

Attachment E
Standard Responses to Public Comments

Response Code	General Topic Addressed	Response
A-1	NEPA 6-Lane with Collector / Distributor Lanes Alternative	<p>The 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) and the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes Alternatives, along with the No Action Alternative, will be evaluated at the same level of detail for the Environmental Assessment (EA). The findings will be presented at the future Public Hearing.</p> <p>Features of the 6-Lane with C/D Alternative include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 main lanes and 2 C/D lanes in each direction along I-30 from Broadway Street in North Little Rock to President Clinton Avenue in Little Rock; • 3 to 5 main lanes in each direction along I-30 from President Clinton Avenue to north of the I-630 interchange; • Primarily, 2 to 3 main lanes in each direction (up to 4 main lanes for a brief distance) along I-30 within the I-630 interchange; • Essentially, 5 main lanes in each direction along I-30 from south of the I-630 interchange to I-530; • 5 lanes in each direction along I-40 from I-30 to US 67; • C/D lanes extend from approximately Broadway St. to the SH 10 (Cantrell Road) interchange; • Replacement of the Arkansas River Bridge; • Right hand exits (3 lanes) will be provided to Highway (Hwy) 67 and Interstate 30 (I-30); • Interchange and intersection improvements, ramp modifications, bottleneck removal, auxiliary lanes, shoulder and frontage road improvements, main lane pavement and horizontal/ vertical curve improvements; • Provisions are included for updated signage, bus on shoulder during peak periods, and bicycle/pedestrian access accommodations in coordination with the cities and their City Master Street Plans; • C/D lanes are concrete barrier-separated lanes, separated from the freeway mainline so that local entering and exiting traffic will avoid conflicts with through traffic; • C/D lanes reduce weaving movements on the mainline while minimizing entrance and exit points on through lanes; • C/D lanes maintain slower speed of travel which is anticipated to result in less severe crashes than would result from travel in higher speed main lanes; • C/D lanes would create a new local connection between Little Rock and North Little Rock across the Arkansas River Bridge, allowing motorists to travel between the downtown areas without entering the main lanes of the interstate. Serving as an additional crossing of the Arkansas River that is separate from main lane traffic, the C/D lanes would provide more convenient access to and between the downtown economic districts and support improved connectivity and cohesion of these financially viable commercial and tourist areas; • Auxiliary lanes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 12 acres of new ROW would be required, thus, the majority of the PEL Recommendation would be constructed within the existing ROW. (Once the draft schematic has incorporated the latest changes, the ROW impacts, wetland impacts, and anticipated relocations will be updated); • Maintenance of traffic policy will allow for three lanes in each direction, when feasible.
<p>A-2</p>	<p>Renaming of 6-Lane with Collector / Distributor Lanes Alternative</p>	<p>The 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor Lanes alternative (previously called the PEL Recommendation 10-Lane with Downtown C/D) has been renamed to better clarify the scope of the alternative and reduce misconception. This was based on feedback AHTD received from stakeholders involved in the project who thought the alternative had five through lanes in each direction for the length of the project. In actuality, this alternative has three through lanes in each direction with two additional lanes serving as decision lanes (where a driver may turn or travel through) that feed into Collector/Distributor lanes across the River Bridge in the downtown area. Frontage roads in each direction would remain, in addition to the C/D lanes.</p>
<p>B</p>	<p>NEPA 8-Lane Alternative</p>	<p>The 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) and the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes Alternatives, along with the No Action Alternative, will be evaluated at the same level of detail for the Environmental Assessment (EA). The findings will be presented at the future Public Hearing.</p> <p>Following approval of the PEL Study on July 1, 2015, continued discussions with Metroplan and FHWA resulted in the decision for the 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) Alternative, along with the 6-Lane with C/D Alternative, which is the PEL Recommendation, to both be carried forward into NEPA..</p> <p>Features of the 8-Lane GP Alternative include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 Main Lanes in each direction along I-30 from Curtis Sykes / 19th Street in North Little Rock to 9th Street in Little Rock; • 3 main lanes (SPUI option) and 2 mainlanes (Split Diamond option) in each direction from 9th Street through the interchange with I-630; • Essentially, 4 main lanes in each direction along I-30 I-630 to I-530; • Replacement of the Arkansas River Bridge; • Right hand exits (2 lanes) will be provided to Highway (Hwy) 67 and Interstate 30 (I-30); • Does not address merging / diverging traffic prevalent in the corridor as well as does the 6-lane with C/D; • Interchange and intersection improvements, ramp modifications, bottleneck removal (additional turn lanes at intersections, more operationally efficient intersection design, etc.), auxiliary lanes, shoulder and frontage road improvements, main lane pavement and horizontal/ vertical curve improvements; • Provisions are included for updated signage, bus on shoulder during peak periods, and bicycle/pedestrian access accommodations in coordination with the cities according to their City Master Street Plan;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approximately 12 acres of new ROW would be required, thus, the majority of the PEL Recommendation would be constructed within the existing ROW. (Once the draft schematic has incorporated the latest changes, the ROW impacts, wetland impacts, and anticipated relocations will be updated; • Maintenance of traffic policy will allow for three lanes in each direction, when feasible.
C	Split Diamond Interchange	<p>The Split Diamond Interchange alternative and the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) Alternative, along with the No Action Alternative, will be evaluated at the same level of detail for the Environmental Assessment (EA). The findings will be presented at the future Public Hearing.</p> <p>Based on public input received following Public Meeting #5, the Split Diamond Interchange design shifted from the interchange with SH 10 (Cantrell Road) south, with access on 4th Street.</p> <p>Used with the 8-Lane GP alternative, the Split Diamond Interchange will increase frontage road capacity to 3 lanes, provide a new connection between 3rd Street and 4th Street, restripe 4th Street, 6th Street and Capitol Avenue, and remove some existing street parking.</p> <p>Used with the 6-Lane C/D alternative, the Split Diamond Interchange will have the same effects, but the I-30 access points will be situated in different locations than the 8-Lane GP alternative.</p>
D	Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI)	<p>The Split Diamond Interchange alternative and the Single Point Urban Interchange (SPUI) Alternative, along with the No Action Alternative, will be evaluated at the same level of detail for the Environmental Assessment (EA). The findings will be presented at the future Public Hearing.</p> <p>Based on public input received following Public Meeting #5, the SPUI design was enhanced in order to provide clearance for the River Rail Streetcar and improved access for east-west streets.</p>
E	No Action Alternative	<p>The No-Action Alternative represents the baseline condition in the I-30 PEL study area as if no additional improvements are implemented other than those already programmed in the fiscally constrained Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS) Long-Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).</p> <p>The No-Action Alternative provides a baseline to gauge how effective various alternatives will be at accomplishing the Purpose and Need and Study Goals for the project. This alternative is required to be considered in the PEL and NEPA analyses.</p> <p>In addition to the programmed transportation improvements that have been identified as fiscally constrained in the MTP, the No-Action Alternative includes the preservation of the existing transportation network and all of the</p>

