



PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES

TECHNICAL WORK GROUP MEETING #3

COMMENT DOCUMENTATION



CA0602

Interstate 530 – Highway 67

April 2015



Arkansas State Highway & Transportation Department





CAP Deliverable QC Comment Review Form

Project Number:	CA0602
Document:	TWG #3 Meeting (Jan. 13, 2015) and Materials Distributed to TWG Members on USB/Flash Drive
Consultant/Authors:	CA0602 Study Team
Date Submitted for QC Review:	N/A

Cmnt No.	Section/ Page No.	Reviewer	Review Comment	Response	Change	Verified	Agency Verified **
					New Pg.	Initials / Date	
1	Email 01/21/15	Michael Sprague, State Trails Coordinator & Project Officer, Ark. Dept. of Parks and Tourism	<p>Bicycle and pedestrian trails along the Interstate-30 corridor will relieve local traffic congestion and improve residents' quality of life. The opportunity to design and implement such trails through Little Rock and North Little Rock is tremendous and timely. I implore Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department to consider such a plan.</p> <p>This transportation corridor may be the only right of way to link the southeast and northeast areas of the Little Rock metro area to the amenities of Downtown, the River Market District and the Arkansas River Trail.</p> <p>Residents around this corridor and visitors would see real benefits and an increase in their quality of life to have the option to use an attractive, non-stressful trail to access parks, schools, shopping, libraries, museums, entertainment, recreation, other trails, etc.</p> <p>Along with getting places, trails also make other great impacts on society. Using trails not only helps folks get in shape and provides an excellent state of mind, and it also helps build communities.</p>	<p>Connecting bicycle and pedestrian friendly facilities is one of the study goals for the I-30 project. The quality of bicycle/pedestrian crossings will be evaluated as part of the screening process such that they foster safe connectivity and meet current design standards.</p> <p>Visioning workshops have been incorporated as part of the PEL process to ensure that bike/pedestrian facilities, E-W connectivity, and other project features are developed in a way that enhance existing and future land uses and incorporate the ideas and priorities for the I-30 corridor as established by local planners and stakeholders. The first visioning workshop was held on 11/19/14 and ideas were shared for improving bicycle/pedestrian connectivity, E-W connectivity, socioeconomic growth, and preserving and enhancing aesthetic, historic and community resources, among other design suggestions. During the NEPA/Schematic phase, a second visioning workshop will be held with stakeholders that examines potential context sensitive solutions (CSS) and design concepts in greater detail.</p>	N/A	JLH/ 3/11/15	✓



CAP Deliverable QC Comment Review Form

1	Email 01/21/15 (cont)		<p>When people walk or bicycle to get places, it gets them out of their cars and allows people to see, talk to and get to know others in their neighborhood they would otherwise never meet. This increases local communication and involvement and decreases misunderstanding and distrust.</p> <p>Having this attractive alternative way to get around would also decrease the impact of local vehicles using the interstate highway (and local streets) and help alleviate demand for parking for amenities located near the corridor.</p> <p>The time to design and implement a quality trail linking these areas of town is right now; the next opportunity may not come for decades, if ever.</p> <p>If plans were made in the early part of the design process, a great design could be made so that people traveling along the trail could have a well-thought-out, unimpeded route parallel to I-30.</p> <p>The possible trail routes don't all need to be confined to the Interstate right of way. They may be coordinated with the cities for the most optimum route. For example, linking MacArthur Park to the River Market District, which would give people a great way to go between Little Rock's large inner-city park, the Arkansas Arts Center and adjacent neighborhoods to one of Little Rock's premiere destinations, could be made using part of Ferry Street near the park and also the interstate right of way near the River Market District (see maps – Attachment A).</p>	<p>Based on stakeholder feedback and available funding, CSS/aesthetic guidelines will be developed following this second visioning workshop and included in the design-build request for proposals, pending AHTD approval.</p> <p>Thank you for suggestions for the trail layout. These comments will be shared with the Environmental Design Consultant (EDC) and will be considered during the next Visioning Workshop. Study Team planners and engineers have and will continue to work with city planners to ensure that city goals for future development are given due consideration and incorporated when practicable.</p>			
---	-----------------------------	--	---	---	--	--	--



CAP Deliverable QC Comment Review Form

1	Email 01/21/15 (cont)		<p>A loop trail could also be created circling the I-30—I-630 interchange (see maps – Attachment A). This trail would give locals a great walking loop, which would also go near area schools. The trails would also improve locals' perceptions and expand people's conceptions of the park because once someone got on to the trail they would have almost unimpeded access to the park. Residents on the other side of the interstates could feel less separate from it.</p> <p>Trail connections to other places along this corridor would also benefit residents immensely, such as a link to Interstate Park, which is where the Southwest Trail (a long distance bicycle trail to link to Hot Springs) is planned to go through; Verizon Arena (or close to it); North Little Rock Neighborhoods (Park Hill, Dixie, City Center); North Hills Boulevard.</p> <p>I encourage the planning and development of trails alongside this corridor during this process while everyone is focused on it to help benefit the communities of Little Rock and North Little Rock. This opportunity is great, and trail facilities along this corridor would be a tremendous asset for the community.</p>				
---	------------------------------------	--	---	--	--	--	--



