

Comment Number	Comments	Name or Organization	Date	Website	Response Code(s)
1	I SUPPORT "NO BUILD" IT NEEDS FORTHER REVIEW	Joan Courtney	6/10/2018	Web Form	H-7, N-1, I-9, E
2	I think this expansion is long overdue. It is the only thing that makes sense let's get it done.	Woody Tedford	6/12/2018	Website	Q
3	Please identify the "similar freeways" compared on page 16 of the EA to "the segment of I-30 from I-630 to I-40" along with their respective relevant crash data. I realize this may just be a matter of identifying the "similar freeways" in a larger table, array or publication.	Dale Pekar	6/15/2018	Web Form	I-8
4	This is nothing but a construction project to benefit investors. It has ZERO to do with making the commute easier for the citizens of Little Rock. It does not take into consideration the effect it will have on the people who live around and under I-30 (because they are primarily people of color and poor). Obviously nothing coming from the state these days is for the actual benefit of anyone who lives here. Follow the money.	Heaven Mercer	6/19/2018	Website	K-1, I-9, K-16
5	I have been told public parking areas in the River Market area, specifically at Sherman and 2nd, under Clinton Library off I-30 ramp and the circular lot between 2nd and Clinton off ramp on Sherman will be closed along with all ramps into River Market. Is this true? Please tell me where to locate the proposal for closing the items above for view before the July 12th public hearing at Wyndham hotel.	Cheryl Allen-Doddridge	6/21/2018	Website	K-7
6	do you have a map of what is the plan for around the Arkansas Art Center	Bobbie Harvin	6/22/2018	Web Form	R
7	Good morning, I am requesting additional maps and plans for the I-40 project from 365 to 67/167. We own and operate our Murphy Express convenience store on W Pershing Hwy, adjacent to I-40, appearing to be within the	Amber Patterson, Murphy USA	6/26/2018		Q, R

	<p>project zone. I have checked the Connecting Arkansas Program website; unable to locate the plans for this particular project. Also, can will you list my information below as the property owner contact for future reference? Thank you, Amber Patterson</p>				
8	<p>You haven't listened to any of the outspoken opposition to this plan so far so I don't see the point in attending this public meeting. Cease the plan to expand the highway!</p>	Dan	6/27/2018	Website	E, N-2, Q
9	<p>I am not saying anyone did this on purpose but the videos showing way more congestion on one than the other makes it appear you are trying to persuade people a certain way. Is this what the simulation tool determined traffic flow would look like using the same traffic flow?</p>	Anthony Martinez	6/27/2018	Web Form	I-10
10	<p>To whom this may concern, My name is James Kingsbury and I am an employee who works in the museum of discovery. If you take away the public parking in the river market I will have no where to park as I cannot afford to pay for parking. The river market is already a busy place and hard to find parking as it is. My coworkers and myself can not afford to park block away from our place of work every day if this were to happen. I'm asking you to vote against taking away the public parking in the River Market as this would cause a significant hardship on all of the people who work in this area. Thank you for your time, James Kingsbury Sent from my iPhone</p>	James Kingbury	6/28/2018	Web Form	K-7
11	<p>As someone who travels this route daily, the proposed design does nothing to impact the daily bottleneck that exists between the I-630 interchange and the south terminal interchange. Due to the lane crossing that must occur between the 630E to 30W ramp and the 440/530 left exit ramp over a relatively short distance, traffic backups and accidents are an almost daily occurrence during the evening rush period. The matter is worsened by the Roosevelt onramp to 30W for those that make the jump across 3 lanes of traffic in order to make the 440 left exit less than 1/2 mile away. Proposed designs appear to add at least 1 additional lane in this area, so the issue will be further compounded by</p>	Todd Fisher	6/29/2018	Website	R

	the additional lateral distance required for traffic to move and the increased volume. The same traffic flow and safety improvement goals could be accomplished simply with ramp reconfiguration and replacement of the I-30 river bridge, compared to the added cost and disruption of added right of way purchases to accommodate a 10 lane solution.				
12	Hello. How do we fight to keep the public parking in downtown Little Rock?	Lisa Wells	7/2/2018	Web Form	K-7
13	My property address is 1500 Geyer LR,AR 72202. Will this project affect my property? Please advise. Thank you,	Curtis Williams	7/2/2018	Web Form	Q, R
14	<p>The Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD) has proposed making a number of changes to the I-30 corridor that runs from Interstate 40 to Interstate 530. Because the "30 Crossing" project implicates numerous interests and considerations, many of the choices AHTD must make are difficult. For example, should the revamped highway remain at six lanes, or should it be expanded to eight or 10? Strong arguments exist on both sides of this question. And the same is true for many other aspects of the project. But there is at least one issue where the evidence overwhelmingly favors a particular side: The I-30/Cantrell interchange must be preserved. One of the most fundamental principles of urban planning is that the transition between major arteries should be as seamless as possible. Failing to comply with this precept generally creates countless problems: It wastes striking amounts of commuter time, increases accidents, elevates pollution levels, undercuts business interests, and promotes traffic patterns that damage residential communities. As a result, major arteries should be directly connected absent truly compelling circumstances.</p> <p>The Little Rock area is currently in full compliance with this artery transition standard. There are four major arteries in the metropolitan area--Cantrell Road, Interstate 30, Interstate 430, and Interstate 630. Under the existing design, each road is easily accessible at the five locations where they intersect: Unfortunately, AHTD is considering eliminating the seamless transition at the fifth intersection--Cantrell Road and I-30.</p> <p>AHTD is reviewing two construction proposals for entering and exiting I-30 in the downtown area. One would retain the interchange in place today. The other, known as the "split diamond interchange," would remove the Cantrell entrance and exit and move access to the highway south to Fourth Street, Capitol Avenue, and Sixth Street. At present, there is effectively only one stoplight between Cantrell and I-30. Under the split diamond proposal, there would be four to six lights between them. Not surprisingly, such a violation of basic urban planning standards would cause numerous problems for both the local community and the broader metropolitan area.</p> <p>First, travel times for commuters and others transitioning between Cantrell and I-30 would increase. This means that tens of thousands of people would spend additional time in their cars each day. How much extra? Our conservative guess is between four and six minutes per day--two to three minutes in each direction--though it could easily be more. This may not seem like much, but four minutes a day multiplied by 240 working days per year equals 16 hours per year. Six minutes a day inflates the lost time to 24 hours per year. Additionally, longer commutes will increase both gasoline usage (which costs money) and pollution. And all of these problems will be even worse if many commuters use alternative, longer paths to travel between different parts of the city, as the AHTD contemplates will happen once the Cantrell/I-30 interchange is eliminated.</p> <p>Second, these greater travel times will impact businesses all along the Arkansas River in Little Rock because it will be more difficult to reach riverside communities like the Heights and Riverdale from North Little Rock and various other parts of the region. Moreover, since it will take longer to exit the</p>	Dale Pekar	7/3/2018	Web Form	K-16, C, I-5, I-1, K-14, K-16, R

	<p>neighborhoods adjacent to the river, residents of that area will be less likely to visit businesses in North Little Rock and other commercial districts, causing critical losses in sales, tax revenue, and jobs.</p> <p>Third, the split diamond will damage downtown residential communities, especially the one currently growing between Third and Ninth streets. Capitol, Fourth, and Sixth will have dramatically increased traffic, more stoplights, and less (or no) parking, making this area considerably less livable. Furthermore, the split diamond will make it harder for those living downtown to access Cantrell and the interstate when they want to travel to other parts of the metropolitan area. These problems will certainly deter people from moving into the heart of the city, slowing down--if not reversing--the rebirth of central Little Rock that began 25 years ago.</p> <p>Proponents of the split diamond interchange make two arguments in defense of that proposal. Neither has merit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They contend that moving highway access to the south will increase development in the River Market. But the area has already been growing rapidly under the present layout with the Cantrell exit and entrance. And if living downtown, parking in the city and traveling to and from downtown all become considerably more difficult, as noted above, the damage to the River Market and the surrounding area will likely be much greater than the benefits gained from having the additional walking spaces that will be created if the Cantrell entrance and exit is eliminated. • Proponents assert that accidents will be reduced by the split diamond because the "dangerous" intersection at Cantrell and President Clinton will have considerably less traffic, increasing pedestrian safety. That seems highly unlikely. First, according to the leading study of the intersection, the crossing at Cantrell and President Clinton only had nine auto accidents over the 10-year period of the study--less than one a year. Second, there may be only a small decrease in traffic through the intersection because each alternative travel route will require far longer travel times. Third, because of the extra stoplights drivers will need to navigate to transition between Cantrell and I-30, commuters accustomed to a speedy one-light trip may rush through the fourplus new traffic lights to reach their destination, increasing accidents. Fourth, the considerable uptick in cars traveling along Fourth, Capitol, and Sixth will also likely elevate the number of accidents in the growing residential community that these streets run through. The best evidence firmly supports the conclusion that shifting highway access south from Cantrell will actually decrease safety rather than promote it. <p>The Third Street Merchants Association, the Downtown Little Rock Partnership, and certain other center city interests support the split diamond. Apparently they believe--wrongly in our view--that shifting the interchange south will do more good than harm for the downtown area. But even if there is some plausibility to this position, the damage to every other sector of the metropolitan area easily outweighs even the most Pollyannaish estimates of the benefits to the River Market and the immediately surrounding community. As a result, removing the Cantrell/I-30 interchange simply cannot be justified under any fair analysis of the 30 Crossing project.</p> <p>It is the duty of the AHTD to consider the interests of the entire region in developing a plan for the I-30 corridor. Downtown businesses are important, to be sure. But they are only one piece of a far broader community, most of which will be irreparably damaged by the loss of the Cantrell entrance and exist. At best, shifting the interchange to Fourth, Capitol, and Sixth serves the interests of a small set of downtown businesses and a select group of residents who are fortunate enough to live within walking distance of the River Market, while hurting virtually everyone else in Pulaski County and the surrounding counties.</p>				
15	<p>Please address the comments made by Joshua Silverstein in his editorial of November 2016 regarding the need to maintain the Cantrell Road/I-30 Interchange. These are important indirect effects which have not been adequately addressed in the EA and its appendices. I earlier input this editorial as a public comment to you. It is also available at: https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/#inbox/16460f2c9cbd4ff0?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1.1</p>	Dale Pekar	7/4/2018	Web Form	K-16, C, I-5, I-1, K-14, K-16, R

16	<p>Please change the wording on your electronic comment form which reads: "The proposed preferred alternative is the 6-Lane with Collector/Distributor (C/D) Lanes with Split Diamond Interchange (SDI) at the Highway 10 Interchange. Please provide comments on the preferred alternative." This effectively creates the misimpression that comments may only be submitted on the preferred alternative--and that's just wrong. Public input is not restricted to Alternative 2B.</p>	Dale Pekar	7/4/2018	Web Form	Q, R
17	<p>I live in Park Hill, just about two miles from the river. As someone who is downtown almost every day for either work or leisure, I find the prospect of a massive freeway expansion (which is what this plan is no matter how the various lanes are characterized) to be a very dismal prospect. I do not believe this plan is for the benefit of the people who live in the central parts of LR/NLR, but instead to help commuters who live in outlying areas to shave a few minutes off their commute. There should be no increased freeway capacity through the urban core. Instead, planners should be looking at ways to divert traffic passing through the city to the roadways on the edge of the city like 440/430, and looking at ways to improve transit options in the central part of the city other than single occupant vehicles. A high capacity boulevard should instead be considered where 1-30 now exists between the 40 and 630 interchanges. This plan just feels very backwards looking, as many cities are dismantling the freeways that slice through the heart of the city, or abandoning plans that would building more freeways through the urban cores. Downtown is finally getting its footing again. This plan would have negative effects of the area for decades. I am strongly opposed to the implementation of this plan. Kevin Christian North Little Rock</p>	Kevin Christian	7/5/2018	Web Form	G, H-1, H-4, H-6, H-7, H-8, J-1, K-1
18	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, I am an employee in the River Market district, Little Rock, Arkansas. After reading Section 5.2.1 per a draft copy of the I-30 Crossing Project dated April 2018, it was very upsetting to discover the city of Little Rock has not requested the public parking areas near the River Market remain as free designated parking spaces. As a commuter, who depends on these spaces, I would like to know where the city would like for me to park?? The parking deck at Sherman and 2nd is at capacity and, from what I have been told by the Little Rock Convention and Visitor's Bureau, the likelihood of renting a space is not possible in the foreseeable future. As far as I know the remaining options would be street parking (which is on the chopping block too), the Clinton Library lot, or the downtown post office lot. Personally, I don't believe the library nor the post office would allow 150 to 200 cars to park, between the two lots, for 8 hours a day; not to mention the personal inconvenience. Does the city have a plan to provide free parking and if so why is the plan not, in some way, part of the report? It seems the city is not concerned about the repercussions of eliminating free parking areas for the River Market employees or businesses...again, not to mention the personal imposition. I contacted Don Kumpuris, city planner for Little Rock, on June 29th and have yet to receive a reply. Any consideration and/or assistance in this matter would be greatly appreciated. Thank you, Cheryl Allen-Doddridge I wanna be a sheep...baa...baa...baa...baa, I don't want to be a goat...nah...nah...nah...nah Matthew 25:31-33</p>	Cheryl Allen-Doddridge	7/6/2018	Web Form	K-7

19	I fully support the preferred alternative 6 lane with C/D lanes with SDI at Highway 10. Arkansas DOT has done a great job keeping the public informed through this extensive process.	Anthony Davis	7/5/2018	Web Form	Q
20	We don't live there but we often visit family and have appointments in LR/NLR. We appreciate downtown improvements and are concerned the plan being considered will reverse and hinder progress. Road plans should consider the people that live, work and visit before the traffic speeding through. Please reconsider the current plan. Thank you.	Charles & Freda Christian	7/5/2018	Web Form	G, I-5, K-1, K-5, K-15
21	<p>\$600 million is a lot to spend on a short span of highway. Little Rock is not growing at a pace that warrants this much investment. This same money could be used to create a commuter rail system in NWA. I never want to hear that, "There's not enough money." When speaking of investing in a public transportation system ever again.</p> <p>Build roads for people, not cars.</p>	Jacob	7/6/2018	Web Form	H-6, L
22	<p>Based on reporting, it seems the commission isn't interested in relying on newest available data and insights from subject matter experts to develop an optimal plan to reduce congestion and slow traffic in the heart of the metro. Is the reporting accurate or incomplete?</p> <p>What data/research has the commission relied upon to develop the proposed plan that invites more traffic into the heart of the metro?</p> <p>As pointed out by Mayoral Candidate Sabin, the project is already being described as a boondoggle which fails to recognize the full array of direct negative consequences, let alone second and third order consequences, to residents and small businesses of Little Rock and North Little Rock.</p> <p>I strongly urge the commission to reconsider development of alternative routes for thru-traffic around the metro and commuter routes for those living outside of Little Rock and North Little Rock.</p>	Josh Fendley	7/9/2018	Web Form	H-3, H-4, I-5, I-6
23	Widening the I30 corridor is a terrible idea for the citizens of Little Rock. When the lanes are increased, you encourage people to move from the city. There is a way to bypass the city already whether coming from I30 or I40 if just passing through the city. This will disrupt the downtown area and the area around Clinton Center which has become a vital part of the city.	Pamela Jones	7/9/2018	Web Form	I-1, I-5, K-1, K-5, K-15

24	<p>Please do not turn “The City of Roses” into “The City of Concrete”. Why are you willing to ruin downtown Little Rock to eliminate 15 minutes drive time for a commuter who lives and pays taxes in another county?</p>	Paula Padilla	7/10/2018	Web Form	G, I-5, L
25	<p>Traffic needs to be moved away from downtown rather than directed to the center. Congestion is due to commercial traffic (trucks and semis) driving thru Little Rock going to Texas or Tennessee. It seems the plan is to push more vehicles over the river which basically will end up being a large parking lot with no where to go. Having multi lanes over the river reduced to 2 or 3 lanes on the other side would no help, but add to the problem. Please spend the money more wisely.</p>	Elliot Esmaeilpour	7/10/2018	Comment Form	I-5, I-6, I-7
26	<p>Concern 1: Noise for Philander Smith College and its neighbors Concern 2: How do minority/disadvantaged businesses get utilized during the process. Concern 3: Are there any environmental issues to be [con????] with this project.</p>	Roderick L Smithers	7/10/2018	Website	K-2, R

27	What cost contingency was used for 30 Crossing?	Dale Pekar	7/10/2018	Web Form	R
28	<p>I do NOT approve of the I-30 crossing project. For the following reasons: First, Little Rock, particularly downtown, has worked so hard to build and establish itself as a place of family fun, entertainment, and outdoor activities. Why would you want to change that, everything the city has worked so hard to create? Second, from my understanding, hundreds of millions will be spent on this project to only save seconds on commute time. Financially, that is not worth it. Third, it is an old way of thinking. People do not want the interstate going through the center of the city. They want it going AROUND the city. There are plenty of examples of this methodology successfully implemented. Work towards a solution that takes what people want into consideration and not destroy the downtown area of Little Rock.</p>	Jerry Adcock	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-9, K-1, K-15, L

29	<p>I have been reading about the damage that this kind of highway proposal can do in the 21st Century. It will continue to move Arkansas backwards not forwards. The progressive cities I have visited are finding ways to open these areas as parks and green space for people not more cars. That's what we will get from this highway proposal; more cars! Why are we spending so much money to relieve those people who have decided to leave the city area and have to sit for maybe 20 minutes in traffic? Big deal! They won't get home any faster and the city will be left with a mess. Arkansas needs to stop making itself 19th on the list of worst places to live in America. This kind of thinking will destroy the beauty of our state and the historic district in its way. Please try to limit if not ditch the plan because this is not progress!</p>	Clementine Infante	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-9, K-1, K-5, K-15
30	<p>I'm opposed to the expansion of I-30 through the downtown area of little rock and north little rock. I love how the downtown area is now, and feel like this expansion is going to roll back much of the progress that has been made in revitalizing the downtown area. This is a huge waste of taxpayer money and widening the lanes will do little to alleviate traffic through the area. Instead, money should be spent to make the area more pedestrian friendly; not less. I'm a native to this state and have lived here my whole life,. I love biking through the area, commute on the current stretch of I-30 multiple times a day, and can say with certainty that there is no need widen the lanes. There will always be traffic through these areas, it's the nature of the beast. Please find a better way to use the money.</p>	Aaron Wessel	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-8, J-2, K-15

	Yours truly, A consistent voter and taxpayer				
31	As a homeowner in Little Rock and someone who works downtown, I oppose the expansion of the I-30 corridor. It serves people whose goals are to avoid the city of Little Rock and does not serve the citizens of the city itself. The money spent on this expansion would go a long way in improving the public transit in Little Rock which does serve the citizens of the city, especially those who cannot afford to drive and maintain a motor vehicle. Why are we spending money to benefit those who are already succeeding and ignoring the underserved population of this city? Until the least of this city start succeeding, we will always be a backward place.	Holly Payne	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-8, J-1
32	This project is wasteful and unnecessary. Many of the FAQ's on your website are not true were clearly written by someone with a financial interest in this project. While modern cities are doing away with massive highway projects in favor of boulevards, parks, are surface streets, Little Rock is trying to force a highway plan on it's citizens that is straight from the 1970's that will further divide neighborhoods and harm local business. This is a terrible idea and I am completely against it.	Brandon Thornton	7/11/2018	Website	H-1, H-8, I-9, K-5, K-15
33	Please send me a copy any Benefit Cost Analyses, economic analyses, or cost estimates for the 30 Crossing project. Email or hard copy is fine. My hardcopy mailing address is: Dale Pekar 1010 Rock Little Rock, Arkansas 72202 I already have the Cambridge Systematics Benefit Cost Analysis which was conducted earlier.	Dale Pekar	7/11/2018	Web Form	R

34	<p>I appreciate this opportunity to publicly comment on the proposed expansion of Interstate 30. While I support infrastructure spending as a means to employ many and improve the quality of life for all, I do not believe that expanding Interstate 30 will improve our lives.</p> <p>Us is an important economic Understanding congestion and the efficacy of policy interventions is not my expertise, but an authoritative study published in the American Economic Review (2011) by Gilles Duranton, et al. has provided valuable insight. Their work reveals that for every 1% increase in city highway construction, total city driving increases 1%. The multi-state study consistently demonstrates that increased provision of interstate highway lanes fails to relieve congestion of these roads. Like others, this study is widely cited and available at no cost.</p> <p>The last decade has witnessed changes in where Americans want to live. Fueled by the desire to live somewhere walkable, many like my wife and I, are moving back to inner cities near restaurants, bars, and offices where they won't need cars. In this vein, Milwaukee and Boston have recently destroyed urban interstates and witnessed substantially more economic development in their absence. As roads are built to facilitate draining urban communities, tax revenue will drain with them. The data is in, Little Rock will likely suffer if our state spends hundreds of millions to drive people out.</p> <p>I remain hopeful that the great state of Arkansas will reject this prodigal expansion of I-30 and reconsider more intelligent infrastructure projects aimed at improving the quality of life for all Arkansans. Thank you for your time and cooperation.</p> <p>Sincerely, Aaron Baldwin</p>	Aaron C Baldwin	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-8, J-2, K-1, ,K-5, K-15
35	<p>The I30 crossing would have detrimental impacts on the social capital of the City of Little Rock in several ways. First, it will double, triple (or more) traffic counts on some of the more currently walkable/bikable streets in the downtown area. Second, it will further split and segregate areas of downtown, particularly among racial and socioeconomic status groups. The city will lose on community-building efforts when various areas of downtown can't interact with each other because there is a huge 10-lane interstate in the way. Third, businesses will lose impact from patrons who enjoy a livable downtown, not a downtown that is bypassed at 70 miles per hour. Fourth, placing a 10-lane interstate through the middle of what should be a livable, walkable area ensures that citizens need to have a car for transportation. It makes active transportation less feasible, as well as limits transportation options for those who choose not to use or cannot afford a car. It is bad for the health, community, and environment. There are better options that can circumvent the city... splitting downtown with the I-30 crossing will be detrimental to so many areas of progress in Little Rock.</p>	Katie Helms	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-3, I-5, K-5, K-15, K-16
36	<p>The Environmental Assessment states: Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations such as shared-use lanes and sidewalks would also have the potential to improve east-west connectivity and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists to reach public transportation and their desired destinations.</p> <p>This is incorrect. Shared use lanes are inadequate accommodation for bicyclists. Bicycles on sidewalks are prohibited by the city of Little Rock so sidewalks are not an option for bicyclists. This EA and the project does not address the needs of bicyclists who use an environmentally friendly mode of transportation.</p>	Robert C Walker	7/11/2018	Web Form	J-2
37	<p>Widening I-30 is not a good solution. For example, traffic will not flow better just because there are more lanes unless you also add lanes to I-40, I-530, or I-30. The 5 lanes for example at the south exchange in front of Bass Pro are the worse part of my afternoon drive. When 5 lanes must squeeze into 3 lanes then it creates a bottleneck. When people try to rush down an merge into the existing lanes actually makes traffic slower and more dangerous. Also adding extra lanes will create more issues under the bridges and create more unsafe areas downtown. Cyclists, tourists, and other visitors already are discouraged already by the parking areas being under the bridges. Please DO NOT add lanes and cost to the public just to create other traffic bottlenecks.</p>	Leigh Gibson	7/11/2018	Website	I-12, I-5, I-9, J-2

