

Response Code	General Topic Addressed	Response
A	NEPA 10- Lane Alternative	<p>The 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) and the 10-Lane Collector/Distributor (C/D) 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>Features of the 10-Lane C/D Alternative include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 main lanes and 2 C/D lanes in each direction from Broadway Street in North Little Rock to 3rd Street in Little Rock; outside the C/D lanes, the facility is 5 main lanes in each direction; • C/D lanes extend from approximately Broadway St. to the Cantrell Road interchange; • Replacement of the Arkansas River Bridge; • 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 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; • 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.

B	NEPA 8- Lane Alternative	<p>The 8-Lane General Purpose (GP) and the 10-Lane Collector/Distributor (C/D) 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>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 10-Lane Downtown C/D Alternative, which is the PEL Recommendation, to both be carried forward into NEPA. The 8-Lane concept is under development and more details will be available once the draft schematics have been completed.</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 from Curtis Sykes / 19th Street in North Little Rock to 9th Street in Little Rock; • 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; • 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; • Maintenance of traffic policy will allow for three lanes in each direction, when feasible.
C= Questions/ Concerns about transit related impacts or improvements		
C-1	River Rail Streetcar	<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. This design will help improve access and mobility at the interchange, improve safety, and provide improved green space and open views.</p> <p>The Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department is currently working with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Rock Region Metro to determine mitigation strategies for streetcar service east of I-30 at the interchange. The current proposal has the River Rail Streetcar line and vehicular traffic along 3rd Street remaining open. 4th Street may remain open for cross traffic, and at a minimum, allow for pedestrian access.</p>
C-2	Transit Improvements as part of project	<p>During the PEL study, potential transit alternatives evaluated as part of the Universe of Alternatives in the Level 1 Screening also included light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail and high speed rail. Heavy rail and high speed rail were</p>

		<p>screened out from further evaluation after Level 1 Screening because they were determined impractical based on high construction cost and the difficulties associated with constructability.</p> <p>Light rail and commuter rail were screened out from the Level 2 analysis and no funding source has been identified for light rail. Light rail was screened out because it would remove a small percentage of I-30 demand and is not included in the Rock Region METRO’s short-range plan. Moreover, although part of their long range plan, Metroplan has indicated that they would implement bus rapid transit before light rail along future light rail corridors. Commuter rail was screened out because it was not included in either the Rock Regional METRO’s short-range or Metroplan’s long range plan and would remove only a small percentage of I-30 demand.</p>
<p>C-3</p>	<p>Transit Improvements as an alternative to widening</p>	<p>A transit oriented alternative was evaluated in Level 2 Screening during the PEL. The transit analysis concluded that a minimum of 795 vehicles passing over screenline 2 (I-30 Arkansas River Bridge) would need to be diverted from auto to transit on I-30 in 2040 to improve from Level of Service (LOS) F to LOS E with the existing 6-lane facility. However, the maximum feasible number of vehicles that can be diverted over screenline 2 is 650, assuming route headways of 10 minutes. Therefore, even under the best case transit-only scenario, there is a deficit of nearly 150 vehicles during the 2040 no-build peak hour to achieve LOS E.</p> <p>The 6 Main Lane Alternative included replacement of the I-30 Arkansas River Bridge, keeping the main line in the core of the corridor, adding C/D lanes for improved downtown access, and other mode and non-recurring management strategies that passed Level 1. This alternative was screened out during Level 2 because it failed to improve mobility and safety for single occupant vehicles (SOV) in the study area, so transit improvements alone would not meet the purpose and need or study goals of the project and no funding source has been identified for light rail. For more information on transit, please refer to Metroplan’s Imagine Central Arkansas (ICA) documentation.</p>
<p>D</p>	<p>Bicycle/ Pedestrian Concerns</p>	<p>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 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 in detail, potential context sensitive solutions (CSS) and design concepts that facilitate safe and efficient bicycle and pedestrian movement throughout the area, also while 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</p>