CAP Deliverable QC Comment Review Form

2	Email 1/12/15	Ann M. Early, State Archeologist	<p>Thank you for sending me the information about your TWG meeting tomorrow regarding CAP planning for the LR/NLR Metropolitan area. One of my representatives, Dr. Elizabeth Horton, will be attending in my place.</p> <p>I've read the document that you enclosed with your invitation. I continue to be deeply concerned that there is no place in your decision making matrices, or in your itemization of Cultural Resources issues, for the prospect that there are Currently Unknown cultural resources in the rights of way. You offer no provision for a search to find out if there are resources in the area, or provision to deal with what is often referred to as 'unanticipated discovery' situations during development. I want to reiterate that this part of Arkansas, at the location of a convenient and long used crossing of the Arkansas River, was used by humans intensively for a very long time. There is no reason to expect that we currently know where all cultural resources in this corridor might be. Like virtually every urban center on the planet, there are older remains of human settlement buried under modern constructions in Little Rock. We just don't know where the significant ones are at this point. Any large scale modification of the corridor is bound to encounter historic era deposits. The sooner that this potential situation is factored into plans, the better any project as large and complex as this one will be.</p>	<p>In response to concerns about currently unknown cultural resources in the I-30 project rights of way (ROW), a Cultural Resources Survey Methodology Memo was developed by the Study Team and coordinated with the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP). A copy of the memo is included as Appendix G.</p> <p>In a letter dated February 6, 2015 to AHTD, the AHPP outlined their concurrence with the Cultural Resources Survey Methodology Memo. The letter acknowledges the Area of Potential Effect (APE) to be all existing and new ROW for archeological sites and the area within 100 feet of the edge of the ROW for historic structures. AHPP agreed with the methodology that surveys shall be conducted at the toe slopes in areas of bridge widening and areas where construction is anticipated to impact soils within two feet of the original ground surface. AHPP also concurred with the designation of the four potential scenarios that may trigger additional coordination and/or investigations which will vary based upon specific site conditions after the preferred alternative has been determined during the NEPA process. These include: 1) areas where additional ROW would be acquired; 2) bridge widening due to potential excavation beyond depths of previous disturbance and existing construction fill; 3) previously recorded archeological sites; and 4) areas of high probability based on the identification of previous structures that no longer exist as shown on the Sanborn 1913 maps or upland areas based on an overlay of the USGS topographic map, soil type and contours. The memo also outlines the procedures for situations of unanticipated discovery.</p>	N/A	JLH/ 3/11/15	✓
---	------------------	--	--	---	-----	-----------------	---

CAP Deliverable QC Comment Review Form

Surveys seeking public input on the various scenarios that had been developed by the Study Team to improve I-30 were distributed to attendees of the November 6, 2014 public meeting. The same surveys were distributed to TWG #3 attendees and six were filled-out and returned. The results of the surveys are presented in the table below. Survey forms are included in **Attachment B**. Although only a few TWG members responded to the survey, three identified the 10-lane scenario as preferable, five identified bridge replacement as preferable to rehabilitation, and other various highway-build, congestion management, other mode and non-recurring congestion management alternatives were identified as preferable for further evaluation.

Table: Scenario Survey Results from TWG #3

Group	Description	Number of Times Circled
Survey Instructions: Circle the scenario you prefer to be further evaluated in the PEL Study		
Scenario	Scenario 1 - 6 lanes	0
	Scenario 2 - 8 lanes	0
	Scenario 3 - 10 lanes	3
	Scenario 4 - 12 lanes	0
Group	Description	Number of Times Checked
Survey Instructions: Check the box next to the Preliminary Alternatives you prefer to be further evaluated in the PEL Study		
Highway Build Alternatives	Main Lane Pavement Rehabilitation	2
	Collector / Distributor (C/D) Roads	3
	Auxiliary Lanes	0
	Frontage Road Improvements	0
	Intersection Improvements	2
	Interchange Improvements	4
	Ramp Consolidation/Elimination	1
	Roadway Shoulder Improvements	3
	Horizontal/Vertical Curve Improvements	1
	Bottleneck Removal	1
	Bypass Route	1
Congestion Management	Information Systems/Advanced Traveler Information	3
	Managed Lanes	0
	Reversible Lanes	0
	Ramp Metering	0
	Hard Shoulder Running	0
	Travel Demand Management	2
	Transportation System Management (TSM)	1
	Wayfinding/Signage	3
	Arterial Improvements	5
Land Use Policy	1	
I-30 Bridge	I-30 Arkansas River Bridge Rehabilitation	0
	I-30 Arkansas River Bridge Replacement	5
Other Modes	Arterial Bus Transit	2
	I-30 Express Bus Transit	0
	Bus on Shoulder	3
	Bus Lanes	0
	Arterial Bus Rapid Transit	2
	Light Rail (Streetcar)	1
	Bicycle/Pedestrian	2
Commuter Rail	2	
Non-Recurring Congestion Management	Crash Investigation Sites	3
	Roadside/Motorist Assist Enhancements	4
	Improvements to Detour Routes	1
	Variable Speed Limits (Speed Harmonization)	3
	Queue Warning	1