38	<p>Please email me or send me a hard copy of the Benefit Cost Analysis that was used in the TIGER VII Grant Application for the I-30 Corridor Project. You previously provided me with an Cambridge Systematics Benefit Cost Analysis but its figures do not coincide with those shown in said Grant Application.</p>	Dale Pekar	7/11/2018	Web Form	R
39	<p>Please take a long hard look at the I-35 corridor history through Austin, Texas. United we stand, divided we fall and that is what happened as they widened the interstate then double-decked it and finally did the smart thing by building a wide bypass around the city. You already have the bypass with I-440, be smart and use it. Dead-end I-30 at the Clinton Museum and make a more walk and bike friendly downtown.</p>	Peter Trabant, Ph. D.	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-3, H-4, I-9, J-2

40	<p>Don't waste our tax dollars on this ill conceived plan to relieve congestion that only happens for an hour at most on workdays. Urban sprawl is linked to lower income, lower education, lower quality of life. Why don't we invest this money into something that actually has a ROI instead of a bridge to nowhere. This will also pollute the downtown area if traffic increases on this interstate. Housing and development next to heavily traveled interstates is linked to health risks including higher rates of asthma, cancer and heart disease. This interstate runs right through downtown, where many people live. We would be paying twice for this in public health expenditures on top of the costs of the widening itself. It is a gross misallocation of tax dollars. The costs and negative outcomes heavily outweigh any benefit here, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to see this.</p>	Richard Hinson	7/11/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, K-8, K-15, L
41	<p>As a resident of downtown Little Rock, I strongly oppose the expansion of the I-30 bridge. This expensive project will further divide expanding neighborhoods, such as East Village, from the rest of the city and will strangle their growth. If anything, we should use the money for this project to redirect the interstate around downtown.</p>	Emily Dobson	7/11/2018	Web Form	H-4, K-5, K-15
42	<p>I am opposed to this project. It will further divide the River Market and the east side which has a lot of investment being poured into it. Secondly, adding more lanes does not improve traffic it actually adds to it by encouraging further development on other counties and having more drivers commuting. Thirdly, those investing into downtown and the east side want to make the area more pedestrian and bike friendly and adding more lanes and creating more separation only ruins those plans and hurts all future investments. Please reconsider this project. It seems it only harms the city rather than improve it. Thank you for your time.</p>	Ana Grynwald	7/11/2018	Comment Form	I-9, I-5, I-10, K-5, K-15

43	<p>In the environmental assessment, Appendix H, 5.4 commonly encountered conditions is 5.4.1. Aerially deposited lead Lines 11 to 17 identify lead as a contaminant within 30 feet of the roadway. There is no recommendation to evaluate this danger or plans to mitigate it.</p>	Robert Walker	7/12/2018	Comment Form	R
44	<p>Public hearings about I-30 Crossing have been going on for quite some time. My involvement in this process has been going on since the beginning, as a tax-paying citizen and a member of the Metroplan RPAC Committee. This plan will take a walkable, livable, vibrant downtown area that LR has been working for years to revitalize to a 14,000 car per day street through the heart of downtown LR. Your statistics about the future has fooled many citizens of LR. The benefits will be experienced and seen by the non-taxpayers from our city. The people who choose to work here, but choose not to live here. How is this plan going to improve downtown and convince me to want to live there? Have you investigated and read valuable best practices in other communities our size? (Not Dallas) My hope is that other transportation choices will be honored. Specifically bus, pedestrians and bicycles. There are other choices, and let the people that choose not to live in LR & pay taxes for things here not dictate what they think needs to be done. These choices that have been made have not been thoroughly vetted, and many in our LR community have been fooled by statistics that are tilted in a way to benefit who? Commuters who choose not to live here.</p>	Coreen Frasier	7/12/2018	Comment Form	G, I-5, J-2, K-1, K-5, K-15, N-2
45	<p>My concern is the noise. It's already loud & I feel like adding more lanes would make it even louder. I was told they were putting sound barriers on one side of the freeway, but they are not putting sound barriers on the side I live on.</p>	Shari D. Rush	7/12/2018	Comment Form	K-2
46	<p>First of all, I'll acknowledge that this project is a huge undertaking w/ lots of factors & variables to consider. I appreciate the amount of planning, communication & transparency - and opportunities to provide input from the public - that the ARDOT has provided. I believe the proposed design will relieve some of the rush hour congestion & dangerous merging & on ramp situations that exist today. I am concerned, however, that it may not provide the volume needed in 15-20 year as the central Arkansas area grows. I would have liked to have seen an option that extended I-630 to the east & then north across the river to meet at the 67/167 south terminus. That would have provided relief of volume related to thru traffic for downtown considering so much of that traffic is going from the hospitals along 630 northeast to 67/167. It also would have provided another bridge access across the river. I'm disappointed that option wasn't push forward but look forward to the improvements nonetheless. Thanks! Chris</p>	Christopher Bauer	7/12/2018	Comment Form	H-3, K-1

47	I'm concerned that I have to exit in North Little Rock to enter Downtown Little Rock heading south. If you miss the C/D lane you are cut off and have to continue to I-630 and circle back. I do like the center thru lanes for thru traffic. Thank you.	Lenna Hopkins	7/12/2018	Comment Form	R
48	I have attended a number of these public meetings. In all of them, I have been impressed by the professionalism and openness to public comments, complaints and suggestions. From my perspective, I believe all the input has produced the best possible approach. Get started!! Thanks Tom White	Tom White	7/12/2018	Comment Form	Q
49	I oppose the lane expansion as proposed in the 30 Crossing plans. The neglect of arterial streets and other infrastructure needs should take priority. This project is typical of an outdated thinking from the 20th Century, not what forward looking communities are doing. Please reconsider - make safety improvements but no lane expansions. Thank you. Kathy Webb Vice Mayor	Kathy Webb	7/12/2018	Comment Form	I-9, L
50	1) One exit at 15th Street, for all traffic from WLR, SWLR, Pine Bluff coming into downtown seem limited and ripe for congestion. 2) Why is the North Hills exit not reqorked to allow traffic from warehouses south of the intersection the opportunity to head east on I-40 rather than head back into downtown NLR?	Stuart Mackey	7/12/2018	Comment Form	R

<p>51</p>	<p>Please consider that the sustainability of this city depends on the livability of its neighborhoods. This project is vastly increasing traffic on 2nd and 4th streets, which currently have residential and commercial entities that attract people to walk, bike, and enjoy the area as residents and as tourists. There is no reason to put 20,000 cars on these roads - we need to consider alternate forms of transportation to truly make our city sustainable and a great place to live. This project seems solely focused on moving people through Little Rock and not actually attracting people to live here, which is exactly the wrong, and dated, way of looking at things. I am sad that our public officials and state departments who are paid by our taxpayer money are not more forward-thinking and innovative to help ensure all coming generations the best quality of life possible. Please reconsider putting more traffic on the downtown streets.</p>	<p>Rachel Furman</p>	<p>7/12/2018</p>	<p>Comment Form</p>	<p>I-5, J-2, K-15</p>
<p>52</p>	<p>There is no debate in my mind that I-30 between LR & NLR needs to be improved. The bridge is old and the entrance ramps are way too short causing slowing of traffic & dangerous hazards on I-30. Despite these issues I would vote to keep the status quo over the I-30 Crossing plan developed by ARDOT. I think there are 4+ issues with the proposed 6-lane C/D solution.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It is currently treacherous for a pedestrian or bicyclist to cross I-30 west to east & the proposed plan does nothing to alleviate these dangers. Walking & biking are forms of transportation too and I am very concerned that the lack of pedestrian access across I-30 will hinder the economic growth that is occurring on the east side of I-30 in LR. 2) It has been demonstrated that this change will significantly increase peak hour car traffic on very important pedestrian streets. I just moved to downtown LR because it is very walkable & safe to walk; this project will completely change that safety while I walk to work. I think that lots of younger people like me will end up moving away from LR b/c we want to live in walkable downtowns & we will no longer have that in LR. 3) There is no focus on alternative modes of transportation like walking, biking, & buses. 4) There is no focus on diverting through traffic to 440, instead this will make it even easier to use I-40 as a thoroughfare. And this will continue to incentivize unsustainable development in Central AR. <p>I truly wish that ARDOT would consider a more holistic plan that incorporates ALL modes of transit & incorporates sustainable development considerations.</p>	<p>Charity Mullins</p>	<p>7/12/2018</p>	<p>Comment Form</p>	<p>H-4, I-5, J-2, K-13, K-15</p>

53	<p>Rush hour traffic leaving the city looks to me to be less efficient. Traffic will increase in the city due to this plan. I don't understand how this plan benefits anyone except people driving through the city? I don't have a problem with improving the bridge. I'm not suggesting you do nothing. But this plan does not look like an efficient way to lead drivers in and out of city grid.</p>	Mike Orndorff	7/12/2018	Comment Form	I-5, I-9
54	<p>The improvements to I-30 should include noise barriers on the east side of the freeway north of the Arkansas River along Locust Street between 5th Avenue and 13th Avenue. Shorter College occupies this area for educational purposes. The uses of this property includes residential dormitories that have been platted and approved by the City of North Little Rock and will be under construction beginning in the fall of 2019. Over 200 students will be living in dormitories on Locust Street between Bishop Lindsey Avenue and 13th Avenue. Jerome Green President Shorter College</p>	Jerome Green	7/12/2018	Written Comment	K-2
55	<p>Where's the lawsuit so I can sign. Thank you Pam whitaker</p>	Pam Whitaker	7/12/2018	Comment Form	Q
56	<p>The idea of designing/building at the same time seems odd to me. I'm hearing a lot of jargon in explanations that aren't really helping with understanding what's going to happen. Other than being required by law, what difference will the input from the public make. Things seem pre-decided. I'd like more information about the phases of building and time frames, which the timeline graphic and people present didn't address. What comes 1st, 2nd, 3rd? Will several parts be going on at the same time? How big a mess will traffic be, and for how long?</p>	DeDe Lynn Hearn	7/12/2018	Comment Form	N-2, O, P
57	<p>I agree with Alternative 2B. Would hope can have expedited construction. We've waited too long already.</p>	Bobbilyn Pearson	7/12/2018	Comment Form	Q

58	<p>I understand the need to fix the bridge over the Arkansas River that is in disrepair, however I am against expanding the capacity of I-30 for the following reasons: 1) Induced demand: building more capacity does not decrease congestion, it increases traffic counts. This will encourage/incentivize people to live outside of the City of Little Rock who work here. This will: 1a) decrease our tax base 1b) increase Vehicle Miles Traveled per day, already one of the highest in the US metro areas 1c) increase air pollution and climate change 2) This will change the landscape/traffic patterns on our local city streets, especially between River Market & the Clinton Library. This will: 2a) make it much more dangerous to walk & bike 2b) decrease tourism revenue 2c) destroy the placemaking the Clinton Library and River Market have created over the past 3 decades Other communities are decreasing highway capacities and paving over them. This is a terrible idea.</p>	n/a	7/12/2018	Comment Form	H-8, I-5, I-10, K-1, K-8, K-13, K-15
59	<p>Meeting was well organized. All questions were answered. It looks like a project whose time has come.</p>	Bob Hayden	7/12/2018	Comment Form	Q
60	<p>This is a total overkill, and a waste of taxpayer money. Everyone has worked so hard to make downtown Little Rock pedestrian friendly. It's a disgrace to chop up our downtown. This is not thought out at all. 1960 Mentality.</p>	Bobby Malone	7/12/2018	Comment Form	L
61	<p>The right of way proposed at our store could hit the underground gas tanks. Moving the tanks will be costly and possibly closer our business.</p>	Aladdin Saraheen	7/12/2018	Comment Form	R

62	<p>4 lane on 2nd Street destroys the Green Space Concept & pedestrian River Market area -- why was Capital not utilized to flow traffic unnecessary red light at Rock & 3rd Street parking should remain on 3rd to allow businesses & residents to thrive. 2nd should be 2 lane w/ street parking.</p>	Amanda Rodgers	7/12/2018	Oral Comment	I-5, K-3, K-7, K-15
63	<p>“Steve Holland with Southern Company North Little Rock. I’m concerned about access off of Cypress Street into our building at 1201 Cypress. That’s going to limit us to getting freight delivered and other things and also parking for our customers. Thank you.”</p>	Steve Holland / The Southern Company of North Little Rock	7/12/2018	Web Form	R
64	<p>The bridge expansion is massively to expensive for such a small population and all the evidence suggest it won't shorten commute times, but more traffic will use it and everyone will still be delayed at rush hour. The interstate should loop around Little Rock, we don't need through traffic inside the city center. Creating a boulevard where the existing freeway is now would unite the East and West sides of downtown and make the area more prosperous, enlarging the freeway will further divide the city and make the area much less desirable.</p> <p>So many other cities are taking out freeways having found them to be cost prohibitive to maintain and the cities have prospered without them. Even Dallas's is looking to remove a freeway and Dallas is more addicted to freeways than any other city I've ever been to.</p> <p>If Little Rock is to attract people into the city it needs to demonstrate it's a progressive place to live, freeway expansion is retro thinking and a real turn off for younger people.</p> <p>A bigger freeway will just indebt the state, won't fix the traffic problem, will divide downtown and make the downtown visually unattractive.</p> <p>Regards Trey Willis</p>	Trey Willis	7/12/2018	Web Form	H-1, H-4, H-8, I-5, I-10, K-5, K-15

65	<p>Absolutely opposed to the I30 widening to the level that ahtd has proposed. I agree 100% with the original assessment for metro plan that just stated this will create induced demand, and future widening projects will have to be done throughout Central Arkansas to keep up with these increased numbers of downtown traffic. A complete waste of money and it appears that ahtd is just creating projects to keep their Developers Pockets happy and future projects on the radar screen. Follow the money, this is a complete waste. It will decimate Downtown Development around the River Market and The Clinton Library in East Village. Separating a very fragile burgeoning tourism scene in Little Rock. And only fueling Little Rock's demise wow boosting Benton Bryant Cabot and Conway. Ahtd cannot keep up with the current roads that it already has for upkeep, why in the world would we spend this much money to grow a system that it we can't already keep up with?</p>	Jeremy Lewno	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-10, I-13, K-5, K-15, L
66	<p>The Arkansas River Trail is one of the best in the country and showcases our downtown, our pedestrian bridges , and our city parks on both sides of the river.. Any plans for the future should consider the safety of all walkers, bike riders, joggers on our trail system. We still need for the City Of Little Rock to the CLOSE THE LOOP. Might as well make that part of the discussion.</p>	Stephen Bentley	7/12/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-4, K-13
67	<p>Expanding I-30 into a ten or twelve lane freeway through downtown Little Rock will not address traffic congestion. The " induced demand" principle demonstrates that almost every highway expansion leads to more traffic, as opposed to reducing it. The project will divide neighborhoods, driving a wedge through the middle of downtown. It will halt or slow further redevelopment. Not only will it fail to solve congestion, it will burden taxpayers with increased debt and divert money away from needed improvements. There are better ways to improve the I-30 corridor through downtown Little Rock. The Arkansas River bridge can be replaced and the exits/interchanges can be redesigned. Thorough traffic can be diverted around the city. This project should not be implemented.</p>	Richard Hutchinson	7/12/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-10, K-1, K-5, L, I-8

68	<p>Terrible plan! Adding lanes will only make it worse. Clean up the 630 to 30 junction and update the bridge. Keep 630 as 2 lanes throughout the ramp and have one dedicated lane into 30 and one merge. Kill the 6th Street ramp and make it part of the Cantrel ramp as 2 lanes with an extra lane (4) across the bridge. The outside lane would become part of the Broadway off ramp. That would give 2 really good on ramps in that area that would have a dedicated lane and a merge lane. This is Arkansas and people cannot/will not merge properly so eliminate the need for it and traffic will flow better.</p>	Joe Carrigan	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-3, I-9
69	<p>Please note my opposition to this project. Study after study has shown increasing lanes does not relieve congestion, negating the stated point of this project. Meanwhile, it would be detriment to the Little Rock and downtown community as a whole, needlessly eradicating land and rightaways the city uses. Please scrap this project.</p>	Elizabeth Kimble	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, K-1, K-5
70	<p>Surely this monster project is not the solution to the traffic situation. After all the money and time that has been spent on revitalizing downtown be jeopardized by catering to mostly out of town commuters? Couldn't the entrances and exits be redesigned instead of making room for just wider traffic snarls?</p>	Van Reid	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-2, I-9
71	<p>I am adamantly opposed to expanding I- 30 in this area over the bridge. I see it as unnecessary and detrimental to the area.</p>	Ellen Justus	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9
72	<p>I am representing the League of Women Voters of Pulaski County. We have been against this project from the beginning. Our national position on transportation includes, " urging measures to reduce vehicular pollution and encouragement of alternative transportation systems." I find several flaws in your FAQ's. Table ES-1 The comparisons with other boulevard creations mention the length of the project as 7.3 miles.Much of that distance is the bridge and the other highways coming into L.R.The boulevard would only be a part of it. The Low Demand category also doesn't it fit- much of the day, there is low demand.</p>	Carol Young	7/12/2018	Web Form	H-1, I-6, J-2

	<p>The FAQ also indicates that bikes and pedestrians would be at a greater risk with a grade boulevard. That hasn't shown to be the case in other cities.</p> <p>Also, even with projections of 220,000 more people coming in before 2040, the mindset of the population regarding alternate transportation and working closer to home, changes the need for more highways. You are using a 20th century mindset, where cars were king, that is not true of younger generations. We need more walkable, bikable neighborhoods, and better mass transit for the 21st century.</p> <p>Thank you, Carol Young</p>				
73	<p>Having been in other major cities, the traffic across I-30 is not that bad and I think the traffic flow would be better served by another bridge to the east, possibly around the airport.</p>	Daniel Danielson	7/12/2018	Web Form	H-3, I-9, I-11
74	<p>While there are numerous reasons to question the expansion of Interstate 30, current plans do not have adequate consideration for pedestrians and cyclists within the River Market. The proposed plan increases average daily traffic counts on 2nd, 3rd, and 4th street to levels similar to what is found on Mississippi Ave (12,000 - 14,000 cars per day, up from 2,000). Crossing three consecutive four-lane roads to move north or south within center of the River Market District will decimate its current pedestrian and cycling friendly status.</p> <p>Help preserve one of our most unique and thriving communities. Demand that we design for a future that moves people, not cars.</p>	Jim Conner	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-5, J-2
75	<p>I love living in Downtown Little Rock. One of the main reasons is the ability to walk and bike easily around the area. I am concerned that dramatically increasing car traffic will make the area less livable and enjoyable to be. I would love to see more bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure being prioritized in order that people of all ages and income levels can enjoy our great City.</p>	Jace Davis	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-5, J-2, K-16

76	<p>I'm totally against this monstrous project. The public was never given an option of just replacing the bridge and improving some of the on- and off-ramps. Since we will probably have no choice but to stand by and see our city destroyed, please at least make an EFFORT to make it safe for pedestrians. We have a lot of tourists, families, students and employees who walk downtown. DON'T turn the River Market/Library/Main Street area into a part of the freeway. The whole thing is OVERKILL. ArDOT talks about not having enough money for maintenance, so how will you have enough money to maintain this project when it's complete? And if the I-30 bridge had been properly maintained, it wouldn't need to be replaced now. DON'T FORGET PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS.</p>	Earl Bell	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9, J-2, K-13, K-15
77	<p>I oppose the 30 Crossing project in its current form. It is ridiculous to think that a city of this size, with its comparative lack of congestion, needs a freeway of this immense magnitude. We DO need bridge repairs, and improvement of on/off access, but decimating the city that I live and pay property tax in, in order to let those passing through arrive (debatably) a few seconds faster, is an affront to all Little Rock citizens. Induced demand is real. Please do not allow this. Interstates do not attract youth and industry - vibrant, historical, diverse, walkable, bikable communities with urban green space DO.</p>	Elizabeth Rogers	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, K-5, K-15
78	<p>The existing design of I-630 is a manifestation of white supremacy. The I30 Crossing Plan is proof that white supremacy is thriving and that the Arkansas Highway Department has created a design for 50 years ago not one for the next 50 years with the increasing density and diversity of the urban core and a move to a gig economy that is and will continue to significantly alter traffic patterns from the 1950s 9 to 5 business hours and factory shifts. This plan prioritizes the needs of white flight with no consideration at all for the investmest individuals, businesses and families have made in the urban core. Progressive cities are taking down their concrete canyons in city centers, not building new ones.</p>	Mary Joe Morris	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-6, I-9, K-16
79	<p>Please reconsider this terrible plan. Although I am only one person, if you follow through with this throwback to last century, I will be leaving Little Rock.</p>	Paul Norris		Web Form	I-9
80	<p>Hey, guys! Thanks so much for the event this evening—it was very informative, and everyone I spoke with was very helpful. That said, I had a quick question for y'all: I was reading through Appendix B of the EA report when I came across some numbers that struck me as somewhat odd, ("Table 5: Action and No-Action Travel Times" on page 24). Specifically, the numbers given for "From River Market to I-40/I-440 Interchange." Would it be possible to get the raw data that was used to reach those figures? Thanks so much! Best, Jordan</p>	Jordan Hickey / Arkansas Life Magazine	7/12/2018	Web Form	R
81	<p>I strongly disagree with the proposed plans to expand I30. I live downtown and really enjoy the ease and convenience of it all. Expanding I30 will essentially cut off all of downtown into separate neighborhoods with no real connections to each other. All of the new development going on east of I30 will basically go to waste. Other major cities are starting to go away from major through ways. Research has shown that more lanes does not make for a faster commute. Congestion is caused by poor traffic patterns once you exit. Why should a city spend millions of its own dollars to make it easier to get out of your city. You should spend the money to make it more inviting so that they want to stay.</p>	Joe Pawlus	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, K-5, I-8

82	I do not agree with the 10 lane c/d option. It is too large. It is over designed for this community. Please reconsider improving the existing infrastructure by going back to a 6 lane with wider lanes and safer bridge.	Jeff Horton	7/12/2018	Web Form	I-9
83	<p>As a resident of Little Rock, I oppose the widening of I-30 and the I-30 Crossing project. The citizens of this city have made it clear that we do not want a monstrous interchange dividing a flourishing downtown area just so commuters can shave - literally - seconds off of their commutes. Even the highway department's own models acknowledge that no change to traffic times will be evident until hundreds of millions more are spent widening I-630 and further decimating our city.</p> <p>In every way this decision goes against national trends of emphasizing walking, biking, ridesharing and public transportation. It ignores the reality of induced demand, and the impact a major highway can have on a revitalized downtown area. This is bad city planning and bad engineering, and will undoubtedly be an embarrassment for the city and state in the future. As the rest of the country tears down highways and attempts to heal their scars in order to better encourage local economies, we build our biggest one yet. The manipulative way in which the highway department has pushed this project through has been disheartening to watch. Bullying and threatening every entity that stands in your way by removing the opportunity to address real issues until you get your way is shameful.</p> <p>At this point I have little hope that this project can be stopped, but I wanted to add my voice to the MAJORITY and restate that regardless of significant and studied arguments against I-30 Crossing, the residents of this city are being forced into a project that will undoubtedly harm us by people who care little for us. What a shame.</p>	Sasha Cerrato	7/12/2018	Web Form	H-8, I-6, I-10, N-2
84	No no no no, do not ruin our reviving downtown. It is a fact that more lanes produce more traffic. Take a look at other cities that are REMOVING freeways to improve quality of life.	Karen Walls	7/12/2018	Website	H-8, I-10, K-5, K-15

