do the freight lines control that real estate.</p> <p>So again, I think there's some real obstacles on that route that could torpedo the whole effort in the near term. So I just wanted to voice my opinion.</p>	
I-120	Cynthia Noblitt, business owner/operator, Deep Woods Distillery	I believe Alternative 1 is the best option, as long as service improvements include a stop in Oakridge OR. I am a strong supporter of rail transportation, but I do not think a new route is necessary, and if it is done in order to allow for so called high speed trains, I don't think that expense is worth the extra few minutes gained.	Thank you for your comment. This Project addresses the corridor between Eugene and Portland; destinations south of Eugene are served by the Coast Starlight are not directly addressed in this study. ODOT and WSDOT published a station stop policy that addresses the process for adding stops on existing routes. <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a>
I-121	Jennene Norblad Umpqua Bank	I was unable to attend in person the presentation of the three options, but in reviewing the information it appears that the proposal design process did not have significant input from citizen prior to the	Thank you for your comments and participation in the public hearings for the DEIS. ODOT has led public engagement processes for the Project

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>evaluate stage and was done in a slow, vacuum-like of perspective of ODOT.</p> <p>As a result, it appears that none of the three proposals have a phased or hybrid approach to making improvements. Also the design approach process doesn't appear to consider many of the changes in the economy of Oregon, generational changes and even current congestion issues in the solutions.</p> <p>I've been using the Amtrak Cascades line for over 15 years, having gone the full span of the track from Eugene to Vancouver with more frequent travel between the other stops. In the early days, when I've commented in the past to Amtrak about possible improvements, it has been focused on time, speed, and reliability. These fronts have greatly improved in recent years, especially in terms of perspective to automobile routes that have become increasingly dangerous and time consuming. In a very short time, the 2.5 hour train trip from Eugene to Portland, has gone from "too long" to perfectly acceptable and often times less time consuming and more reliable than driving. Now, the things that I wish the rail service would provide are more connectivity to other mass transit (connect to MAX?, Free Park and Ride, buses, bicycle storage/transport, etc.), stops near other major cities/junctions (Wilsonville, Tigard/Lake Oswego, Woodburn, Keizer, connectivity to Washington County), better marketing to expose more users to the rail options and to really consider long-term fast passenger rail solutions.</p> <p>While the simulations in the designs are very important work, it seems like all of the designs seem to leave out the opportunity to engage the local transportation and local governments to also elevate their game and work together. In the short time of this proposal being advertising via media outlets it seems like I've seen a lot of truly great out ideas come out of friends and family, that aren't even remotely on the radar of these designs. This is a HUGE missed opportunity, but I can't tell if this is due to the scope of what the state is able to do or because we aren't trying to actually prepare for the future need and/or address the immediate needs.</p>	<p>over several years, as outlined in Chapter 5 of the DEIS. Activities included work with the Governor-appointed Leadership Council, Community Advisory Groups, the Corridor Forum and multiple public meetings and outreach efforts. Responses to each of your four specific suggestions follow.</p> <p>1. Regarding better bike storage, ODOT will work with Amtrak to improve the bike storage at the existing stations. There are currently bike lockers in Albany and Salem. ODOT will consider further investments in bike storage capacity. ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains and at stations while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p> <p>Additionally, Portland's Union Station is directly adjacent to a Max stop; most Oregon stations have free parking and bus connections. Portland, Salem, and Eugene now have bike share facilities adjacent to the station.</p> <p>2 and 4. ODOT and WSDOT published a station stop policy that addresses the process for adding stops on existing routes. You can find the station stop policy here: <a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p> <p>3. ODOT has worked with hotels and the University of Oregon in past marketing efforts when budget for marketing was available. Travel to and from home games on the Amtrak</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Additionally, it appears that in this evaluate stage, there are no space for the public comment to improve the options, only to decide between the three options - which have been proposed in a classic, too little, moderate, and too much, so that we as a public will fall for not even considering high-speed rail due to cost, and then land on the do nothing or barely doing anything options.</p> <p>Using more advanced design thinking techniques, we should have seen this public outreach much earlier in the process. We should have seen a broader diversity in the leadership committee of the project, that included citizen and actual train users of different ages. And most importantly, the evaluate stage shouldn't feel like the end of the road to creating better ideas or options to adjust to the changing environment and needs of Oregon.</p> <p>I'm in full agreement with Governor Brown that the rail system in Oregon is one of the most underutilized transportation options we have. I hope that ODOT, the leadership committee, and program coordinators for this effort are committed to actually improving the state of the rail system in the Willamette Valley and will consider a broader array of solutions from improvements.</p> <p>Please at a minimum, consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Better bicycle storage/transport for Amtrak riders, where they can transport their bicycles in their own storage containers and where locked long-term bicycle parking is available at each station.</li> <li>2. A stop and connection on the south end of the Portland-metro area that could connect to existing or future MAX lines.</li> <li>3. Private-public or inter agency partnerships to improve existing ridership, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. building alliances between local hotels and Amtrak for shuttle pick-ups/advertisement, etc.</li> <li>b. Coordination between University of Oregon and Amtrak to provide packaged incentives to event attendees travelling between Portland and Eugene for UO personnel and special events - such as Duck Football games.</li> <li>c. discussion with local transportation groups to find additional ways to improve the user experience from Amtrak to other modes to get</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Cascades can be difficult due to the fact that kick-off times are not announced in sufficient time to allow for a schedule change, and the schedule often does not align with the kick-off time. ODOT is currently developing a marketing plan for the Cascades service. ODOT continues to collaborate with local jurisdictions and transit agencies to support transit and rail service in Oregon.</p> <p>5. A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p> <p>ODOT, along with WSDOT and British Columbia, are exploring ultra high-speed rail from Portland to Seattle to BC.</p> <p><a href="https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ult-ra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study">https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ult-ra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study</a></p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>around the cities.</p> <p>4. If maintaining the existing line, a station stop in Woodburn or other passed by cities to allow for additional flexibility in train travel.</p> <p>5. If a decision is made for the least costly option, there needs to be a plan to start planning for the inevitable need for high-speed rail in some part of the state, even if it is between the The Dalles/Bend, instead of the Willamette Valley as a test project. We have got to make a serious investment in our future transit needs in order to stay competitive in the next century. A 'No' to high speed rail, cannot be a 'No' forever.</p>	
I-122	Phillip Norman, Owner, Attic Access	<p>The demand that plans are consistent with those in California and Washington, means highest hopes everywhere must prevail. A 50% boost in ridership on slow trains is not wanted. We need rail service to far surpass auto and air transportation, for example between Salem and Olympia. We need ridership to increase by orders of magnitude for the plan horizon. The horizon must extend past 2035 and must be guided by achievements in Europe. Swiss engineers are ready to help, fully trained in high speed rail opportunities met and now ended. Available NOW. Not in twenty years.</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger network.</p>
I-123	Sigh O'Nara	<p>I'm excited that this plan is being talked about and considered. I hope Alternative 1 doesn't actually use the rail that Amtrak runs on, since that rail is also used by the freight lines which actually own the lines and have higher priority.</p> <p>Purely selfishly I hope any high-speed/direct rail will start in Eugene rather than Springfield.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative would continue to share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements.
I-124	Pat [no last name provided]	More priority to passenger service ...currently the rail service puts the freight trains first with some delays to passenger (Amtrak) service	The Preferred Alternative would continue to share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements.
I-125	Dr. Patrick Ardron-Hudson	<i>Comment filed alphabetically with "A" comments, between I-2 and I-3</i>	N/A
I-126	Kenneth Peters	To make Alternative 1 work a major revamping of the right of way near the Salem station will have to be done. The current situation is much like Defiance Point Tunnel in Tacoma, it only differs in that downtown Salem is desirable rather than near Lancaster Drive (I-5).	While more detailed engineering will be done through future Tier 2 studies, the Preferred Alternative does not require additional right-of-way at the Salem station.
