

3.24 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Implementation of any of the build alternatives would involve short-term uses of the environment as a means to achieve long-term productivity gains and benefits for the regional study area. The uses of the environment and the specific long-term benefits vary between the No-Action Alternative and the build alternatives.

What's in Section 3.24?

3.24 Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity

- 3.24.1 No-Action Alternative
- 3.24.2 Package A, Package B, and Preferred Alternative

3.24.1 No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would result in minimal anticipated short-term use of the environment because no major transportation improvements associated with this project would be made to the regional study area. The No-Action Alternative would provide no long-term productivity improvements because current deficiencies, as described in **Chapter 1 Purpose and Need**, would continue. In fact, long-term productivity would be expected to decrease because increased traffic would place greater demand and stress on unimproved roads. While the No-Action Alternative would provide the least amount of short-term uses of the environment, it also would impact long-term productivity the most.

3.24.2 Package A, Package B, and Preferred Alternative

Because the components proposed under Package A, Package B, and the Preferred Alternative would result in similar short-term uses and long-term benefits, they are discussed together in this section. Short-term uses of the environment under any build alternative would include:

- ▶ Loss of soil through erosion and fugitive dust
- ▶ Temporary disruption of traffic and businesses in the proposed construction areas
- ▶ Temporary visual impacts during construction
- ▶ Temporary noise and vibration impacts
- ▶ Temporary use of land for construction staging and storage of materials

1 Any of the build packages would provide similar long-term transportation benefits. Long-term
2 benefits under Package A, Package B, or the Preferred Alternative would include:

- 3 ▶ Improving travel safety within the regional study area
- 4 ▶ Increasing the efficiency of movement within large and critical transportation corridors
- 5 ▶ Decreasing the overall travel times throughout the corridor
- 6 ▶ Improving product and material distribution
- 7 ▶ Improving access to businesses within the travel corridor
- 8 ▶ Improving emergency vehicle access
- 9 ▶ Modernizing existing transportation infrastructure to accommodate future demands
- 10 ▶ Creating more environmentally sound and aesthetically pleasing transportation corridors
- 11 ▶ Improving air quality within the corridors by reducing traffic congestion

12 The build alternatives have some key differences that could alter the way they use resources
13 in the short term and enhance productivity in the long term. Over the long term, Package A
14 and the Preferred Alternative would tend to reinforce development and add density in the core
15 cities along the corridor which could help alleviate development pressure along I-25 and
16 therefore result in less impact to wildlife habitat and farmlands along I-25. This likely pattern of
17 development would also enhance commercial productivity in the cities where it is more likely to
18 be sustainable over the long term. Similarly, with both general purpose lanes and TELs, the
19 Preferred Alternative would increase the capacity for freight transport and distribution resulting
20 in increased commercial productivity.

21 Package B and the I-25 improvements included in the Preferred Alternative would influence
22 development and add density to cities along the I-25 corridor.