85	<p>I avoid driving on this stretch as much as possible, especially during peak daily drive times. Folks drive like maniacs, but it looks like the decision to go ahead has already been made, regardless of any input from the public. Gentlemen, start your engines!</p>	Douglas McDowall	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
86	<p>I'm not in favor of highway expansion, especially along I-30. As someone who used to commute back and forth to Conway, I-40 gets backed up very quickly particularly when there's an accident. While having a third lane on I-40 would be helpful, it just contributes to a car-centric culture which is bad for the environment. As someone with family living downtown, I don't like the idea of highway expansion through an area that's seen new development and growth. I'd rather see the funds invested in complete streets, expanding the bus system, reassessing the trolley system for better use, and reviewing things like traffic signal timing and traffic calming to mitigate traffic concerns. Bridges have value and it would be great to see some that can accommodate pedestrian use. Many cities are doing away with highway expansion as</p>	Nicole Chandler	7/13/2018	Web Form	H-7, I-6, J-1, J-2, K-1, L

	its an injustice on many levels. I disagreed with the reconstruction of I-630 as it confused people with the wayfinding, a section still ends at stoplight contributing to westward expansion, and just not worth the money. I want systems to better connect people and communities as destinations rather than pit stops along the way.				
87	<p>The idea to expand the I-30 bridge with be such a colossal mistake for Little Rock, for several reasons. Firstly and the most obvious is the price tag on this project. \$650,000,000 is a lot of zeros to which the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department can already not afford. When they asked citizens to vote on this half-cent sales tax on the ballot I believe the AHTD manipulated the ballot to make it seem like that half cents would go toward maintenance on state roads. It bill also mentions that the money would be used to improve highways that exceed no more than four lanes. As a tax paying citizen who voted against the half-cent sales tax, I do not appreciate being lied to. Second, there is absolutely no reason for the expansion to occur. I drive the I-30 route often and with the exception of the usual morning and evening rush hours, there is not traffic on this route, no reason to expand</p> <p>Thirdly, with this expansion you are messing up commutes to work for people that live outside of Little Rock. My father lives in Hensley and this project will add an hour to his already long commute time both ways.</p> <p>Fourth, this expansion will be nothing more than a race tack, a speed way for the traffic that will not be there. There will be less cars for the amount of road that will cause people to drive crazy. It's already happened in Memphis and Knoxville, Tennessee.</p> <p>Fifth, there are roads that the AHTD are not maintaining just in Little Rock and they want to spend money on a new project that could already maintain our existing roads for years to come. Also, when it comes time to maintaining the I-30 expansion, where is that money going to come from?</p> <p>I ask that you please consider what harm this expansion will do for those who live in Little Rock. We should be working toward a walk-able city with ways of public transit that will actually work. Thank you for your time.</p>	Caitlin Avant	7/13/2018	Web Form	H-8, L
88	What happens to the Osborne Eagle statue that is near this overpass? I haven't seen any mention of it in the plans.	Tristan Wingfield	7/13/2018	Web Form	K-4
89	ABSOLUTELY 100% AGAINST WIDENING I-30. Little Rock should be smarter than this.	Debra Garrison	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
90	I am in favor of the ArDOT’s preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the “Highway 10 Interchange”). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of	Shep Russell	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q

	an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.				
91	I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented. Thanks	Rajesh G Chokhani	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
92	6 + C/D --- good plan. Time to get on with it. This project is already years late for those who use this roadway. There is no disruption in the connections between E & W of I-30 through the downtown areas - all the E/W city streets remain. Very little additional RoW is needed -- and the Clinton "Park" gets more land. Win Win Win..... It seems that those who oppose the project are just opposed to vehicular transportation and the 21st Century. Goodwork ---- carry on.	Mark Barnhard	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
93	I approve of the proposed configuration	Ronald Dedman	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q

94	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p>	Bill Rector	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
95	<p>I strongly oppose the widening of I-30</p>	Priscilla Baltz	7/13/2018	Web Form	Q
96	<p>I approve and endorse wholeheartedly the proposed configuration. Thanks</p>	Gus Vratsinas	7/13/2018	Comment Form	Q
97	<p>My family has property located between the 15th and 16th hundred blocks of Locust Street (1604 Locust St. NLR, 72114). My family and I have grave concerns about the easement the ARDOT is taking the liberty of taking from our property. We were also told that a "retainer wall" would possible be built in the area in front of our property. The planned or designated easement will be taking a good part of the front yard of our property. What will this do to our property value if we decide to sale the property? We were told by ARDOT representatives that this would not have an effect on our property, but we can see clearly that it will.</p> <p>Our second concern is that there is an underground spring that flows across the highway onto our property. If a retainer wall is to be erected, what will be the stability of that wall? Long term effect would possibly be a crumbling or decaying, splitting or cracking of the wall because of the flow of the water. The water from the spring is especially noted in the fall and winter seasons. During warm or hot weather, the water stream is not as prevalent or seen or noted.</p> <p>We are concerned that the ARDOT is taking privileges from the "Black Community" properties owned in that area. I took pictures of the plans shown at the last community meeting (July 12, 2018) at the Wyndham Riverfront (Silver City Room) NLR, AR. I must say, that my family and I are not pleased with how the ARDOT is taking privileges without consulting or reimbursing property owners for the property being taken. It can clearly be seen that the easement space has been increased, taking and defacing parts of our properties. The retainer wall will certainly not add beauty to our properties either. What else can be done?</p>	Margaret Moore-Bland	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q, R

98	<p>I have reviewed the Environmental Assessment document for ArDOT Job # CA0602, have attended the public information session on July 12, 2018, and have followed the deliberations regarding the 30 Crossing project since it was first proposed. I am in favor of the proposed "6-Lane with Collector/Distributor Lanes and Split Diamond Interchange" alternative, and I believe our local community and our state will be best served in the project proceeds on the schedule proposed by ArDOT. The many enhancements this project will provide for our city include: safety for drivers, safety for pedestrians, connectivity within downtown areas, aesthetic improvements, relief of traffic congestion and future capacity, green spaces for downtown areas, shipping efficiency and safety, better use of existing roadways for traffic distribution, continuation of downtown development activity, and downtown accessibility for residents throughout the region.</p>	Jeff Hathaway	7/14/2018	Web Form	Q
99	<p>Absolutely not. This effects walkability of the downtown neighborhood , noise levels, appearance. Increasing the speed of traffic is dangerous to all. From a promised park\ greenspace yo this?</p>	Claudia Hopkins	7/15/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-2, K-13, K-15
100	<p>No!!! It is already dangerous walking with the current traffic pattern. This street change between the Main BEAUTIFIL library and the building I Live in will add to the danger. The noise levels, spiting downtown, effecting the charm is absolutely wrong. You are going to drive traffic right where the most people have invested in actual living downtown helping to bring the downtown back. This would be a huge mistake!</p>	C Ragon	7/15/2018	Web Form	K-2, K-5, J-2, K-13, K-15
101	<p>I have a concern that I think should be addressed. Because of the new I-30 plan, most traffic in NLR trying to access I-40 West, especially areas on the east of I-30, will travel on 13th St/North Hills Blvd. This will include 18 wheel trucks, e.g Pipe and Tube Supply on Cypress. I have witnessed 18 wheel trucks already having a hard time on these streets. Trucks that are traveling to get to the warehouses are having to swing wide to make the right turn which is stopping traffic going in both directions. I have also witnessed a truck go off the road. The street is very narrow. My concern is that there are going to be more accidents and traffic problems. . Also, heavy rain will cause the street to close. What are the plans and/or solutions to this? If they use the frontage road, to access I-40 west, would it not be difficult with the narrow curve by the bridge? I am thinking of the Pipe and Tube trucks that are carrying those huge pipes. . Also, accessing the left lane to make that left to get on 40 will be difficult if you take out the access on the right. The other route on the frontage road , staying in the right lane, then turn left, instead of right toward 13th St., would also block traffic and it floods in that area. at the end of the bridge going west. Again, what about the car traffic when it floods? North Hills is almost impossible to drive through when there is a heavy rain. If traffic is re-routed to frontage road, does that mean that the trucks that are turning right on Gregory Street would use that route also, still same problem to make that left turn.</p>	Belinda Burney	7/15/2018	Web Form	R

	Another thought, will there be traffic lights on 19th & Locust because students use that route to walk to NLRHS.				
102	I'm in favor of the ArDots preferred alternative, the 6 lane collector/distributor lanes	Gus Blass	7/15/2018	Web Form	Q
103	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT’s preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the “Highway 10 Interchange”). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District.</p> <p>Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p> <p>I am further hopeful the State of AR, City of LR, Pulaski County and ArDOT can join forces with the private community to cover I-30 from 6th street to 9th street and create a fabulous park space that can unify the growth in East Village with Downtown LR. THIS WOULD BE A GAME CHANGER FOR CENTRAL AR</p> <p>Thanks Philip</p>	Philip Tappan	7/15/2018	Web Form	Q
104	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT’s preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the “Highway 10 Interchange”). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District.</p> <p>Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p>	Scott Copas	7/15/2018	Web Form	Q
105	<p>Resubmission of earlier submission, with footnotes.</p> <p>--Page 62, Indicated epage 79/3992, Line 17. Failure to provide full disclosure of potential adverse effects if no acceptable bids meet the bid target price. The analysis fails to disclose what project components will be deferred and the order in which they would be deferred if the project cost estimate proves to be unrealistically low: “In the event that none of the Design-Build firms are able to provide the full project scope, additional projects will be programmed and contracts will be let at a future date to complete the project scope. Any work postponed to a future date will include additional costs for inflation.” ...</p>	Dale Pekar	7/15/2018	Web Form	R

106	<p>Expanding I-30 to and adding more lanes will never relieve rush hour traffic. When lanes are added on major arteries, simply, more people use them and in a year you are back where's you started. Of course, you already know this. Rush hour in down town last 45 minutes to an hour. Not a significant time...of course you know that. You already know there is no real need for an expansion of this magnitude. So The only end this will accomplish is the perception of ease on exiting the city for those who don't live here. You are catering to the few folks who work in downtown, but live in Benton, Bryant, Cabot, and Sherwood. People who never come back downtown to spend money here. People who see no need in a vibrant and sustainable downtown. Then you promise us parks that you won't have the responsibility of building.</p> <p>I know that Argenta will be negatively affected by this expansion.</p> <p>My comment is to take this entire plan and file it in the drawer labeled "bad ideas we need to learn from and never attempt again".</p> <p>Thank you Lisa Luyet Argenta resident</p>	Lisa Luyet	7/16/2018	Web Form	I-10, K-I, K-5, K-15
107	<p>From everything I saw at this hearing, this project is what has been needed ten years ago. This project once completed will bring Little Rock into the twenty first system with safety being the number one benefit. No longer will tractor trailer trucks and automobiles traveling Interstate 40 East or West bound will no longer have to change two lanes in order to go to Memphis East bound or Little Rock West bound on I 30. Traffic will move extremely better through town with the new design. With better interstates through the capitol city this should attract new industry to our area. Please go ahead with this project next year.</p>	Monty Pride / Highway Patrol Admin	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q
108	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p>	Johnny Burgess	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q
109	<p>The new I-30 corridor eliminates the current exit Cumberland exit into Little Rock and we gain a tremendous amount of park land. I like that the bridge will be higher so we can better view east to west and this proposal by ARDOT provides Little Rock with the opportunity to dress up the bridges and under the river bridge with better lighting and accessibility. The North Little Rock side and 67 North will be more accessible and safer when headed north. The entire road will be safer and less congestion.</p>	Gary Smith	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q

110	<p>As someone who lives downtown, I continue to be strongly opposed to the 30 Crossing Project. I have attended multiple public hearings and nothing presented by ARDOT changes my view that this project will be disastrous for those of us who live, work, and recreate downtown. My concerns are as follows:</p> <p>1) No one denies that the I-30 bridge needs to be replaced and that several exits and entrances need to be made more safe. However, ARDOT has not provided an alternative that will accomplish just these needs. Instead, ARDOT has used the the real problem of an unsafe bridge and unsafe ramps downtown as an excuse to create a concrete gulch to satisfy the needs of those who travel through our city or who only come to our city to work.</p> <p>2) Based on the information received at the most recent public hearing, traffic on our downtown streets will increase dramatically. For those of us who live here, who enjoy walking in the downtown area, who enjoy taking our pets to MacArthur Park and the Clinton Presidential Park, this project makes walking more difficult and more dangerous. Vehicular traffic will increase dramatically outside of my window on Capitol Avenue.</p> <p>3) The concrete gulch will separate two parts of our city that have been undergoing a tremendous and wonderful revitalization: The River Market area and East Village. The concrete gulch will make it more difficult to connect those two areas.</p> <p>4) There will be people who move out of the new apartments and condos that have been built in recent years because of the construction noise and the increased traffic after the project is completed. Occupancy rates will go down and residential development will stop.</p> <p>5) At least one business owner has closed his business because of the impending 30 Crossing Project (Zin Wine Bar on RiverMarket Avenue). Other business owners are likely to follow and business/retail development will stop.</p> <p>6) The current 30 Crossing Project is based on old views of how people travel. ARDOT is projecting traffic patterns and number of vehicles 25 years out. Technology is changing the way that we travel. As more cities are removing freeways and interstates in the downtown area, why are we significantly increasing lanes through our downtown? ARDOT must surely have talented people who can devise an alternative that does not add multiple lanes and concrete downtown.</p> <p>7) Noise pollution and air pollution will increase with the added lanes downtown. Thus, the walkability and liveability of downtown will be threatened.</p> <p>8) Finally, this process has been most frustrating and undemocratic. At one of the first public meetings that I attended, Scott Bennett assured all in attendance that ARDOT "would not shove this down our throats." Yes, ARDOT, for those of us who live downtown and will be impacted the most, this is exactly what you are doing. Danny Straessle stated, "This is not a vote of the people whether or not this project should go forward." This project will be close to \$700 million (if not more), it will impact the downtown area for decades to come. If the people of Little Rock, and particularly those of us who live downtown, don't matter, then we have no democracy and no state or local government that respects or responds to our concerns and needs.</p>	Kim Hoffman	7/16/2018	Web Form	R
111	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p>	Charles McNulty	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q

	Sincerely, Charles McNulty				
112	I appreciate your efforts to provide such an easy way to have public input. My hope and comfort for the best solution for our city, state and all citizens is : six lane plus collector/distributor lanes with split diamond interchange. This is very thoughtful of various means of transportation and the continuation of positive development of the immediate and entire market. Thank you, Jim	Jim Cargill	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q
113	Gentle persons, Congratulations to the ArDOT staff and commission for achieving the best possible combination of features for the preferred Interstate 30 crossing design, involving the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. You have maximized safety, environmental compatibility and relief of traffic congestion in the booming River Market area while still allowing through traffic to have the minimum of restrictions. Redesign of an existing system is frequently a process of eliminating the least acceptable of marginal solutions. In this case, I think you have achieved a positive solution that justifies our total support. Dickson	Dickson Flake	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q
114	I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented. Thank you.	Mark Saviers	7/16/2018	Web Form	Q
115	I live in North Little Rock, but work downtown. I work for a business who would be directly harmed by this initiative. Driving my son across the bridge would be so much worse due to this. STOP IT PLEASE. Traffic is NOT that bad. Leave it alone. Thank you.	Brittany Wheeler	7/16/2018	Web Form	I-1, I-9, I-11
116	My comments are in the attached document. Thanks much. Josh Silverstein	Josh Silverstein	7/17/2018	Web Form	R
117	What guarantees can you assure residents who live close to the proposed expansion that it will not adversely affect their access to local streets? Why has this become such a focused effort instead of looking at other alternatives that would not have so much of an impact on the downtown area? What studies show that the proposed expansion is the best for all concern and why are you not seriously taking suggestions and complaints from both Little Rock and North Little Rock residents?	Bob Powers	7/17/2018	Web Form	H-7, I-2, I-5, N-1, N-2

118	While I agree that there needs to be improvements/expansion (my office overlooks I-30 bridge and I observe wrecks & congestion) I don't agree at all with the magnitude of the project. I think it will increase, not decrease, traffic through downtown Little Rock.	Deborah K Green	7/17/2018	Web Form	I-5, I-10
119	<p>The Little Rock Marathon takes place on the first Sunday in March every year. Our marathon weekend consists of two days of races, with a 5K & 10K on Saturday, and a marathon and half marathon on Sunday. Currently, our course on both days takes us under and over the I-30 section in and around downtown Little Rock. We cross under I-30 on Saturday at both 3rd and 4th Streets. On Sunday, we cross under I-30 on 3rd Street and cross over I-30 on 9th Street. Our race weekend attracts more than 14,000 participants annually, as well as spectators, family and well-wishers numbering above 20,000. This weekend is the largest annual event produced by the City of Little Rock, and has an economic impact of \$6,000,000 annually.</p> <p>We are requesting cooperation during the construction process to ensure that our event may be produced this one weekend each year causing as little disruption to the construction contractors and the race producers. If it is possible to alter or delay work schedules on those particular days, plan for work to be done in a different section of the project on the weekend in March, or whatever options there might be, the Little Rock Marathon will do everything in our power to be a cooperating and considerate partner in this endeavor.</p>	Gina Pharis, Executive Director, Little Rock Marathon	7/18/2018	Web Form	R
120	I want to complement Danny Straesle, Tammy and Marc, fine employees who fully answered my questions and readily put at ease my disabled neighbor who was concerned about losing his home. My family was displaced by the original I-30. It is refreshing to have people who truly care about the feelings of concerned citizens. I know it will be disruptive, but the project is needed. God bless you in your efforts.	Pat Hanson	7/18/2018	Web Form	Q
121	<p>The following comments are in response to the Environmental Assessment issued by ARDOT and the public hearing on July 12th, 2018: The Environmental Assessment issued by ARDOT, though thousands of pages, falls well short of addressing the issues involved in the 30 Crossing project. The problems I have and would like to see addressed are outlined below:</p> <p>1. One would assume that any assessment of widening 30 (and 630) would begin with documenting the effects of the original construction of the I-30 and I-630 urban freeways had on Little Rock including the immense damage to historic buildings and neighborhoods and the dividing our city along racial and economic lines. The neighborhoods east of 30 and south of 630 in Little Rock suffered extreme loss of property value and still suffer from the on-going effects of this segregation of Little Rock neighborhoods. Concurrent with this loss of value in urban Little Rock was the rise in population and real estate values of outlying bedroom communities of Cabot, Conway, Bryant, Benton and other smaller towns. Also concurrent with the construction of the 30 and 630 urban freeways was a dramatic increase in single occupant vehicle use for long distance commuting encouraged by the freeways. This environmental and civic damage to these urban neighborhoods continues because of the freeways. This damage includes the on-going loss of historic properties because of the depressed real estate values imposed by the freeways in question. There was no mitigation for this damage beyond ROW acquisition and other limited efforts to "get the project through". Little Rock, as a whole, has had stagnant population growth so any claims by ARDOT of the advantages for Little Rock as a city with this expansion are not based on the facts. There is every reason to believe the new freeway widening will have similar effects on these neighborhoods further isolating and separating south and east Little Rock. Yet, where is the study of the demographic history of Little Rock since the freeways were built?</p> <p>2. ARDOT has violated the mandate from the Federal Highway Administration to consider reasonable alternatives to its proposed massive freeway widening. Rather than actually studying and developing a plan that followed the approved Imagine Central Arkansas plan from Metroplan, ARDOT decided early</p>	Tom Fennell	7/18/2018	Web Form	R