I-127	Madeline Phillips	Please provide reliable service between Springfield and Portland to help alleviate traffic impacts of drivers and freight traffic on I-5. Current passenger rail to Portland is not reliable enough to meet current needs, and will have to provide greater reliability in order to generate the demand and regular users. Alternative 2, providing a separated track would show: - vision for future Oregonians, - enhance the State's ability to serve a growing population/economy, - develop an alternative for single-occupancy trips (reduce VMT), and - establish Oregon as a partner to the CalTrans high-speed corridor.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-128	Leslie Polson	Stupid, expensive alternative to run by I-5, change stations after expensive investments away from central core. Albany and Salem biggest dumb new locations. Connectivity in Oregon City is bad. One	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		mile away from TriMet stop. No covered shelter in Salem. Greyhound in Springfield is only location where it makes sense. Corvallis connectivity is still a problem.	forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route, and in coordination with local jurisdictions and transit agencies to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service. ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the OPR decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.
I-129	Julia Pommert	I see benefits in both routes. I would like to see investment in passenger rail service.	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route.
I-130	Sharon Posner	I would like to encourage the renewal of the 9 am Cascades train to Portland which originated in Eugene. That time is just perfect for a meeting in Salem or a day in Portland and definitely beats catching the 5:30 am train. I think you would see a major uptick in passenger travel.	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route, including future train schedules that optimize ridership.
I-131	Robert Poulsen	Usually I am in favor of more ambitious public projects. In this case, Alternative 2 makes no sense. Alternative 1 is best due to lower cost, less environmental impact, and more service to city cores. Also: please include Corvallis in your planning, including highly-dependable bus shuttle service from Corvallis to Albany Station, coordinated with exact arrivals and departures of trains -- including allowing for delays, with notification to Corvallis residents, perhaps via app or online.	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route. ODOT will take actions in coordination with local jurisdictions and transit agencies (including

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			transit service between Corvallis and Albany) to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service between Eugene and Portland.
I-132	Douglas Quirke Eugene, OR 541-686-3027	<p>Section 2.2.3 ("Transportation Modes and Train Technologies") lists five locomotive technologies at the top of page 2-9; the more detailed discussion of technologies (under 2.2.3.2 ("Technologies") about halfway down page 2-9) discusses only four of the five technologies-- electric is not discussed for some reason. Electric technology is then dismissed from further consideration on page 2-16 via the following statement:</p> <p>"Electric propulsion technology would not be compatible with service provided or planned in Washington State." The basis for this statement is not clear--is Washington truly locked into non-electric technology going forward, especially in light of what appears to be near-daily reports revealing the increasingly dire nature of climate change (for example, last Thursday's report from the Oregon Global Warming Commission, which concludes that "Oregon's GHG goals are not likely to be met with existing and currently planned actions"). The Rail Division of the Oregon Department of Transportation issued a report in June of 2009 entitled "Passenger Rail Solar Electrification: A Primer."</p> <p>According to this document, "Green house gas (CO2) emissions from six diesel roundtrips per day would equal 8,851 tons per year. If 109 miles of the 120-mile corridor was electrified with solar power, greenhouse gas emissions would be reduced to 767 tons per year, a 91 percent reduction." Additionally, "If service grows to six roundtrips per day, 1 million gallons of diesel and \$3 million in fuel costs will be saved each year." Given advances in solar in the nine years since this document was produced, I'd think that solar electrification is even more promising now than it was at that time. The DEIS appears to ignore the 2009 document, and appears to dismiss dual mode technology without addressing the significant reduction in GHG emissions discussed in the 2009 document. The DEIS also fails to do an updated analysis of possible GHG reductions associated with electric or dual mode technology in light of technological advances that have taken place since 2009.</p>	<p>Washington State has no adopted plans to change the propulsion technology of Amtrak Cascades intercity passenger trains. The OPR Project considered the ODOT 2009 "Primer," along with additional information about electric and dual-mode train set propulsion to inform the study and Preferred Alternative recommendation. Section 2.4.3 of the DEIS, "Evaluation of Transportation Modes and Train Technologies", describes that the dual mode/power technology was found to require electrification of the rail line (typically through an overhead catenary) at an added cost. Unless substantial portions of the alignment were electrified, the technology would not achieve the benefit of higher speeds compared to the existing diesel technology. Further, the electrification of the line would require increased overhead clearance on existing and proposed rail alignments due to the overhead catenary lines.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Thank you,</p> <p>Douglas Quirke</p>	
I-133	Carleen Reily	<p>What is the relationship between Oregon Passenger rail and Union Pacific? Will we still be put on the side rails to let freight go through?</p>	<p>Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law.</p>
I-134	Marilyn Ripley	<p>Excellent! For two 2-years periods I was a weekly rider from Eugene to Portland. I appreciate the service and agree that Alternative 1 is also my preference. Thanks for all the dedicated, thoughtful work.</p> <p>Most important issues to me:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increasing scheduled trains choices</li> <li>2. Timeliness</li> <li>3. Lower or create a discounted ticket option for family groups.</li> </ol> <p>As a senior the fare is a good value for me, but I think it would increase ridership for group families if there was a better/lower fare for a family group.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT and FRA appreciate your comment on fare structures and have shared your comment with the ODOT Passenger Rail Project Manager. In addition to offering special pricing for seniors, children qualify for reduced rate tickets on the Amtrak Cascades. For more information see: <a href="https://www.amtrakcascades.com/specials">https://www.amtrakcascades.com/specials</a></p>
I-135	Mark Robinowitz	<p>After many years of delay, ODOT has finally released a long overdue Draft EIS on better train service between Eugene and Portland. The proposal would increase Amtrak Cascades frequency to six round trips a day by 2035, which would bring service back to 1940 levels (when there were also six round trips daily).</p> <p>Six trains a day nearly two decades from now would not be noteworthy in most of the industrialized world, but in Oregon this is an unprecedented initiative.</p> <p>It would be nice to have choices of departure times from Eugene to Portland beyond 5:30 am, lunch time (when the Coast Starlight is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>With the publication of this FEIS and Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route, including future train schedules that optimize ridership. ODOT understands that many of their customers, and potential customers, would value increased service and improved reliability. The Tier 1 EIS is being completed as the major component of the FRA and ODOT-led Oregon Passenger Rail Corridor Investment Plan. A</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>approximately on time) or late afternoon. I have friends who have lived in Eugene and worked at the State Capitol and Salem who regretted they were unable to use Amtrak to commute despite living and working walking distance from each train station.</p> <p>As every Amtrak frequent rider knows, the train schedule can be unreliable due to freight congestion and the lack of double tracked sections that force trains to wait in sidings. The DEIS would address some of this, but does not detail why some single track sections would be added to and others would not be. Some of the train lines through towns would require substantial community disruption for double tracking, but other segments that would remain single track are in rural locations that would not bulldoze homes or wetlands with endangered species.</p> <p>There does not seem to be any money appropriated beyond funding this study. Contractors who create NEPA documents are spendy, but laying down rail, buying train sets, installing new crossing gates, rail bridges over waterways, grade separating roads over rail lines are much more expensive.