

3.28 SUMMARY OF DIRECT AND INDIRECT IMPACTS

This section summarizes the social and environmental consequences that would result from the No-Action Alternative and the two build packages (Packages A and B). Measures to mitigate these consequences are summarized in **Section 3.29 Mitigation Summary**.

This section focuses on impacts to the social and environmental resources discussed earlier in this chapter. Transportation improvements and impacts are presented in **Chapter 4 Transportation Impacts**.

Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Land Use and Zoning		
<p>Growth would continue to occur largely on undeveloped agricultural land at the fringe of the regional study area's urbanized areas</p> <p>Development would likely be pushed towards outlying areas to avoid I-25 congestion, which would hasten the conversion of agricultural land</p> <p>The more dispersed development pattern would result in greater land consumption and a broader potential impact to the regional study area's environmental resources</p> <p>Continuation of leap-frog type growth practices in southern portions of the regional study area east of I-25 would further fragment remaining agricultural lands</p>	<p>Under Package A, commuter rail would shift growth towards urban centers, especially in Fort Collins</p> <p>Longmont would increase in density and size</p> <p>Feeder bus routes along east-west corridors designed to serve commuter rail stations could also stimulate increased levels of development</p>	<p>BRT along I-25 would provide less incentive for transit-oriented development than commuter rail</p> <p>Market-driven growth would continue to be focused along I-25</p> <p>Communities west of I-25 would continue to expand towards the east</p> <p>Some concentration of growth could occur near BRT stations along I-25</p>
Social Conditions		
<p>Potential direct and indirect impacts on communities caused by traffic congestion and impaired mobility would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased air emissions and noise • Longer travel times • Traffic queues at key interchanges • Neighborhood traffic intrusion • Deteriorating safety conditions • Lengthened emergency response times 	<p>Adverse impacts associated with Package A would include:</p> <p>Relocation of 59 residences</p> <p>Increased noise and vibration, out-of-direction travel, and travel time delays associated with commuter rail</p>	<p>Adverse impacts associated with Package B would include:</p> <p>Relocation of 24 residences</p> <p>Increased noise, air emissions, and visual impacts to residents near frontage roads, parking lots, bus routes, transit stations, and maintenance facilities</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Social Conditions (Continued)		
<p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Adverse effects (highway noise) to minority residents of the Mountain Range Shadows subdivision would exceed those experienced by the general population.</p>	<p>Air emissions and visual impacts to residents near carpool lots, commuter rail, transit stations, bus stations, and maintenance facilities</p> <p>Exacerbated “barrier effect” in Fort Collins, Loveland, Berthoud, and Longmont</p> <p>Temporary construction-related impacts such as noise, dust, out-of-direction travel, and travel-time delays</p> <p>Potential re-distribution of population in response to highway capacity or transit improvements</p> <p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package A would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional connections between communities • Improvements in mobility, safety, and emergency response • Improved mobility for transportation-disadvantaged populations <p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Adverse effects to minority and low-income residents in Longmont would exceed those experienced by the general population. These impacts would arise from the implementation of Component A-T1 (commuter rail between Fort Collins and Longmont) and would include 16 residential relocations, noise above impact levels at one receiver (after mitigation), visual impacts, and the potential for community disruption.</p> <p>Impacts to minority and low-income populations associated with all other components of Package A would not exceed those experienced by the general population.</p>	<p>Temporary construction-related impacts such as noise, dust, out-of-direction travel, travel-time delays, and access revisions</p> <p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package B would include:</p> <p>Regional connections between communities</p> <p>Overall improvements in safety, mobility, and emergency response, but no improvements in emergency response where toll lanes are barrier-separated</p> <p>Moderate improvements in mobility for transportation-disadvantaged populations</p> <p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package B would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short-term and long-term employment opportunities would occur during the construction of the facilities as well as their ongoing operation and maintenance. • Transit components would result in moderate improvements in mobility and would improve regional connectivity. • Minority and low-income populations are concentrated around transit improvements and would benefit from the transit-related components. • Impacts to minority and low-income populations associated with all other components of Package B would not exceed those experienced by the general population.