<p>on to only study similar versions of the same freeway expansion plan. Even though the Federal Highway Administration encouraged local highway entities to look at holistic approaches, ARDOT dismissed, and refused to study, alternatives plans such as the Boulevard plan with a Chester Street bridge even though independent traffic studies (Smart Mobility) showed the boulevard performed as well or better than the freeway expansion. ARDOT’s one sentence dismissal of this plan in the assessment is not enough to explain why ARDOT was opposed to this plan. ARDOT states they couldn’t build a bridge at Chester – this is patently false as ARDOT could designate that portion of Chester as a State Highway and the property is actually for sale. They state that an 8 lane boulevard couldn’t handle the traffic – it actually does handle the traffic and does it in a way to dramatically increase commerce and real estate value by operating at slower, safer, speeds.</p> <p>ARDOT’s task is to spend \$630 million dollars in state and federal tax dollars in Little Rock to improve urban transportation. The intelligent approach would be to study the problem from the perspective of quality of life, walkability, mass transit, economics, the environment, historic resources, racial demographics and real benefits to citizens and commuters. This effort would involve scientists, historians, city planners, architects, civic groups, community groups, economists, landscape architects, etc.</p> <p>The Highway Department, instead, hired highway engineers to design a bigger freeway. They came in with a mega-expansion plan four years ago and it has not changed since.</p> <p>3. The biggest problem with the EA (Environmental Assessment), however, is the “segmented” approach to looking at the impacts of freeway expansion. Rather than looking at the big picture for the whole region, ARDOT has broken up the project into narrowly divided pieces including the 30 Crossing portion which only extends a couple of blocks either side of the 30 corridor and does not address 630, 30 south to Benton, 430, 440, etc. Segmentation is an underhanded way to study the problem without dealing with the overall impact, especially financially. ARDOT has stated that the entire system expansion would cost \$4 billion. ARDOT doesn’t tell you this in the EA for 30 Crossing.</p> <p>ARDOT only tells you that this project will not solve congestion and bottlenecks – future projects will take care of those. For a state like Arkansas to spend this kind of money on one area and saddle everyone with the maintenance is a recipe for long term hardship and financial disaster. The EA should look at the overall impact of all these expansions as a whole.</p> <p>4. And it won’t work. This expansion will not solve congestion by ARDOT’s own admission. It does not work anywhere else why should it work here. Cities across the country are re-thinking urban freeways. The mayor of Houston has said “no more freeway expansions” – they don’t work! Many cities are taking out urban freeways – converting many to boulevards and arterials where slower speeds encourage business activity and walkability. Our current arrangement may be all we need in the future as autonomous vehicles, ride sharing and transit will more than make up for any future demand. ARDOT has refused to study and properly account for future transportation trends steadfastly adhering to the highway design philosophy of the 50s and 60s (even to the point of using outdated slogans about spurring new suburban development).</p> <p>5. ARDOT is acting in bad faith in the EA in terms of mitigating the harm the freeway expansion will do. ARDOT uses various amenities to tout their planning such as park space, landscaping, streetscapes, etc. but, in the fine print, indicate that ARDOT will not pay for any of these amenities. Taking credit for creating “recreational resources” that they do not intend to pay for is dishonest.</p> <p>6. ARDOT stated that they were going to respond to each comment. They have not responded in any kind of appropriate way to alternative plans I have submitted. Merely saying “it won’t work” does not meet any standard. I have also submitted independent traffic studies by Norm Marshall and Smart Mobility both electronically and in person. I have yet to receive any reasonable response from ARDOT. You would think ARDOT would be interested in the best thinking and solutions but, as stated, they had a plan when they started and do not intend to let the facts get in the way.</p> <p>7. Finally, I believe ARDOT has violated the public trust and the intent of the Federal Highway Administration process by ignoring the citizen’s advisory board (RPAC) of Metroplan and ignoring the overwhelmingly negative public comments received as part of their “public comment” work. ARDOT has</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>employed hundreds of people and spent millions of dollars to “sell” this project in carefully orchestrated “public hearings” to avoid negative feedback and suggestions for alternatives. The fact that the mayors and county judges get their road and bridge funds from ARDOT tells you all you need to know about how the Policy Board of Metroplan will vote. A rubber stamp of Metroplan for ARDOT was not what was intended by the Federal mandate to form a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Metroplan is not functioning as a responsible MPO; especially while ignoring (and now dismantling) RPAC. Little Rock deserves better than the EA put forward by ARDOT. A true Environmental Impact statement is needed that looks at our region as a whole and what has happened racially, economically and demographically as a result of the urban freeways. A comprehensive study will show how we have sacrificed the neighborhoods south and east of 30 and 630 for suburban and bedroom community growth. The stagnation of population growth, decline in property values and the reality of racial red-lining in Little Rock is being perpetuated and increased by the 30 Crossing project.</p> <p>It is not right for Little Rock and a true EIS will bear this out.</p> <p>Sincerely, Tom Fennell 30 7 W. 17th, Little Rock, 72206</p>				
122	<p>I am opposed to the I-30 Crossing program as planned. This is a solution in search of a problem in terms of congestion in the downtown corridor. Congestion in Little Rock is limited to less than an hour of rush hour every week day in the morning and evening hours and the solution should not be limited to building more road space that will be empty for 150 hours a week. In addition to further splitting downtown Little Rock in order to serve commuter traffic for outlying communities, this project will negatively impact local business in the path of construction, isolate areas of downtown currently undergoing restoration and revival, and further negate the positive efforts of alternative forms of transportation (pedestrian, cycling, and mass transit). Our neighborhoods in downtown Little Rock should not bear the enormous impact this will bring to serve the needs of those who choose to only spend their time there during the working hours of the week.</p>	David McWhorter	7/18/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-11, K-5, K-15, J-1, J-2
123	<p>Keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market. Don't build traffic signals on Rock and River Market, keep the 3-way and 4-way stop signs</p>	Henry L Nichols	7/19/2018	Web Form	K-7, K-13
124	<p>As a resident of the downtown area, I am pleading with you to keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market. Do NOT build traffic signals on Rock and River Market, keep the 3-way and 4-way stop signs. It's CRITICAL for our neighborhood merchants and pedestrian safety!!!! PLEASE RECONSIDER!!!</p>	Amy Longo	7/19/2018	Web Form	K-14
125	<p>We are against traffic signals planned for Rock St and 3rd St and River Market St and 3rd St. Keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market. Don't build traffic signals on Rock and River Market, keep the 3-way and 4-way stop signs. This will save the project money and preserve the sense of community for the residents of 300 E Third Tower Building and River Market Tower Building. This is critical for our merchants and residents.</p>	Hardy Winburn	7/19/2018	Web Form	k-5, K-13, K-14, K-15
126	<p>please keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market do not build traffic signals keep the stop signs!!</p>	Clark Rabom	7/19/2018	Web Form	K-7, K-13
127	<p>As a resident of 300 Third Tower in downtown Little Rock, I would like to voice my concerns about the I-30 project that directly affects the street in front of my home. I have three main concerns: 1. I object to the addition of traffic signals at the 3rd Street intersections with Rock and River Market. We like stop and go traffic and don't want a 1/4 mile long drag strip in front of our homes. As it is currently, it is difficult to make a right- or left-hand turn out of our parking deck during rush hour. We rely on the kindness of people to let us out of our garage. I can only imagine how much worse it will get with the</p>	K Shurley	7/19/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-7, K-13, K-15

	<p>influx of cars and a traffic light that will NOT slow them down in front of our building. I implore you to look at an alternative street to reroute traffic; perhaps a street that does not have 150+ houses/residences in a two-block span.</p> <p>2. I want the parking on Third between River Market and Cumberland to remain. It's critical for our merchants and residents.</p> <p>3. I live here! While I understand the desire to make commuting in and out of Little Rock easier, that should not be to the detriment of those that made the deliberate decision to help revitalize downtown Little Rock. I chose to live in downtown Little Rock so that my family could be part of a vibrant, beautiful city. We walk, bike, and take-in all that downtown has to offer from the time the sun goes up until the late evening hours. I simply want to remind those involved in this project to think this..."What if this was my backyard. Would I want [blank] happening here?"</p> <p>I appreciate your time and willingness to listen to the residents and pioneers of the downtown revitalization.</p>				
128	<p>While I seriously doubt whether anyone reads these submittals (I have provided several in the past and have never gotten any acknowledgment of receipt or a reply), I would again like to express my strong disapproval for the conversion of Third Street into a major artery leading into Interstate 30. Third Street is the heart of the downtown residential district. Tree-lined, quiet and pedestrian/pet oriented should be the appropriate goal to be realized by the state highway department, not a unique and well conceived downtown neighborhood will be totally destroyed as a result of an increase in a ridiculous amount of traffic. On street parking is absolutely critical to the residents and businesses in this area, And their quality of life and income, by design, will drop accordingly. Candidly, I wonder whether the states actions rise to the level of an inverse condemnation. How curious that fourth Street is already a well-developed and well-established one-way route, and how curious that we do not simply direct traffic down this already established artery? Does is make too much sense? In any event, your proposed actions, candidly, will justify and support the "poor quality of life" ratings that Little Rock and Arkansas have recently been receiving. Just a curiosity, just to prove that you are reading these comments, it would be interesting if you could send me a simple email with a simple acknowledgment. My email address: ragon@gill-law.com. I would be happy to visit with anybody at any time in order to further discuss my observations. Thank you for your time.</p>	Heartsill Ragon	7/19/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-7, K-13, K-15
129	<p>By the way, I do not consider these auto replies to constitute the acknowledgment that anyone actually read my email. As noted in my email. Would it be interesting if you could somehow actually confirm receipt by a "physical person"?</p> <p>Heartsill Ragon III Gill Ragon Owen, P.A. Little Rock, Arkansas 501-376-3800 (main) 501-801-3810 (direct) ragon@gill-law.com</p>	Heartsill Ragon	7/19/2018	Web Form	Q
130	<p>I am strongly opposed to the changes planned for 3rd Street in downtown Little Rock. I oppose taking out the parking places and making 3rd Street east of Cumberland and major feeder road for I-30. This will greatly impact the local businesses and nearby residents, making this high foot-traffic area much less safe compared to today for all local pedestrians. Businesses on 3rd Street will be hurt by the lack of available parking in the area. I ask to keep the parking on 3rd Street between Cumberland and River Market Streets, and to continue keeping the 3-way and 4-way stop signs presently in place on this street. Please consider changing the proposed plans for making 3rd a major feeder road for downtown LR. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	John Eckart	7/19/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-7, K-13, K-15

131	Little Rock does not need a bigger interstate through our City as suggested. The dollars being put toward this I-30 expansion should be put toward improved arterial roads or incentivizing viable alternative options for transportation other than single-occupancy cars is how this money should be spent, not on expanding an interstate. Other cities are taking down interstates because they have not solved any increased traffic problems like the proposed model is trying to do. Little Rock should learn from other cities' mistakes that were similar sized when they expanded interstates and consider other ways to alleviate future traffic issues, even if they are not traditional road expansions. It's time for us to stop being 20-30 years behind with how we approach these issues.	Lauren Morris	7/19/2018	Web Form	H-6, H-7, H-8, L
132	I oppose widening of the I-30 bridge as described. The traffic on 2nd and 4th streets or adjacent feeder surface streets will be increased many times and will detract from the increasingly desirable River Market and East LR districts. No one will want to be under these freeway lanes. They don't now even though a city park has been proposed. The traffic may get over the bridge a little faster but will back up just farther out. I suggest widening I-30 from I-630 to I-440 and feed the commuter traffic out of town via I-440. This uses a mostly an industrial area. Thank you.	James Britt	7/19/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-5, K-7, K-13, K-15
133	I prefer the 8 lane split diamond but I see that's off the table. Unless the diamond 6 lane alternative is guaranteed to fix the traffic problems, why tear down 6 lanes to put 6 lanes back up? Why not build public transit instead of widening out lanes even farther? The upfront cost is more but it's a lot easier and people will use it from Benton/Bryant, Conway, Cabot and Pine Bluff. This has been mentioned many times before but our backwards way of thinking continues to be build more and more and more and not solve the ultimate problem.	Kent Skiles	7/19/2018	Web Form	G, H-6, I-9
134	Keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market. Don't build traffic signals on Rock and River Market, keep the 3-way and 4-way stop signs.	Elliot Esmaeilpour	7/20/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-7, K-13, K-15
135	This expansion will have a harmful environmental impact on Arkansas. I used to commute to Little Rock for my job. Two years ago, I was given the option to work from home. I have more time to work, and I am actively taking myself out of the dreadful commute from Conway to Little Rock. I am saving money on gas and helping to save the environment. I'd like to see Metroplan and the state of Arkansas put in more corporate incentives to have employees work remotely, work flex hours, or use an improved public transportation system.	Julee Jaeger	7/20/2018	Web Form	I-6
136	I am for building the I-30 Crossing Project. When complete the safe and less interrupted flow of goods and services will be improved and people will be able to go places safer and faster, like to Childrens Hospital in an emergency.	Haskell Dickinson	7/20/2018	Web Form	Q
137	The proposed I-30 widening will have a negative effect on pedestrians like myself who use the area including sidewalks and paths at the underpass. It is already a long stretch of malodorous, roaring loud, unsanitary, and unsightly underpass. The I-30 improvement project should improve the pedestrian and cyclist experience of this area connecting the river front park and Bill Clark wetlands by routing semis (tractor trailers) and other through traffic around the city at I-440, thus reducing noise pollution, exhaust pollution, and bird feces under the I-30 bridge. Have a nice day. Stefie Gold	Stefie Gold	7/20/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-2, K-8
138	Frequent traveler to or through downtown LR and currently plan our travel to avoid mornings from 7-9 and afternoons from 4-6 due to regular stand still traffic during those times. Even worse when an accident. Considerable congestion where I-530 drops to one lane to merge to I-30 and even worse when	Drew Atkinson	7/21/2018	Web Form	M

	630 traffic merges in toward the bridge. Construction of additional lanes seems an annoyance, but is a necessary process.				
139	This job is crucial to our future. Without this project our twin cities will not be able to expand in the most highly congested areas of the state. Everyone that has to travel along the I-30 crossing in its current condition is put through the most unsafe corridor in the state of Arkansas. Everyone's lives depends on this project and its successful and timely completion.	Michael	7/23/2018	Web Form	Q
140	I think ArDOT has done a good job of listening to the people and altering the design to be responsive to the public's concern about the project. In my opinion the design has been much improved by the ArDOT during this process. However, I am concerned about ArDOT's position regarding the cost to move affected Trolley poles. The poles are not a Utility, but part of a transportation system that is being asked to fund a cost brought on by this project, for which there are no funds available! You are a Transportation Department, not just a Highway Department, and this cost should be funded as part of this project.	Paul W Pool	7/23/2018	Web Form	K-14
141	<p>Dear Sir or Madam:</p> <p>The Coalition of Little Rock Neighborhoods heartily supports replacement of the I30 bridge across the Arkansas River, as we have stated previously. However, we strenuously object to the preferred expansion from six lanes to twelve. Nothing prevents another barge accident that again requires a bridge replacement; putting so much of our traffic in a single place risks too much. Your dismissal of adding a bridge at Chester St. failed to take that risk into account, as well as failing to consider other benefits to that approach.</p> <p>Since 2013, the state has made clear its intention to add lanes to resolve the stated problems of the 30 Crossing area, regardless of whether other actions could solve problems. The state letter of 6/17/2016 flatly demanded Metroplan officials support the added lanes, and said that if that was not forthcoming, officials would get nothing for a bridge replacement or to address defects in the original construction of this interstate. Federal policy calls for fairness among all approaches considered, which has been lacking. The state analysis refers to needed future expansion of I630, as well as at the Baseline Rd. junction with I30, but then fails to include those expansions in cost estimates, or impacts to be anticipated. That is an overwhelming flaw in state planning to date, and now is the time to rectify that with an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).</p> <p>One is badly needed, to take into account major impacts and possible damage to frontage road homes, and businesses, as well as the downtown commercial district, and historic structures. Dollar cost and benefit analysis is needed throughout this plan, and the alternatives rejected by the state. Federal highway regulations cite "segmentation" as a problem to be avoided, in which needs are found throughout a corridor but issues are discussed for only a segment of the whole. The federal policy notes "staged construction" would be suitable, once the entire corridor was identified and analyzed; however, related improvements should be evaluated as one project. Coalition members want such an evaluation. Nor does the state proposal take into account the Induced Demand to be anticipated, when motorists are attracted to this newest stretch of highway, and how that will stimulate more suburban growth, typically. Forecasting the same residential growth near the corridor in all alternatives fails to take that known outcome into account.</p> <p>The state has concluded that, for 30 Crossing to be fully implemented, expansions will be required at I630 and Baseline Rd. Today's paving may stay inside your Right-Of-Way; we cannot expect that along I630. What choices will be made MacArthur Park? Or at Broadway and I630, where Mt. Holly Cemetery faces the Mosaic Templars structure? What choices will be made at Chester St. and I630, where the historic Dreamland ballroom faces Philander Smith College? Will the route at I630 and Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd, between Ark. Children's Hospital and the state Capitol grounds, bring traffic lanes up to monuments and the Ark. Supreme Court Building? What is the cumulative impact on I630 neighborhoods such as Capitol View-Stift Station, or Forest Hills, in terms of noise and air pollution, etc.?</p> <p>The summary asserts this proposal "would have a positive effect on the local and regional economy"</p>	Little Rock – Coalition of Neighborhoods	7/23/2018	Web Form	R

	<p>without any supporting study. Regrettably ignored is the negative impact that would be likely to affect Ninth St. structures, as well as Fourth St. structures, from the loss of free parking on the street, and in parking lots, for example, if your proposal was to be built as planned. Lacking is the cost estimate to be paid by others for this plan, such as \$455,000 to the street car system if this plan was implemented. What will employers pay for new parking?</p> <p>Once vehicles leave your pavement, and are fire-hosed onto city streets, that becomes the problem of municipal officials and budgets. Our city has nothing to pay for handling such loads, such as those four additional traffic lights in the state proposal. That green space left behind after removing the existing Hwy. 10 interchange would also be a municipal responsibility; no state funding will be provided for any park in that area, your documents make clear. There's no city money for any park there, either.</p> <p>A troubling omission is the No-Action Alternative in charts where it shows the best result; one example is Appendix B of Appendix A, Table 12, on page 59 (epage 335/3992). Likely, this alternative would have the best result of all – if included. Federal Fairness Standards call for all possible actions to be shown together and analyzed on the same basis. An EIS is needed to achieve this.</p> <p>Information is offered on noise pollution where mitigation is proposed, but not for areas where noise barriers were actionable, yet rejected for some reason; the public should have ALL this information.</p> <p>What's the cost to the community from construction delays in travel times and obstructions along this corridor for the years this will be under construction? Provide an EIS.</p> <p>The proposal says less than 20 percent of corridor traffic is through traffic, yet it devotes 60 percent of the lanes for through traffic. The remainder gets four lanes in future compared to six lanes today. The suburban commuter motorist outweighs local traffic; furthermore, this proposal displaces minority and low-income residents of the corridor so that majority population commuters can move more quickly through these areas. The Coalition objects to this.</p> <p>The study uses the River Market and Clinton Presidential Library as destinations when accessibility is considered, yet these sit adjacent to the corridor, tilting the beneficial result. Major employers such as UAMS are identified, yet are a distance away, and not part of the accessibility analysis. Provide an EIS.</p> <p>Yours Truly, Kathy Wells President</p>				
142	<p>I-30 corridor. I am against enlarging the interstate to any more lanes. I think the bridge in question does need to be replaced and minor fixes made to the highway that already exists. Enlarging to 10 lanes is short sighted and a huge mistake. Do not do this. There is a better way and the DOT doesn't seem to be listening.</p>	Jan Baker	7/23/2018	Web Form	I-9
143	<p>I have listed a few reasons why we need to move ahead with the I30 Crossing Project.</p> <p>We need to make sure that we ease congestion through the 530-630-40-67 Corridor on I30. It is already congested everyday at 4:00 PM. If there is a wreck on the bridge it is near impossible for emergency vehicles to access the incident due to space limitations. A lot of the entrance and exit ramps along this route are spaced and laid out in a way that makes navigation complex and difficult.</p> <p>We need to improve this area to assist commuters and the transportation of goods and services both for today and the future.</p>	Thomas Dickinson	7/23/2018	Web Form	Q
144	<p>Yes, the I-30 River Bridge is 60 years old, and needs to be replaced, before we have a catastrophic failure like the one on I-35 in Minneapolis. Yes, the ramps from I-630 onto I-30 were obsolete the day they opened. And, yes, traffic on I-30 gets backed up on weekday mornings and evenings, though, if you are eastbound on 30 in the morning, by the time you get to the NLR Broadway exit, the bottleneck magically clears. But none of that justifies the 10-lane monstrosity that is contemplated. Widening this road to 10 lanes uses the same logic used by someone who is gaining weight - get a longer belt and bigger pants - and I am unconvinced, with the rise of telecommuting and other socioeconomic changes that will keep people closer to their homes, that the traffic projections for this corridor are anywhere close to reality.</p>	Mark W. Riley	7/23/2018	Web Form	I-6, I-9, L

	<p>This colossal amount of money would be better spent putting a roundabout in at Asher and University, the most dangerous intersection in the state, and building I-49 from Index, through Ashdown, up to De Queen. Having lived in that area for a number of years, I know that people are literally dying on the stretch of US 71 that runs down to Texarkana. Completing I-49 to Fort Smith will produce significant economic activity, in a part of the state that desperately needs a boost, instead of lining the pockets of developers in Central Arkansas with this I-30 horror, which will destroy the River Market District and Argenta, which are only now beginning to fulfill their real economic promise.</p>				
145	<p>Although I think the whole project should be completely revised my comment is ONLY directed at the proposed revision of the traffic patterns on 3rd street from Cumberland to the current freeway. This whole area (River Market) is basically residential and entertainment with the 2 largest residential buildings in downtown located on 3rd street. One building's (300 3rd) ONLY entrance is directly on 3rd street. To make 3rd street a main artery to the new freeway is going to totally destroy the residential atmosphere currently present. People using this area will be at a much greater risk of being injured by a passing vehicle driven by someone whose only reason for driving on 3rd is to get to the freeway. I think a better answer is to totally rethink the removal of the "Cantrell ' ramp. This way the whole area which is north of 9th street and east of Cumberland and the current freeway can retain its neighborhood feeling which will further help the return of downtown Little Rock to its former status as a "community" where people can work, play and live without having to use a vehicle for transportation. Please DON'T turn 3rd street into a mimi freeway which people will be afraid to cross for fear they will be injured. In addition people living in 300 3rd building will have an almost impossible ability of getting into or out of the building especially during rush hours. Find an alternative that can KEEP the residential flavor of 3rd street rather than destroying it. Leave the traffic pattern just as it is between Cumberland and the freeway (ie---no lights and parking on the street).</p>	H T Larzelere	7/23/2018	Web Form	D, G, I-5, K-15
146	<p>I think the split diamond alternative will be the best solution for downtown Little Rock. When the contractor is selected, what assurances after all the hard won negotiated details will prevent the contractor from choosing and different design during the design-build process? Has there been progress negotiating with the finalists regarding this issue? If the street grid is better connected downtown, why is the "Texas U-turn" still in the design? Wouldn't it be wasted money? Have all the issues regarding the streetcar been resolved so both cities will be able to keep our tourist draw intact? I very much enjoyed the cross section renderings, they provide a clearer picture in more locations than the original animation. Thank you.</p>	Kathleen A Lambert	7/23/2018	Web Form	P, K-15
147	<p>I sometimes drive I630 to I30 to I 67/167. If I drive during rush hour, between 5:15 to 5:45 PM, the trip takes about 8 minutes longer than if I drive outside of those times. The amount of disruption and delays during construction will easily surpass this excess time of travel during 'rush hour'. Metro Little Rock is not expected to grow any faster than about 2% - 3% per year. Building for a capacity that we are not going to reach for decades is a waste. Yes, replace the bridge. It's time. Don't tear up our downtown needlessly.</p>	NELL MATTHEWS	7/23/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-11
148	<p>I am in favor of the ArDOT's preferred alternative, the 6-lane with collector/distributor lanes and split diamond interchange. In addition to increasing vehicular safety and planning for projected population growth, this configuration will provide better pedestrian connectivity both east-west and north-south by removing the cloverleaf exit ramps on either side of I-30 between Clinton Ave. and 3rd St., as well as the 3-block long exit ramp running east-west between 2nd and 3rd from I-30 to Cumberland (the "Highway 10 Interchange"). All of this concrete - around 15 acres - will be replaced with green space that the city can then upgrade to a series of parks in the heart of our River Market District. Additionally, with the removal of the Highway 10 Interchange, vehicles will no longer be dumped from the interstate onto Cumberland to fly through the pedestrian-heavy Clinton Avenue intersection at high speeds. Removing this interchange will also shift traffic patterns since, without direct access to</p>	Lynn Wright	7/23/2018	Web Form	Q