</p> <p>Meanwhile, the region, the country, global civilization is facing the start of intensifying climate change and the end of the fossil fuel boom due to depletion. Both of these interconnected problems need consideration for future transportation and economic planning.</p> <p><u>Revised Purpose and Need</u></p> <p>The next stage of the NEPA process needs to consider physically possible scenarios for transportation demand and funding of maintenance and construction. Primary among considerations would be the expected availability of finite concentrated fossil carbon, since expensive oil and/or rationing would make existing projections moot.</p>	<p>Service Development Plan will also be completed to determine the incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, including scheduling additional intercity passenger rail trains to support optimal ridership.</p> <p><u>Revised Purpose and Need: Limited fossil fuels</u></p> <p>Thank you for raising the question about fossil fuels and the relationship to transportation. The Tier 1 EIS addresses a 20-year planning horizon; major shifts in energy availability are not anticipated during that time.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p><u>"New Circumstances" will require a Supplemental Draft EIS</u></p> <p>If a final EIS is prepared and published without consideration of energy descent, an SDEIS would be needed to address the "new circumstances" of energy shifts that will change the assumptions in the study.</p> <p>The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires a revision to the Environmental Impact Statement to address the new information about Peak Oil and climate change.</p> <p>40 CFR 1502.9: Draft, final and supplemental statements.</p> <p>(c) Agencies:</p> <p>(1) Shall prepare supplements to either draft or final environmental impact statements if:</p> <p>(i) The agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns; or</p> <p>(ii) There are significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts. 23 CFR § 771.130 Supplemental environmental impact statements.</p> <p>(a) A draft EIS, final EIS, or supplemental EIS may be supplemented at any time. An EIS shall be supplemented whenever the Administration determines that: (1) Changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the EIS; or</p> <p>(2) New information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearings on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIS.</p> <p>The Peak of global petroleum extraction is a "new circumstance" that impacts the purpose and need for any federally funded transportation project.</p>	<p><u>Supplemental Draft EIS</u></p> <p>The Tier 1 EIS addresses a 20-year planning horizon; major shifts in energy availability are not anticipated during that time.</p> <p>As noted in Section 4.17, improved passenger rail service has the potential to replace automobile, bus, and airplane trips along the length of the study area, as well as to generate demand for new rail trips. Ridership is projected to increase under Alternative 1 compared to existing conditions and the No Action Alternative. Based on ridership modeling completed in 2020, Oregon-supported Amtrak Thruway bus and passenger rail ridership in 2015 would increase by approximately 34 percent by 2035 under the No Action Alternative and would more than double under Preferred Alternative. A portion of this increase would be attributed to mode shift, including replacing Thruway bus trips with passenger rail trips.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>The global peak of conventional oil is now past, and this reality needs to be a primary consideration for any study of economics, energy, travel demand, financial futures, resource availability and related concerns over the next two decades (the timeline of this study).</p> <p>Energy limits is not something “outside the scope” of this study, but fundamental to any consideration of energy in 2035. Obviously a precise guess of what will happen on the energy downslope is impossible to quantify, but assuming that it will continue as usual is likely the most erroneous prediction. Availability of concentrated energy is at the core of any transportation demand projection so the SDEIS needs to anticipate how Oregonians will continue to travel as oil becomes scarcer.</p> <p>The Obama / Biden administration gave more support to Amtrak than any previous administrations. Senator Biden was a frequent Amtrak rider between Delaware and Capitol Hill. The main reason is probably because that administration understood Peak Oil even if they dare not admit it in public. Rebuilding the rails would be required to mitigate Peak Oil's transportation impacts. But the soundbite of "High Speed Rail" distracts from some inconvenient truths – the appropriation of eight billion dollars will only pay for modest fixes to a few lines. Higher speed rail for all of the initial corridors would require hundreds of billions, and a national network of actual high speed rail would be even more expensive -- that would require redirecting funds for more freeways and converting military contractors to build trains. It creates more jobs per dollar to make trains instead of missiles. On the downslope of Peak Energy we need "Transportation Triage" to prioritize systems more likely to be useful during the permanent oil shock, not new highways built on the assumption traffic levels will go up forever. The money the United States spent to destroy Iraq could have been used for renewable energy systems to power a real national rail network. It would take a lot of fossil fuel inputs to make these systems. Steel and concrete need a lot of energy to produce. It would be wise to prioritize the remaining fossil and mineral resources to anticipate the lower energy future that lies ahead.</p>	

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p><u>Peak energy, limits to growth, depletion</u></p> <p><u>Alaska Pipeline has declined three-fourths, nearing low flow shutdown. It powers Cascadia’s motors including food delivery trucks</u></p> <p>During the DEIS comment period the Trans Alaska pipeline narrowly escaped disruption or destruction due to a Magnitude 7 earthquake on November 30, 2018. But even without seismic shocks, the pipeline continues to dwindle toward the inevitable low flow shutdown. Cascadia is totally dependent on this source of concentrated energy to run our motors, including cars, trains, planes, container ships and food delivery trucks. It is hard to predict the point when this system will close down, but the potential exists for systemic impacts within the twenty year planning horizon assumed in this NEPA process, even if new drilling is started in northwest or northeast Alaska.</p> <p>I have had transportation planners from different levels of government quietly admit that this is a real concern and ask me how I think it could be considered. Perhaps a range of alternatives reflecting different scenarios makes sense. There could be the pollyanna “100% renewable green growth” future where techno-fixes save the day at the end of the oil era. I have personally used solar PV since 1990 and enjoy it, although not so much in the wintertime. (I have concluded living on our solar budget might be able to power enough things to stave off the worst case scenarios, but won’t power ever increasing exponential growth and therefore our way of life won’t be solar powered.) There could also be an “oil rationing” scenario which includes substantially less VMT, a permanent economic recession or depression, and more demand for trains and buses to facilitate travel (but less ability to pay for those services or rail construction to add service). A collapse scenario could also be examined, but in that circumstance railroads might be moot as a consideration.</p> <p>In 2005, the US Department of Energy (Bush administration) commissioned a study to examine the economic impacts of peak energy. Robert Hirsch was the lead author and the report is popularly</p>	



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>known as the Hirsch report. He concluded that we would need two decades of preparations to react to the impacts of Peak Oil, or risk severe economic shocks. I heard Mr. Hirsch speak at the Association for the Study of Peak Oil conferences (ASPO-USA) and asked him if he was subtly suggesting that we blew it when our society ignored President Carter’s warnings to pay attention to the energy crises. He just smiled in response ...</p> <p>Since the Hirsch report, the US has engaged in a massive expansion of unconventional oil and gas to avert the shocks of peaked energy. Fracking has been a steep boom for both fuel sources and has enabled much of the society to go back to sleep - a snooze button. However, fracked wells decline far faster than conventional wells and the early fracked fields have mostly peaked and started their declines. When the fracking boom tips over into bust, the energy crises are likely to return like the passage of the eye of a Category Five hurricane, a scenario we are totally unprepared for either logistically or psychologically.</p> <p>Here is some relevant background on this limiting, fundamental factor for any economic and transportation planning in Ore-is-gone.</p> <p><i>[Remainder of comment letter comprised of articles, maps and attachments. The full submittal is included in this appendix within the record of individual comments.]</i></p>	