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Social Conditions (Continued)		
	<p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package A would include:</p> <p>Short-term and long-term employment opportunities would occur during the construction of the facilities as well as their ongoing operation and maintenance.</p> <p>Transit components would improve access to community facilities, provide broader opportunities for employment, facilitate participation in regional social and cultural events, promote interaction between communities, and stimulate business activity</p> <p>Adverse effects to minority and low-income residents in Longmont from the implementation of commuter rail would exceed those experienced by the general population. Although the commuter rail would improve regional connections and access to some community facilities, the benefits of transit would not be commensurate with the impacts experienced by minority and low-income populations. For these reasons, impacts associated with the commuter rail between Fort Collins and Longmont would be predominantly borne by minority and low-income populations in Longmont.</p> <p>Impacts to minority and low-income populations associated with all other components of Package A would not exceed those experienced by the general population.</p>	

2

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Economic Conditions		
<p>Would not require relocation of any existing businesses</p> <p>Would be no loss to property tax base and revenues</p> <p>Would be increasingly difficult to access businesses</p> <p>Future economic growth would most likely concentrate along the I-25 corridor and in the southern end of the regional study area</p>	<p>Adverse impacts associated with Package A would include:</p> <p>Relocation of 33 businesses</p> <p>\$5,079,960 loss in the tax base and \$150,290 loss of tax revenues</p> <p>Temporary construction-related detours, delays, and out-of-direction travel</p> <p>Temporary impacts to existing freight operations during construction</p> <p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package A would include:</p> <p>Potential for long-term growth of property tax base and revenues as a result of transit-oriented development</p> <p>Some access revisions; transit would improve access to businesses and expand employment opportunities</p> <p>Creation of 10,822 temporary jobs over the six-year construction period; permanent employment created by transit operation and maintenance</p>	<p>Adverse impacts associated with Package B would include:</p> <p>Relocation of 16 businesses</p> <p>\$2,814,220 loss in the tax base and \$88,720 loss of tax revenues</p> <p>Temporary construction-related detours, delays, and out-of-direction travel</p> <p>Beneficial impacts associated with Package B would include:</p> <p>Limited potential for long-term growth of property tax base and revenues as a result of transit-oriented development</p> <p>Creation of 9,135 temporary jobs over the six-year construction period; permanent employment created by transit operation and maintenance</p> <p>Some access revisions; transit would improve access to businesses and expand employment opportunities</p>
Right-of-Way		
<p>Would not require acquisition of property or any relocations</p>	<p>Highway components would require 23 residential relocations and 12 business relocations</p> <p>Transit components would require 36 residential relocations and 21 business relocations</p> <p>All property impacts, including displacements and partial acquisitions, would total 1,068 acres, 719 acres for highway components and 349 acres for transit components</p>	<p>Highway components would require 24 residential relocations and 15 business relocations</p> <p>Transit components would require one additional business relocation and no residential relocations</p> <p>All property impacts, including displacements and partial acquisitions, would require a total of 877 acres, 859 acres for highway components and 18 acres for transit components</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Air Quality		
<p>No substantive impacts</p> <p>Growth and development changes would affect traffic patterns and air quality</p> <p>Benefits include: (1) emissions for all pollutants from mobile sources would be reduced from existing levels; and (2) continued conversion of agricultural land uses would lessen nitrogen deposition effects to Rocky Mountain National Park.</p>	<p>No substantive impacts</p> <p>No exceedances of standards or thresholds due to mobile sources</p> <p>Growth and development changes would affect traffic patterns and air quality. In areas of transit oriented development, air quality could improve due to more efficient travel patterns. This improvement would be more noticeable with Package A than Package B.</p> <p>Benefits include: (1) emissions for all pollutants from mobile sources would be reduced from existing levels; and (2) continued conversion of agricultural land uses would lessen nitrogen deposition effects to Rocky Mountain National Park.</p>	<p>No substantive impacts</p> <p>No exceedances of standards or thresholds due to mobile sources</p> <p>Growth and development changes would affect traffic patterns and air quality. In areas of transit oriented development, air quality could improve due to more efficient travel patterns.</p> <p>Benefits include: (1) emissions for all pollutants from mobile sources would be reduced from existing levels; and (2) continued conversion of agricultural land uses would lessen nitrogen deposition effects to Rocky Mountain National Park.</p>
Noise & Vibration		