	<p>Highway 10, there will be less of an incentive to exit downtown if your ultimate destination is a point further west. For all of these reasons, I am supportive of the plan as presented.</p>				
<p>149</p>	<p>As a 15-year resident of the MacArthur Park area, I am horrified at the thought of what is about to be done to my neighborhood and to downtown Little Rock by the greediness of construction alliances and the transitory desires of those who choose not to live in Little Rock. Rather than taking a proactive, forward-looking approach to improving all forms of travel and general life in this city, the Highway Department and its allies are taking an insanely expensive, short-sighted approach that benefits only the pockets of those securing contracts while destroying a vibrant downtown just coming into its own. An Environmental Impact Statement is needed to consider this proposal's full impact on I-30/I-630/intersecting roads, including the full length of I-630 and the area from downtown Little Rock to past the I-430 intersection of I-30. The current information fails to take into account the full impact of this proposed monstrosity. Of particular importance is that this will require the expansion of I-630, further destroying neighborhoods just now starting to thrive after the initial construction of that highway and threatening MacArthur Park itself, the Arkansas Arts Center, and the UALR Bowen School of Law – all anchors of this community.</p> <p>While the I-30 Arkansas River bridge needs replacing – and that alone will disrupt downtown life and traffic for several years – to force the expansion of lanes as proposed on I-30 will destroy a growing downtown area, full of historic structures, expanding residential areas, and thriving small businesses. This will force people to avoid downtown for three to four years, starving that growth and encouraging the abandonment of plans and current buildings. All of this to reduce a very few minutes of commute time for those who choose to live elsewhere and not support our downtown community. Other than greed, why? It certainly does not serve this community! The studies show that only 20 per cent of I-30 traffic is through traffic; there are much better ways for that 20 per cent and commuters to navigate this area, like one or two additional bridges at Chester Street and to the east closer to the airport. But those options are not included or considered – how shortsighted!</p> <p>The proposed park/green space at the current Cantrell/I-30 access point is madness. You will make it very difficult for downtown residents and those coming from I-30 to move west on a major highway. It will force more surface street traffic in congested area with no real alternatives for accommodating that inflow. It will increase the danger for pedestrians and bike traffic. It will deter people from the Rivermarket, the East Village, and growing downtown business sectors. It will decrease available parking that is convenient to those points of interest. Shades of the downtown mall area of years ago – ugh.</p> <p>No place in Arkansas needs 12 lanes of traffic, much less the Little Rock downtown area. Induced demand tells you that (hello, Houston). It's simply insane. A forward-thinking proposal would look at including alternate routes and avoiding as much disruption of the community as possible. This approach, from the beginning, has failed to consider the impact on the residents and businesses of downtown Little Rock. Our voices have not been heard. Those who will live with the construction and its consequences are being ignored. If implemented, we will suffer for four years with noise, dust, more accidents, less ingress/egress, and still have traffic jams at rush hour. Displacing low-income and minority residents in favor of commuters, who chose where they live, needs to stop. A little common sense would go a long way here, e.g., two new bridges easing the commuting with alternative approaches. saving residents and businesses from the proposed madness, and benefiting all concerned.</p> <p>I oppose the current proposal and urge reconsideration with appropriate weight given to the negative impact on downtown residents and businesses, the threat to historic structures and community life, and the future cost of maintaining this proposed horror show and its required expansion of other intersecting roads. Do a true EIS and reconsider the approach.</p>	<p>Regena Sanders</p>	<p>7/23/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>H-3, I-5, I-9, K-5, K-15</p>

150	I was wondering if there is a planned project timeline or schedule available for the above referenced project.	Hannah Derriso	7/23/2018	Web Form	O
151	This project, as proposed, will have a negative impact on so many different aspects of Little Rock and its vibrant downtown. So much time, energy, and emotion has gone into trying to make downtown a great place to live and work. Expanding I-30 will only set up back and we may never be able to recoup from this. A park under a massive bridge is not somewhere I want to relax. Please reconsider your approach. I am against the current proposal.	Lindsey Boerner	7/23/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15
152	<p>The highway department does discriminate. It follows the national pattern of routing urban interstates through low income and minority neighborhoods disrupting them and degrading their quality of life. The highway department has noted the presence of lead in soils adjacent to urban interstates. These soils will be distributed with any construction putting this lead back into the air to drift. There are no plans to assay the damage this causes or to mitigate it. The highway department relies on air quality monitoring stations distant from the urban interstates to reassure all that air pollution from automobiles is not a significant problem. Monitoring should be conducted roadside between citizens and the source of the pollution. Relying on distant monitoring stations is incorrect and invalid risking harm to citizens living near interstates.</p> <p>The highway department standards for noise pollution were written by the department. They are self serving. There are set far too high based on false assumptions. The normal noise levels in an urban environment are well known. The highway department should use these levels as normal. Any excess noise due to urban interstates should be eliminated with new construction.</p> <p>Addition of more lanes of impervious concrete will increase the frequency and severity of flash floods off the highway department right of way.</p>	Robert C Walker	7/23/2018	Web Form	R
153	All public comments must be made available for the public to read and digest! The widening of I-30 will not solve the morning and evening rush hour congestion (example: the I-430/640 reconfiguration transferred the morning congestion to I-630, at Baptist Hospital and the John Barrow exit; the evening congestions are in the same locations as pre-reconfiguration). Rush hour congestion is not going to go away (it will when most of the vehicles on the road are autonomously driven), and Little Rock is not the only city in the world with congestion. A more progressive solution to our problem could become a blueprint for other cities to incorporate. The congestion is caused by too many people using the same road surface area at the same time, with each person having their own driving agenda. Alternative ideas: 1) public education (why a change in driving behavior and attitude can alleviate a portion of the congestion); 2) I-75/71 in the Covington/Cincinnati area uses electronic billboards to advise drivers as to the current optimum driving speed, and how many minutes it will take to arrive at the next three exits (Dallas, Texas has a simpler program). We have the capability to electronically count the cars exiting and entering the congested areas, and with this data being able to determine the current optimum driving speed and post arrival time information; 3) during the morning and evening congestion, lower the speed limit (lower vehicular speed decreases the amount of serious accidents); 4) find employers, that can maintain their	Kurtis F Priebe	7/23/2018	Web Form	I-6

	current level of goods and services, while staggering work schedules (even a 15% change will decrease congestion; 1/3 start at 8:30am, 1/3 at 9:00, and 1/3 at 9:30). From an environmental viewpoint, the expansion of I-30 will decrease the planet's current amount of green space (cooling effect; just ask the cows) and increase the square footage of steel, cement, and asphalt. Each of these materials absorb the sun's energy. I have people perform the following exercise at my garden: in full sun, at three in the afternoon, standing bare foot, stand on the grass for as long as you can, then move another twelve inches onto the cement, standing until your feet hurt, then move another twelve inches onto the asphalt. I then have them repeat the same exercise at ten at night. It is time we accept the fact that human activity has affected changes in weather patterns, and we can alleviate a percentage of our mistakes. The above alternative ideas will cost much less than the proposed action, and will be more planet friendly.				
154	No-Action Repair Existing as Needed. There are two bypass Highways going around Little Rock off I-40 which is adequate for travelers going south. People going to work in Little Rock, the congestion for one hour is not a big problem. Most of the congestion is caused by wrecks and adding more lanes will not solve this problem, Sometimes it is good to keep part of the past, everything does not have to be in the fast lane especially old downtown-slow down and enjoy the past.	Dennis Long	7/23/2018	Web Form	H-2, H-4, I-9
155	Build it!	Steve Kincheloe	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
156	This is a much needed project to improve traffic and safety for those commuters traveling into downtown from areas north and south of Little Rock. The real stakeholders are those who actually use the Interstate for commerce and travel not the vocal minority who are solely interested in their own interests Downtown.	Gary Brown	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
157	I've been against this since it came up 2 years ago. I only hope someone is listening, and maybe watching NWA to get an idea of how to attract talent, business, etc. HINT: it's not because of 8 lane highways. Induced demand is real, and I don't understand why Arkansas decision makers are ignorant to that fact.	Tina Mitchell	7/24/2018	Web Form	K-1, I-10
158	Little Rock and North Little Rock have a great opportunity to upgrade the highway system on the I-30 and I-40 corridors. The 30 Crossing Project is a much needed project that will allow local and through commuters the ability to travel with ease. It will provide the much needed additional capacity to ease congestion and travel times. It will also upgrade other components of the facility and be a centerpiece for the community. I fully support the Department and the Project and I am excited to see not only the change that the project will bring, but also the job opportunities for local residents.	Matt Shepherd	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
159	I am 100% for the updating of the highway but ruining our Rivermarket is not an option. We have worked hard for the last 15 years getting folks to come to downtown on both sides of the river. Our cities culture has completely changed with the number of folks who daily exercise on our pedestrian bridges and Rivertrail. Our city is still an undiscovered treasure for many folks in the US. Why would we want to move folks through downtown rapidly. Also do we really need to widen the bridge, for the most part our traffic moves very good in comparison to other cities in the south. I think we need to continue to promote alternative travel options, "Close the loop" in Little Rock and finally complete our Rivertrail, expand the Trolley line to the (1) airport, (2) Park Hill (3) to the Heights. If the trolley actually went somewhere people would use as areal source of commuting . A connector from the airport would be huge and open up the east end of the city. The big massive project in LR in my opinion is really not needed.	Stephen Bentley	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-6, I-5, K-7, K-15

160	<p>This has to be the worst idea ever floated by the highway department. We can't keep doing things the same way we always have. Our love affair with the car and making drivers commute quicker at the expense of everyone else has to end. This project certainly will not end the rush hour traffic in Little Rock and will negatively impact the pedestrian and bicycle friendly community we need to be focused on building. Just don't do it!</p>	Frank Kelly	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-9
161	<p>Thank you for reviewing public comments on the proposed I-30 expansion. I am against the proposed expansion, primarily for the following reasons. 1) The expansion will increase traffic in downtown Little Rock to five times the current level. This will have a negative influence on the attractiveness of downtown for tourists residences and businesses. 2) The increase in traffic will make downtown unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. 3) Downtown will be overwhelmed by increased traffic, creating traffic jams, noise and air pollution. 4) Little Rock has invested a lot of money revitalizing downtown so that it is an attractive place to work, live and play. Turning it into a highway will likely eliminate, or greatly reduce, the progress that has been made over the past many years. 5) Diverting traffic to downtown will harm, possibly ruin, Little Rock's plan for a BikeShare program in Little Rock. 6) Little Rock has a wonderful cycling community and network of cycling paths and downtown Little Rock is a very important part of the network of bike paths. Diverting an enormous amount of traffic into downtown will greatly reduce the positive impact that our network of cycling paths has on central Arkansas (This includes the Big Dam Bridge and Two Rivers). It will also make it much harder to complete the loop of cycling paths by including a continuous path along the Little Rock side of the Arkansas River. 7) There are alternative solutions to the long-term needs of our highway system that have been effectively implemented in other cities. Why would we want to unnecessarily damage the progress that has been made in downtown Little Rock? 8) The infrastructure of downtown Little Rock cannot accommodate five times more traffic.</p>	Robert Corwyn	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-7, I-5, J-2, K-7, K-13, K-15
162	<p>This highway widening is idiotic. The Clinton Library and the new developments in the East Village are tourism assets that will be distanced from the heart of our municipality if this widening happens. We need to be developing ways to connect these parts of town via greenways and other pedestrian friendly avenues. Other cites like Atlanta have seen favorable economic growth in commercial developments along greenways. Just look at Ponce City Market and the incredible success of the Atlanta Beltline Eastside Trail! Wouldn't it be great to see a flourishing community in the heart of Little Rock rather than building a larger highway to shuttle people to the suburbs and other communities to live???</p>	Charles Wyrick	7/24/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15
163	<p>I am appalled at this pointless waste of my tax dollars I voted for to be used as yet another vast cash cow for outsiders to suck up, our state is pretty much 50th in everything, the last thing we need is more dirty stupid roads, please invest in schools, hospitals, free health clinics, housing the homeless, small business's (real ones) not fake big business scams, business incubators, how about some public pools, new shop fronts, rent controlled workshops etc etc</p>	Andrew Cains	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-9, L
164	<p>I am a 34-year resident of downtown Little Rock. I retired three years ago from my position as a Vice President of the National Audubon Society; I served as Vice President/Executive Director for the state of Arkansas. Because of my work, I am experienced with large and complicated projects that require a great deal of public input and planning. I have been involved in the I-30 Crossing planning since</p>	Ellen Fennell	7/24/2018	Web Form	R

<p>October 2015.</p> <p>I am a member of Improve 30-Crossing, a Facebook page comprised of some 1,700 citizens that have over the past two years engaged in informal and formal study and discussion of traffic planning, the evolution of freeways in cities, including: interstate removal, economic benefits of urban density, making city streets safe for bikers and pedestrians, and other topics vital to discerning the best approach to the I-30 Crossing challenge. I would encourage you to look at the Improve 30Crossing FB page if you wish to see the full extent of the online community's involvement in this process and people's frustration with ARDOT's handling of I-30 expansion plans. I was among a small group of citizens who, under the aegis of the Arkansas Public Policy Panel, raised funds to hire a nationally known traffic consultant, Norman Marshall, of Smart Mobility, Inc., to study ARDOT's traffic modeling and analysis (phase 1) and to provide alternative recommendations for I-30 Crossing (phase 2). These studies may be found on the Arkansas Public Policy Panel website www.arpanel.org. Our citizens group has gone to considerable trouble and expense based on our perception that ARDOT was determined not to listen to us, nor would they provide any palatable alternatives to a massive interstate expansion in the city's urban core. We also suspected that ARDOT's numbers and analysis might not hold up under scrutiny. (This proved true; as one example, they refused to say that Induced Demand is even real.) Compounding these problems was the browbeating and intimidation of local officials (city board, mayors, county judge and MetroPlan) by ARDOT. Future projects would not be backed by ARDOT for any who opposed their massive expansion; they said it verbally and in writing. ARDOT has NEVER RESPONDED to alternatives put forward, such as Tom Fennell's Boulevard Plan and Norm Marshall's public comment and analysis which has been both hand delivered to ARDOT and submitted electronically. Egregious steamrolling of the public and local officials by ARDOT has taken place at many levels and at many junctures of this process, failing the Cooperative test.</p> <p>First and most importantly, ARDOT has not offered any palatable alternatives to their massive expansion plans, only offering, initially, an 8-lane expansion as opposed to a 10-lane expansion. Then at later meetings offering a 10-12 lane expansion. We, the public, asked that they study the possibility of solving I-30 congestion using an Enhanced 6-lane plan, within the parameters of Metroplan's Imagine Central Arkansas. (A Chester Street, or Bond Street Bridge, along with serious beefing up of arterials and use of freeways ringing the city for through traffic makes this a feasible solution. Chester Street could be made a highway and the land needed is for sale presently.) This study has never been done by ARDOT. To add multiple layers of confusion, after the initial meeting, ARDOT rolled out a 12-lane plan that they started calling a "6 plus 4," thereby misleading the public with both their language, and by not saying how many lanes the plan actually included.</p> <p>At the April 26, 2016 meeting, ARDOT provided a platform to an all-volunteer group of young design professionals for a 30 minute presentation on how the proposed Crossing could be dressed up. It was unclear to the audience that none of the amenities would be funded by ARDOT and that any improvements would be the City's responsibility, also any congestion on city streets likely to be caused by ARDOT's mammoth freeway as it dumps into the heart of the city.</p> <p>At the same meeting, ARDOT denied the public the opportunity to ask questions of the presenters and instead herded participants into a large room across the hall that contained multiple confusing exhibits. Again, not a cooperative tactic. This is the same tactic they used at this most recent meeting. Herd people into a room to look at exhibits, where questions cannot be asked and answered in a group setting. Not a public hearing or comment opportunity at all. The comment form that meeting goers were given to fill out at initial public meetings offered several multiple-lane build options, the only other option being a No Build. There was no explanation of what No Build meant or represented. Did it mean no bridge replacement? No one knew. So communication appeared to be designed on many levels to keep the public from getting questions answered, confuse the public as to the true nature of what was being proposed and to shut down the study of any alternatives not blessed by ARDOT.</p> <p>ARDOT has been overheard at meetings threatening local officials with the loss of funding for decades to other regions of the state. At the first meeting we attended, Director Scott Bennett, told the public, "We are not going to cram anything down anyone's throat." Yet, officials have been told if Little Rock does not</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

	<p>acquiesce, ARDOT will take all their funding to Northwest Arkansas. He again made this threat in an April 16, 2017 letter to Metroplan.</p> <p>Due to the size, expense and nature of the project (in the heart of Little Rock’s urban, primarily minority and historic urban core), ARDOT should be conducting an Environmental Impact Statement that will consider all ramifications from this massive project. ARDOT has not taken a comprehensive look at the project and, in fact, does not have the funding in hand to adequately address the problems the expansion will create. The expansion they propose will create bottlenecks outside of the extremely short 6.7-mile “project area.” These bottlenecks will require “fixing” in the next few years. So, after initial great expense, AHTD is planning to come back to ask for even more money to fix the new bottlenecks they created with this “fix”. The cost of this by their estimation has been estimated at \$4 billion. This is a perfect example of segmentation of the project. ARDOT has NOT studied the impacts on the entire area that will be affected by this 7-mile “fire hose” that will burst onto arterials outside of that segment producing traffic congestion that ARDOT will be forced to come back and fix later. Please make ARDOT present an environmental impact statement on the full \$4 Billion project.</p> <p>The city, sadly, seems largely unaware of the severe congestion problems that massive freeway expansion will foist on downtown streets. ARDOT however, will be long gone, leaving the city to deal with these problems with inadequate resources. This does not meet the Cooperative nor the Comprehensive test. Norman Marshall of Smart Mobility, Inc., has pointed out errors in methods of calculations of traffic projections by ARDOT. It appears that ARDOT came up with what they wanted, then fiddled with the traffic projections to back up the design they had already picked. If we had not hired Smart Mobility, no one would have ever known the difference, something we believe ARDOT was counting on. Norm Marshall’s two study documents pointing out errors in modeling have as yet, not been addressed by ARDOT.</p> <p>The pressure on Metroplan to drop their 6-lane highway policy so ARDOT can ram their I-30 Crossing plan through has been shameful. Decades of conscientious work by Metroplan with laborious input by many citizens is being thrown out in ARDOT’s rush to embrace a 1960’s solution to urban congestion. Metroplan was steamrolled by ARDOT, as are the citizens who have tried to counsel a more moderate and fact-based approach to the problem of urban congestion in our town.</p> <p>Additionally, it is clear from ARDOT’s choice of an EA rather than an EIS that they are unwilling to look at the impact on our low-income neighborhoods, our minority areas, our parks and our health. I respectfully urge you to ensure that federal dollars are not wasted in a project that will damage Little Rock and the Central Arkansas area while not solving our traffic congestion problems.</p> <p>I also urge you to make ARDOT accountable through performance of an EIS.</p>				
165	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.</p>	Kristi Barr	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
166	<p>As a member of the Quapaw Quarter Association, downtown Little Rock's premier and oldest historic conservation association, I am posting this commentary.</p> <p>Arkansas Blog Archives RSS</p> <p>Quapaw Quarter Association joins concerns about I-30 project Posted By Max Brantley on Thu, Nov 12, 2015 at 8:51 AM click to enlarge qqa_logo.jpg</p> <p>The venerable Quapaw Quarter Association — which worked to preserve historic neighborhoods downtown against enormous odds — has joined the chorus urging smarter thinking about the project to alter Interstate 30 through downtown. In short: They cannot be “pro-interstate.” Neighborhoods are at</p>	Ellen Fennell	7/24/2018	Web Form	G, K-5, I-1, J-2, K-2, K-11, M, K-13

<p>risk. More planning is necessary. The major exit from I-30 at 2nd, particularly, needs more study. (Even if City Director Lance Hines thinks the Highway Department knows better.) Here's the QQA's statement: The 30 Crossing project is not, strictly speaking, a historic preservation issue. As far as we presently are aware, no significant historic resources would be directly affected by the project. However, the project almost certainly would have an impact on redevelopment efforts east of Interstate 30 in Little Rock, an area in which the Quapaw Quarter Association has a vested interest as owner of the Woodruff House. In addition, 30 Crossing brings with it a wide array of design and quality-of-life issues that would affect the Quapaw Quarter - and the City as a whole - for decades to come. Consequently, the Quapaw Quarter Association offers its perspective: As historic preservationists who have witnessed firsthand the destructive and divisive impact interstate highways have had on cities across the country, we cannot be "pro-interstate." There can be no doubt that the interstate highway program was poorly conceived when it came to routing interstates through cities, and Little Rock has suffered accordingly. History reflects that in past generations, many state and city leaders wrote off areas east of Interstate 30 and south of Interstate 630 as the "bad" parts of town, best separated from the rest of the city by concrete barriers. Ideally, these barriers would come down, and our city could be knitted back together. However, it is our belief - after meetings with highway officials and city leaders, as well as much discussion - that there is very little chance the interstates will be removed entirely from the heart of downtown Little Rock. Given that belief, we consider it critical to be involved in guiding the 30 Crossing project so that it has the least possible detrimental impact on the Quapaw Quarter and is designed with features that might even be viewed as positive. As an organization committed to the preservation and revitalization of historic places in Little Rock, we believe any major undertaking like this should focus on getting people to downtown Little Rock, not through it; enhancing safety; and repairing as much of the physical divide created by I-30 and I-630 as possible. Some traffic congestion in an urban area should be accepted as a fact of life. In addition, research suggests that transportation innovations will lead to fewer, not more, cars driving through and into Little Rock in years to come. We hope that the following factors will be addressed before the 30 Crossing project is finalized: Consider all options to enhance safety Repair of the I-30 bridge should be seen as an opportunity to design the best possible solution to safety and traffic concerns in downtown Little Rock. While most are not fatal, this stretch of I-30 has a high number of accidents. Those travelling this route would benefit from better-designed interchanges and on and off ramps. Preferably, these safety issues can be addressed without widening the Interstate footprint so much that it will trigger construction and widenings in Little Rock and central Arkansas for many years to come. We look forward to learning the results of the NEPA process evaluation of an eight lane option. Repair divide between east and west All streets that currently connect the east and west sides of I-30 need to remain open. The connections should be enhanced to encourage pedestrian and bicycle traffic in addition to vehicular traffic. Noise should be reduced along the corridor, and, in particular, where roads will pass under the Interstate. The Hanger Hill area has struggled since the construction of I-30, and is now seeing renewed interest and investment in spite of it. One issue the neighborhood faces daily is the 15th Street exit off I-630 that allows drivers to exit, cut through the neighborhood at high speeds on College Street, and enter I-30 further north. The high speeds at which they travel on College Street create constant safety concerns for local residents. This problem needs to be addressed, but a 15th Street exit should remain open for use by residents and local businesses. Design and prepare for transportation innovations Many people and organizations have worked very hard to revitalize downtown and surrounding neighborhoods, and they will continue to do so. Nationwide, people are driving less and moving back to vibrant urban areas. Perhaps fewer lanes for through traffic would accommodate future needs and encourage drivers to take other routes around downtown. If collector distributor lanes are built at grade and integrated with the existing street grid, we believe the</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>visual impact of ten lanes through downtown would be lessened. Ideally, the final plan would be such that future construction work, which would further disrupt life and commerce downtown, could be avoided.</p> <p>Minimize disruptions during construction</p> <p>Even if all goes according to plan, we understand that the construction phase of this project is scheduled to last a minimum of four full years, beginning in 2017 or 2018 and running through the end of 2021. If not planned and staged thoughtfully to minimize disruptions to the downtown area, the project could possibly slow or halt downtown's renaissance, particularly east of I-30, at a critical time for Little Rock. We urge AHTD, with input from city government and other stakeholders, to work hard to avoid harming the very good things happening throughout the downtown area.</p> <p>We are specifically opposed to the pairing of Second and Fourth Streets as the "off and on- ramps" for downtown Little Rock. A better solution must be found for the problems associated with the intersection of La Harpe Boulevard, President Clinton Avenue, and Cumberland Street. We favor the idea of a design charrette drawing upon local talent.</p> <p>We are encouraged by AHTD's continued discussions with the public and stakeholders and with the recent changes to the plan in response to local concerns. The Quapaw Quarter Association urges the continuation of these discussions until all parties with a vested interest in downtown are satisfied</p>				
167	<p>I support the ArDot's preferred configuration for the I-30 river crossing, six lanes and the split diamond exchange. I have served on the Board and Executive Committee of the Little Rock Downtown Partnership and closely followed the planning for the construction of the new I-30 crossing and related traffic lanes. The new plan will add green space, assist pedestrian connectivity along and under the freeway and will certainly be beneficial to the increasing number of downtown residents, businesses and visitors from out of town. This will be accomplished along with needed increase in vehicular safety for those entering the city and passing through the city. Again, I strongly support the plans of the ArDOT.</p>	A. Wyckliff Nisbet, Jr.	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
168	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.</p>	Derrell Hartwick	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
169	<p>https://drive.google.com/file/d/16dwCH7YifIs11o6m0i_I0lyalOSzF25U/view PDF from Quapaw Quater Association. Comment on I-30 submitted by QQA member, Ellen Fennell.</p>	Ellen Fennell	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-1, J-2, K-7, K-3
170	<p>I oppose the current 30 Crossing proposal as a waste of taxpayer dollars that will bring increased congestion to Little Rock and Central Arkansas, result in overbuilding highway capacity in a time of declining growth of car ownership (owing to ride-sharing and eventual autonomous vehicles). Google the video on disruption by Tony Seba to see what is likely to happen if such projects materialize: huge investments will be stranded by this overcapacity, but taxpayers will be burdened by the costs that are going to be sunk into them if this goes forward as planned. I completely agree with the comments submitted by Tom Fennell.</p>	Walter Nixon	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-6 ,I-9, L
171	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, while also simultaneously increasing vehicular safety.</p>	Jay Chesshir	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q