		<p>short-term operational and maintenance improvements currently underway and planned within the study area.</p> <p>In the 2041 design year, with no improvements in the study area, the I-30/I-40 westbound facility is expected to experience severe congestion in the morning from the Arkansas River Bridge back to Highway 67 from 7:00 AM to 8:45 AM. Congestion is expected beyond 8:45 AM, but analysis was only performed to 8:45 AM. Severe congestion represents travel speed in the 10 to 30 mph range.</p> <p>Additionally, in the 2041 design year, with no improvements in the study area, the I-30/I-40 eastbound facility is expected to experience severe congestion in the afternoon from Highway 67 back to the south terminal between the analyzed hours of 4:00 and 6:00 PM. Congestion is expected beyond 6:00 PM, but analysis was only performed to 6:00 PM. Severe congestion represents travel speed in the 10 to 30 mph range.</p> <p>Safety is already an issue along the corridor with high crash rates along the route that would continue to worsen through the 2041 design year. Other identified needs include: traffic congestion, structural and functional roadway deficiencies, navigational safety, and structural functional bridge deficiencies. The No Action Alternative will be advanced for further evaluation as required by NEPA.</p>
<p>F – Other Alternatives</p>		
<p>F-1</p>	<p>At-Grade Boulevard</p>	<p>According to Metroplan’s analysis of the boulevard alternative, the boulevard lacks sufficient capacity to accommodate current and future traffic, resulting in worse delays than are currently experienced in the corridor. A six lane boulevard can carry approximately half of a six lane freeway in vehicles per day. Currently, I-30 carries approximately 120,000 (<i>AHTD 2015 Traffic Count Data</i>) vehicles per day at the River crossing. Therefore, more than 45,000 vehicles per day would need to find alternative, less desirable routes in the region to downtown Little Rock and North Little Rock. The impact of a boulevard goes beyond just the mainline capacity. Impacts to other regional roadways as a result of excess traffic not accommodated by the boulevard, would necessitate improvements. Improvements would be needed to other local and regional roadways in the metropolitan area (e.g. I-430, I-630 and other local roads) to handle the increased traffic.</p> <p>In regard to improved mobility and safety for other modes of transportation (pedestrian, bicycle, and transit), the boulevard is expected to have a negative impact on these modes of transportation. While the Department’s proposed alternatives would keep pedestrians and bicyclists separated from the main I-30 traffic flow, the boulevard would place these users directly in conflict with vehicular traffic. To protect pedestrians and bicyclists from this at-grade conflict across a 6-lane boulevard, lengthy pedestrian traffic signal phases would have to be added to the traffic lights. This would result in greater congestion to motorists and transit users, not only in the corridor but also in</p>

		<p>the downtown grid. Pedestrians crossing will be less desirable as a result of the risk of crossing the at-grade intersections and the wait time associated with the traffic signal timing.</p> <p>Due to the size, complexity, and importance of this corridor, a large amount of funding has been set aside to improve the current and anticipated issues of the corridor. The Department has an obligation to the tax payers of the state to make sure any scenario considered to improve the corridor is validated through engineering analysis to ensure a benefit is provided to all users of the facility. Although a boulevard could provide aesthetic benefits to the corridor, it would make the safety and mobility of the corridor much worse.</p>
F-2	Repairing or Rehabilitating I-30 Bridge	<p>AHTD bridge inspection of the I-30 Arkansas River Bridge as well as input from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) has shown that rehabilitation and improvements would not sufficiently address the structural deficiencies of the existing bridge and that it is in need of replacement. Also, navigational safety would be greatly improved due to removal of pier obstruction and improvements to horizontal clearance.</p>
F-3	Additional River Crossing	<p>Creating additional or alternative river crossings to the Arkansas River Bridge has been considered and was evaluated as part of the PEL. The significant cost of \$80-\$100 million was estimated for a new Chester Street bridge, due to expenses associated with ROW, roadway intersections, and the bridge itself. The anticipated relief provided will not result in major shifts of traffic patterns on I-30 (approximately 3.5% of daily traffic as evaluated in the PEL). A new river crossing east of the existing I-30 corridor was also considered. This corridor was determined to have significant impacts to existing businesses and residents. In addition, any new crossing would introduce significant new environmental and community impacts to existing development, such as displacement of homes and business located along a new corridor.</p> <p>A new river crossing would not address the safety or infrastructure issues with the current I-30 bridge. This bridge would still need to be replaced even if a new crossing were created.</p>
F-4	Route Traffic Around Downtown	<p>I-440 exists as an alternative route to the east of downtown, I-430 exists as an alternative route to the west of downtown, and I-40 serves as a route to the north, together serving as a beltway around Little Rock and North Little Rock, to which I-30 and I-630 serve as radial connections. Due to the amount of the traffic on existing I-30 that is destined to the downtown business district, these routes would not serve as attractive alternate routes. Routing traffic to these routes does not improve accessibility to the downtown business district. Additionally, existing development limits opportunities of any new alignments.</p>
F-5	Questions/ Concerns regarding I-630	<p>Current recommended alternatives include improvements to I-30 and I-40; it does not include major improvements to I-630.</p>

