

As previously discussed, Station 5 presented the results of the Level 1 Screening (Preliminary Alternatives) and illustrated the grouping of the Preliminary Alternatives into 6, 8, 10 and 12-lane scenarios to be combined with other highway build, I-30 Bridge, other modes, congestion management, and other non-recurring congestion management alternatives. Once established, these groupings will be carried forward and evaluated as part of the next level of screening (Preliminary Alternatives to Reasonable Alternatives). **Table 7** provides an accounting of all the scenarios identified in the survey by attendees as preferable for further evaluation in the PEL Study. Survey forms are included in **Attachment D**.

**Table 7. Survey Forms: Scenarios for Further Evaluation (Station 5)**

Group	Description	Number of Times Circled
<b>Survey Instructions: Circle the scenario you prefer to be further evaluated in the PEL Study</b>		
<b>Scenario</b>	Scenario 1 - 6 lanes	8
	Scenario 2 - 8 lanes	22
	Scenario 3 - 10 lanes	11
	Scenario 4 - 12 lanes	5
Group	Description	Number of Times Checked
<b>Survey Instructions: Check the box next to the Preliminary Alternatives you prefer to be further evaluated in the PEL Study</b>		
<b>Highway Build Alternatives</b>	Main Lane Pavement Rehabilitation	21
	Collector / Distributor (C/D) Roads	13
	Auxiliary Lanes	7
	Frontage Road Improvements	17
	Intersection Improvements	24
	Interchange Improvements	31
	Ramp Consolidation/Elimination	19
	Roadway Shoulder Improvements	18
	Horizontal/Vertical Curve Improvements	6
	Bottleneck Removal	32
	Bypass Route	18
<b>Congestion Management</b>	Information Systems/Advanced Traveler Information	23
	Managed Lanes	17
	Reversible Lanes	9
	Ramp Metering	9
	Hard Shoulder Running	6
	Travel Demand Management	11
	Transportation System Management (TSM)	12
	Wayfinding/Signage	19
	Arterial Improvements	22
	Land Use Policy	10
<b>I-30 Bridge</b>	I-30 Arkansas River Bridge Rehabilitation	24
	I-30 Arkansas River Bridge Replacement	25
<b>Other Modes</b>	Arterial Bus Transit	10
	I-30 Express Bus Transit	19
	Bus on Shoulder	14
	Bus Lanes	13
	Arterial Bus Rapid Transit	11
	Light Rail (Streetcar)	16
	Bicycle/Pedestrian	19
	Commuter Rail	19

Group	Description	Number of Times Circled
<b>Non-Recurring Congestion Management</b>	Crash Investigation Sites	20
	Roadside/Motorist Assist Enhancements	16
	Improvements to Detour Routes	16
	Variable Speed Limits (Speed Harmonization)	15
	Queue Warning	20

As shown in **Table 7**, the most popular main lane widening scenario selected for further evaluation was an 8-lane scenario, followed by a 10-lane scenario. Of the other Preliminary Alternatives to be grouped with the 6, 8, 10, or 12-lane scenarios for future screening, the following alternatives ranked highest among their respective groupings: interchange improvements and bottleneck removal for highway build alternatives; information systems/advanced traveler information and arterial improvements for congestion management alternatives; I-30 express bus transit, bicycle/pedestrian improvements, and commuter rail for other mode alternatives; and queue warning and crash investigation sites for non-recurring congestion management alternatives. Results were split almost evenly among survey respondents between rehabilitation and replacement of the Arkansas River Bridge.

**Table 8** provides a listing of all comments received at the public meetings as applied via post-it note directly on the large, aerial photograph map of the study area. Also included is the corresponding response code. The response code key is presented in **Table 9**. Comments are listed verbatim.

