
TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
4.16 <i>Relationship Between Local Short-Term Uses of the Human Environment and the Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity</i>	4.16-1
4.16.1 No Action Alternative	4.16-1
4.16.2 System Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and the Preferred Alternative	4.16-1

This page intentionally left blank

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

Implementation of any one of the system alternatives would involve short-term uses of the environment to reach the long-term productivity gains and benefits offered by that alternative. These uses and benefits vary between the No Action Alternative and system alternatives, which include System Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and the Preferred Alternative.

4.16.1 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would have no planned short-term uses of the environment because no changes to the project area would be made as part of the Valley Highway Project. It should be noted that selection of the No Action Alternative would lead eventually to replacement of highway infrastructure, and these activities could involve short-term uses similar to the system alternatives. The No Action Alternative also would provide no productivity improvements because the current deficiencies of the project area, as described in **Chapter 1 Purpose and Need**, would remain. In fact, productivity would be expected to decrease because this alternative would place greater demand of increased traffic on unimproved, over-capacity roads. This alternative would involve the least short-term uses of the environment in the near term, but also would provide the least long-term productivity increases. This alternative would not fulfill the project purpose and need.

4.16.2 System Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and the Preferred Alternative

System Alternatives 1, 2, 3, and the Preferred Alternative would have similar short-term uses and long-term benefits, and so they are discussed together. Each of these alternatives would involve a substantial amount of road construction, so uses of the environment typical of road construction would be necessary. Some of these short-term uses could include:

- Loss of soil through erosion and fugitive dust
- Temporary disruption of traffic and business in the corridor
- Temporarily undesirable viewsheds and aesthetics
- Temporary noise impacts
- Relocation of residences or businesses from properties needed for construction. Relocations would be permanent for residents and businesses. Portions of some properties could be resold for redevelopment after construction.

These alternatives would rebuild the project corridor in different ways (see **Chapter 2 Alternatives**) to reach the same general goals of providing some long-term benefits. The overall goals and corridor shortcomings were discussed in **Chapter 1 Purpose and Need**. Some of the long-term productivity benefits expected from these alternatives include:

- Improving safety for the traveling public
- Increasing the efficiency of a critical transportation corridor
- Improving transit access



- Modernizing deteriorating and out-of-date transportation infrastructure
- Creating a more environmentally friendly and aesthetically pleasing transportation corridor
- Improving the energy efficiency of vehicle movement through the corridor
- Improving corridor air quality by reducing congestion
- Removing high-volume at-grade railroad crossings

The transportation improvements associated with the system alternatives are consistent with state and local comprehensive planning that considers the need for present and future traffic requirements in the context of present and future land use development. Therefore, the local short-term impacts and use of resources by the system alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative, are consistent with the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity for the local area.