		<p>Traffic modeling determined that additional capacity improvements on I-630 from Louisiana Street west beyond the PEL study limits (“outside area”) are needed in the future year (2041) to avoid backups from congestion outside the study limits impacting traffic and safety inside the study limits on I-30.</p> <p>AHTD has acknowledged this outside area warrants additional study and plans exist to evaluate and potentially improve, as determined necessary.</p>
<p>F-6</p>	<p>Transit as an Alternative</p>	<p>Transit-oriented alternatives were evaluated during the PEL and are included in the NEPA phase. Appendix D (Alternatives Development and Evaluation) of the Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (PEL) identifies the transit alternatives analyzed and when and if they were screened out during the three level PEL screening process.</p> <p>Universe of transit alternatives considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. High speed rail – Screened out in Level 1 2. Heavy rail – Screened out in Level 1 3. Commuter rail – Screened out in Level 2A 4. Light rail (streetcar) – Screened out in Level 2A 5. Arterial bus transit – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 6. Arterial bus lanes – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 7. Arterial bus rapid transit – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 8. I-30 Express bus service – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 9. Bus on shoulder – Included as part of PEL Recommendation <p>As shown, alternatives 5 through 9 were included in the PEL recommendation. AHTD is committed to ensuring that the NEPA preferred alternative not preclude Rock Regional Transit from implementing alternatives 5 through 9 on AHTD facilities.</p> <p>A transit memo was developed in Appendix F of the PEL Report. The transit memo outlines transit information around the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the estimated mode shift under the most ideal reasonable transit scenario? 2. What mode shift is required, in terms of auto trips diverted to transit, to achieve a material positive effect on traffic volumes and volume/capacity relationship on I-30? <p>The table below shows that the baseline express transit and bus on shoulder alternatives would remove approximately 510 peak hour directional vehicles from I-30 and the enhanced scenario would reduce 650 peak hour directional vehicles from I-30 at the Arkansas River Bridge. Neither the baseline nor enhanced scenarios achieve the AHTD desired LOS D goal or the LOS E threshold.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2040 I-30 No Action Comparison of Feasible and Required Mode Shifts</p>

		<table border="1" data-bbox="581 216 1498 426"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="581 216 967 268">Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)</th> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="967 216 1498 268">Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="581 268 912 317"></th> <th data-bbox="912 268 967 317"></th> <th data-bbox="967 268 1097 317">LOS E</th> <th data-bbox="1097 268 1230 317">Deficit</th> <th data-bbox="1230 268 1364 317">LOS D</th> <th data-bbox="1364 268 1498 317">Deficit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="581 317 912 369">Baseline (30 min. headways)</td> <td data-bbox="912 317 967 369">510</td> <td data-bbox="967 317 1097 369" rowspan="2">795</td> <td data-bbox="1097 317 1230 369">-285</td> <td data-bbox="1230 317 1364 369" rowspan="2">1,604</td> <td data-bbox="1364 317 1498 369">-1,094</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="581 369 912 426">Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)</td> <td data-bbox="912 369 967 426">650</td> <td data-bbox="1097 369 1230 426">-145</td> <td data-bbox="1364 369 1498 426">-954</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="581 432 1195 457">Source: PEL recommendation, Appendix F, Transit Memo, p. 10</p> <p data-bbox="568 499 1487 636">The baseline capital costs to implement the baseline and enhanced scenarios was estimated to be \$39.9 million (2014 dollars) with an operating cost of \$4.4M annually. The enhanced scenario was estimated to be \$58.7 million (2014 dollars) with an operating cost of \$6.2M annually.</p> <p data-bbox="568 678 1484 888">In April 2016, Rock Region Metro provided a letter, requesting that the following items be taken into consideration: support for the split diamond interchange and proposed access points; improvements to turning movements; roadway design to facilitate a “bus on shoulder” transit option; future technology with regard to final design. A follow-up meeting with Rock Region Metro will be scheduled forthwith.</p>	Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)		Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS						LOS E	Deficit	LOS D	Deficit	Baseline (30 min. headways)	510	795	-285	1,604	-1,094	Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)	650	-145	-954
Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)		Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS																						
		LOS E	Deficit	LOS D	Deficit																			
Baseline (30 min. headways)	510	795	-285	1,604	-1,094																			
Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)	650		-145		-954																			
F-7	More Options for Evaluation	<p data-bbox="568 926 1503 1419">AHTD initially created over 40 alternatives as part of the 30 Crossing PEL Study. This “Universe” of alternatives then went through a thorough, three-level screening process. The Alternative Screening Methodology reviewed alternatives derived from multiple sources, including the 2003 Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS) Areawide Freeway Study, Phase 1 Arkansas River Crossing Study, the Long Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the CARTS area, and the I-30 PEL Purpose and Need Report, along with input from the Technical Work Group, public, and other stakeholders. Alternatives were evaluated against the study goals and study area needs. The first level reviewed the “Universe” of alternatives against fatal flaws. The second level of preliminary alternatives refined the alternatives. The third level performed a detailed evaluation of the reasonable alternatives. Throughout the entire screening process, stakeholder and public input was solicited and evaluated as part of the methodology.</p> <p data-bbox="568 1461 1386 1524">Examples of alternatives eliminated by the screening process include dedicated truck lanes, elevated highway lanes, and heavy rail.</p>																						
G – Schematics																								
G-1	Safety	<p data-bbox="568 1661 1503 1900">An extensive Traffic and Safety report was completed as part of the PEL Study. The crash data determined that from 2010-2012, the fatal (K) and severe injury (A) (KA Crash Rate) was more than double the statewide average of 0.06 crashes per million vehicle miles traveled on comparative roadways. The full report may be found in the PEL Study, available on the project website www.30crossing.com or by contacting the project team by emailing info@30crossing.com or calling 501-255-1519.</p>																						