I-136	Robert Rose	<p>ODOT’s designation of Alternative 1 (A1) over Alternative 2 (A2) as the preferred alternative is disappointing. A1 does not represent the innovation and problem-solving spirit that is needed to address the challenges that face our region, and the nation, in the coming decades. We are beset with a climate-change outlook that requires drastic cuts to carbon emissions in the decades ahead. Some Improved service on the existing alignment, the A1 solution, will be an improvement for current users of the service; it will do very little to encourage potential new users to leave their cars at home and take the train.</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project’s goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>ODOT developed a high-speed rail concept vision as part of the OPR EIS process, which</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>I question the use of the slightly higher ridership snapshot projection associated with A1 over A2 in 2035 as a justification for A1 as the preferred alternative. While likely accurate, does it represent the trend for the years and decades beyond 2035? And does it respond to where the expected 27% population growth is likely to occur? I'm skeptical.</p> <p>A2 represents a material improvement in Willamette Valley rail transportation. A1 represents more of a tweak that is analogous to a bandaid. In addition to a shorter trip and a right-of-way that is by and large free of conflicts with freight traffic, A2 provides stations that are closer to where people live, or are likely to live. Densely populated areas of the Portland Metro region have good transit options to the centrally located stations, e.g., Union Station. This is not the case for outlying locations. Close proximity to stations in these areas is what is needed to entice people to use the train. People will bike, drive, or take transit for a short distance to a station near their homes, but would not likely use a service that requires them to drive to the current centrally located stations of A1. If forced to do the latter, they would likely just stay in their cars for the entire trip.</p> <p>Finally, in spite of its much lower cost, A1 is more vulnerable to the vagaries of political will and opportunistic critique. The fact that it could be built incrementally, as long as politicians in power remain favorably disposed to a solution, means that its completion could be easily curtailed. Portions of an incremental solution are much more subject to delay and cancellation than is a bold undertaking that is responsive to present and future needs. Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Robert B. Rose Lake Oswego</p>	<p>examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC). The Rogue Valley is not within the PNWRC and outside the Project study area. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail —generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment. The study outlined the necessary steps to progress, including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014); Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p>
I-137	Mark Ross	More trains, fewer cars	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-138	Rob Roy	<p>I encourage the Oregon Department of Transportation to continue to serve bicyclists as it improves inter-city passenger rail service between Eugene-Springfield and Portland. I live in Eugene and have traveled often on the train with my bike.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have traveled often to Portland on the Amtrak Cascades for the day with my bike, returning to Eugene.</li> <li>• I have visited my brother in Davis, California, several times with my bicycle and have taken the Coast Starlight.</li> <li>• One year, I and three friends took the Amtrak Cascades from Eugene, OR to Seattle, WA for week of cycling in the San Juan Islands. We boarded the south-bound Amtrak Cascades train in Mount Vernon, WA with four bikes, and rode back to Eugene.</li> </ul>	<p>ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p>
I-139	Robert Roy	<p>I encourage Amtrak to accommodate passengers with bicycles.</p> <p>I've ridden on the Amtrak Cascades with my bike many times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I ride on the Amtrak Cascades often from Eugene, OR to Portland, OR, with a bicycle.</li> <li>• Once, I rode Amtrak Cascades with three friends and our four bikes to Seattle WA., returning to Eugene, OR from Mt. Vernon, WA.</li> <li>• I have ridden Amtrak several times with a bicycle to Davis, CA.</li> </ul>	<p>ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p>
I-140	Rob Roy	<p>Bicycle facilities to match rider projections.</p>	<p>ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p>
I-141	Paul Sachet	<p>Topic: Long term plans for increasing service between Portland and Eugene</p> <p>Good day. My name is Paul Sachet. I reside at 2191 Westwood Ln, Eugene, Oregon. Train travel for me pre-dates my earliest memory. My father received various soldier assignments in the US, which led to steam powered trips for my mother and I to training bases. However, for this Beaver State, for the "webs between my toes" and for my acquisition of Duck wings I do have also many miles of experience</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Early in the planning process, FRA and ODOT established the OPR Project Purpose and Need, and Goals and Objectives that provided the foundational framework to develop, screen initial concepts, compare and evaluate preliminary alternatives, evaluate a smaller and refined set of alternatives, and provide information to support selection of a Preferred Alternative. The Project</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>across, and up-and-down, this fine state. In fact, I do remember only having 99E and 99W for north and south travels and how lightly traveled I-5 was while attending my early childhood education here in the Willamette Valley. Contrasting negotiating I-5 today with the 1950s leaves on shaking over the volume and stress level of differences. And, my travels have continued to include train services.</p> <p>I have lived in and traveled widely by train in various European countries and, as well, am an occasional user of Amtrak service between Eugene and Seattle. European service is by-and-large "First World" for me. Amtrak is "Second World," at best. The leading problem here, while acknowledging progress, is the sufferable sharing of tracks with freight service. Then, it is also the road bed conditions that impair fast and efficient service. Now I do not need to belabor matters over today's service with my own examples. The larger issues have been laid out before us. One, to make current roadway better and somehow faster. Or, two, to build a new, fast roadway, such as along I-5 corridor. I am not sure that a bifurcation of such leads to what I would envision.</p> <p>Briefly. my thoughts are as follows:</p> <p>Build for the present and future. Plan for these Objectives: 1. Relieve I-5 congestion. 2. Increase travel safety. 3. Reduce our carbon footprint. 4. Envision routing that best services the population concentrations. And 5. Plan and fund for service efficiency.</p> <p>Each on of these objectives should follow with discussion, however in the interest of time I will be glad to submit such to the respective officials in writing. The gist of my discussion before you today is that I do not see the current Eugene-Portland route as adequately addressing the population concentrations. It should run from Portland west of I-5 to Salem. It should continue to serve Albany. It should be routed such that it serves Corvallis. From there is should continue to serve Junction City ad then reconnect to Eugene. Furthermore, service should not only be more frequent between Eugene and Portland, but it should also include frequent intra-regional services with 1-2-3 car "commuter" like services between two or three cities. Added to such</p>	<p>engaged a large and diverse array of stakeholders and explored a wide variety of ideas, including different routes and station locations. The process resulted in the Preferred Alternative recommendation provided in the Tier 1 DEIS.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>connections should be connections for regional and international airports.</p> <p>In my lifetime, Oregon's population has grown tremendously and this too will not abate. Passenger rail service can be ever more vital and popular. I believe that a time for planning and establishing fast and efficient service is best established today and while there is less pressure for where to place roadways.</p> <p>Thank you for your interest and making this opportunity available.</p>	
I-142	Eric Sandoval	Alternative 1 provides a healthy growth for this vital transportation resource.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-143	Meredith Schreiber	<p>Alternative 1 makes good sense. Not having to share tracks with freight would be a huge improvement - giving options for travel seems essential, less fuel, carbon emissions, affordable housing choices for commuters, social justice, quality of life.</p> <p>If MAX in Portland can keep expanding, the money should be there, competing interest, etc. but I appreciate the excellent work done so far and hope progress continues. I've been hoping for this for 18 years already!</p>	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-144	Richard Scott	<p>The displays and oral presentation were very helpful in providing more full understanding that the newspaper.</p> <p>Alternative 1 seems like a very sound and attainable solution in the foreseeable future and I appreciate its potential for additions beyond that.</p> <p>High speed doesn't seem like a necessary goal at the present. Frequent service (without time on sidings) is desirable for now.</p> <p>Thanks for the presentation.</p>	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.