		for future development are given due consideration and incorporated when practicable.
E	Congestion Management strategies for improving non-recurring congestion	<p>Congestion management strategies and other mode alternatives are currently included in each the proposed 10-lane Downtown C/D Alternative and 8-lane Alternative designs, including implementation of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), incident management detection program, updated signage improvements, bus on shoulder and bicycle/pedestrian access accommodations.</p> <p>Other congestion management technologies include, Intelligent Transportation Services (ITS), along with incident; instant management/detection program; (readied tow-trucks); signalization; and express/managed lanes/express lanes.</p> <p>Congestion management strategies alone will not solve the congestion problems anticipated for I-30 and I-40.</p>
F	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 will be directed via new 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 only trucks needing to make local, downtown deliveries.
G= Suggestion/Comment about the design of current alternatives		
G-1	Questions/ concerns about adding lanes	<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: Although the No Action has no environmental impacts and zero cost, the I-30/I-40 facility already 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 poor 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, adding C/D lanes for improved downtown access, and other mode and non-recurring management strategies that passed Level 1.</p>

		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.
G-2	I-30 Bridge Replacement	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.
G-3	Suggest new location or route for 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 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 (approximately 3.5% of traffic as evaluated in the PEL). 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 issues with the current I-30 bridge. This bridge would still need to be replaced even if a new crossing were created.</p>
G-4	Suggest new passage (around downtown) for through traffic	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 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. Diverting traffic to these routes would not sufficiently satisfy the purpose and need of the project due to trip origins and destinations. Additionally, existing development limits opportunities of any new alignments.
G-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, and AHTD is very sensitive to the issues associated with the I-630 corridor. AHTD is committed to work with the community to develop the best solution to meet the needs of the community as a whole.</p>
G-6	LaHarpe/2 nd / Cantrell (Hwy. 10) Design	AHTD is very sensitive to the issues around the LaHarpe/Hwy. 10 area. AHTD is continuing to work together with the city and stakeholders to best meet the needs of the project and the community.

G-7	HOV Lanes	<p>HOV lanes are not currently being considered at this time.</p> <p>However, unrelated to the project, AHTD is looking to partner with Metroplan in order to conduct a system-wide study, analyzing the suitability for HOV/HOT lanes.</p>
G-8	Questions/ concerns about Safety	<p>An extensive Traffic and Safety report was done as part of the PEL Study. The crash data determines 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.connectingarkansasprogram.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 operations.</p> <p>In the 10-lane C/D alternative, C/D lanes between Broadway and Cantrell interchange will be separated from the main lanes by a concrete barrier. This, with reduced speeds will allow for safer access between Little Rock and North Little Rock. The 8-lane GP does not include reduced speeds. Both alternatives are continuing to be evaluated.</p> <p>Proposed access changes will enhance safety by providing improved traffic operations.</p>
G-9	Speed Limits	<p>AHTD undertakes periodic travel speed studies and evaluates the effectiveness of current posted speeds to assess safety and mobility within the corridor.</p>
G-10	Changes in Access	<p>There is a presentation available on the project website that illustrates the proposed access with regards to the proposed alternatives. Please visit https://connectingarkansasprogram.com/downloads/208/ca0602-nov-2015-board-meeting-presentation/.</p> <p>The current recommended improvements associated with the 10-Lane C/D 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

		<p>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> <p>North Little Rock</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A SB FR bridge over the railroad will be provided. • The Locust Street Bridge over the railroad will be replaced and converted to one-way. <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>The 8-Lane GP Alternative is undergoing further evaluation. A summary of the proposed changes in access will be available at Public Meeting 6 and in future reports.</p>
<p>G-11</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 gore 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 shift 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. 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>The 8-Lane GP Alternative is undergoing further evaluation. A summary of the proposed changes to interchanges will be available at Public Meeting 6 and in future reports.</p>
G-12	Impacts on network outside of study area	Current traffic issues to the roadway network beyond the study area will exist regardless of this project. An increase in travel lanes within the study area will create more free-flowing traffic within the extents of the project. During the PM peak hour, it is anticipated that congestion may increase beyond the