		<p>Proposed entrance and exit ramps will be longer than existing ramps to improve safety, and impacted intersections will be redesigned to improve safety and operations.</p> <p>Each of the build alternatives include several measures to enhance and improve safety conditions such as new auxiliary lanes and shoulders.</p> <p>In the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes alternative, C/D lanes between Broadway and Cantrell interchange will be separated from the main lanes by a concrete barrier. Reduced speeds will allow for safer access between Little Rock and North Little Rock. The 8-lane GP does not include reduced speeds. Additionally, C/D lanes are separated from the freeway mainline, reducing weaving movements on the mainline, so that local entering and exiting traffic will avoid conflicts with through traffic.</p>
<p>G-2</p>	<p>General Adding Lanes</p>	<p>A No Action Alternative and 6 Main Lane Alternative were evaluated as part of the PEL study in an effort to achieve the study goals without adding lanes to the existing roadway. As discussed below, neither alternative was determined to meet the purpose and need or study goals of the project.</p> <p>No Action Alternative (see E above): The I-30/I-40 facility today exhibits severe Level of Service (LOS) F congestion (worst level of congestion) over a long duration in several areas, during the peak hour. By 2041, the section of I-30 north of the Arkansas River would operate at LOS F congestion almost continuously throughout the AM peak period. Safety is already an issue along the corridor with high crash rates along the route that would continue to worsen. Needs that have warranted this project include the following: Issues such as traffic congestion, roadway safety issues, structural and functional roadway deficiencies, navigational safety issues, and structural functional bridge deficiencies. The No Action Alternative will be advanced for further evaluation as required by NEPA.</p> <p>6-Main Lanes (3 main lanes in each direction): This alternative included replacement of the I-30 Arkansas River Bridge, keeping the main line in the core of the corridor, and other mode and non-recurring management strategies that passed Level 1 (the initial screening involved during the development of the PEL study. This alternative was screened out during Level 2 because it failed to substantially improve mobility and safety in the study area, and as traffic volumes continue to increase, the conditions would grow progressively worse over the next 20 years. Accordingly, it did not meet the purpose and need, or the study goals of the project, and was not advanced to Level 3 in the PEL.</p>
<p>G-3</p>	<p>Access Changes</p>	<p>The current recommended improvements associated with the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes Alternative include modifying entrance and exit points along I-30 to meet current ramp design length requirements for safe acceleration and deceleration. The following is a summary of the proposed changes:</p>

		<p>River Bridge Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C/D lanes between Broadway and Cantrell interchange will be separated from the main lanes by a concrete barrier. This will allow for lower travelling speeds and safer access between Little Rock and North Little Rock. The traffic in the main lanes will not be able to directly access Cantrell or Broadway. There will be new guide signs to direct traffic accordingly. <p>Dark Hollow Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The I-30 NB entrance ramp from Curtis Sykes will be shifted to the north, eliminating the current weaving condition for traffic bound for I-40 WB. To access I-40 WB from Dark Hollow, traffic will head west and turn north along N. Main St, or take North Hills Blvd to the northeast. <p>North Little Rock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A SB frontage road bridge over the railroad will be provided. • The Locust Street Bridge over the railroad will be replaced and converted to one-way NB. <p>I-40 / I-30 Interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The I-40 WB roadway will shift to be located adjacent to the existing I-40 EB roadway. This will allow the WB traffic bound for I-30 SB to utilize a right-hand exit which is more in line with driver expectancy and thereby enhancing safety. • New guide signs will be provided. <p>I-40 / US 67 Interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I-40 EB traffic headed for US 67 NB will utilize a right-hand exit which is more in line with driver expectancy and thereby enhancing safety. • There will be new guide signs provided to direct traffic accordingly. <p>A summary of the proposed changes in access will be available at the public hearing and in future reports.</p>
<p>G-4</p>	<p>Ramp Changes</p>	<p>The current recommended improvements includes modifying existing interchanges to improve safety and reduce congestion. The following is a summary of the proposed changes:</p> <p><u>North bound Ramp Changes:</u></p> <p>Roosevelt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing entrance ramp from the Roosevelt Frontage Road will be shifting closer to the intersection. Traffic will no longer have direct access to the ramp from Vance St. <p>I-630</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I-630 EB to I-30 NB will provide for two lanes on the entire approach to I-30 NB <p>6th Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Improvements include adjusting ramps to provide for safer access at 6th St. The existing bridge will be lengthened to allow for widenings. <p>Cantrell Interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shifting exit Hwy. 10 / Cantrell Rd. / Clinton Ave. exit to south• Adjusting entrance ramp from Cantrell interchange <p>Bishop Lindsey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Entrance from Bishop Lindsey will be shifted to south to come from Broadway <p>Curtis Sykes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exit to Curtis Sykes gore shifting to south• The I-30 NB entrance ramp from Curtis Sykes will be shifting to the north, eliminating the current weaving condition for traffic bound for I-40 WB. To access I-40 WB from Dark Hollow, traffic will head west and turn north along N. Main St, or take North Hills Blvd to the northeast.• The directional signage will keep the name Curtis Sykes <p><u>South bound Ramp Changes:</u></p> <p>I-630</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I-630 EB to I-30 SB providing for two lanes on the entire approach to I-30 SB• I-30 SB to I-630 WB increasing to a 3 lane exit. <p>9th Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Providing access to 9th St. via the 6th St. exit from the C/D road.• Exit to 9th St. is eliminated <p>6th Street</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exit to 6th St. shifting north. Access will be available from C/D. (No direct access from mainlanes) <p>Cantrell Interchange</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exit to Cantrell interchange shifting north. Access will be available from C/D. (No direct access from mainlanes) <p>Bishop Lindsey</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exit to Bishop Lindsey shifting north of railroad <p>Curtis Sykes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing exit to Curtis Sykes shifting to north at 19th St.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entrance from 19th St. remains in the same location as existing exit to Curtis Sykes Adding exit to 19th (from both EB and WB I-40 traffic) – Will serve as both 19th and Curtis Sykes exit ramps The directional signage keeping the name Curtis Sykes <p>A summary of the proposed changes to interchanges will be available at the public hearing and in future reports.</p>
G-5	Traffic Conflict Points	The build alternatives include improved merging aspects and improved signage, meaning that merging and diverging traffic will be isolated in limited areas, minimizing potential points of traffic conflict. An increase in travel lanes within the study area will create more free-flowing traffic within the extents of the project.
G-6	Congestion Management	<p>Congestion management strategies alone will not solve the congestion problems anticipated for I-30 and I-40.</p> <p>Congestion management strategies that may be implemented in the future include updated signage improvements, bus on shoulder and bicycle/pedestrian access accommodations. Additional technologies include Intelligent Transportation Services (ITS), along with accident notification Dynamic Messaging Signs (DMS); instant management/detection program; (readied tow-trucks); signalization; and express/managed lanes/express lanes.</p>
G-7	Truck Traffic	The project is not anticipated to direct trucks into downtown. Trucks making local deliveries will continue to be present in the downtown area. However, trucks without local destinations are directed via signage to continue using I-440 as a route to the east of downtown or I-430 as a route to the west of downtown, and I-40 serving as a route to the north. These routes serve as a beltway around Little Rock and North Little Rock, to which I-30 and I-630 serve as radial connections for trucks needing to make local, downtown deliveries.
H – Alternative Transportation Considerations		
H-1	Transit as Part of Project	<p>Transit-oriented alternatives were evaluated during the PEL and are included in the NEPA phase. Appendix D (Alternatives Development and Evaluation) of the Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (PEL) identifies the transit alternatives analyzed and when and if they were screened out during the three level PEL screening process.</p> <p>Universe of transit alternatives considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> High speed rail – Screened out in Level 1 Heavy rail – Screened out in Level 1 Commuter rail – Screened out in Level 2A Light rail (streetcar) – Screened out in Level 2A Arterial bus transit – Included as part of PEL Recommendation Arterial bus lanes – Included as part of PEL Recommendation