I-145	Brenda Scotton	Currently Amtrak passenger service is unreliable due to shared time with freight traffic using the same time. Would Alternative 1 address this conflict? It would be great to increase existing 2 trips daily to 6	Thank you for your comment. The Preferred Alternative would share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>trips daily if the reliability of the service became a reality. If Alternative 1 doesn't result in schedule efficiency, then Alternative 2 with a new track is preferred.</p> <p>I have a problem with Portland Union Station. It is in some ways ideally located next to Greyhound and accessible to regional buses forming a commuter hub. Security at that location is needed within a 4-6 block radius so elderly, handicapped or other vulnerable commuters can safely travel between Amtrak/Greyhound/regional bus hub to Trimet.</p> <p>Summary: I want a reliable and safe rail commute.</p>	<p>the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements.</p>
I-146	Elaine Sedlack	<p>I am retired so I don't commute, but want to be able to go to art museums.</p> <p>I would prefer the plan which follows the existing rails line, as it will make it accessible to more people. The 18 minute difference is not importance to me. I love taking the train, and would do so much more frequently - probably at least twice a month, if not more, if there were enough trains running to allow going to Portland from Eugene easily in one day. I avoid taking the bus so I use the 5:30 AM train when I do go to Portland. I refuse to drive to Portland. I also would encourage you to be sure to accommodate as many bikes as possible.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1, which follows the existing Amtrak Cascades route, has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p>
I-147	Roberta Sesso	<p>I have lived in Wilsonville for 5 years. I don't drive &amp; find public transit very limited &amp; difficult to access. Wilsonville is a "transportation desert", providing, along with Tri-Met, a very limited access geographically. I have to travel by 2 buses into Portland to get to Amtrak, or two buses to Salem to get to Amtrak, which I use frequently.</p> <p>I could get on the Cascades in Canby- right across the river from Wilsonville; but it doesn't stop there. I watched the Cascades go through Canby twice in one day!</p> <p>Route 1 would require me to keep on doing this, or take 3 buses to Oregon City, then a 4th bus to the Amtrak stop!</p> <p>Therefore, I favor Route 2- this opens up many alternative transportation connections, which do not exist now or are too timely &amp; arduous. This applies to many people in this "transportation desert",</p>	<p>One purpose of the OPR Project is to "integrate with existing and planned transportation networks." As the Project progresses beyond the Tier 1 EIS and Record of Decision, local transit providers and ODOT will have the ability to improve connections to the service. Regarding adding a station in Canby, ODOT and the Washington Department of Transportation adopted a Station Stop Policy that outlines what criteria need to be met before additional stops on the Cascade Routes are added to the service (see <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a>).</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>both in &amp; around Wilsonville- Tualatin north to PDX, east to West Linn, south to Canby, Aurora, etc.</p> <p>This is a large resource of potential passengers, yet has been overlooked for many years by transportation planners in this area. Route 2 gets my vote :)</p>	
I-148a	Elise Shearer	<p>Favor existing route with improvements. Any chance of adding more stations is always welcome, but I know it changes travel time &amp; interferes with schedules. Thank you for more efficient passenger options for travel besides driving &amp; flying.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. Regarding adding stations in the future, ODOT and the Washington Department of Transportation adopted a Station Stop Policy that outlines what criteria need to be met before additional stops on the Cascade Routes are added to the service (see <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a>).</p>
I-148b	Elise Shearer	<p>Please keep the Wilsonville station if possible. It serves a lot of businesses &amp; a growing population base in South Metro area.</p>	<p>While the Preferred Alternative does not include a station in Wilsonville, one purpose of the OPR Project is to “integrate with existing and planned transportation networks.” As the Project progresses beyond the Tier 1 EIS and Record of Decision, local transit providers and ODOT will have the ability to improve connections to the service.</p>
I-149	<p>Mark Siddall Resident of Albany (541) 929-0021</p>	<p>Advocating for continued use of Albany station as the location of passenger rail service to the Albany, Corvallis, Lebanon, Sweet Home, Newport communities.</p> <p>Double tracking and consequent more frequent departures is most important to increase of passenger rail.</p>	<p>To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements.</p>
I-150	Mark Siddall	<p>Verbal testimony:</p> <p>Basically it's because I'm a consumer of rail passenger service. Stacy and I were discussing things which actually turned out to be quite parallel to what -- from her position as an ODOT, Oregon Department of Transportation person, what services can rail perform that's</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>economical and safe and appropriate for people like myself, who are consumers of the service.</p> <p>And more specifically, how does our -- my consumer's point of view align with the point of view of national, state, and local -- did I get that right?</p> <p>-- services align. And it's surprising -- it is surprising to me, anyway, that there's a great deal of correspondence of interest. It's got to be fast -- I mean, from the time I'd like to go to when I'm there is important, particularly in competition with airline and automobile. And safe, particularly with respect to automobile safety and pleasant.</p> <p>So I've used rail service a number of places in Europe and here, and I do so quite often. Now that I'm fully retired, I use rail services a lot more even. In the past when I was on vacation time, I used rail services in Europe a lot. And as a bicyclist, which is the other factor, I look for both speed and safety and convenience as a factor too. That's not just vacation.</p> <p>I was describing when my late wife was requiring medical at OHSU in Portland, I was identical to the many other commuters I found on the Cascades from here to Portland. So it was important to me that I was able to get to the hospital in time for their opening at 8:00, and that I was able to find a train home. And that when I got on the train, it was important that I could find something to eat, and to be in safe surroundings and be in a pleasant place. You know, read and do other work I had to do, which includes Internet connectivity and the like. It needed to be affordable. It's no big deal, but it matters.</p> <p>So with regard to tonight's meeting decision it occurred to me that it would be less desirable for me to have to go to a high-speed rail terminal than to utilize one that's already there, but with more frequent service. But it doesn't necessarily have to be fast, because from the point of view of the user, it's not how fast you go. We were talking about the Channel Tunnel, my present wife, she decided to take a nap and woke up in France 20 minutes later. It's not necessarily scenic because you can't even see the scenery above 200 hundred miles an hour. It's kind of like two trains, you pass another train and it's a blur. The scenery was a blur out to about a quarter mile or half</p>	<p>adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>mile so it's not scenic.</p> <p>What actually mattered is could I get up in the morning, you know, I had to be there 6:10 or 6:11 on the early train. And her ICU closed at 8:00 and I couldn't sleep on the -- I was, for a while, in her room sleeping and I didn't need the train. But in the last month, I had to have someplace to sleep. Well -- or taxi or keep a car and go down to a motel. But what I found was if I take the cynicular (ph) down from OHSU, take the streetcar over to Portland Union Station and jump on the, what was it, 5 or 6:00 train, I guess. Oh, no, it was closer to the 8:00 train.</p> <p>It was aligned perfectly for me then. Nowadays it's not quite as good. Anyway, then I was able to go right straight to the bistro car and get dinner. I'd go to sleep and I'd wake up early enough to get the 6:10, and I did that for several months. She eventually passed away. Well, I did notice that I wasn't alone. There are a lot of people who commuted. That was their lifestyle. And it's kind of an important one if you have to commute. It's a much better one, in my opinion. I have commuted to Portland from here, and it's -- when you can only drive, you can't sit and catch up on email or whatever. So do you have to have Internet connectivity.</p> <p>I know this is not all new to you, but the only thing I'm pointing out is in my opinion, it would be less convenient for me to have out-of-town, high-speed interface. I've used them. And in Europe particularly, there are -- just last week I mentioned we went up to Everett from Albany for Thanksgiving. Well, it worked out perfectly because we were able to get the 6:10 and avoid rush hour through Portland and Seattle and go right up to Everett. They were booked up so they had to give us a taxi, well, nothing's perfect. And my daughter- in-law picked us up. And same story second verse coming home, beautiful, much easier than commuting by car, much more pleasant.</p> <p>Yeah, the frequency. That was from the user's point of view, it's frequency more than velocity.</p> <p>I explained to him the difference between Alternative 1 and</p>	

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Alternative 2, and that Alternative 2, you get there a little bit faster.</p> <p>Let me describe the trip from -- we were up in northern England in the Lake District and my grandson was attending Prep school, college I guess you call it. And then we went down to Paris. So Sir William Branson has a fast train that goes through Manchester down to the Midland Station, I think it is. And you get there quick, but you really don't see anything. So if I were a sightseer, it really wouldn't be of any interest.</p> <p>But I had to tailor everything else to match that bullet train. Now they do travel more frequently than here, but the point I was making is it was really more important to have frequency of starting times than the maximum velocity while traveling. So the experience for me, the user, maybe looks similar, but it's really different from that point of view of maximizing velocity. And to maximize velocity, you've got to have some open space. I realize that but it's better to have localized, centralized mass transit available places to depart -- arrive and depart from than it is to maximize the velocity through a linear straight line, point-to-point destination.</p> <p>So that's all I wanted to say is just simply keep the old station here and to do your best to straighten up the line just a few pinch points around here. You know, when you come down past -- from the south, you may need to put in some overpasses or some traffic detours or a little something. If I describe European travel, it's like that. They've got corridors that keep oxcarts from coming --</p> <p>Yeah, exactly so. Off grade.</p> <p>And then, Lydia, to let you know, the Albany station here -- you might know this --</p> <p>Back in the day when I did run that part of the Albany bike commission, and we worked with Peter DeFazio at the time. And we were able -- we had a grand title for our station -- Mass Transit -- anyway. It is that, effectively. Taxis, buses from other communities, each of which would like a high-speed station but which don't happen to be geographically located. We decided the best thing was to simply</p>	

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		maximize the connectivity at the interface. So Albany station is a hub. We used to call this town a hub city when rail travel was predominant.	