		<p>project extents. However, AM peak hour, as traffic enters the limits of the project, traffic movement will improve.</p>
G-13	Turning I-30 into a boulevard	<p>The current alignment of I-30 is to best serve the movement of people and freight into, out of and through the central Little Rock area.</p> <p>Converting I-30 to a boulevard-style roadway does not meet the stated Purpose and Need or goals of the 30 Crossing project. Issues such as traffic congestion, roadway safety issues, structural and functional roadway deficiencies, navigational safety issues, and structural functional bridge deficiencies will not be adequately addressed by rebuilding I-30 as a boulevard-style roadway.</p> <p>I-30 was designed and constructed as part of the Federal Highway Administration’s National Highway System (NHS). The NHS is important to the nation’s economy, defense and mobility.</p> <p>All roads that are part of the Interstate Highway System are also part of the Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET), which are important to the United States’ strategic defense policy, providing defense access, continuity and emergency capabilities for defense purposes.</p> <p>Turning I-30 into a boulevard would result in a downgrade of the capacity and functionality of the facility. Such a downgrade would not align with the intent of the NHS or the STRAHNET.</p>
<p>H= Concerns about potential social, economic or environmental impacts and/or request for protection of environmental resources in the study area</p>		
H-1	General comment about social, economic or environmental impacts	<p>AHTD is committed to environmental justice in all 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 will be evaluated in the Environmental Assessment (EA).</p>
H-2	Noise Impacts and Mitigation	<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</p>

		<p>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 November 2015 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>H-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>No impacts are currently anticipated to MacArthur Park, MacArthur Park Historic District, the Governor’s Mansion Historic District or City Museums.</p>

		<p>Additionally, there will be no anticipated direct impacts (ROW takings) to historic districts.</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 not anticipated to change the nature of the park.</p> <p>As a part of the ongoing NEPA efforts, assessment of all impacts will be included in the final documentation.</p>
H-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 E 3rd Street, by increased flow under I-30. Similarly, improved access is provided on E 6th Street.</p>
H-5	Aesthetic Impacts	<p>Aesthetic priorities of the community were identified by stakeholders in the two Visioning Workshops. 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>
H-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 downtown Little Rock from the interstate, and improve access to key tourist attractions such as the Clinton Library and the River Market District. The</p> <p>For the 10-Lane With C/D 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 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>Furthermore, additional open space and more open and direct East-West access are key goals of the NEPA Cantrell Interchange 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> <p>The 8-Lane GP Alternative is undergoing further evaluation. A summary of the proposed changes associated with this alternative will be available at Public Meeting 6 and in future reports.</p>
H-7	Impacts to Parking	AHTD will be working closely with the city pertaining to any changes in parking spaces, and how to mitigate impacts.
H-8	Air pollution and emissions	AHTD is proceeding in conjunction with Metroplan, ADEQ, and FHWA on a quantitative evaluation of potential air quality impacts. The results of this assessment will be included in the final environmental documentation.
H-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 each the 10-Lane C/D Alternative and 8-Lane GP Alternative, 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>).
H-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. These considerations, while not dictating the design of the alternatives, will enable AHTD to respond efficiently in adapting and retooling roadways to accommodate new technologies.
I	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 would 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 \$500M- \$600M.</p>
J	Questions/ Concerns about construction impacts	Construction is expected to begin in 2018 and anticipated to take 3-4 years. During reconstruction of the bridge and interchanges and the roadway, the department has determined that a maintenance 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. Temporary signing for directions to local businesses and other facilities will be provided.
K = Questions about Public Involvement and project timeline.		

K-1	Public Involvement	<p>The Connecting Arkansas program and legislation is focused on improving highways and interstates. AHTD is dedicated to working with our 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 our mission. There have been five 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>A sixth meeting will be held, which will be followed by a public hearing. At the public hearing, 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>
K-2	Delay of Process	<p>AHTD has committed to an additional public meeting at which a comparison of the 8- and 10- Lane Alternatives will be reviewed. Additional input will be sought in conjunction and coordination with local officials, Pulaski County, the City of Little Rock and the City of North Little Rock, and stakeholders. There will be further opportunity for public comment after this meeting.</p>
L	Additional Contact Requested or Needed	<p>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>
M	General Comment	<p>Thank you for your comment, it has been documented. The input gathered at Public Meeting #5 and the Town Hall Meeting will be used to move forward with the NEPA process.</p>
N	Screening Process	<p>The production of the PEL Study involved 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</p>

		<p>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>
--	--	---