		<p>7. Arterial bus rapid transit – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 8. I-30 Express bus service – Included as part of PEL Recommendation 9. Bus on shoulder – Included as part of PEL Recommendation</p> <p>As shown, alternatives 5 through 9 were included in the PEL recommendation. AHTD is committed to ensuring that the NEPA preferred alternative not preclude Rock Regional Transit from implementing alternatives 5 through 9 on AHTD facilities.</p> <p>A transit memo was developed in Appendix F of the PEL Report. The transit memo outlines transit information around the following questions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the estimated mode shift under the most ideal reasonable transit scenario? 2. What mode shift is required, in terms of auto trips diverted to transit, to achieve a material positive effect on traffic volumes and volume/capacity relationship on I-30? <p>The table below shows that the baseline express transit and bus on shoulder alternatives would remove approximately 510 peak hour directional vehicles from I-30 and the enhanced scenario would reduce 650 peak hour directional vehicles from I-30 at the Arkansas River Bridge. Neither the baseline nor enhanced scenarios achieve the AHTD desired LOS D goal or the LOS E threshold.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">2040 I-30 No Action Comparison of Feasible and Required Mode Shifts</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="581 1190 1500 1398"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" rowspan="2">Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)</th> <th colspan="4">Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS</th> </tr> <tr> <th>LOS E</th> <th>Deficit</th> <th>LOS D</th> <th>Deficit</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Baseline (30 min. headways)</td> <td>510</td> <td rowspan="2">795</td> <td>-285</td> <td rowspan="2">1,604</td> <td>-1,094</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)</td> <td>650</td> <td>-145</td> <td>-954</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Source: PEL recommendation, Appendix F, Transit Memo, p. 10</p> <p>The baseline capital costs to implement the baseline and enhanced scenarios was estimated to be \$39.9 million (2014 dollars) with an operating cost of \$4.4M annually. The enhanced scenario was estimated to be \$58.7 million (2014 dollars) with an operating cost of \$6.2M annually.</p> <p>Since the Public Meeting #5, a revised interchange has been developed for the intersection of I-30 and Hwy. 10 that will provide direct access to both the east and west sides of I-30 for vehicles and still allow the River Rail Streetcar to remain operational in its current location along 3rd Street.</p>	Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)		Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS				LOS E	Deficit	LOS D	Deficit	Baseline (30 min. headways)	510	795	-285	1,604	-1,094	Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)	650	-145	-954
Feasible Auto Trips (Screenline 2)		Required Mode Shift to Achieve Desired LOS																				
		LOS E	Deficit	LOS D	Deficit																	
Baseline (30 min. headways)	510	795	-285	1,604	-1,094																	
Enhanced (10 - 15 min. headways)	650		-145		-954																	
H-2	Bicycle / Pedestrian	Accommodating bicycle/pedestrian facilities and improving the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists, including pathways for students walking or bicycling to school, were all issues identified by local agency, government, and																				

		<p>community representatives at the I-30 PEL visioning workshop held on 11/19/14. A second visioning workshop was held 10/06/15 with stakeholders that examined potential context sensitive solutions (CSS) and design concepts that facilitate safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian movement throughout the area, while also maintaining aesthetic continuity with the surrounding environment. CSS/aesthetic guidelines are being developed as a follow up to this second visioning workshop and will be included in the design-build-to-a-budget request for proposals. The workshop’s purpose, scope and guidelines included pedestrian- and bicyclist-focused designs.</p> <p>However, potential bicycle and pedestrian accommodations must be coordinated between the cities for implementation and maintenance, and the Study Team will continue to work with city planners to ensure that city goals for future development are given due consideration and incorporated when practicable.</p>
<p>I – Concerns about potential social, economic or environmental impacts and/or request for protection of environmental resources in the study area</p>		
<p>I-1</p>	<p>General comment about social, economic or environmental impacts</p>	<p>AHTD is committed to social, economic and environmental issues in all their projects. Social, economic, and environmental resources were considered during the development, evaluation and screening of alternatives for the I-30 PEL Study. Efforts have been made to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential environmental impacts associated with the identified NEPA alternatives. Continued coordination with resource agencies will occur throughout the NEPA processes to ensure compliance and minimization of potential impacts.</p> <p>Per Executive Order 12898 and USDOT Order 5610.2(a), AHTD, “...shall make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”</p> <p>Potential impacts resulting from the proposed alternatives to social, economic and environmental resources are being evaluated in the Environmental Assessment (EA).</p>
<p>I-2</p>	<p>Noise Impacts and Mitigation</p>	<p>The Noise Impacts Analysis is part of the NEPA study and it is conducted in accordance with the procedures and provisions of Title 23, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 772, U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Procedures for the Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise. These regulations establish a requirement for a noise assessment for any proposed federal or federal-aid project. Per the most recent update to the AHTD Policy on Highway Traffic Noise Abatement, highway traffic noise prediction requirements, analysis, and abatement criteria comply with the noise standards established by 23 U.S.C 109(i).</p> <p>The noise analysis includes:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identification of existing activities, developed land and land currently under development. - Measurement and/or estimation of existing noise levels. - Prediction of Design Year (future year for which the roadway is designed) No Action noise levels. - Prediction of Design Year Build noise levels for all alignment alternatives considered by the project. <p>Studies generally include efforts to avoid or minimize noise impacts to sensitive receptors through alignment shifts and overall avoidance of residential areas. If this is not possible, there are several types of noise reduction measures that can be considered for mitigation of highway noise impacts.</p> <p>These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alteration of vertical and horizontal alignments. - Traffic controls. - Construction of noise barriers. <p>As of April 2016, AHTD has taken measurements of the current noise levels at all noise sensitive receptors along the study area and have begun modeling future noise predictions. Noise sensitive receptors are areas that may be adversely impacted by increased noise as a result of a traffic project.</p> <p>The noise analysis process will be presented to the public at the next public meeting.</p> <p>If any noise walls are proposed, the locations will be presented at the public hearing. Construction of noise walls is subject to approval by the affected residents, who will be given the opportunity to vote on their preferences.</p>
<p>I-3</p>	<p>Cultural Impacts, Historic Districts and Parks</p>	<p>Social, economic, and environmental resources were considered during the development, evaluation and screening of alternatives for the I-30 PEL Study in an effort to avoid and/or minimize any potential future negative impacts on these resources.</p> <p>Indirect impacts to historic properties, including the MacArthur Park, Park Hill, Hangar Hill, and Marshall Square Historic Districts are currently being evaluated in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and in coordination with the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP). Section 106 of the NHPA requires federal agencies to take into account the effects a proposed undertaking may have on historic properties. The NHPA's implementing regulations (36 CFR 800) define the steps to be followed under the Section 106 consultation process. The Section 106 consultation is ongoing. Additionally, there will be no anticipated direct impacts (ROW takings) to historic districts.</p>