172	am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with splitdiamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	JAY STANLEY,SR	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
173	I support ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with splitdiamond interchange. This will be a good addition to downtown's green space and pedestrian walkways. I think giving this plan a chance to work will make the area even more viable than it is presently.	Elizabeth Small	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
174	I am against this project as it's been proposed. The scale of the project is too big, it's purpose to keep rush hour moving can be accomplished by other means than a giant highway going through an area that has struggled to be viable in the past, has made great strides that all will be lost with this expensive project that does not help Little Rock, it will not even help those who only want to drive through Little Rock faster because of indused demand. The cost of this unnecessary project is too high, it causes there to be bottle necks that will need to be widened overtime, costing more. The projected growth of the central Arkansas are does not support a need for this project. The landscape of our struggling city will be changed forever and in a negative way. We need a more indepth study to accurately access the effects of building this monster highway through our city, especially when through traffic could be routed around the city. Sincerely, India Cheairs	India	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-6, I-9, I-13, K-1, K-5, K-15, L
175	I am against the I30 Crossing project. 1. An Enviornmental Impact Statement should be done to evaluate the cumulative impact of enlarging I30 and I630 instead of evaluating the projects segment by segment. Little Rock is the historic capital city of the state not a "Kum-n-Go" for suburbanites. This project will negatively affect the tax base of our city. 2. A new 6 lane bridge is needed at I30 and a 4 lane bridge at Chester to better disperse traffic. Traffic should be encouraged to by-pass Little Rock by driving I440. Arterial roads like 12th street and Roosevelt should be better utilized. Roosevelt, a state highway, is unsafe and a disgrace to ARDOT. 3. I have to been to several of the ARDOT meetings and have seen the manipulation of the public and of the "information" fed to the public. I will never vote for a CAP tax again. I would vote for mass transit in the future. In closing, it is time for ARDOT to become the Department of Transportation that plans for an environmentally safe transportation network.	Susan Chambers	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-3, H-6, I-12, N-2
176	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. We need more green space and less concrete!	Autumn Wilder	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
177	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety. It is long overdue and it's time to move ahead with this project. LR needs to begin a new chapter on our downtown freeway system.	Daryl Coker	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
178	The widening of I-30 is not beneficial to Downtown Little Rock and will create an unsafe corridor for alternate modes of transportation. Tourism in the downtown and Rivermarket areas accounts for almost 2 billion of Pulaski County's income. The I-30 expansion will create an unwelcoming corridor due to increased traffic, noise and unsafe conditions; and it will divide Little Rock's most visited tourist destination (Clinton Library) from the place	Gregory Esteve	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-15

	<p>where tourists spend money (Rivermarket). There has been a huge effort to revitalize downtown with new business and the addition of the Creative Corridor. The 1-30 widening will cause pedestrian activities to become unsafe and unwelcoming, negatively impacting businesses in downtown. The widening of I-30 is not beneficial to Downtown Little Rock and will create an unsafe corridor for alternate modes of transportation. Thank you.</p>				
179	<p>Please keep the parking on 3rd between Cumberland and River Market. Don't build traffic signals on Rock and River Market, keep the 3-way and 4-way stop signs. We are trying to preserve the sense of community we have worked so hard to develop!</p>	Bob Longo	7/24/2018	Web Form	K-7, K-13
180	<p>Of overarching concern is the fact that this 631-million-dollar project is a 1950 transportation solution to a 2050 transportation opportunity. Additionally, ARDOT bullied the Metro Plan Board into gutting their Transportation Plan to accommodate this ten-lane project with its detrimental social and environmental impacts. I grieve over the excellent work of the duly appointed Citizens Advisory Board that crafted many of the points in the now eviscerated Transportation Plan.</p>	John Baker	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-9, N-3
181	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.</p>	Wes Martin	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
182	<p>I very much like ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus the local lanes. The ability for traffic to easily get in and out of downtown without creating huge backups is very important to the future of downtown Little Rock. Also like the addition of more green space.</p>	James Hendren	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
183	<p>I do not think the I30 crossing is needed. In any big city, there will be traffic delays during rush hour, but the delays in Little Rock are not very long. This project will spend entirely too much money, and take way too long to compete. I believe that during construction and after it is completed, it will make it difficult to walk, bike, drive downtown. The downtown area has been revived in the last few years and I truly believe this will be a big detriment to the area. Since talk of this project started, I have not heard one person say they think it is a good idea or that we need it. Other cities are trying to steer traffic away from downtown. Why are we doing the opposite? Please do not do this to our beautiful city!</p>	Darlene Emison	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-11, K-15, M
184	<p>We desperately need a light rail system and better public transportation to move Little Rock and North Little Rock into a first-class community: this is something most educated young professionals consider essential in a cultured community. A part of this highway money through I-30 needs to go there, yet it is not listed as an alternative. The Environmental Impact Study is an example of how important information can be buried in piles of paper- no well-publicized summary. How can one adequately compensate land owners whos property will come closer to the constant noise polution on the interstates? Can you do more study and funding for having a circle around the city, and avoiding the downtown area?This is a major change for our community: please try to do better on the above three points.</p>	Lee Cowan	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-3, H-4, H-6, J-1, K-2
185	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.</p>	Kristie Flynn	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q

186	I approve!	Kristie Flynn	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
187	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Mary Read Askew	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
188	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Millie Ward	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
189	It's my belief that the impact of road changes is more than a simple look into the traffic and congestion issues that we have. By driving people away and around the heart of city, there are serious consequences that will only further depreciate the state's Capital. I believe that expanding I-30 would create more negative impacts on our city (including increased crime, poor quality of life, etc.) than it would help ... the easier it is to leave the city, the more people will do so and the congestion will simply continue no matter how wide the road.	Marie Stacks	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-4, I-10, K-5, K-15
190	What on earth are you guys thinking??? Go to Europe and look at a real city! They encourage bikes, don't run giant expressways right through the city center. That is crazy. We should be thinking of quality of life for people who actually live here rather than moving to for suburbs like Conway. Compare Little Rock with Aix-en-Provence, which has a similar population. But living in Aix is being surrounded by amenities, restaurants, outdoor markets, concerts, street musicians, art, public fountains and public spaces that are wonderful. We are richer than Aix, we shouldn't spend it destroying the city with a giant expressway. You had a chance to consider a boulevard approach. This train is being railroaded through town. Stop! Please!	Ray White	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-1, I-9, J-2, K-5, K-15
191	Big fan	Maeghen Carter	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q

192	I am in favor of the "six lanes plus collector/distributor lanes with split-diamond interchange" proposal and its many benefits to Little Rock's downtown core.	Liz Hamilton	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
193	Please do not go forward with the current plan for the I30 expansion! Down Town Little Rock will loss tourism, it will be far less safe of foot and bike traffic and there will be a significate environmental impact from the increase of vehicular traffic on the air quality of that area. Please, do not do this!!!!	Mike Simmons	7/24/2018	Web Form	K-5, J-2, K-8, K-13, K-15
194	I am opposed to the widening of I-30 according to the current plan, as it fails to account for pedestrian and bicyclist safety. Alternative options need to be considered and a middle-ground should be reached between those opposed and those in favor of the current I-30 Crossing plan.	Lindsey Clark	7/24/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13
195	I think the expansion is not a great idea at all for our city. In my opinion while the highway is great for those moving through Little Rock quickly. But I think it makes those who live in Little Rock, specifically the residents who live downtown or residents who enjoy spending time downtown, have a much harder time getting around. I think it hurts business development downtown. I believe it drives up the need and therefore the cost of public transportation for our city and honestly makes our improving downtown and riverfront areas much less appealing for the future. This seems to me like a very temporary fix that we will only regret more and more in the future. It will almost immediately hurt the expansion that's happening downtown and in East Village. I believe we need to stop this, and rethink how we make it a better for connecting our downtown first and then moving vehicles through that area second.	Austin	7/24/2018	Web Form	K-1, K-5, K-15
196	Looks Grand! I especially like the idea of greater pedestrian enjoyment area.	Kathleen Blackman	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
197	Do not need additional lanes. Bridge itself probably does need to be inspected for safety, but don't need an entirely new bridge. Adding lanes because twice a day (morning and afternoon commutes) the lanes slow down is not a reason to spend billions of dollars. Will completely ruin all of the downtown development that is bearing fruit now. Will make downtown a ghost town once again. Money would be better spent on a light rail system to the suburbs. Also, I've noticed the contracts are awarded to out of state companies, who bring their own employees to Arkansas. So doesn't result in any local hiring. Only local benefits is to the hotels and restaurants that serve the out of state employees. Extremely disappointed the the AR DOT refuses to think outside the box and conduct business differently. Simply more of the same and rewarding the usual contractors. Encouraging more vehicular traffic and flight to the suburbs doesn't make a diverse community. Simply because the federal government baits this poor state with money doesn't mean you have to accept it to the overall detriment of your citizens.	Yolanda Dreher	7/24/2018	Web Form	H-2, H-6, I-9, I-11, K-5, K-15

198	I support ARDOT’s preferred configuration for 30 Crossing.	Frank Thomas	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
199	I support the I30 Crossing plan and look forward to the many benefits it will provide our community.	Mark Doramus	7/24/2018	Web Form	Q
200	This project is not needed or wanted.	William Samuel McCumber	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-9
201	After reading the EA, it is clear to me that ARDOT has worked extremely hard to create a plan for 30 Crossing that provides the most benefit to the most people. The functional and safety enhancements to I-30 will be tremendous. While I would prefer other alternatives to widening the corridor, it has been encouraging to see the alternatives evaluated and tweaks made in response to public feedback. In continuing to refine the project plans, please give strong consideration to the effects of the project on downtown at the street level. Vehicle traffic should maintain low speeds in the downtown grid, and north/south connectivity should be preserved for bikes/pedestrians. Also, the visual impact of the freeway should be minimized. Finally, please design the corridor to allow for future "quality of life" enhancements such as bike trails, etc. These suggestions will have a low cost/high benefit impact on downtown LR and the region.	Sam Davies	7/24/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-6, K-13, K-15
202	WE DO NOT NEED MORE CAR TRAFFIC IN THE RIVERMARKET AND CLINTON LIBRARY AREA!!! I have seen pedestrian and cyclists almost get hit by motorists looking for a parking or trying to find a certain restaurant. And we certainly don’t need more traffic! In fact, I think the area that houses the River Market, Clinton Library, should be free of any motorized vehicle. I love riding my bike around the Rivermarket and by the Clinton Library, stopping to go in to shop, eat, and sit for a while. Please don’t add more traffic to this jewel of an area that we in Little Rock are proud of. The streets do not need to be any wider, that just make traffic flow faster through the area. The focus should be on bringing more people to the “downtown” area and not more vehicles! Thank you for reading this message, Debbie Dinsmore	Deborah Dinsmore	7/24/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13

203	The City of Little Rock has adopted "Complete Streets." Any modification of a city street should comply with the Complete Streets design criteria, t\There should be pedestrian lanes, bicycle lanes, and vehicle lanes. These should be separate, not shared lanes. All road improvements should include separate bicycle lanes.	Robert C Walker	7/24/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13
204	I am opposed to any of the proposed I30 widening projects that have been put forth thus far. These solutions will penalize LR residents for the sake of residents that live elsewhere. The costs for this project are astronomical. The money should instead be used to maintain existing highways and improve safety statewide. To improve bottlenecks at peak time, focus on removing the most abrupt on and off ramps nearest the river on both sides and implement exit only lanes and advanced signage to alert drivers. Lastly, work with LR and NLR leaders to promote alternative work schedules to reduce peak load.	David Humphrey	7/25/2018	Website	I-9, I-3, I-6, L
205	Can you please add these comments to the public file? For some reason, I'm having difficulty finding the comments section on the web page. Thanks, Heartsill Ragon My final thoughts regarding this project. First, are commuters really "complaining"? Our "congestion" is something that residents of Atlanta, Nashville. Dallas and Austin dream of and hope for. Is \$1 billion in expense worth a 5 minute drive-time savings? Second, beware of "unintended consequences". After studying the numerous issues resulting from the construction of I-630, I wonder if everyone has concluded that this project was "great for the city"? Finally, it seems that we love to construct new projects, but that we don't maintain/administer existing projects very well. Not a great example, but I'm always disappointed when I see facilities in downtown that are boarded-up with plywood sheets. Seems like the St. Louis to Dallas truck drivers and the out-of-town commuters will reap the benefits, while the downtown residents will fund the social costs.	Heartsill Ragon	7/25/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-11, K-5, L
206	I am not in favor of the proposed plan for widening I-30. It will encourage more traffic and will not solve the long term problem.	Steve Scott	7/25/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10
207	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Tonya Willingham	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
208	The idea of turning I-30 into a boulevard, seems to ignore the fact the traffic won't decline as a result; it would only would be re-routed to another less efficient and desirable route. While input from the public is important, eventually, we need to rely on the experts (those who know and plan traffic patterns) to make the ultimate decision which seems to be the case here. Input has been made and plans have been altered, though not to the extent some desire. As usual, compromise is needed to get important matters accomplished. Seems the current plan is a reasonable compromise.	Michael Boschetti	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
209	If Arkansas wants to grow and prosper then we need the infrastructure to allow this. People make this commute daily and is a pass through for carriers to other busy areas. We need to be seen as a forward thinking state and we need to provide safe travel opportunities in our state.	Cindy Ingram	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q

210	I am commenting in SUPPORT of the I-30 Crossing Project	Rob Cress	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
211	I am in favor of this crucial project. The Little Rock downtown area is in need of this project for future growth and traffic relief. We need to move forward. Thank you!	George Cress	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
212	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing	Larry Bowden	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
213	Move ahead with the project	Kenny Rice	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
214	I am in favor of the 30 Crossing Project. It will improve public safety by adding or widening sidewalks, it will help build the local economy by making the area more accessible and improve our downtown image by adding green space and parks. My family will support the project along with the employees at our office in Little Rock. I have worked with the Convention and Visitors Bureau and there support should speak loudly. The downtown economy is growing and adding lane for additional traffic make sense.	Doug Bagley	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
215	<p>Arkansas is mainly a rural state but the Arkansas Highway and transportation department is ignoring the needs of its residents to build its current projects. The funding that will be used on this bridge was created through a special tax voted on by the people of Arkansas. The measure on the ballot was worded in such a way that it said the money would be spent on 'improving the highways of Arkansas' but using legalistic jargon in the actual text of the law, not generally distributed to the public, improvements was specified as 'roadway expansion and no maintenance.' Arkansas Highway and transportation Department and its head, Scott Bennett, has abandon its fiduciary responsibility (as well as its trustworthiness) to the people of Arkansas to make sure that Arkansas roads are safe to travel on as well as abandoning its fiduciary responsibility to make sure that funds are spent on the projects that will best suit the needs of the people of Arkansas in the future. The attitude of the Arkansas Highway and transportation department since the beginning of its public input phase for these projects can be summed up by the departments own spokesperson and recent comments that he made for the highway department: "This is not a vote of the people whether or not this project should go forward," Danny Straessle Arkansas Highway and transportation department public spokesman.</p> <p>Scott Bennett also seems to have a personal dislike for Little Rock and has expressed his disinterest in protecting the interest of those living in Little Rock. Here is just one example from his twitter feed in response to the following comment:</p> <p>"Are you saying that Little Rock has no voice and how you destroy ours vehicle movement? That moving traffic to Cabot is your top priority?"</p> <p>Scott Bennett (@AHTDSCOTT): "why do you think people are moving to Cabot? It's not because of highways."</p> <p>"Are you telling me this concrete disaster can't be stopped. That Little Rock is powerless to prevent its destruction by you?"</p> <p>Scott Bennett (@AHTDSCOTT): "would it be better if it were asphalt?"</p> <p>I believe these two quotes begin to illustrate Scott Bennett total indifference to the needs of the residents</p>	David Peterson	7/25/2018	Web Form	L

	<p>of Little Rock.</p> <p>Because of all these things I believe it is safe to say that the environmental assessment that the Highway and transportation department completed is most likely extremely skewed in its assessments because of the assumptions and the indifference of the top management of the Arkansas Highway and transportation department to the needs of the residents of Little Rock.</p>				
216	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety</p>	Brandy Tucker	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
217	<p>I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.</p> <p>The safety, health of our citizens is served best with this thoughtful plan and approach. It will serve us well for many years to come and provide for an appealing and inviting landscape on which to move all varieties of traffic for which each deserves careful consideration.</p> <p>Thanks! Jim Cargill</p>	Jim Cargill	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
218	<p>I think that the I-30 expansion that is currently proposed is poised to proceed in a fashion that is not in the best interest of our city, its historic structures, its environment, or its residents. Little Rock does not even have "real" traffic compared to any other major cities. A 5 to 8 minute delay during peak hours of demand does justify the risks that such an expansion could bring to the quality of life for downtown residents and visitors. After all of the progress that has been made to revitalize the downtown and re-connect parts of our city that have been obliterated by road development in the past, this appears to be a foolish waste. As a downtown property owner who operates a business very near to the I-30 bridge (523 E. 6th St., near the Holiday Inn Presidential Suites - 850 feet from the interstate), I'd much rather see traffic calmed in ways that would bring traffic TO, not THROUGH our city. I'd like to see a tree-lined grassy median over the river (or some other awe-inspiring or beautiful pass-through for visitors who only "taste" our city as they whiz past it on the interstate) rather than an enlarged version of cars whizzing by on concrete that we already have. I believe this will encourage more Little Rock workers to move to Benton and Bryant and other areas further afield, while also creating a dark and ugly area beneath where it is certain that no grass can grow. I want our downtown to be walkable and attractive and safe, and this is counter-intuitive to that point. Of great concern is the fact that this plan will inevitably lead to the widening of I-630, a previous project that has already cut through some of our city's most important historic neighborhoods. In order to survive, these historic properties need human stewards who are interested in occupying and maintaining the properties. Noise and air pollution from a wider interstate hardly seems a sensible way to accomplish this. It is my understanding that the environmental monitoring requirements of a 1978 Memorandum related to I-630 may have never occurred, creating a situation in which four decades of data about concentrations of pollution (and any adverse effects on neighboring citizens) are not available to inform this project. Any decrease in environmental air quality in the "Natural State" (and anywhere else, for that matter) is simply unacceptable. Ultimately, I find it troubling that citizens are being asked to embrace a plan enacted by the very entities that appear to have failed at meeting their end of an obligations from 40 years ago. I would</p>	Jennifer Carman	7/25/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-11, I-13, H-1, J-2, K-2, K-5, K-6, K-15

	implore the serious reconsideration of alternatives, and, at the very least, an ongoing commitment to emissions-monitoring and environmental justice for all of our citizens.				
219	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. This process has now encompassed a long time, and a large amount of public input to arrive at this consensus plan of many stakeholders. This is democracy in action to have taken the time to obtain so much community input to now have a consensus plan that represents compromises among many different stakeholders. In particular I like the amount of public green space that will be added to the downtown area.	Greg Flesher	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
220	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Cathy Tuggle	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
221	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Lyndell Lay	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
222	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Thomas F. McLarty, III	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
223	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety. It also raises the height of the bridge, thereby allowing a clearer line of sight from the River Market to the Clinton Library and East Village. It also keeps a separation between local traffic and through traffic. I support this plan.	Van Tilbury	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
224	I think it's about time it was widened. That will make it easier when I have to go downtown.	Chris Dollar	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
225	We are against the widening of I 30 through N. Little Rock and Little Rock. We feel that it will destroy what is left of downtown Little Rock and prevent or stop altogether the redevelopment of the area. Other cities have found that interstate type highways are detrimental to business and to the general health of the population. There was a proposal some months ago to put the highway at ground level with a beautiful parkway in the center where trees and other plants can flourish. That sounds better than a noisy, dirty highway.	JS Clatworthy	7/25/2018	Web Form	H-8, H-1, K-5, K-15
226	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Schawnee Hightower	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q

227	I am in support of the current ArDOT plan for the 30 Crossing. I believe the new footprint of the roadway and right of way is hardly different from the current configuration, so there should be little impact to the businesses and residents nearby. Also, I am greatly in favor of removing the cloverleaf system south of the river. I especially like the increased connectivity along the riverfront.	Brandon R Ryan	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
228	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	James Reddish	7/25/2018	Website	Q
229	Evening, how will the I-30 Bridge and lane expansion effect my property/home at the corner of 10th and Barber st.? will there be a buyout? Thank you	Danny Lewis	7/25/2018	Web Form	R
230	Going back to 2015, I've been involved from a variety of angles with the 30 Crossing project. While I was very displeased with the initial design back in 2015 (the SPU), I believe that through a lot of work on all sides, we have arrived at a configuration that achieves all goals. Not only does the "six lane plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange" configuration help with future congestion that would otherwise choke off downtown, it enhances downtown by removing acres upon acres (around 8.5 football fields worth) of divisive elevated concrete and replacing it with green space for the city to turn into park land. This improves pedestrian connectivity east to west and north to south, and makes our downtown core more livable and more desirable, which is why it's been endorsed by so many downtown advocates and entities.	Lewis Buckley O'Mell	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
231	<p>My primary critique of the current Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT) plan to substantially widen I-30 through downtown Little Rock is that it either willfully or by oversight fails to recognize the systemic nature of the interrelated roadways that serve central Arkansas. The problem that ArDOT is presumably striving to fix is a moderate delay in travel time during rush hour traffic along the 6.7 miles of the corridor under study. In searching for a solution the questions should include: 1) Why is the problem occurring? 2) Is the problem likely to get worse over time? And 3) What collateral impact will a given solution have regarding interconnected roadways?</p> <p>In 1995, Metroplan (Central Arkansas' regional planning authority) produced Metro 2020, which articulated the vision of "widening all freeways in the metro area to six through lanes" by 2020. As of November 2016, with the completion of widening I-40 from Conway to LR, that goal was achieved. Consider the following interconnected 6-lane highways that serve Central Arkansas: I-30 (Benton to I-40), I-430 (entire corridor), I-630 (entire corridor), I-440 (entire corridor), I-40 (Conway to US 67/167) and US 67/167 (I-40 to Jacksonville). After 20 years and more than a billion dollars this interconnected system is finally and impressively balanced.</p> <p>In just the past few years there have been significant improvements in our highway system. Projects recently completed include: widening I-40 to 6 lanes (I-430 to Morgan Maumelle, the Big Rock interchange (I-430/I-630), an additional lane from I-430 west onto I-30 east, the widening of nearly four miles of Cantrell Road (Highway 10), the addition of an on-ramp from Cantrell to I-430 North), the replacement of the Broadway Bridge and a renovation project along almost 3 miles of I-440.</p>	Pat Riley	7/25/2018	Web Form	R