<p>An estimated 505 Category B receivers and 121 Category C receivers would be impacted by traffic noise</p> <p>Noise levels at 85 Category B locations would be at or above 75 dBA</p>	<p>An estimated 450 Category B receivers and 120 Category C receivers would be impacted by traffic noise after recommended mitigation measures</p> <p>Traffic noise levels at 18 Category B locations would be at or above 75 dBA, 67 fewer locations than the No-Action Alternative</p> <p>With the recommended mitigation actions, an estimated one receiver would be impacted by rail noise, and no receivers would be impacted by rail vibration</p> <p>Construction noise impacts would be somewhat limited because the majority of the corridors do not abut residential areas. Construction noise would be subject to relevant local regulations and ordinances to minimize impacts.</p>	<p>An estimated 491 Category B receivers and 133 Category C receivers would be impacted by traffic noise after recommended mitigation measures</p> <p>Traffic noise levels at 17 Category B locations would be at or above 75 dBA, 68 fewer locations than the No-Action Alternative</p> <p>Construction noise impacts would be somewhat limited because the majority of the corridors do not abut residential areas. Construction noise would be subject to relevant local regulations and ordinances to minimize impacts.</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Water Resources		
<p>Highway Impacts:</p> <p>Would result in 1,257 acres of impervious surface area</p> <p>Direct effects on surface water quality from increases in stormwater runoff velocity and volume would be negligible. The majority of stormwater runoff from I-25 would continue not to be treated prior to discharging to water bodies.</p> <p>Groundwater impacts are not expected as a result of major and minor structure maintenance activities associated with this alternative.</p> <p>Drainage improvements may occur in areas where roadway improvements are currently planned.</p>	<p>Highway Impacts:</p> <p>Would result in 1,946 acres of impervious surface area, with the greatest impacts expected between SH 14 and SH 60</p> <p>Would require relocation of as many as 105 wells within the right-of-way.</p> <p>Modifications to the existing drainage system or a new system could improve drainage compared to the No-Action Alternative</p>	<p>Highway Impacts:</p> <p>Would result in 2,001 acres of impervious surface area, with the greatest increase between SH 14 and SH 60</p> <p>Would require relocation of as many as 111 wells within the right-of-way</p> <p>Modifications to the existing drainage system or a new system could improve drainage compared to the No-Action Alternative</p>
Wetlands		
<p>Would generally not affect existing wetland resources, except those associated with development activities and rehabilitation of major and minor structures.</p> <p>With continuing development in the project area, some affects to wetlands would be expected</p>	<p>Would result in total direct impacts of:</p> <p>17.48 acres for wetlands</p> <p>1.86 acres of jurisdictional open water</p> <p>Indirect wetland effects would include increased roadway runoff, surface flows in adjacent streams, sediment from winter sanding operations, erosion, creation of channels in wetlands that were previously free of channelization, and decrease or elimination of upland tree and/or shrub buffers. De-icers, petroleum products, and other chemicals would also likely reduce water quality.</p>	<p>Would result in total direct impacts of:</p> <p>18.11 acres for wetlands</p> <p>2.27 acres of jurisdictional open water</p> <p>Indirect wetland effects would include increased roadway runoff, surface flows in adjacent streams, sediment from winter sanding operations, erosion, creation of channels in wetlands that were previously free of channelization, and decrease or elimination of upland tree and/or shrub buffers. De-icers, petroleum products, and other chemicals would also likely reduce water quality.</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Floodplains		
<p>Existing conditions would continue. Floodplain impacts would be addressed during the final design phases of each CDOT project along I-25 within the regional study area, such as rehabilitation of various drainage structures.</p>	<p>Would impact a total of 12.8 acres of floodplains, 10.8 acres from highway components and 2.0 acres from transit components</p> <p>Would result in seven I-25 crossings of floodplains and ten drainage structure replacements</p> <p>Would result in 11 commuter rail crossings of floodplains</p> <p>Would result in two floodplains impacted by queue jumps for commuter buses</p>	<p>Would impact a total of 13.5 acres of floodplains, all from highway components</p> <p>Would result in twelve I-25 crossings of floodplains and 16 drainage structure replacements</p> <p>Would not have any floodplain impacts beyond those for the highway components</p> <p>None of the bus facilities would impact a floodplain</p>
Vegetation		
<p>Would only have a minimal effect on existing vegetation resources. Effects from increasing development on vegetation could include population fragmentation, reductions in riparian zones, and ground and soil disturbance which could promote increased germination of noxious weed populations.</p>	<p>Safety improvements between SH 1 and SH 14 would result in impacts not to extend beyond the existing I-25 right-of-way.</p> <p>General purpose and auxiliary lanes would include the removal of approximately 860 acres of riparian woodland, agricultural, urban landscape, and various wetland vegetation communities. Impacts would be expected from fill placement and damage by construction equipment. Soil disturbance from construction equipment could allow weedy species to establish. Other indirect impacts would include the reduction or elimination of upland tree and/or shrub buffers.</p> <p>Upgrading structures could have minor impacts on existing vegetation located adjacent to and beneath existing structures.</p> <p>Commuter rail would result in the removal of 107 acres of vegetation in fragmented parcels of native prairie.</p> <p>Addition of a highway lane on either side of the roadway would increase impervious surfaces, thereby increasing runoff and exposing the surrounding vegetation to higher levels of pollutants. Other indirect impacts would include the reduction or elimination of upland tree and/or shrub buffers.</p>	<p>Safety improvements impacts would be the same as those associated with Package A.</p> <p>Express lanes would remove 774 acres of riparian woodland, agricultural, urban landscape, and various wetland communities</p> <p>Bus rapid transit would not result in direct or indirect impacts on existing vegetation communities.</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Noxious Weeds		