**Table 8. Comments from Aerial Photograph Map (Station 6)**

Comment Number	Comment	Response Code
MAP-1	Provide U-turn overpass for vehicles getting on at Curtis Sykes that need I-40 W. <i>Post it note comment placed near I-40 and North Hills Blvd interchange.</i>	A
MAP-2	Kids cross under to go to NLR [North Little Rock] school. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointed at I-30 and 19<sup>th</sup> St. underpass.</i>	C
MAP-3	Make on ramp I-40 E access only. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointed northward at I-30 on ramp at Curtis Sykes Drive.</i>	A
MAP-4	What is the effect that will be had on Shorter College? <i>Post it note comment placed near I-30 and Bishop Lindsey Ave.</i>	B, I
MAP-5	Move ramps south of 7th St. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointed southward at I-30 exit ramp to Bishop Lindsey Ave (east-west) and N Cypress St (north-south).</i>	A
MAP-6	Walk route for school kids. <i>Arrows on post it note comment pointing along Bishop Lindsey Ave. .</i>	C
MAP-7	School is fed from west side of I-30. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointed at school located at N Beech St. and E 7<sup>th</sup> St.</i>	C
MAP-8	Elevate bridge - bury it. <i>Post it note comment placed along I-30 Bridge.</i>	O
MAP-9	Ditto [Assumed comment is referencing MAP-8 comment]. <i>Post it note comment placed along I-30 Bridge.</i>	O
MAP-10	Provide north/south walking/biking access through here. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointing southward, immediately south of the Junction Bridge in Little Rock, west of I-30.</i>	C
MAP-11	Make on/off ramps longer. <i>Post it note comment placed near I-30 and Cantrell interchange.</i>	A

Comment Number	Comment	Response Code
MAP-12	Eliminate this on ramp, its dividing city from Clinton Library. <i>Post it note comment placed near I-30 and Cantrell interchange.</i>	A, D
MAP-13	Close 6 <sup>th</sup> or 9 <sup>th</sup> St. exit southbound. <i>Post it note comment placed near I-30 and 6<sup>th</sup> St.</i>	A
MAP-14	Could work with cities to create bike trails that weave in and out of corridor providing a great north-south route connecting neighborhoods with downtown. <i>Post it note comment placed between McGowan St. and S Commerce St.</i>	C
MAP-15	A bike trail that follows the corridor maybe weaving in and out of it, would allow an alternative way for locals to access downtown - freeing the highway of some traffic. <i>Post it note comment placed along I-30 and 9<sup>th</sup> St.</i>	C
MAP-16	Accidents on ramp. <i>Arrow on post it note comment pointing towards I-30 and I-630 interchange (I-630 entrance ramp to northbound I-30).</i>	A
MAP-17	Replace driveway. <i>Post it note comment placed between E 23<sup>rd</sup> St. and E 24<sup>th</sup> St. immediately adjacent to I-30 on east side.</i>	A
MAP-18	Move Roosevelt Rd. on/off ramps north and south closer to Roosevelt Rd. <i>Post it note comment placed along I-30 just south of Roosevelt Rd. between E 26<sup>th</sup> St. and E 28<sup>th</sup> St.</i>	A

**Table 9** below presents the key to the response codes presented in **Tables 6 and 8**.

**Table 9. Comment Response Code Key for Public Meeting #2**

Response Code	General Topic Addressed	Response
A	Identification of a specific transportation need or solution to address issues of concern.	<p>Input regarding the need for improvements within the I-30 PEL study area or potential solutions to address issues of concern identified as part of the November 6, 2014 public meeting will be used in the continued development and screening of alternatives.</p> <p>The Study Team has and will continue to reach out to members of the public, stakeholders, and community leaders for input on alternatives and design considerations. For example, local representatives (agency, government, and community) appointed by the Mayors of Little Rock and North Little Rock and the Pulaski County Judge attended a visioning workshop on 11/19/14 where they provided input on access locations, ramping and weaving issues, traffic patterns, local attractions, land use plans and other design features to consider when developing and evaluating potential transportation solutions along the I-30/I-40 facility. The Study Team has and will continue to meet regularly with the city mayors, county judge, and representatives from Metroplan, all Project Partners in the PEL Study. Additionally, community meetings at local churches and with various community organizations have provided valuable input on the community vision for the I-30/I-40 facility. All of these individuals have and will continue to provide valuable planning knowledge used by the Study Team in the development of the proposed alternatives.</p> <p>At the time of Public Meeting #2, the Universe of Alternatives was screened to a set of Preliminary Alternatives (Level 1 Screening). Moving forward, the Preliminary Alternatives will be screened to a set of Reasonable Alternatives (Level 2 Screening), to be presented at Public Meeting #3 on January 29, 2015. (response continued on next page)</p>