I-151	Robert Siegwarth	Alternative 2 is the best. More ambitious and faster.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-152	Lin Sime	I strongly support alternative 1, and I would think businesses in all affected cities, would, too. I would take many more trips to Portland if we had this, and Portland businesses should help in the funding.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-153	Ellen Singer	Alternative 1 makes the most sense.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-154	James Smith	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There should be a direct rail line from UofO to OSU (Eugene to Corvallis), then on to Salem. OPR should serve the needs of these academic communities.</li> <li>2. The "kinks" should be taken out of the route. Example: no detour to Oregon City (it should be served by MAX).</li> <li>3. For safety and speed, eliminate train-car/truck intersections.</li> <li>4. Back to the drawing board: Alternative 1 is basically the status quo, Alternative 2 is worse.</li> <li>5. What ever happened to bullet trains? This is embarrassing!</li> </ol>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p> <p>ODOT, along with WSDOT and British Columbia are exploring ultra high-speed rail Portland to Seattle to BC.</p> <p><a href="https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ultra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study">https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ultra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study</a></p>
I-155	Randall Smith	<p>Verbal testimony:</p> <p>It's Randall Smith, R-A-N-D-A-L-L, Smith. It's Dr. Smith, PhD.</p> <p>So I am affiliated with Portland State University Department of Geology but my testimony is not related to Portland State University or the Department of Geology.</p> <p>I had a concern that the limited scope of the DEIS -- and I know it's related to the alternative plans, but there are several adjacent freight lines which could, say in an emergency, be used as either alternative lines or areas of growth for the rail system. So at present everything is sort of aligned on the high speed rail, the standard line with improvements and stuff, but there's very little said about relations with adjacent freight and other rail. And I think that's a general weakness to the plan because the gap in rail traffic is so large. People are just unfamiliar with using rails, you know, in a routine way, and so it limits the ability to grow.</p> <p>So if you had spur line, let's say to Corvallis, maybe alternative trains going to Albany, Corvallis even to Lebanon where an existing freight line occurs. And even I think it goes to Mill City. So there are other things that could be in the future plan to expand rail service, not just to the central corridor but other lines.</p> <p>I think that's all I need to say because that's -- yeah, that part is really not discussed. And it appears that it wasn't discussed very much in the beginning. Everything really has narrowed very quickly to the alternative plans without looking at expansion of railroad to spur</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The focus of the study was on intercity rail service, rather than the use of existing rail infrastructure for emergency service. The study does not preclude ODOT from considering the provision of spur service in the future. ODOT planning documents can be accessed on its website:</p> <p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Planning/Pages/Plans.aspx</a></p> <p>ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the OPR decision does not preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>areas, like Corvallis, and even beyond Eugene up to -- what's the city beyond Eugene? Oakridge. Like you go up to Oakridge as a recreational site. Nor does it address future connections to the coast, say to Florence, Coos Bay from -- maybe beginning from Eugene and so forth. Okay. That's all I have.</p>	
I-156	Kayla Smith	<p>While it would be great for passenger rail to not compete with freight rail and for it to be more dependable, the cost is out of reach. I would think ridership would be higher if Amtrak could figure out how to be on time AND if riders didn't have to take a bus to return home.</p>	<p>The Preferred Alternative would continue to share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements to accommodate four additional daily passenger rail round trips that will increase service and reliability.</p>
I-157	David Sonnichsen	<p>Strongly favor the Preferred Alternative. If Alternative 2 had been selected I would oppose it due to its conversion of Willamalane Park and Recreation District parkland just east of I-5, using an example from my local area. Federal regulations make taking parkland for transportation purposes difficult and invite litigation. Further, the necessity of building two additional bridges over the Willamette River immediately east of the I-5 Whilamut Passage Bridge would degrade the view shed along the Willamette River corridor. If such a monumentally expensive project was chosen I would favor tunneling under the Willamette and Willamalane's parkland (part of the Whilamut Natural Area of Alton Baker Park, shared by Springfield and Eugene). The price tag of Alternative 2 is simply prohibitive as it has been outlined. It is therefore encouraging that ODOT favors enhancing the existing rail corridor and serving so many communities historically linked to rail transportation</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-158	Pamela Spettel	I heartily support this transportation infrastructure investment. The opportunities for business expansion and general day travel would be ready for what is to come.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-159	Jessie Spillers	Verbal testimony:  Jessie: The Alternative 2, now that's the one that's going to require more construction of new track, correct? Tracie: Yes.  Jessie: Okay. I'm in favor of that because, you know, you always hear about, you know, infrastructure, oh, it needs to be replaced. It's falling apart. Which, Alternative 1 was basically older track; is that correct? Tracie: Correct. Existing plus some improvement to the existing.  Jessie: Okay. Whereas, Alternative 2 being newer track. So I think in the long run for maintenance issues, that's the way to go.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-160	Tina Springer	I like alternative 1 and will definitely take advantage of it. Any chance we could get rail service to La Grande after the Eugene to Portland Project is completed?	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. La Grande is not within the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC) and outside the Project study area, but this comment has been shared with the Passenger Rail Program Manager.
I-161	Adam Stallsworth, District Operations Coordinator	Is this funding being gathered through state wide taxes or through local levies?	It is anticipated that the Preferred Alternative will be implemented in phases, as funding becomes available. Currently, funding for advancing the Preferred Alternative has not been identified. ODOT anticipates seeking a combination of Federal and State funding into final design and construction.
I-162	Andrew Stephenson	Alternative 2 would be better, due to its increased speed and reliability. However, a combination of the two alignments would be preferred, such that the existing urban stations are used (which are located centrally in urban areas with public transit connections). But the route should be entirely new and dedicated to electrified high-speed rail for trains to travel above at least 100 mph. The route can	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2 and other concepts with new and dedicated alignments considered, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>follow I-5 for direct routes and cost reductions, but most Oregonians live in the medium-sized towns away from the freeway.</p> <p>The study of Portland-Eugene rail comes at an auspicious time when ODOT, WSDOT, and British Columbia are working together in a study to bring high-speed rail to the Cascadia megaregion. If forward-thinking is prioritized, the route built between Portland and Eugene can reliably serve accelerated rail travel between Portland and Eugene after Portland-Seattle-Vancouver high-speed rail is complete.</p> <p>Disclaimer: I live in the Seattle area, but I travel to Portland occasionally and would likely use this Portland-Eugene rail to visit friends in Corvallis once annually.</p>	<p>other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. Environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p> <p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p> <p>As you noted, ODOT, along with WSDOT and British Columbia are exploring ultra high-speed rail Portland to Seattle to BC.</p> <p><a href="https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ultra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study">https://www.wsdot.wa.gov/planning/studies/ultra-high-speed-travel/ground-transportation-study</a></p>
I-163	Ted Stonecliffe	<p>If Oregon is going to be serious about high speed passenger rail for the future, we need an alternative that takes the passenger trains off of the freight rail tracks. That is alternative 2. I am a transit planner with Cherriots, the local transit system for Salem-Keizer and Marion and Polk Counties. I know that ridership depends on three main things, especially if you are trying to compete with the automobile: frequency, reliability, and speed. Alternative 1 is less costly, but there is more and more interest in high speed rail in congested corridors such as the Willamette Valley, and this is a much better scenario than running trains on the existing UP tracks through cities like Salem, which have many at-grade crossings. Reliability of the existing Cascades Amtrak trains is very low compared to the buses we run on I-5 between Salem and Wilsonville (Route 1X express). Therefore, the</p>	<p>Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project’s goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		state of Oregon needs to request more federal funds to build it right the first time. People want a reliable schedule and frequent service, and that isn't possible if the system relies on the freight rail network.	