<p>Would not contribute to the spread of noxious weeds.</p>	<p>Safety improvements might increase the spread of Canada thistle and Leafy spurge into open or disturbed areas.</p> <p>Construction of general purpose and auxiliary lanes would cause soil disturbance (approximately 287 acres) that could increase the spread of noxious weeds on roadsides, possibly introduce new noxious weed species, and prevent the establishment of native vegetation.</p> <p>Soil disturbance along the banks of streams could increase the invasion and establishment of Tamarisk, which threatens native riparian trees and shrubs.</p> <p>Construction of commuter rail would cause soil disturbance (approximately 36 acres) that could increase the spread of Leafy spurge and Canada thistle into open and residential areas, as well as patches of native prairie that lie within the rail alignment.</p> <p>Proposed bus routes would not contribute to the spread of noxious weeds.</p> <p>Both temporary roads and work areas would be susceptible to potential new weed population invasions.</p>	<p>Safety improvements impacts would be the same as those associated with Package A.</p> <p>Construction of general purpose and tolled lanes would cause soil disturbance (approximately 258 acres) that could increase the spread of noxious weeds on roadsides, possibly introduce new noxious weed species, and prevent the establishment of native vegetation. Soil disturbance along the banks of streams could increase the invasion and establishment of Tamarisk.</p> <p>Construction of bus rapid transit stations and park-and-ride facilities could cause minor impacts that would increase the spread of Leafy spurge and Canada thistle into open and residential areas.</p> <p>Both temporary roads and work areas would be susceptible to potential new weed population invasions.</p>
Wildlife		
<p>Existing conditions would continue. Increased traffic on secondary roads would increase mortality of wildlife from collisions.</p>	<p>Would impact 2.01 acres of sensitive wildlife habitat</p> <p>Would impact 1.82 acres of aquatic habitat</p> <p>Would impact 10 wildlife movement corridors and 9 raptor nests</p>	<p>Would impact 2.35 acres of sensitive wildlife habitat</p> <p>Would impact 2.25 acres of aquatic habitat</p> <p>Would impact 5 wildlife movement corridors and 11 raptor nests</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Threatened & Endangered Species		
<p>Would not affect threatened and endangered species. Existing conditions would continue.</p>	<p>Direct impact to 0.8 acres of potential Preble's habitat</p> <p>Direct impact to 204 acres of bald eagle foraging habitat</p> <p>Direct impact to 51 acres of black-tailed prairie dog colonies</p> <p>Direct impact to 20 acres of habitat for northern leopard frogs and common gartersnakes</p> <p>Direct impact to 0.4 acres of habitat for state threatened, endangered, or sensitive aquatic species</p> <p>Direct impact to 7 acres of habitat for bald eagle roost sites</p> <p>Direct impact to a total of 283 acres of sensitive habitat</p>	<p>Direct impact to 0.8 acres of potential Preble's habitat</p> <p>Direct impact to 231 acres of bald eagle foraging habitat</p> <p>Direct impact to 104 acres of black-tailed prairie dog colonies</p> <p>Direct impact to 21 acres of habitat for northern leopard frogs and common gartersnakes</p> <p>Direct impact to 0.4 acres of habitat for state threatened, endangered, or sensitive aquatic species</p> <p>Direct impact to 2 acres of habitat for bald eagle roost sites</p> <p>Direct impact to a total of 359 acres of sensitive habitat</p>
Visual Quality		
<p>Would generally have minimal effect on visual resources. Growth would continue to occur on undeveloped agricultural land. This would change the landscape character along the I-25, BNSF, and US 287 corridors, and alter views and perception of visual character.</p>	<p>Most of the proposed improvements would not have a substantial effect to the visual quality of the corridors.</p> <p>Long-term impacts would include relocation of businesses and residences, rebuilt interchanges, increased right-of-way, additions of station amenities, and changes to the surrounding landscape through the use of overpasses, bridges, retaining walls, medians, as well as alterations to the existing roadway grade.</p> <p>Indirect impacts of the proposed improvements could encourage development that is more compact and denser, especially within walking distance of a commuter rail station.</p>	<p>Most of the proposed improvements would not have a substantial effect to the visual quality of the corridors.</p> <p>Package B would have the same basic visual impacts as described for Package A, except that BRT elements would occur along I-25 instead of the commuter rail and bus elements along other rights-of-way.</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Visual Quality (Continued)		
	<p>The addition of stations and a maintenance facility would generate lighting that would be seen by motorists, as well as from adjacent businesses and residences.</p> <p>Short-term impacts would include detours, increased roadway congestion in and around the area, the presence of large equipment, and dust from construction.</p>	
Historic Preservation		
<p>Would generally not affect significant (NRHP-eligible) historic resources. The present trend of conversion of much of the remaining farmsteads (many of which are historic) into residential, industrial and commercial development would continue.</p> <p>No significant (NRHP-eligible) archaeological resources would be affected within the Area of Potential Effect.</p>	<p>Direct Impacts:</p> <p>Five <i>adverse effects</i> from direct impacts, including:</p> <p>Total takes of two NRHP-eligible buildings, and removal of contributing farmhouse on NRHP-eligible farm;</p> <p>One NRHP-eligible ditch requiring extensive burial in culvert(s); and</p> <p>One NRHP-eligible railroad with extensive alterations and removal of two contributing historic railroad bridges</p> <p>Section 4(f) Use:</p> <p>Five individual 4(f) uses and 32 de minimis uses</p> <p>No NRHP-eligible archaeological resources would be affected within the Area of Potential Effect</p>	<p>Direct Impacts:</p> <p>One <i>adverse effect</i> from direct impacts:</p> <p>One NRHP-eligible ditch/canal requiring extensive burial in culverts.</p> <p>Section 4(f) Use:</p> <p>One individual 4(f) use and 22 de minimis uses</p> <p>No NRHP-eligible archaeological resources would be affected within the Area of Potential Effect</p>