		<p>Identified historic properties include the Locust Street Overpass and the MacArthur Park, Park Hill, Hangar Hill, and Marshall Square Historic Districts. There will be no acquisitions of property for ROW within the historic districts.</p> <p>The Locust Street Overpass will be replaced. AHTD bridge inspection of the I-30 Arkansas River Bridge as well as input from the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the United States Coast Guard (USCG) has shown that rehabilitation and improvements would not address the structural deficiencies of the existing bridge and that it must be replaced. A Memorandum of Agreement will stipulate measures to be carried out to address the adverse effect on the bridge.</p> <p>The Cultural Resources Technical Report attached to the EA will discuss the identified historic properties, the effects analysis, the consultation process, and the measures to minimize or mitigate impacts.</p> <p>There are minor impacts anticipated for Julius Breckling Riverfront Park, William J. Clinton Presidential Park, and the North Little Rock Riverfront Park. The impacts are being analyzed as part of the Environmental Assessment.</p> <p>As a part of the ongoing NEPA efforts, assessment of all impacts will be included in the final documentation.</p>
I-4	Social / Community Impacts	<p>The NEPA alternatives are not anticipated to impact any public facilities (churches, schools, etc.) that create unity and facilitate community gatherings.</p> <p>Furthermore, bridges along the I-30 facility would be expanded when feasible, thereby opening up east-west connectivity in a safer manner and better facilitating the interaction of areas previously divided by the existing facility. The alternatives will improve the enclosed nature of the area from 3rd St. to Markham St. and Sherman St. to Mahlon Martin St. by removing interchanges that add highway width to the area. Improved access will be provided on E 3rd Street and E 6th Street, by increased flow under I-30.</p>
I-5	Aesthetic Impacts	<p>Aesthetic priorities of the community were identified by stakeholders in the two Visioning Workshops during the PEL. Improved lighting and other aesthetic suggestions were provided by workshop participants such as designing an open and inviting facility, not having an iconic bridge and keeping consistent use of construction materials throughout the corridor. More specific guidelines are being developed following the second visioning workshop held 10/06/15, and will be included in the design-build-to-a-budget request for proposals. Aesthetic impacts will be evaluated as part of the Environmental Assessment (EA).</p>
I-6	Tourism / Economic Viability of Downtown	<p>AHTD is continuing to work closely with the city and stakeholders to minimize impacts to the continuation of the area’s economic development, revitalization and urban identity of Little Rock and North Little Rock. The planned improvements are anticipated to improve safety and access to</p>

		<p>downtown Little Rock from the interstate, and improve access to key tourist attractions such as the Clinton Library and the River Market District.</p> <p>For the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes alternative, the C/D lanes would create a new local connection between Little Rock and North Little Rock across the Arkansas River Bridge, allowing motorists to travel between the downtown areas without entering the main lanes of the interstate. Serving as an additional crossing of the Arkansas River that is separate from interstate main lane traffic, the C/D lanes would provide more convenient access to and between the downtown economic districts and support improved connectivity and cohesion of these financially viable commercial and tourist areas.</p> <p>Additional open space and more open and direct east-west access are key goals of the project design concepts.</p> <p>The 6th Street crossing will be more pedestrian and bike friendly than the existing crossing due to the longer off-ramp on the west side and the service road not being continuous on the east side.</p>
I-7	Impacts to Parking	AHTD will be working closely with the city pertaining to any changes in parking spaces, and how to minimize or mitigate impacts.
I-8	Air pollution and emissions	AHTD is proceeding in conjunction with Metroplan, Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on a quantitative evaluation of potential air quality impacts. The results of this assessment will be included in the final environmental documentation.
I-9	Displacements / Relocations	It is anticipated that there will be very few instances of residential or business relocations due to the final design of the project. As the development continues on the engineering designs for the 6-Lane with C/D Lanes Alternative and 8-Lane GP Alternative, some relocations may be necessary. Any and all displacement/relocation issues will be done in compliance with the Uniform Relocation Act (<i>USC Ch. 61</i>).
I-10	Evolving Technology	Developing and evolving aspects of transportation technology are being considered in the development of the 30 Crossing project. It is anticipated that these technologies will be a standard part of traveling in the coming decades. Consideration of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies and congestion management strategies are ongoing. These considerations, will enable AHTD to respond efficiently in adapting and retooling roadways to accommodate new technologies.
I-11	Additional Greenspace	<p>Currently, the circular ramps between 3rd Street and Clinton Avenue are generally prohibitive to impactful public usage, with the exception of parking, due to several unavoidable pedestrian-automobile conflict points.</p> <p>All build alternatives evaluated will, through coordination with landowners and local governments, provide foundation to enhance the amount of land available for transformation into public greenspace.</p>