I-164	Shawna Stovall	<p>I used to ride between Seattle and Portland. My only concern is that this project may be a wasted effort towards antiquated system upgrades.</p> <p>Leon musk is building a high speed rail system in a tunnel, currently being tested. Maybe you should network with that dude. The point being, improving old technology, or new technology? It is such a conundrum.</p>	<p>A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider “true” high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands (<i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i>, ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network.</p>
I-165	David Strubhar	<p>1) I don't know if this is still possible or not, but it strikes me that a selective combination of the two Alternatives may serve the traveling public the best for the Cascades routing (less so for the Coast Starlight)--e.g., Altern.#1 Eugene to north of Hubbard (Hito area), then new alignment switching over to the PNWR to travel Altern#2 with its new stations at Wilsonville and/or Tualatin, etc. This would allow an easy transfer to/from existing WES service at Wilsonville and the potential of some shuttle transfer to any new TriMet Light Rail terminal at Bridgeport, both of which would fan out the rail service access quite nicely for anyone from the Willamette Valley.</p> <p>2) As anyone who has tried to travel I-5 during game days at Eugene and Corvallis can tell you, there would be reason to try to capture Corvallis in the travel route, although I feel hesitant to go with Altern#2 there because it feels like it gives up a significant stretch of higher speed potential routing.</p> <p>3) With the beauty and significant work put into the Salem station area, unless the route capacity constraints are too restrictive, stick</p>	<p>1) The Project involved a robust process that engaged rail planning, design, operations, and environmental specialists to work through an extensive range of ideas and possible route alignments throughout the broad Project study area that extends between Eugene/Springfield and the Portland metropolitan area. This process resulted in recommendation of Alternative 1 as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to all other options to meet the Project's Purpose and Need, and Goals and Objectives.</p> <p>2) ODOT and FRA eliminated the preliminary alternative that would directly serve Corvallis from further consideration, because it increased travel time between Eugene and Portland and reduced ridership as result of the increased travel time. However, the OPR decision does not</p>



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>with the current station. Same with Albany.</p> <p>4) Perhaps there is reason to consider slight divergence of routings for the Cascade trains compared to the Coast Starlight, since the focus of each set is different...</p>	<p>preclude potential future enhanced connections to Corvallis.</p> <p>3) The Preferred Alternative would continue to use existing stations including in Salem and Albany.</p> <p>4) The Project focused on the Amtrak Cascade service area in Oregon, and considered alternative routes for Cascade trains.</p>
I-166	Brenda StVincent	Alternative 2 looks like the best option. Hits more cities that are apt to use it. I like this idea. Very positive outcome.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-167a	Reddit user: u/suffusion	<p>From r/Eugene</p> <p>If the proposal includes getting off of the Union Pacific tracks, I'm on board. I hate airline travel and find the train much more comfortable, but with slowdowns and delays taking the train takes longer than driving. Not the way it works in the Northeast Corridor.</p>	The Preferred Alternative would continue to share track with freight rail. Because passenger and freight trains operate on the same track owned by Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR, the host railroad) passenger rail's on-time performance often depends on how UPRR handles dispatching passenger trains. Priority dispatching of Amtrak trains operating on shared tracks remains established federal law. To further avoid disruption to freight rail operations and improve reliability of passenger trains, the Preferred Alternative will add track and other rail infrastructure improvements to improve service frequency and reliability.
I-167b	Reddit user: u/Suffusion	<p>From r/Eugene</p> <p>If you read the online open house (linked in another comment), Alternative 1 (continue with existing infrastructure) has been recommended as the 'preferred' alternative. I'll show up to the open</p>	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		house and let them know how ridiculous that is, but I don't expect to get anywhere.	performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-168	Reddit user: u/swarmingblackcats	From r/Eugene  Regardless of which is selected, this seems like a no brainer to me. Our existing rail service is a joke.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-169	Emily Taussig	I would want Alternative One, along the existing route with improvements to track and signals. Alternative Two, even though it seems to promise a faster time, does not promise to reach the central cities and leaves a larger environmental mark and that is what I do not like about Alternative Two, which would build an entirely new route along part of the plan.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-170	Blake Thompson	I am happy to tell you that Ridesource was chosen for the 2018 Eugene Awards in the category of City & Regional Planners. The Eugene Award was created to acknowledge the best businesses in our community.  For additional information please visit us at:  <a href="https://eugene.city-recognition.com/MDKM3-UBAZ-MQJJ">https://eugene.city-recognition.com/MDKM3-UBAZ-MQJJ</a>  If needed for reference - your code is: DKM3-UBAZ-MQJJ  Congratulations,  Blake Thompson Eugene Awards	Thank you for your comment. While this comment does not pertain to the Tier 1 EIS, it has been included in the record.
I-171	Tom <i>[no last name provided]</i>	The most important improvement is to stop sharing rails with freight trains. The arbitrary delays caused by freight train precedence has soured tons of people off taking Amtrak. It seems like you could add the Springfield Station as an option to Alternative 1.  Will this increase the speed of the trains? It still looks like your travel times are slower than car travel times (on a good traffic day), which of	The Project considered a rail terminus in Springfield as part of Alternative 2, but the current Eugene station is in a downtown core that is more convenient and accessible to more people and would attract more passengers. Currently, local transit services provide

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>course means you will be missing out on most of your potential riders. Would it be possible to add safe bike parking near the Oregon stations? right now I either get a cab or a ride, or take my bike on the train because there is no way my bike would still be on the bike rack after a long weekend's train trip. Quite honestly, this has led to me deciding to just drive my car on several occasions.</p> <p>Finally, it sure would be nice to have a station around Woodburn or so to make it easy to link transportation modes to all of those small communities around there. It would be great to get one in Harrisburg too, but I imagine that's too small of a community for you.</p>	<p>connections between the Eugene train station and destinations in Eugene and Springfield.</p> <p>Regarding bike storage, there are currently bike lockers in Albany and Salem; ODOT will consider further investments in bike storage capacity. ODOT supports and encourages bicycling and will continue to accommodate bicycles on Cascades trains and at stations while also exploring ways, in partnership with other local agencies, to increase convenience and access for bicyclists to use intercity passenger rail.</p> <p>Regarding additional stations in Springfield and Woodburn, the Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add one or more stations, such as in Springfield, Woodburn, and Harrisburg, beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative, would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.</p> <p><a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a></p>
I-172	Greg Tompkins	<p>Well are you going to actually do anything about the passenger rail or just waste an outlandish amount of taxpayer money for 30 years and do absolutely nothing? Shameful how bad our transportation system is in Oregon all you guys ever do is piss away outrageous amounts of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with implementation of the Preferred</p>

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		money on studies like you did the bridge to Vancouver and the bridge to Salem whatever came about with that? and then do you do NOTHING. What do you have to show for any of the money wasted ?	Alternative, which will include incremental improvements of service on the existing route.
I-173	Randal Toth	<p>for the projected increase in ridership going forward, Alternative 2 disrupts too much infrastructure including farmland, and costs too much to implement.</p> <p>Under the existing rail system, the cost of transporting a family of three by Amtrak is prohibitive even compared to driving the family vehicle getting 15mpg.</p> <p>The cost is too great!</p>	Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative; it provides greater improvements in ridership and minimized environmental impact.
I-174	Matthew Trecha	Please institute Alternative 1 to keep stations near central city--my generation (millennial) is moving away from car use, etc. and we need to be able to access stations on bike, walking and via public transit.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-175	William Van Vliet	[Form submitted included no comments.]	Thank you for your interest in the Project.
I-176	Karrie Walters	It seems clear that simply improving and upgrading our current line (alternative 1) has the most benefits (same amount of ridership, only 15 minutes extra, saves much more money, less environmental impacts, meets needs of more cities.). HOWEVER - it won't work if we can't have more frequent routes with better, more user-friendly times. 5:30am Eugene departures for weekdays? That's not a regular feasible option for people. I would LOVE to be able to hop on a train to Portland around 7:30 or 8:00am in the morning and catch a train back either at 6 or at 8pm or so.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT continues to develop train and bus schedules that support riders and also allow smooth connections with service north to Seattle and Vancouver, BC.
I-177	Sharon Way	I support using Alternative 1 in the Oregon Passenger Rail project.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-178	Mark Weinrott	Keys are frequency of service and on-time performance. Speed is secondary. Main impediment now is unreliability, which probably implicates Union Pacific more than Amtrak. Aside from providing Union Pacific with greater incentive to accommodate passenger service, there will need to be additional double-tracking and/or sidings. Ultimately, major increase in ridership will require faster trains. Short and intermediate goals should be to improve on-time-	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to include rail infrastructure enhancements that would reduce delay associated with competing demand

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
		performance by reducing unintended "stops." Alternative 1 is clearly the more realistic option.	between freight and passenger trains, and improve reliability.