1 **Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)**

2

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Paleontological Resources		
<p>No impacts</p>	<p>Construction along the existing BNSF rail-line between Fort Collins and Longmont, and along I-25 between US 36 and SH 7, especially where cuts are necessary to expand rail alignments, highways, and interchanges, has the highest likelihood of adversely impacting paleontological resources.</p> <p>Ground disturbance associated with the construction of commuter rail lines and facilities is anticipated to be significantly greater than that required for bus rapid transit facilities.</p>	<p>Construction along I-25 between US 36 and SH 7, especially where cuts are necessary to expand highways and interchanges, has the highest likelihood of adversely impacting paleontological resources.</p> <p>Because Package B would generally require less ground disturbance than Package A, Package B has a lower potential for impacts on paleontological resources.</p>
Hazardous Materials		
<p>No direct impacts</p> <p>Indirect impacts include the potential to encounter contaminated soil and/or groundwater during structure maintenance activities or during safety improvements that require ramp terminal widening.</p>	<p>38 parcels with potential environmental conditions and 16 parcels with recognized environmental conditions are associated with the highway components.</p> <p>58 parcels with potential environmental conditions and 2 parcels with recognized environmental conditions are associated with the transit components.</p>	<p>41 parcels with potential environmental conditions and 16 parcels with recognized environmental conditions are associated with the highway components.</p>
Parks and Recreation		
<p>Portions of three parks, a wildlife area, and one golf course would receive noise impacts.</p>	<p>Direct use of seven properties, six having minor impacts. McWhinney Hahn Sculpture Park would likely have to be acquired.</p> <p>Indirect effects would include visual impacts at the sculpture park, change in access at one location, and noise impacts at five properties.</p> <p>Benefits would include improved access and mobility to and from these recreational resources.</p>	<p>Direct use of eight properties, seven having minor impacts. McWhinney Hahn Sculpture Park would have a trail impacted.</p> <p>Indirect effects would include visual impacts at the sculpture park, change in access at one location, and noise impacts at four properties.</p> <p>Benefits would include improved access and mobility to and from these recreational resources.</p>