I-12	Environmental Documentation	<p>Per Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) NEPA Documentation standards, an Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared to assist in determining the significance of environmental impacts.</p> <p>The determination of class of action is at the sole discretion of the FHWA.</p> <p>As cooperating agencies, it is anticipated that both the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and United States Coast Guard (USCG) would adopt the FHWA/AHTD NEPA document as their environmental document, issuing a joint NEPA determination. All coordination, environmental documentation, review and decisionmaking with the USCG would occur in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the USCG and FHWA and the Application for Coast Guard Bridge Permits guidance. Additionally, the FHWA/AHTD NEPA document must comply with the USCG environmental document checklist before issuance of a joint NEPA decision.</p>
J	Questions / Concerns Regarding Project Cost / Funding	<p>As the design schematics of a NEPA preferred alternative are advanced, and cost estimates become more refined, the NEPA project team will identify the set of “most likely improvements”, which will form the basis for the first construction phase. To maximize the amount of construction delivered, the project will be delivered using the Fixed Price – Best Design methodology as outlined in the AHTD Design-Build Guidelines and Procedures. AHTD will establish the baseline project scope and the not-to-exceed baseline project budget, consistent with the most likely set of improvements identified in NEPA. Operational modeling of the preferred alternative during the NEPA phase will provide relevant information needed in the determination of the priority of improvements for inclusion into the Fixed Price – Best Design project.</p> <p>The current preliminary cost estimate is approximately \$630.7M.</p>
K	Questions/ Concerns About Construction Impacts	<p>Construction is expected to begin in 2018 and anticipated to take 4 years. During reconstruction of the bridge and interchanges and the roadway, the department has determined that a maintenance of traffic plan will be developed for six-lanes of traffic (three in each direction) throughout the construction phase. Given the magnitude of the project there will be isolated disruptions during construction that will be temporary in nature and minimized to the extent possible.</p>
L – Questions about the Project Process and Public Involvement		
L-1	Screening Process	<p>The production of the PEL Study involved a thorough, three-level screening process. The Alternative Screening Methodology, reviewed by the Project Partners, Technical Advisory Group, stakeholders and the public, reviewed alternatives derived from multiple sources, including the 2003 Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS) Areawide Freeway Study, Phase 1 Arkansas River Crossing Study, the Long Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan for the CARTS area, and the I-30 PEL Purpose and Need</p>

		<p>Report, along with input from the Technical Work Group, public, and other stakeholders. Alternatives were evaluated against the study goals and study area needs. The first level reviewed the “Universe” of alternatives against fatal flaws. The second level of preliminary alternatives refined the alternatives. The third level performed a detailed evaluation of the reasonable alternatives. Throughout the entire screening process, stakeholder and public input was solicited and evaluated as part of the methodology.</p> <p>Examples of alternatives eliminated by the screening process include dedicated truck lanes, elevated highway lanes, and heavy rail.</p>
<p>L-2</p>	<p>Public Involvement</p>	<p>The Connecting Arkansas program and legislation is focused on improving highways and interstates. AHTD is dedicated to working with the community to provide safe and reliable transportation solutions for Arkansas. Continuously involving the community in the discussion and visioning process for transportation improvements along I-30 in central Arkansas is key to AHTD’s mission. There have been six public meetings and two visioning workshops held to date, with additional meetings anticipated on an as-needed basis.</p> <p>Public meeting attendees could make comments verbally with a provided audio recorder in addition to providing written comment.</p> <p>Outreach has been advertised through a variety of methods, including print ads in the <i>Arkansas Democrat Gazette</i>, <i>North Little Rock Times</i> and <i>El Latino</i>; radio public service announcements on <i>Power 92.3 FM</i> and <i>La Pantera 1440 AM</i>; online at the websites <i>ConnectingArkansasProgram.com</i>, <i>Metroplan.org</i>, and others; on social media such as the Facebook and Twitter accounts of AHTD and Metroplan. Additionally, direct mail and email flyers were distributed to stakeholders within the study area, elected officials, ministers at area churches, libraries and community centers, and other stakeholders. Several small group meetings were held with ministers of minority churches and other community groups. For a full list of outreach please refer to the summaries that have been published following each public meeting, or contact the project via the information in the following paragraph.</p> <p>FHWA and AHTD are also consulting with Section 106 consulting parties, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historical Preservation Act (NHPA), 36CFR800, the implementing regulation of the act. This consultation is ongoing.</p> <p>A public hearing will be held, at which time, there will be a formal presentation and there will be an opportunity for attendees to verbally comment in front of the hearing. If you have a recommendation to further improve our outreach efforts, would like to request a presentation, or would like to be notified of future events, please email info@30crossing.com or call 501-255-1519.</p>

