

Marja-Railway line, EIA

SUMMARY

EIA

In September 2000 the Marja-railway line EIA programme was completed. This programme is a description on the planned actions and process for carrying out the EIA prepared by the responsible project promoter, the City of Vantaa. The responsible body for controlling the EIA process, The Environmental Centre For Uusimaa region arranged the programme to be publicly available 4.9.-17.10.2000 as required by the law. Based on the given statements and opinions the Environmental Centre For Uusimaa region gave its own statement on the EIA programme at 17.11.2000.

The EIA report was set publicly available for the 60 day period in April-June 2001 and statements were asked from the stakeholder groups. The EIA process ended at 13.8.2001 when the Environmental Centre For Uusimaa region gave its own statement on the EIA report. The issues brought up in the statement have and will be taken into account in the further planning and decision making as well.

Traffic system alternatives

In the EIA process alternative traffic system principles were studied. The other one based on Marja-railway line and the other one based on bus operated traffic systems followingly:

0+: Marja-railway will not be built and the public transport is based on similar principles as nowadays.

M1: Bus traffic provides partially feeder connections to Marja-railway, but some present east-west connections and regional connections remain as presently.

M2: East-west traffic has been almost fully concentrated on Marja-railway line and bus traffic provides effective feeder connections. Main part of the regional bus traffic between Vantaa and Helsinki has been replaced by railway traffic..

Track alignment alternatives

To the east of Kivistö three alternatives (alternatives A, B and C) were studied. Between Viinikkala and Airport two alternatives have been considered. Basic alignment goes directly from Viinikkala to Airport and Aviapolis alignment (Aviapolis alternative) goes via the business area indicated in the Lentokentäntie general plan (land use plan). At the Ruskeasanta two alternative alignments were studied (alternatives 1 and 2).

The impacts and comparison of traffic system alternatives

Railway alternatives (M1 and M2) provide significantly better level of service for public transportation than the alternative 0+. Environmentally alternatives M1 and M2 do not differ significantly from each other. Alternative M1 provides better level of service for public transportation, because some existing regional and east-west directional bus connections remain as presently. Alternative M2 is more effective economically and environmentally as well, because there are less bus traffic.

Impacts and comparison by track alignment

The impacts by all alignment alternatives on nature, landscape and land use have been defined and compared to each other. All alternatives have both positive and negative impacts that differ from each other.