I-179	Darise Weller	Why not a line from Astoria to Eugene, From Vancouver, Wash to Hillsboro (connection in Linnton). Could circle the west side of Portland, connecting to WES	The Oregon Passenger Rail Project is focused on the Oregon portion of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC), which extends between Eugene and Portland, and does not include other areas in the State, including Astoria or other communities situated west of the Willamette Valley. During the screening of alternatives, routes through the western portion of the Portland region were considered but dismissed from further analysis. See Chapter 2 of the DEIS, "Alternative Development and Screening Process," for more information on the options considered throughout the development of the Draft EIS.
I-180	Jeff Wells	Would it be possible to extend Alternative 1 from Eugene to Springfield?	The Preferred Alternative would use the five existing stations served by the current Amtrak Cascades passenger rail service in Oregon, which are located in or near Central Business Districts. Final decisions on any new stations and specific locations would be made in association with future Tier 2 studies. The Station Stop Policy for Amtrak Cascades Service, jointly issued by ODOT and WSDOT on June 1, 2016, gives the PNWRC administrators the responsibility for evaluating proposals to add, remove, or skip station stops for the Amtrak Cascades service. The companion Station Stop Policy Guidance Document that ODOT and WSDOT completed in 2016 describes the process for evaluating proposed station changes. Proposals to add one or more stations, such as in Springfield, beyond the five proposed under the Preferred Alternative, would need to be considered through future Tier 2 studies with adherence to the Station Stop Policy.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			<a href="https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf">https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/RPTD%20Document%20Library/HB2918-Legislative-Report-2017.pdf</a> and <a href="http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm">http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/Publications/Manuals/M3125.htm</a>
I-181	Gabriel Wihtol	I agree with officials that alternative 1 is the best option with upgrades but maintaining same route. I ride the train 2-3 times a month from Eugene to Portland and am very familiar with its travel. Keeping the same route but adding improvements will reduce environmental impacts associated with making a whole new line, and keep costs lower while improving service time mildly. I look forward to seeing how this project continues and how I can voice my support further for Oregon rail transport.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-182	Telly Wirth, owner/operator, Wirth Farms	Alternative 1 definitely seems to make more sense. Since it incorporates existing infrastructure its impacts to the environment and community would be dramatically less. Also the cost savings would be great, potentially allowing future money to be used for other types of improvement. The obvious concern is how to have no adverse affect on freight rail. The freight rail is a vital part of the industries that support the region. As long as this concern can be adequately addressed alternative 1 is the obvious choice.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative was developed to include rail infrastructure enhancements that would result in no adverse effects to freight rail.
I-183	Peggy Woolsey	<p>I'm a frequent railroad passenger to and from Bellingham and occasionally southern California. I've enjoyed riding trains in Europe.</p> <p>I recognize the recommended route is based on today's needs, decreased use of land, and the ability to get more bang for the buck. However, building for today is short sighted. None of use have a crystal ball for 2035. I believe we need to plan for a more advanced future. A straightened, shortened route allowing faster speeds will fit that advanced future. As for the reduced ridership predicted for Alternative 2, I believe "If you build it, they will come." I live about six miles from the station in Salem. A new station near I-5 would not change my ability to ride. Especially since cities plan their public transit around airports and railroad stations.</p>	A high-speed rail concept vision was developed, as part of the OPR EIS process, which examined true high-speed rail for the Eugene-to-Portland segment. Based on Leadership Council and stakeholder desire to consider "true" high-speed rail—generally meaning speeds of 125 mph on an exclusive rail (new) alignment—the study outlined the necessary steps to progress including ridership and population demands ( <i>High Speed Rail Concept Vision Report</i> , ODOT, September 2014). Alternative 1 is an important step toward building ridership as the population increases and can serve as the backbone of a passenger rail network. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
			performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.
I-184	David Wortman, Sustainability Officer, State of Oregon	Commenting on own behalf, not for the state of Oregon I have briefly reviewed the project documents, though admittedly I have not delved into them in detail. However, I support Alternative 2. While I do not have a hard reference, I have heard that up to 30% of state employees in Salem live in the Portland area. For at least the Portland to Salem runs, having the train run through the growing population centers of Wilsonville and Tualatin makes a lot of sense. Plus, connections can be made to both the future MAX line coming to Bridgeport Village, as well as the WES terminus in Wilsonville. If we really want a more seamless and connected public transit system that serves the Willamette Valley and greater Portland area, this alignment makes a lot more sense, in my opinion.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors. Alternative 2 would serve one station in the Portland metropolitan area south of downtown Portland that could be located in either Wilsonville or Tualatin, but not in both communities.
I-185	[No Name Provided]	I favor Alternative 1 of the alternative identified in the DEIS. It is the most effective at the meeting project purposes at least cost.  Short of large increases in speed which would require infrastructure, I believe the most significant improvements to passenger rail service on the Portland to Eugene line is increased frequency.	Thank you for your comment. With the publication of this FEIS and FRA's pending Record of Decision, ODOT will be able to move forward with incremental implementation of the Preferred Alternative, which will consist of improvements on the existing route to adequately support increased intercity passenger rail service.
I-186	[No Name Provided]	Alternative 2 serves the population. Low population in Alternative 1. Take some time and build it in the right place, population, the first time. It will save money.	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. One purpose of the OPR Project is to "integrate with existing and planned transportation networks." As the Project progresses beyond the Tier 1 EIS and Record of Decision, ODOT will have the ability to work with TriMet, SMART, and other transit service providers to improve connections to the service.

Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-187	[No Name Provided]	Alternative 2 - for \$4 billion the train is 18 minutes faster and has 16,000 less passengers.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-188	[No Name Provided]	Disappointed that the 7:20am train from Oregon City on weekends was stopped.  Glad to see a path to improve rail service. I don't think it is advertised enough to the public as a good alternative to travel - will help if on time emphasis really happens.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT continues to develop train and bus schedules that support an optimal number of riders, and that also allow smooth connections with service north of Portland to Seattle and Vancouver, BC.
I-189	[No Name Provided]	Really got to have more end of workday trains, not buses, from Portland to Eugene. It would be a great way to reduce CO and traffic on I-5. The buses are a pain without stops - 4:15/4:30 hours versus 2:15/2:30 hours by train. Please!	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT continues to develop train and bus schedules that support riders and that also allow smooth connections with service north to Seattle and Vancouver, BC.
I-190	[No Name Provided]	Alternative 1 is the only politically and economically realistic alternative - California's high speed rail is building on decades of improvement in higher speed conventional rail.  All these studies are paralyzing any progress - go with Alternative 1, just as was studied again the 1990s.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-191	[No Name Provided]	I support Alternative 1 over 2. My reasons are 1) trains can be added incrementally (I would like to see a 9am train daily) 2) it will cost less so it will be more likely to be funded and 3) the train between Eugene and Portland (the cascades) is usually on time and reliable. The train between Portland and Seattle is often delayed en route. I would definitely use the train more if morning train schedules were improved.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative. ODOT continues to develop train and bus schedules that support riders and that also allow smooth connections with service north to Seattle and Vancouver, BC.
I-192	[No Name Provided]	While a shorter trip between Eugene and Portland would be nice, Alternative 1 seems to make more sense due to the lower cost, increased ridership and decreased environmental impact.	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.
I-193	[No Name Provided]	Prefer alternative 1 (continue service at existing stations in Albany and Oregon City), but improved	Thank you for your comment. Alternative 1 has been selected as the Preferred Alternative.



Comment Number	Name	Comment	Response
I-194	[No Name Provided]	Why is Eastern Oregon left out of this? Is there something stopping expanding passenger rail service to Bend?	The Oregon Passenger Rail Project is focused on the Oregon portion of the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor (PNWRC), which extends between Eugene and Portland, and does not include other areas in the State, including Eastern Oregon. Study of improving intercity transportation to Bend would need to be studied through a separate process.
I-195	[No Name Provided]	Prefer alternative 2	Alternative 1 was selected as the Preferred Alternative because of its ability, compared to Alternative 2, to meet the Project's goals and objectives. While Alternative 2 has a faster travel time over the route, the other performance attributes favor Alternative 1. In particular, environmental impact, ridership, and capital costs were key discriminating factors.

