

SCREENING MEASURES AND RESULTS - ENVIRONMENTAL



		8-Lane C/D Reasonable Alternative	8-Lane GP Reasonable Alternative	10-Lane C/D Reasonable Alternative
		3 main lanes + 1 C/D lane widening (each direction)	3 main lanes + 1 main lane widening (each direction)	3 main lanes + 2 C/D lane widening (each direction)
Goals	Measures			
Community Impacts	ROW (acres)	8.7	8.6	9.0
	Parcels (count)	47	45	46
	Displacements (count)	17 Total • 5 Residential • 6 Commercial • 6 Billboards	17 Total • 5 Residential • 6 Commercial • 6 Billboards	19 Total • 5 Residential • 7 Commercial • 7 Billboards
	EJ / LEP	All EJ/LEP impacts same between Reasonable Alternatives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 displacements in EJ/LEP areas: 5 residential and 1 commercial • Decent, safe and sanitary replacement housing available (8 homes for sale, 8 rentals, 33 Section 8 properties) • ROW and property acquisition to follow Uniform Relocation Act • No anticipated impacts to community cohesion • Ramping changes not anticipated to eliminate access • Sensitive noise receptors identified in EJ/LEP areas (6 schools, 1 church, 2 daycares, and 48 residential parcels in low income areas; 6 schools, 1 church 2 daycares, and 96 residential parcels in high minority areas) for all Reasonable Alternatives; mitigation anticipated to be possible (e.g., noise walls if determined feasible and reasonable and voted on by adjacent property owners) • Beneficial impacts to mobility, safety and E-W connectivity for EJ/LEP populations 		
Cultural Resource Impacts	Cultural Resources ^{1,2}	No anticipated impacts to recorded archeological sites. One NRHP-eligible historic property (Site #18 – Locust St. Bridge over UPRR) would be impacted by the Reasonable Alternatives. Number of areas along existing and proposed ROW determined to have a high probability for archeological resources similar for all Reasonable Alternatives (36 areas).		
Natural Resource Impacts	Parks (name / acres) ¹	North Shore Riverwalk 1.6	North Shore Riverwalk 1.7	North Shore Riverwalk 1.7
		Julius Breckling Riverfront Park 0.5	Julius Breckling Riverfront Park 0.5	Julius Breckling Riverfront Park 0.5
		William J. Clinton Presidential Center and Park 0.5	William J. Clinton Presidential Center and Park 0.5	William J. Clinton Presidential Center and Park 0.4
	Parks (total / acres) ¹	2.6	2.7	2.6
	Waters (acres)	0.8	0.8	0.9
	Emergent Wetlands (acres)	0.3	0.7	0.3
	Forested/Shrub Wetlands (acres)	0.9	0.5	0.9
	Non-Maintained Herbaceous Vegetation (acres)	0.5	0.0	0.4
Woodland Vegetation (acres)	1.3	1.3	1.9	
Riparian Vegetation (acres)	0.1	0.1	0.1	
Other Impacts	Hazardous Materials (count)	6	6	8
	Traffic Noise Receptors (count)	184 sensitive traffic noise receptors (churches, schools, daycares, residences) directly adjacent to ROW potentially impacted		
Public Input	Meeting comments (feedback from Public Meeting #3)	See footnote ³		

- Section 4(f) regulations govern the use of land from publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and public or private historic sites for Federal highway projects. Section 4(f) applicability to be determined during the NEPA process for impacts to parks and cultural resources.
- Cultural resources assessment to be completed in accordance with the CA0602 I-30 Cultural Resources Survey Methodology Memo (AHPP Tracking Number 90015.02). Memo coordinated with the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, State Historic Preservation Officer; concurrence received 2/6/15.
- Public input has and will continue to be gathered on the alternatives under evaluation as part of the 30 Crossing project. Public input on the 8-lane C/D and 10-lane C/D alternatives was gathered at Public Meeting #3 (PM #3) in January 2015 as part of the I-30 PEL Study. PM #3 was attended by 171 individuals, of which 32 provided comments on a variety of subjects related to the corridor. Of the 32 total comments received, 12 expressed a preference for a specific alternative, broken down as follows: 5 comments supporting the 8-lane C/D alternative, 2 comments supporting the 10-lane C/D alternative, 2 comments requesting no improvements except for the replacement of the Arkansas River Bridge, and 3 expressing neutral opinions of the alternatives presented.