M	General Comment	Thank you for your comment, it has been documented. The input gathered at Public Meeting #6 will be used to move forward with the NEPA process.
N	Additional Contact Needed	Commenter has been or will be contacted by a Study Team member and provided the requested information. The contact information for the project is info@30Crossing.com
P – Individual Responses		
P-1	Individual	Please visit https://connectingarkansasprogram.com/corridors/11/highway-67-pulaski-lonoke-county/#.WCSromCQJaQ for information about Highway 67 enhancements.
P-2	Individual	Currently, there are two alternatives being considered in Cantrell area (each for the 8-lane and 6-lane with collector/distributor lane options). They are the SPUI and the Split Diamond. The lane configurations for Barber, 9th and Welch Streets will remain as they are currently. The 9th Street bridge over I-30 will be widened to accommodate two through lanes and possibly left turn lanes. However, the improvements are not planned to extend beyond the I-30 corridor.
P-3	Individual	The latest proposed improvements were placed on display at Public Meeting #6 on April 26, 2016. Exhibits included roll plots, Powerpoint presentations, 3D video traffic simulations, as well as environmental and history information. All meeting materials provided at that time can also be viewed on the Connecting Arkansas Program website at the following link: https://connectingarkansasprogram.com/meetings/i-30-pulaski-county/169/public-meeting-6-april-26-2016-30-crossing/#.V7m5mCQKM8
P-4	Individual	We have received the report you have referenced, and the information is being considered and evaluated throughout the NEPA process. Please refer to the published Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study that is available on the 30 Crossing website. During the PEL Study, dozens of alternatives were developed and screened for feasibility and quality in meeting the stated Purpose and Need of 30 Crossing. The evaluation of alternatives and impacts will be further detailed in the upcoming 30 Crossing Environmental Assessment (EA), which will also be available on the 30 Crossing website.
P-5	Individual	The exit to which you make reference is outside the scope of the 30 Crossing project. It is scheduled to be completed in late 2016.
P-6	Individual	As the project is underway, oversight is maintained by AHTD and other agencies in order to make sure the project is developed and completed at the highest standards. Auditing will be accordance with AHTD standard practices. For more information, please contact the Audit Division of AHTD.
P-7	Individual	Regarding concerns about the I-30/I-40 interchange, the following actions are being proposed:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A second left-turn lane (southbound) onto JFK Blvd from the I-40 west/I-30 east exit • A second right-turn lane (southbound) onto JFK Blvd from the I-40 east exit • A second through lane will continue from I-30 east to I-40 west ramp • Improved signage
<p>P-8</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>The Design-Build Finance funds are only anticipated to make up 16% of total project funding. These funds will be provided by the Design-Build team to fill any gap that may exist between available project funds and the cost of the project as proposed by the Design-Build team. The Department has set an available amount of Design-Build-Finance funds, however it is possible the Design-Build team will be able to build the project without utilizing all of these funds. Repayment will be made over a five-year period starting in 2019 using federal funds designated in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for this purpose. The department has committed to additional funding for Central Arkansas to cover the repayment of these funds.</p> <p>The widening of I-30 to 8 lanes from the South Terminal of the Project to 65th Street was included in the PEL Study for the 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) Alternative. The No-Action/No-Build alternative was not evaluated with this widening, as the No-Action/No-Build Alternative represents the baseline condition in the I-30 PEL study area as if no additional improvements are implemented other than those already programmed in the fiscally constrained Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS) Long-Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).</p>
<p>P-9</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>30 Crossing is a very important project for the state. As stated in the Purpose and Need from the published 30 Crossing Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (available at www.30Crossing.com, there are a variety of needs that are to be met by the 30 Crossing project. This includes improving the following issues: traffic congestion, roadway safety, structural roadway deficiencies, functional roadway deficiencies, river navigational safety, structural bridge deficiencies, and functional bridge deficiencies.</p> <p>Approximately 64% of the estimated \$631.7 million budget is projected to come from the Connecting Arkansas Program funds, which are collected as the additional ½% sales tax. There are other projects throughout the state that are ongoing concurrently to 30 Crossing. Please visit www.ConnectingArkansasProgram.com for more information.</p> <p>To answer your additional outstanding question, aspects of transportation technology are certainly being considered throughout the duration and development of the 30 Crossing project. It is anticipated that these technologies will be a standard part of traveling in the coming decades. Consideration of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies and congestion management strategies are ongoing. These considerations, will enable AHTD to respond efficiently in adapting and retooling roadways to accommodate new technologies.</p>

<p>P-10</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>30 Crossing is a very important project for the state. As stated in the Purpose and Need from the published 30 Crossing Planning and Environmental Linkages Study (available at www.30Crossing.com, there are a variety of needs that are to be met by the 30 Crossing project. This includes improving the following issues: traffic congestion, roadway safety, structural roadway deficiencies, functional roadway deficiencies, river navigational safety, structural bridge deficiencies, and functional bridge deficiencies.</p> <p>Approximately 64% of the estimated \$631.7 million budget is projected to come from the Connecting Arkansas Program funds, which are collected as the additional ½% sales tax. There are other projects throughout the state that are ongoing concurrently to 30 Crossing. Please visit www.ConnectingArkansasProgram.com for more information.</p> <p>To answer your additional outstanding question, aspects of transportation technology are certainly being considered throughout the duration and development of the 30 Crossing project. It is anticipated that these technologies will be a standard part of traveling in the coming decades. Consideration of Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies and congestion management strategies are ongoing. These considerations, will enable AHTD to respond efficiently in adapting and retooling roadways to accommodate new technologies.</p>
<p>P-11</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>As this is an important project, located centrally within the state, many living in and visiting Arkansas will be benefitting from the enhancements.</p> <p>As the project moves forward in its development, intensive evaluation is ongoing, looking at issues such as noise and other environmental impacts. Should anticipated impacts be significant and unavoidable, mitigation will be implemented.</p> <p>Currently, I-440 exists as an alternative route to the east of downtown, I-430 exists as an alternative route to the west of downtown, and I-40 serves as a route to the north, together serving as a beltway around Little Rock and North Little Rock, to which I-30 and I-630 serve as radial connections. Due to the amount of the traffic on existing I-30 that is destined to the downtown business district, these routes would not serve as attractive alternate routes. Routing traffic to these routes does not improve accessibility to the downtown business district.</p>
<p>P-12</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>Currently, I-440 is designated as an alternative route to the east of downtown, I-430 exists as an alternative route to the west of downtown, and I-40 serves as a route to the north, together serving as a beltway around Little Rock and North Little Rock, to which I-30 and I-630 serve as radial connections. Due to the amount of the traffic on existing I-30 that is destined to the downtown business district, these routes would not serve as attractive alternate routes. Routing traffic to these routes does not improve accessibility to the downtown business district.</p> <p>A 4-Lane + C/D would not adequately address the purpose and need issues of improving traffic congestion and functional roadway deficiencies. The existing</p>

		<p>traffic counts and future traffic projections would not enable a 4-Lane + C/D alignment to meet minimum lane capacities.</p> <p>Funding for all of the Connecting Arkansas Projects, including 30 Crossing is sourced from a statewide tax. To maximize the amount of construction delivered, the project will be delivered using the Fixed Price – Best Design methodology as outlined in the AHTD Design-Build Guidelines and Procedures. AHTD will establish the baseline project scope and the not-to-exceed baseline project budget, consistent with the most likely set of improvements identified in NEPA. Operational modeling of the preferred alternative during the NEPA phase will provide relevant information needed in the determination of the priority of improvements for inclusion into the Fixed Price – Best Design project.</p>
<p>P-13</p>	<p>Individual</p>	<p>The Six-Lane alternative includes Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes to provide enhanced access to and between the downtown economic districts and to support improved connectivity and cohesion of these areas. As such, the video simulation indicates that enough vehicles will be using the C/D lanes, that it will improve congestion and thus safety and travel time in the I-30 through lanes. Additionally, the Six-Lane + C/D alternative includes three lanes traveling from I-30 to I-40 east, whereas the Eight-Lane alternative has only two. Because of traffic levels traveling in this direction, there is a significant reduction of congestion on the Six-Lane alternative, when compared to the Eight-Lane.</p>