<p>What is the impact of all of these improvements on the I-30 study area? Well, we don't know yet because so many of them have so recently been completed. We do know that during all of these many projects at least some traffic was diverted from the roadways under construction to the 30 Crossing study area exacerbating the delays on that stretch and inflating its traffic counts. Now that all of those projects have ended and the system is (finally) in balance it would be prudent to first see how the completed roadway system envisioned by Metroplan performs before starting a new project.</p> <p>What is the rush to begin this project? Is it because the traffic along the 30 Crossing study area has significantly increased?</p> <p>According to the ArDOT, the traffic over the I-30 Bridge reached 121,000 vehicles per day in 1999. Below are the traffic counts for the I-30 bridge over the past ten years:</p> <p>Daily Average Traffic Counts across I-30 Bridge*</p> <p>2007 124,600 2008 122,000 2009 120,000 2010 124,000 2011 121,000 2012 117,000 2013 119,000 2014 114,000 2015 120,000 2016 123,000** 2017 125,000**</p> <p>*http://ahfd.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8deb09579210490bafb97bd03c3c0792 ** Broadway Bridge closed during parts of 2016/2017</p> <p>In almost 20 years the traffic counts within the study area have remained essentially unchanged and that's with non-stop construction occurring on connected roadways throughout this time frame. What is the evidence that this situation will change now – now that the system is finally completed and in balance?</p> <p>Recently developed but widely available technology is likely to incrementally improve traffic flows. Anyone with a smart phone and Google maps can now get real time traffic data to optimize route selection. Everyday commuters can use this technology to avoid congestion and reliably choose the quickest route. The universal availability of optimized routing strongly argues for developing a robust street network filled with multiple alternative routes rather than focusing major resources on a single roadway.</p> <p>Technology is and will continue to change transportation in ways that are difficult to predict. Some of those ways are likely to make ever-wider freeways obsolete. Disruptive technologies like ride-sharing, self-driving cars; enhanced delivery services (including drones) are here or coming soon and their impact will be immense.</p> <p>None of this is to say that I-30 along the study area should not be improved. However, the solution offered by ArDOT, which doubles the number of lanes at the bridge while eliminating half of the on/off</p>				
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>ramps in downtown LR (from 2 to 1) doesn't make good sense.</p> <p>It is well understood that significantly widening one stretch of roadway "induces" demand causing that roadway to be favored over alternative routes. This phenomenon has predictable residual effects. For instance, according to ArDOT's modeling, the widening within the study area would immediately shift traffic delays to I-30 south of the study area and I-630 to the west. The resultant congestion would only be relieved by widening those adjacent roadways (while this impact is acknowledged by ArDOT, those projects have not been scheduled or budgeted for). According to a Metroplan estimate, the total cost to rebalance the integrated roadway system within Central Arkansas after doubling the width of I-30 in the study area would be \$4 billion!</p> <p>Furthermore, the induced demand along I-30 will result in a significant increase of vehicles entering and exiting the freeway in downtown Little Rock. That increase in traffic will predictably create additional strain on the downtown LR grid. Eliminating one of two exits/entrances to I-30 in downtown LR will substantially exacerbate the problem. This is a serious traffic issue that ArDOT does not address because it lies outside of its study area.</p> <p>Lastly, according to a consulting report authored by Norm Marshall, a nationally renowned expert on transportation system design/analysis, widening I-30 as envisioned by ArDOT would not improve overall traffic conditions system-wide. Mr. Marshall input travel data from Metroplan into a dynamic traffic modeling program (ArDOT uses a static traffic modeling program) and found that the "6-Lane with C/D Lanes alternative would increase both regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and regional vehicle hours traveled (VHT) relative to the No Build alternative in 2040". In other words "there would be no improvement in regional congestion over doing nothing at all." (Emphasis added).</p> <p>So what should be done instead of the ArDOT plan? I personally favor an in-depth exploration of adding a bridge at Chester Street and making improvements along Pike Avenue to I-40. This approach would redirect substantial traffic off of I-30 while simultaneously increasing property values along that section of riverfront and across that entire stretch of road. As for 30 Crossing, my first suggestion would be to monitor traffic for another two years to see what benefits are derived from the recent completion of six lanes throughout the system. In the meantime, ArDOT should fully develop plans for improving traffic flows with the least amount of systemic disruption. Perhaps that plan would increase shoulder width while adding at most two lanes (one in each direction) while maintaining the Cantrell Road exit. The combination of a bridge at Chester Street and the addition of two lanes along I-30 should have the effect of relieving traffic congestion with minimal negative impact.</p>				
232	I support the project as proposed.	Roy Ragland	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
233	We definitely need to improve the commute through downtown. Thanks!	Don Hensley	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
234	30 Crossing, as described, is viable to the growth of Little Rock and Arkansas as a whole. Definitely I'm favor of moving forward with this project.	Brian Bourne	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q

235	I am in favor of the new plan. I believe it would be safer than our existing option.	Justin Bourne	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
236	I live downtown and currently commute to work by bicycle. The I-30 expansion project would substantially increase vehicle traffic on surface streets downtown and cause safety issues for me. Given this increase, I ask that you also increase measures for the safety of bicyclists. This includes separated bike corridors, 5/6 foot bike lanes (as recommended in the Quapaw Quarter Association Report), and separate bike trails where possible. The financial burden to accommodate bicycle traffic, to avoid displacement by the I-30 expansion project, must be absorbed by the I30 construction budget itself and not left to the City following construction. Please consider the recommendations in the QQA report on minimizing the negative impacts of increased traffic on the downtown Little Rock Community. If bicyclists and pedestrians are not considered, downtown Little Rock will be a less attractive place to live, work and play, regardless of how much time it saves commuters coming in from the suburbs. It will actually subsidize people living outside of the city and encourage further urban sprawl. If bicycling and walking become unsafe, I would consider moving my family to a city that is safer for these activities.	Andrew Carberry	7/25/2018	Web Form	I-5, J-2
237	I don't want to see the 30 Crossing project Downtown. There is no need for this project and the majority of the traffic could be routed around the outer loop. This will make it more dangerous downtown. I don't think you guys care about any of this and just want to spend \$\$\$ for the sake of spending \$\$\$\$. Based off other states I've lived in I am not impressed with ADOT and their planning or projects. You do not have my support for 30 crossing or what you're doing on 630.	Jeremy Adams	7/25/2018	Web Form	E, I-5, K-5, L
238	I used to live in view of the I-30 bridge on the southern approach. Nearly every single day for years there was some form of wreck/accident/18 wheeler blowouts on the bridge, shutting all traffic down for hours. The 630 bottlenecks into the 30 for both directions. Entrances onto the 30 on the south end of the bridge add to more bottlenecking. There is no emergency lane. The current central Arkansas highway network is inefficient and produces bottlenecks at every single merger. The roads and highways as designed do not meet current traffic needs, nor do they address future development in the central Arkansas area.	Michael Fincher	7/25/2018	Web Form	Q
239	I think the 30 crossing project is a critical plan for the Little Rock area, much needed and there's not a better time in history to get it started with our growing economy and strong workforce. This improvement would bring great face to the Little Rock community. I certainly hope to see it happen.	Cole Wisely	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q
240	Additional lanes are needed to better handle the traffic flow.	David Cook	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q
241	Dear City, I am a pedestrian. I walk, I bike, and I love downtown Little Rock. I moved here from another state and intend on continuing to live here for years to come in the home that I purchased downtown. Please do not expand I-30. It has the potential to decimate its current pedestrian and cycling friendly status. Increasing the average daily traffic will increase the risk of accidents for residents and tourists that are enjoying sites downtown. Bike sharing is finally coming to Little Rock but this decision may eliminate that as a possibility. Please think beyond the excitement of expansion. Take a walk downtown. Take a bike ride to the Clinton Library. If the public concerns and comments are ignored and I-30 is indeed expanded through downtown, I urge you to follow the recommendations of the Quapaw Quarter Association Report, which includes	Claudia Carberry	7/26/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13

	absorbing the cost of making this space bike friendly once again. I am in support of 5-6 foot bike lanes and separated bike corridors.				
242	<p>After attending your public presentation July 12 at the Wyndham Hotel in North Little Rock, I remain opposed to the expansion of I-30 beyond six lanes, and I consider the collector-distributor lanes to be just such an expansion. I feel that ArDOT has not given adequate consideration (and perhaps none at all) to reasonable alternatives that did not include widening the freeway. As well as I can tell, the only 6-lane alternative you ever put forth is the “no build” option. I would dearly love to see as much effort put into designing what I call an “improved 6-lane” option. In addition to replacing the bridge, perhaps this alternative would involve wider shoulders in the corridor, improved on- and off-ramps, and innovative flyovers at critical junctions (such as I-30 / I-40). There is considerable engineering expertise at the AHTD, and much thought has provided notable improvements in the earliest designs. I would not be surprised to find that an honest and equally determined effort could come up with some very good designs that require only six lanes.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I do not feel that such an effort was undertaken by ArDOT. I firmly believe that ArDOT began this whole process with the intent to expand the size of the I-30 corridor, and that all the time the public has spent arguing against the expansion has been a waste of effort.</p>	Patrick Staifr	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, H-7, N-1, N-2
243	<p>Dear CAP</p> <p>We live near - and south of - I-630, and use I-30 often. We are concerned that the draft Environmental Assessment prepared for the I-30 Crossing project does not adequately analyze alternatives to the current proposals. We represent the south side of I-630, which forms the racial and class dividing line through the heart of our city. It is obvious to us that downtown highways broke the inner city and built the suburbs. This was, and remains, their intent.</p> <p>We lost in the building of this dividing line. We do not want to lose again when enlarged highways solidify it further, after years of disruptive construction. For over 50 years, there has been almost no new private residential construction in our historic neighborhoods south of the interstate – while increasingly remote exurban developments race ahead, subsidized by new roads. This tide must turn.</p> <p>We see no possibility for benefit, and a great risk of suffering further harm, from 1950’s style plans that ease the already well-established pathways of white flight from the inner city. These segregationist plans are perfectly suited to continue the region’s already far too efficient systems of separating white from black, poor from prosperous, Democrat from Republican. The social, environmental, economic and political impacts of I-30 crossing have not been adequately weighed in the thousands of pages of documents prepared by the Highway Department.</p> <p>These proposed highway “improvements” risk encouraging further depopulation of our already too empty neighborhoods. They will make our homes, institutions and businesses less desirable, by making them less accessible to a less attractive downtown, and encouraging the highway fed sprawl, which destroyed our neighborhoods in the first place. We have suffered decades of loss of property values, on ours, the “wrong” side of I-630. The current plans seem pre-programmed to bring further loss of property values, when we are finally just beginning to see some increases.</p> <p>These plans fail to provide for alternatives of improved public transportation, bike paths or any investments whatsoever to foster human scale, urban regeneration that will make more highways, less necessary. They have been deceptively oversold, with Highway Department encouraged public presentations, showing beautiful pictures of parks that will never be built, just as they were never built above I-630. There are good historic reasons for our suspicion. These cannot be ignored.</p> <p>The power brokers behind this boondoggle will throw us under their steamrollers, as before. They are not defending our interests, as they have not over the decades. We will pay with continued poverty,</p>	Central High Neighborhood Association	7/26/2018	Web Form	R

	<p>empty houses and vacant lots. They will win with fat construction-related contracts and new, wasteful developments far from us. This is the plan. The big money is behind it. And city leadership refuses to protect us, afraid to raise challenges to the Chamber of Commerce status quo.</p> <p>The Highway Department presents the impacts of the downtown I-30 widening in a contrived vacuum. The assessment ignores the fact that I-30 Crossing is part of a much broader set of planned expansions to the regional highway system, including widening I-630 to ten lanes and turning Rte 67 into an interstate linking Little Rock to St. Louis. Intentionally ripping this assessment out of the true planning context is designed to obscure impacts of what is really going on with the broader system.</p> <p>The Highway Department is impermissibly using a “divide and conquer” approach of looking piecemeal at what are, in fact, much larger plans. This leaves the current assessment unable adequately to consider the true long-term direct, indirect and cumulative impacts of the I-30 crossing project on historic areas. These real impacts need to be studied now, in the real planning context, so that we can know what to expect from this massive expenditure of our tax dollars.</p> <p>We already know the devastation that poorly planned highways brought our neighborhoods. We may own the wrong side of these tracks, but our existing property rights matter too. Or at least they should. We want the Highway Department to show us clearly that we will not again suffer, as we have in the past. The Department is trying, yet again, to pave even more broadly through the highway damaged heart of downtown. Your goal is to carry more people, faster, away from downtown - and from us. Please tell us, what we are really in for?</p> <p>If we must suffer again for this “progress”, tell us how, based on careful analysis, sound projections and historical data. Then develop plans with realistic and adequately funded ways to compensate for, and mitigate against, what will, yet again, be taken from us by this State action. Give us more than pretty pictures of parks that will never be, lining massive, unneeded highways that will degrade where we live, purely to benefit others.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>				
244	<p>In the 60's, the thriving community of Ninth Street was killed by the installation of 630. Now 50 years later, ArDOT is planning to do the same to downtown with this new "expansion" by taking away access into the heart of downtown. Frontage roads are not the answer--simply look at Benton, Bryant, and Dallas for how successful frontage roads are--they limit people's access to businesses and shops, they are frustrating, and they create even more traffic problems (Lordy, look at Dallas.)</p> <p>Little Rock has spent MILLIONS of dollars creating a thriving downtown; ArDOT's plan will effectively seals off the down town.</p> <p>Rather than throwing up your hands and saying VMT is going to increase! LR's population is going to increase! MORE ROADS! , perhaps ArDot could focus on expanding alternative forms of transportation and ways of making alternative forms of transportation more available and more accessible. Perhaps ArDOT could become more creative--why is there no HOV lane planned, if traffic will increase so much? Why is there not attempts to decrease the VMT?</p> <p>In addition, the area by the Pentacostal churches just lost 8+ acres of wetland thanks to a new planned development of 900 apartment units (that ArDOT apparently did not know anything about.) Is it really a good idea to take even MORE wetlands from that area? What is the environmental impact of that?</p> <p>It's pretty clear from all the indices that a good public transit and creating a walkable city is a significant part of a thriving community. ArDOT is once again charging in and making sure that won't happen.</p>	Barbara L'Eplatteneir	7/26/2018	Web Form	H-6, I-6, I-10, J-2, K-1, K-5, K-13, K-15
245	<p>The Quapaw Quarter Association (QQA) has reviewed 30 Crossing Environmental Assessment, ARDOT Job NO. CA0602: I-30 (From I-530/I-440 to I-40) and I-40 (From Hwy. 365/MacArthur Dr. to Hwy.67) Pulaski County, Arkansas; May 2018. We take this opportunity to submit for the record our comments, observations, and recommendations on the 30 Crossing Environmental Assessment (EA). We believe that prior citizen inputs have improved the project and we appreciate ARDOT and FHWA for working with us as we carry out our mission--preserving Greater Little Rock's historic places.</p>	Patricia Blick, Executive Director, Quapaw Quarter Association	7/26/2018	Web Form	R

<p>The QQA remains concerned about the final design elements of the project that were not a part of the Draft EA that was provided. The final design details can have a significant impact on the public’s acceptance of the project. We also have continuing issues that we do not believe have been acceptably resolved at this point. We are gratified that the majority of traffic exiting from I-30 has been diverted out of the MacArthur Park National Register listed Historic District and away from the National Historic Landmark, U.S. Arsenal, Little Rock. We are also supportive of the decision to retain all on street parking within and adjacent to National Register listed historic districts and individually listed historic properties (Go to: Parking HD). We continue to advocate for measures to maximize connectivity between the areas on the east and west sides of I-30 and to minimize impacts to historic properties within the undertaking’s Area of Potential Effect (APE) (see QQA letter to Randal Looney, FHWA, August 21, 2017 Go to: QQA FHWA Letter 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit frontage roads to two lanes • Install traffic devices allowing pedestrians to cross Capitol, 6th, and 9th Streets easily • Aggressively slow traffic through enforced speed limits <p>In addition to the recommendations raised in our comments last year we submit the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of recommendations found in 30 Crossing Content for Quapaw Quarter Association I-30 Group, 5/21/2018; Patricia M. Blick, Ngozi (Nome) Brown, Brett Budolfson, Ed Sergeant, Tanner A. Weeks. (Go to: QQA Design Team Recommendations) • Reducing speed limits on I-30 adjacent to historic properties to reduce vehicular noises • Employ measures to reduce vehicular noise on overpasses <p>As the primary and longstanding preservation organization focused solely on the greater Little Rock area, the QQA reiterates its request to be a signatory on a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in order to ensure the protection of historic properties within the APE in perpetuity, with other signatories to include the Federal Highway Administration, the Arkansas Department of Transportation and the City of Little Rock.</p> <p>In the future, if and when changes are contemplated, the MOU can be revisited and amended if warranted.</p> <p>I-630 Widening</p> <p>Although not mentioned in the body of the EA as an indirect or cumulative impact, and instead hidden away in Appendix B of Appendix B, the Traffic Analysis Report of the Interchange Justification Report reaches a surprising conclusion:</p> <p>Action Alternative 2A: 6-Lane with C/D with SPUI Action Alternative serving downtown Little Rock experiences morning congestion between downtown Little Rock and I-630 due to capacity constraints on I-630 in 2021. The speed profile shows that the travel speeds slow to 20-30 mph and the total congestion lasts approximately 1 hour before travel speeds increase back to free-flow conditions.</p> <p>Five years later in 2026, congestion has increased slightly over time, become more severe and lengthened along the corridor.</p> <p>The same impact is found on I-30 at the South Terminal in the PM peak unless I-30 is widened to eight lanes west to 65th Street immediately and from 65th Street to Benton prior the 2041 study year. Just as I-30 from the South Terminal to 65th Street will have to be widened immediately in order to make the 30 Crossing project function as designed (a fact acknowledged in the EA and integrated into the many different technical reports assessing the benefits of the project), it is reasonable to also conclude that I-630 will need to be widened immediately in the same manner (a fact that appears to be ignored in the EA).</p> <p>From our standpoint, then, a decision to approve the 6 lane + CD alternative recommended in the Draft EA will be a de facto decision to widen the eastern part of I-630 through Little Rock’s most historic neighborhoods. That indirect and cumulative impact has been part of concerns all along about 30 Crossing (see QQA letter to Randal Looney, FHWA, August 21, 2017)—that it might lead to the “inevitable” widening of I-630 through these historic neighborhoods, resulting in adverse effects on historic</p>				
---	--	--	--	--

	<p>properties. The commencement of the I-630 widening project west of University Avenue appears to make this widening even more inevitable. ARDOT and others consistently have downplayed the tie between 30 Crossing and widening the eastern part of I-630. But Appendix B of Appendix B suggests otherwise, and should have been included prominently in the EA of the 30 Crossing. It was not.</p> <p>With the inclusion of impacts to I-630 as part of the evaluation of this current undertaking, we seek clarification on whether the stipulations of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), Interstate Highway 630, executed in June 1978 between the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Federal Highway Administration, the Arkansas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department were carried out (Go to: MOA 1978 I-630).</p> <p>Note, in particular Section O. Monitoring for Future Effects, which is included below for reference.</p> <p>Memorandum of Agreement Interstate Highway 630, Federal Highway Administration O. Monitoring for Future Effects</p> <p>It has been pointed out that the Scott-Cumberland area is rich in historic resources. After the freeway is opened to traffic, the AHTD will monitor these areas to determine increases in possible freeway-related noise and air pollution. If levels exceed Federal standards, mitigation will be provided, such as double glazing, storm windows, extra landscaping, etc. If particulates above acceptable levels are produced by freeway or freeway-related traffic, electro static filters will be provided. The FHWA will review this monitoring.</p> <p>It should be pointed out that air pollution has been calculated using the worst hypothetical conditions possible, such as maximum traffic, extremely poor weather conditions, and peal inversion times. Even under these conditions, the calculations indicate that pollution produced will be substantially below maximum acceptable levels.</p> <p>In other words, there should be no unacceptable air pollution.</p> <p>Monitoring will also take place at the other properties identified in the first paragraph of this Agreement [MacArthur Park Historic District, Mt. Holly Cemetery, Reichart House, Governor’s Mansion Historic District, a structure east of I-30 at 1500 College Street, a structure east of I-30 at 1501 Welsh Street, First Methodist Church at 8th and Center, a structure at 1221 Louisiana, a structure at 1305 Louisiana Street, Conrad House] as well as any other historic places which might be identified by SHPO’s survey. If freeway-related impacts are produced on these structures, mitigation such as described above will be provided.</p> <p>We are aware of studies that purport a link between proximity to freeways with significant negative health impacts, particularly for children. See the Nelson/Nygaard 30 Crossing Strategies Report of June 2016, Health and Freeway Proximity, pp 4/9-10. Frankly, to our knowledge, we are not aware of monitoring contemplated in the 1978 MOA being done at any time, and it certainly was not done as part of the 30 Crossing EA. This was a concern during construction of I-630 and remains a concern 40 years later, today as additional expansion is anticipated.</p> <p>Consequently, the QQA believes that to not include the widening required on I-630 as the result of constructing 30 Crossing in the EA recommendation is an improper segmentation of the project’s environmental analysis and, therefore, the EA as published for comment is incomplete. Further, we call upon ARDOT and FHWA to immediately honor the monitoring requirements of the referenced MOA as the 30 Crossing project independently, or including the referenced I-630 widening, effects the enumerated historic properties mentioned in the MOA as well as additional historic properties identified since 1978.</p>				
<p>246</p>	<p>Hi Jon, I am attaching the comments I submitted via the website, it looked like my link to the documents we reference didn't translate into the submittal- So I am sending this along so that the documents referenced are part of the record- Thank you, Patricia</p>	<p>Patricia Blick, Executive Director, Quapaw Quarter Association</p>	<p>7/26/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>R</p>