1 Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Section 6(f)		
Would have no impacts on any of the 6(f) properties	Would have no impacts on any of the 6(f) properties	Total impacted area in Grant Park for two water quality ponds would be 0.17 acres Conversion of that area would not impact the remaining park
Farmlands		
<p>Would not directly impact prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, or farmland of local importance.</p> <p>The more dispersed development pattern would further fragment remaining agricultural lands, reducing their long-term viability.</p>	<p>Package A would result in the direct conversion of 982.3 total acres, if certain farming conditions are present. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.8 acres of farmland of local importance • 44.4 acres of farmland of statewide importance • 936.1 acres of farmland that would be considered prime if four certain conditions are present 	<p>Package B would result in the direct conversion of 926.8 total acres, if certain farming conditions are present. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.7 acres of farmland of local importance • 35.7 acres of farmland of statewide importance • 889.4 acres of farmland that would be considered prime if four certain conditions are present
	<p>No farms would be severed or lose access.</p> <p>As a result of commuter rail, the rate at which environmental resources (including farmlands) would be affected in undeveloped and suburban areas within the regional study area would likely be slowed, especially near I-25.</p>	<p>No farms would be severed or lose access.</p> <p>Most of the farmland impact is associated with the widening of I-25 to accommodate additional buffer or barrier separated express lanes in each direction.</p>
Energy		
<p>Annual energy consumption from operations would be 403,220 million BTUs</p> <p>Energy demand would be directly proportionate to the increase in population as land development occurs</p> <p>Population is anticipated to increase at the same rate for all three alternative</p>	<p>Would use approximately 1.0 percent more energy than the No-Action Alternative, as a result of increase in annual vehicle miles of travel within the project area</p>	<p>Would use approximately 0.9 percent more energy than the No-Action Alternative, as a result of increase in annual vehicle miles of travel within the project area</p>

1 **Table 3.28-1 Summary of Direct and Indirect Impacts (Con't.)**

No-Action Alternative	Package A	Package B
Energy (cont'd)		
Public Safety and Security		
<p>As congestion increases, there would be a greater likelihood of both highway and railway crashes; and emergency response times would be negatively affected</p> <p>The likely higher number of crashes also could affect the likelihood of a crash involving a transporter of hazardous materials</p>	<p>A 70 percent reduction in accidents associated with trains and other vehicles is predicted</p> <p>An increased security presence would be needed on trains, buses, and at existing and proposed stations</p> <p>There is a potential for modest increases to police services in response to increases in crime</p> <p>There is a potential for increased theft during the construction phase (a temporary impact)</p>	<p>An increased security presence would be needed on trains, buses, and at existing and proposed stations</p> <p>There is a potential for modest increases to police services in response to increases in crime</p> <p>There is a potential for increased theft during the construction phase(a temporary impact)</p>
Construction		
<p>Would result in no construction or utility impacts aside from those associated with the currently programmed projects</p>	<p>Would have the greatest construction impacts (noise, air quality, transportation) to residential areas since construction of the double-track commuter rail would extend through residential areas. The double-track commuter rail would use the existing BNSF railroad track plus one new track from Fort Collins to downtown Longmont, and a new double-track commuter rail line would connect Longmont to the FasTracks North Metro end-of-line station in Thornton.</p> <p>Construction of either build package would cause varying temporary impacts to traffic patterns and congestion, noise and vibration, air quality, and visual presence</p> <p>Construction impacts would be short-term and isolated in extent depending upon the types and location of construction</p>	<p>Would have fewer impacts than Package A because there is no rail component, and I-25 consists primarily of commercial, industrial, and agricultural development</p> <p>Construction of either build package would cause varying temporary impacts to traffic patterns and congestion, noise and vibration, air quality, and visual presence</p> <p>Construction impacts would be short-term and isolated in extent depending upon the types and location of construction</p>

2

1
2
3

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.