	[Attached Document]				
247	I have crossed the bridge that intersects 530,30,440 numerous times at peak travel hours and been stuck in traffic for nearly an hour if I leave my home 5 minutes too late. The road is rutted and needs widening to accommodate the large quantity of traffic flowing through this interchange area	tiffany jolene lyche	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q
248	My husband and I strongly oppose the additional construction of lanes which will increase the total to 10 lanes. We suggest that this plan as put forward will divide a city and prevent its economic development of the East side of the highway. We believe that other cities have made decisions that will lead them into the future designs that are pedestrian friendly, accommodate for more inbuilding in areas that will lead to smarter growth and in planning for the future of wider use of public transportation, biking and other means of travel. We are most unhappy that this huge project is preparing to move ahead despite the feelings of the citizens of Little Rock. Thank you for your consideration.	Bonnie Nickol	7/26/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-5, K-13, K-15
249	I object to the "preferred alternative", which the ADoT supports, for the I-30 Project. I believe the 1-30 bridge should be replaced and the entrances and exits to and from I-30 on the south side of the river to Roosevelt Road be studied for changes leading to increased safety. I do not think any lanes should be added to I-30 in the Project area, which is the same position the RPAC took on multiple occasions when providing advice to the Metro Plan Board. The previous Plan restriction to six lanes should be honored.	Robert Lyford	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-1, I-3, M
250	The attached comments are provided on behalf of Metroplan Staff on the 30 Crossing EA. We appreciate the opportunity to be involved in this project. Casey R. Covington Metroplan [SEE PDF]	Casey R. Covington Metroplan	7/26/2018	Web Form	R
251	SEE PDF	Barry Haas	7/26/2018	Web Form	R
252	I suggest the bridge be painted a pretty blue color.	Alison Gambill	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q
253	I own the property at 2812 commerce and 423 East 28th. The property has been in my family since before the freeway was built. Before there was no flooding. After the freeway was built and open..our house constant flooded. The street was built about my yard and caused my yard to be a sub drain off. He had to move out often because of flooding and it still floods my yard. It is my wish that the project buy out my property as I know the flooding will only be worst. I'm renting the house now but will not be able to continue if the flooding gets worst. Please but my property. I am a willing seller. Please my family has suffered enough. Home purchased in 1939.	BEVERLY A JACKSON	7/26/2018	Web Form	R

254	Please do NOT expand I-30. If the goal has been to revitalize the downtown area, I'm not sure how adding that many more cars to the area is helpful. And as an avid cyclist, I'd like to be able to safely ride my bike downtown.	Emily Evans	7/26/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13
255	Coming from Atlanta, I don't believe the traffic in Little Rock warrants further investment in increasing interstate capacity, especially when most all other efforts in similar cities have seen traffic simply grow to fill the expanded interstates. I would much rather see these types of funding be directed towards public transit, multi-use trails, etc. that enhance the quality of life for LR (and surrounding) residents while also attracting young professionals who value these features in their neighborhoods.	Micah McLain	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, H-6, J-1, L
256	This is a huge investment for a very poor outcome - cutting LR in two, more traffic and congestion causing air pollution, for very little time saved if any. Instead consider mass transit for more time saving along with all the advantages of speed, convenience, economy, clean air. Improve our state roads and save some lives around the state. Even fix the pot holes in LR! This project is definitely an out of date white elephant.	JEAN GORDON	7/26/2018	Web Form	E, H-6, K-1, K-9
257	The email you recently received from Kathy Wells of the Greater Coalition of LR Neighborhoods is supported by me also. It gets really irritating that the Highway Dept makes a pretense of listening, but always does what it first intended to do. It is time to be responsible and accountable to CITIZENS!!!	Daniel Hopwood	7/26/2018	Web Form	N-2
258	I agree and I'm strongly in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. Extremely excited about the plan of adding green space to this downtown core area, which will not only effectively streamline pedestrian connectivity, but will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, while simultaneously increases vehicular AND pedestrian safety. Thank you!	Katherine A Perez	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q, K-11
259	I support of the proposed plan as it appears to be the best option for the challenges presented. I don't spend a lot of time down town but would think that local residents would prefer additional green space for outdoor activities.	Jeff Littlefield	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q, K-11
260	The wasteful use of public funds to build yet more pavement in an area that could be so much more user-friendly in redevelopment. Those who choose to commute should be willing to pay the price in more time spent doing so, and those engaged in commerce should be willing travel around and not through downtown Little Rock. Those who stand to profit from the continual addition of more lanes of pavement should not dictate what will be done.	Jack W. Hill	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, H-4

261	<p>I am firmly opposed to the planned expansion of the I-30 freeway thru downtown Little Rock. It will have an extremely detrimental effect on the environment because of increased fuel pollutants and create major stress on downtown traffic corridors so that commuters can save time getting to work. This scarce money should be spent on improving other road projects in worse shape in other parts of the state. Above all, an Environmental Impact Statement should be required before any construction begins.</p>	Jim Rule	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-5, K-5, K-12, L
262	<p>The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT) initiated this project with an impressive public outreach (PEL, I believe it's called). Impressive but ultimately superfluous, because the outcome was predetermined. From the beginning, ArDOT was committed to this huge widening project - a project that will necessitate even more freeway widenings and untold billions of taxpayer money. Alternatives were considered in isolation from each other instead of as combined efforts, and public concerns were ignored. That is my first objection.</p> <p>Like most residents of Central Arkansas, I am not opposed to maintenance and safety improvements. However, I am opposed to this project, because I think it will have negative effects on our economic vitality and social cohesiveness. Positive effects are nebulous and minimal. Therefore, Objection #2 is that we are asked to pay more than \$100,000,000 a mile for the possibility that with additional widening some person in Cabot might - might - save 4-5 minutes driving into Little Rock. No matter how you cut it, this is a massive waste of taxpayer dollars, one that will haunt future generations. Objection #3 is that this project will leave downtown Little Rock and North Little Rock scarred. This project will further divide neighborhoods and harm our wonderful, revitalizing downtown businesses and neighborhoods. Objection #4 is that there are alternatives to this huge project. A few examples: investing in bus rapid transit and reinvigorating our region's arterial roads. Downtown businesses could be encouraged to become part of the 21st century (incentives offered?) to stagger work hours and allow more flexibility for commuters entering the city. Increasing bus service to allow people in Jacksonville and Cabot to park their cars and use buses to enter the city and the same for Conway commuters would offer a worthy alternative, too. No one alternative would have a major effect, but taken together, all could have some impact, although none, including 30 Crossing, will alleviate congestion. Again I ask the question: are we comfortable paying \$100,000,000+ per mile to address minor congestion that occurs twice a day?</p> <p>Decades ago the Department divided the cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock from north to south and from east to west. It set the city back for a generation. At the time no one could predict that downtown Little Rock would flower in the next century. 30 Crossing could do worse, and never mind the "park" that is dangled before us. None of this adds up to worthwhile investment. Apparently, cost is not a factor to the ArDOT. It has money to burn. If predicted dire consequences do occur and cast a pall on the flowering of downtown Little Rock/North Little Rock for a generation or more, then I would recommend the ArDOT again change its initials: to DDT.</p>	Robert Markman	7/26/2018	Web Form	H-7, L, K-5, K-15, H-6, K-10, I-6
263	<p>I'm on vacation and away from internet. I'm writing again to express my opposition to the massive expansion of I-30 in central Arkansas. There are multiple reasons I think this is a terrible idea. The financial cost is outrageous, especially considering that we can't already maintain our current highways. There is nothing convincing that suggests this will decrease traffic congestion. The construction will go on for years and then perpetually there will be more physical divide in our community by what the highway and access roads cause. As a physician, I'm extremely concerned about increasing air pollution and toxic byproducts. As a person concerned about our environment and what we leave to our children and our grandchildren,</p>	Lucy Sauer	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-9, K-8, H-6, J-1, L

	<p>the effect of greenhouse gases on climate change is unconscionable. We should be promoting mass transit, etc. Enough!</p>				
<p>264</p>	<p>I am a property owner within approximately one-half mile of the proposed Interstate 30 expansion corridor. I fully support replacement of the aging interstate bridge over the Arkansas River and safety improvements downtown that might reduce the number of closely spaced entrances and exits. I oppose your plans to widen the freeway and believe you are advancing outdated transportation policies on the residents of Central Arkansas. It is rather difficult to comment on your plans because they represent mid-to-late 20th century thinking on traffic management that fewer and fewer State transportation agencies consider appropriate to meet U.S. mobility needs in the 21st century. Since 2013, ARDOT has made clear its intention to add lanes to resolve the stated problems of the 30 Crossing area, regardless of whether other actions could solve or reasonably mitigate peak period traffic congestion. It is particularly appalling that ARDOT basically blackmailed Metroplan officials into supporting changes in the regional Transportation Improvement Plan to allow wider freeways in Central Arkansas.</p> <p>ARDOT appears to be attempting to avoid the necessary environmental review of the big picture of its Central Arkansas highway expansion plans by dividing the work into smaller components. Instead of seeing the freeway network in Pulaski County as a network, ARDOT has attempted to implement piecemeal expansion plans using Categorical Exclusions and Environmental Assessments (The I-630/I430 Interchange, the western widening of I-630 and the I-430/Highway 10 interchange expansion). The FHWA should require ARDOT to produce a network level Environmental Impact Statement since all of these actions are highly related and affect regional traffic volumes and land development.</p> <p>The Section 106 impacts of the proposed I-30 widening will be severe. Little Rock's MacArthur Park historic district is already walled-off on two sides by interstate highways. Expansion of I-30 will further widen the eastern moat and, as ARDOT has stated, increase the pressure for you to widen I-630 downtown further separating that historic district from older residential neighborhoods to the south. Perhaps more importantly, the planned changes to entrances and exits along I-30 will greatly increase traffic through downtown Little Rock negating one of the few benefits of I-630's opening in the late 1970s. This increased traffic on 4th and 6th streets will greatly decrease the quality of life in the new multi-family housing built downtown in the last ten years and the MacArthur Park and Terry Mansion area historic homes. A relatively quiet residential area adjacent to downtown will suffer from constant heavy traffic volumes on streets that the City of Little Rock will have to maintain.</p> <p>ARDOT's question and answer pages about your 30 Crossing expansion project make the assumption that more crowded freeways would dampen interest in commuting to jobs in downtown Little Rock and North Little Rock. You should address the opposite proposition as well, that building more freeway capacity only encourages people to move further from their jobs and raises their cost of commuting. People consider both travel time and costs as part of their location decisions. There is no shortage of affordable housing in Little Rock or North Little Rock.</p> <p>ARDOT proposes freeway expansions as the only solution to projected increases in vehicle miles traveled because, as it points out, it is constitutionally restricted from offering the citizens of Central Arkansas other mobility choices. Rather than pointing fingers at other agencies to offer these additional mobility choices, why doesn't ARDOT seek legislative changes to allow it to actually be a Transportation Agency and not just a Highway Department?</p> <p>Finally, ARDOT needs to address the impact of building all of the proposed additional road capacity on the FAST Act requirements to properly maintain federal aid highways in the state. Driving around Central Arkansas and elsewhere confirms that ARDOT is not meeting its asset maintenance responsibilities. In a July column in Talk Business and Politics ARDOT Commissioner Alec Farmer stated that the "Highway Commission" voted in 2017 to spend 80 percent of its discretionary federal funding on system preservation and "congestion relief" (i.e. highway expansion projects). Mr. Farmer went on to state that</p>	<p>Steve Strauss</p>	<p>7/26/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>N-3, I-13, K-12, K-3, I-5, H-6, J-1, I-6, L</p>

	<p>an additional \$400 million per year is needed just to maintain the existing system at a minimum level. By the Commissioner’s statement he is admitting that ARDOT is deferring necessary road maintenance in order to build unnecessary highway expansion projects. If the agency cannot properly maintain Arkansas roads and highways then the FHWA should not permit ARDOT to expand its asset base using federal funds.</p> <p>Unless ARDOT changes its highways only solution to meet the mobility needs of Central Arkansas it will face increasing opposition to its expensive and out-dated practices.</p>				
265	<p>Widening I-30 is a monstrous waste of money. When cities all over are investing in alternative transportation methods and building complete streets to encourage community and entrepreneurship, why would our city be so adamant about doubling down on a highway system that serves zero long term benefit to our city and its residents.</p>	Nathan Miller	7/26/2018	Web Form	H-7, I-9, J-2
266	<p>My comment attached. Thank you.</p> <p>[SEE PDF]</p>	Timothy Daters	7/26/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-7, K-13, N-2
267	<p>I think the expansion of 2nd street to 4 lanes is a poor last minute reaction, made in an attempt to avoid further study of the impact of the project on east/west streets south of 4th street.</p> <p>The benefit of a large green open space has been decreased by the reintroduction of a 4 lane street between the green space and the River Market.</p> <p>When first proposed the large green space would have allowed unhindered pedestrian access from the residential towers on Third Street to the River Market.</p> <p>i could find no mention of this in the Environment Assessment.</p> <p>i have been told by one of the professionals familiar with the project that the role of 2nd Street was revised to avoid the preparation of a full Environmental Impact Statement and part of an attempt to appease owners and groups representing areas south of Fourth Street.</p>	Timothy Daters	7/26/2018	Web Form	K-11
268	<p>The new design for the I-30 Crossing is exactly what downtown Little Rock needs. After the concrete walls are taken down and green spaces are added, our downtown will feel like a more fun, safe place to be. I know I will frequent it more often.</p>	Peyton Ellis	7/26/2018	Web Form	Q
269	<p>As someone who regularly travels I-30, I oppose widening it for a number of reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The areas traversed are in need of development that is friendly to the people who live there. Instead, this would devalue property, and inhibit its healthy development. · There is overwhelming public opposition to the proposed project, clearly expressed in numerous public comment periods. · There is no Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which this project clearly requires, as it would add particulate, chemical, and noise pollution to the area. <p>Please do NOT proceed with this horrendously expensive and destructive project!</p>	Janine Perlman	7/26/2018		K-1, K-5, K-2, K-8, K-12
270	<p>I understand from speaking with Tony Evans that you are heading up the project that proposes to revise 3rd Street between Cumberland and River Market. I have serious concerns about the proposed changes which I have described in the attached letter. understand that the environmental impact is still under consideration; please let me know if there are others that I should contact to express my concerns.</p>	John Barron	7/26/2018	Web Form	R

271	<p>I am AGAINST the widening of I30 in the current proposal. I feel that this project is going to be detrimental to the city of Little Rock. I think it will hurt businesses downtown. Research has proven that larger interstates take traffic away from the businesses in the area. I think that it is going to further cause socio ad economic gaps by closing off communities such as Hanger Hill, from Downtown. I know it is going to create an unsafe and unwelcoming corridor downtown, that is visited by thousands of people a year, essentially harming tourism in Downtown Little Rock. There will be such an influx of cars, that it will be unsafe to walk or bike Downtown.</p> <p>I do not understand why we are willing to decrease the quality of life for residents of Little Rock to build a massive structure essentially for people who do not live in Little Rock. To decrease a traffic build up of 15 minutes for people LEAVING Little Rock to go to their homes in Jacksonville, Cabot and Bryant. This does not make sense to me.</p> <p>Please reconsider this project. Please consider safer and more equitable options. Please consider walking and cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>Thank You!</p>	Stacy Tierney	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-5, K-5, K-13, K-15
272	<p>I am deeply disappointed at the short shrift _all_ of the non-lane expansion alternatives have been given in the PEL, the environmental assessment (EA), and at public meetings. While a multitude of extremely similar laneexpansion solutions received funds for fuller development, ARDOT is ignoring the comments of area residents and selectively including/excluding parameters to model non-expansion alternatives in the worst light possible, thus filtering them out at Level 1.</p> <p>Every metro area I've been to that has gone the route of interstate expansion has an absolutely hellish environment for travel. Congestion, wrecks, constant construction, high-stress driving, pollution, and noise-- interstate expansion makes all our lives worse. One of the main reasons I moved to Little Rock was because I could _walk_ to so many of the local businesses. Note that I didn't say bike, or ride a bus, or take a taxi--I said W-A-L-K. Little Rock is becoming a place where people can actually get where they need to be and get some exercise at the same time. ARDOT's I30 plan feels like a part of a decades long mission to push back environmental and social progress and force residents into their cars, into traffic, and out of the city.</p> <p>Sadly, I was even more disturbed after reading the "I-30 Alternatives Analysis", a document prepared by Norman Marshall with funding from the Arkansas Public Policy Panel. My reading of this document indicates that ARDOT has:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Failed to fully account for drivers re-routing during times of peak congestion. (i.e. assuming I30 is the only route popping up on maps for people.) 2) Through the use of outdated Static Traffic Assignment (STA) processes, failed to constrain forecasts so that roadway capacity is not exceeded. (i.e. they are modeling situations that are not physically possible) 3) Fed CARTS models with flaws 1) and 2) into VISSIM models that in turn calculate extreme delays that, again, are not possible in reality. 4) Failed to model additional routes specified by alternative plans, thus failing to accurately accrue benefits to alternative plans that provide drivers with multiple routes. 5) Acknowledged that widening will induce I30 travel, but fail to model for traffic bottlenecks on the edges of the study area. Again, ARDOT cherry picks their costs and benefits. They know modeling edge bottlenecks makes the case for widening worse, so they just skip it unless someone in public comments makes a stink about it. <p>=== Comment 2 ===</p> <p>Regarding the Pike Avenue extension alternative, page 707 the EA mentions that development of this alternative was ceased due to the possible impact on "a highly contaminated hazardous waste site just south of the Pike Avenue roundabout". How was the cost of constructing around this waste site estimated and what was the estimated cost?"</p> <p>Page 707 also mentions that this alternative was discarded due to it not being "an efficient connection to I630". The specific efficiency of connecting to I630 is not a relevant reason to discard the alternative as</p>	Matt Pekar	7/27/2018	Web Form	R

	<p>the stated goal of this project, on page 35, is: "...to provide for increased travel speed and reduced travel time to downtown North Little Rock and Little Rock as traffic demand increases in the future. "</p> <p>The Pike Avenue extension alternative cannot be discarded unless it models worse in pursuit of this goal.</p> <p>=== Comment 3 ===</p> <p>Regarding the Chester Street extension, which was discarded by ARDOT at level 1, on page 707 of the EA it states that ARDOT modeled this route as being capable of "only 3.5% removal of the traffic from I30". However, ARDOT's PEL and EA modeling is invalid because it does not:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) account for shifts among the bridges 2) does not consider the impacts of induced travel outside of the study area 3) does not consider traffic impacts in downtown Little Rock outside of the study area <p>Analysis done by Smart Mobility--with these necessary adjustments included--indicate that the Chester St. Bridge in conjunction with a form of the Boulevard alternative meets the requirements to move to level 2 and be considered for refinement along with all of the current alternatives that involve widening. Because ARDOT has failed to bring forth a single alternative that does not involve widening of I30, it is <u>especially</u> critical that this alternative be properly and honestly developed by ARDOT.</p>				
273	SEE PDF	George Wise	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
274	<p>This project is very much needed as can be evidenced on a daily basis of traffic bottlenecking at this location several times throughout the day. My wife was actually involved in an accident at this location several years ago. With the increased traffic flow and continued growth in the LR/NLR area this change is a must, regardless of the short term inconveniences during the construction process</p>	Jason Hooper	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
275	<p>As a former resident of Houston, TX (home of the Katy Freeway) and all of its commuter problems, I always think to myself-- there has to be a more desirable option than expansion. I'll be making Little Rock my home in 3 weeks and a part of its charm is in the big city amenities with a small town feel situated right in the middle of a beautiful natural backdrop. Lane expansions take away from that. Houston is home to the world's widest freeway and commute times are still increasing. Will we keep expanding as more residents hit the road? Have we fully considered the alternatives? There has to be a better way to spend these funds.</p>	Izzy Harris	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-7, I-9, I-10
276	<p>The I-30 expansion project is a very bad decision for the City of Little Rock. It is bad city planning. ArDOT has put out numbers that show the daily traffic count would increase 3 fold. While many cities around the country are in the process of fixing these kinds of mistakes by taking out over sized highways that scar the downtown area our Highway Department is in the process of making one of these decisions. I am vehemently against this expansion. This expansion will not solve congestion by ARDOT's own admission. It does not work anywhere else why should it work here.</p> <p>ARDOT has violated the mandate from the Federal Highway Administration to consider reasonable alternatives to its proposed massive freeway widening. Even though the Federal Highway Administration encouraged local highway entities to look at holistic approaches, ARDOT dismissed, and refused to study, alternatives plans such as the Boulevard plan with a Chester Street bridge even though independent traffic studies (Smart Mobility) showed the boulevard performed as well or better than the freeway expansion. ARDOT's one sentence dismissal of this plan in the assessment is not enough to explain why ARDOT was opposed to this plan. ARDOT states they couldn't build a bridge at Chester – this is patently false as ARDOT could designate that portion of Chester as a State Highway and the property is actually for sale. They state that an 8 lane boulevard couldn't handle the traffic – it actually does handle the traffic</p>	Nathan Keltch	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-7, N-2, H-1, H-3, H-8, I-10

	and does it in a way to dramatically increase commerce and real estate value by operating at slower, safer, speeds.				
277	This is something we need for Little Rock. Coming from the Dallas area, I've seen firsthand how these types of changes benefit the city. Very excited for this program! Makes me proud to live in Little Rock.	Brett Parker	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
278	I have grown up in this city and commuted from NLR to LR via I-30 every day of my adult life. The traffic has become more congested in this area every year. I cannot imagine how bad it will be in the next 20 years. This has to be done.	Russ Furcron	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
279	I'm very excited to see this project come to life. The opportunity to expand parks in the downtown areas sounds amazing. I moved here last year from midtown Memphis and one of my favorite things was Overton Park which sits right in the middle of midtown. Having a green space is really wonderful when living in a large city. I believe Little Rock would benefit greatly from this project and I look forward to more opportunities to get out and explore downtown.	Anna Pearson	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
280	I'm just glad that area is being made safer for everyone. Aesthetically — that area could use a face lift. Besides, anything that increases connectivity for pedestrian, cyclists and dog walking traffic is a big positive for those of us who live downtown.	Chris Kindrick	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
281	Nice. This will be a really positive change and a great way improve our city more than just adding a lane to a freeway.	Daniel Koterias	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
282	<p>As a resident and property owner in the River Market District, I do not support the 6 lane, with 4 c/d lane expansion of I-30 Crossing. This expansion is one of the larger model proposed, and I don't appreciate the marketing strategy of describing this as 6 lanes with 4 c/d lanes because this confuses the public. It should clearly be called what it is... a 10 lane free way crossing, with four additional street level lanes to feed the new massive freeway.</p> <p>This expansion is literally 2 blocks from my home. I am seriously concerned about the massive increase of traffic that is projected for 3rd street. This roughly 300% increase on my street. With a family member who has severe asthma, this traffic expanse is a health hazard to residents in the immediate proximity of the expansion. More vehicles will produces more toxic substances and is an environmental hazard for residents, school children, park goers, and pedestrians in the River Market. Also, increased water rain off and noise issues in an already very noisy area due to increased traffic will be environmental problems for residents and pedestrians in this area.</p> <p>Also, since I just mentioned pedestrians, this area of the River Market is a huge pedestrian area. Residents, visitors, business men and women, and school children walk 3rd Street everyday. 3rd Street itself is primarily a residential area, with a thriving business community that will be drastically and negatively impacted by this expansion. As a resident, I'm quite concern for the 3rd Street businesses community and the potential loss of street parking on 3rd street. Plus the massive increase in traffic, to solely feed the highway on ramp/off ramp configuration is quite problematic.</p> <p>Further, the River Market District as a whole, as well as the new East end developments are a huge economic boom for the city and our region. I am highly concerned that the DOT has not thoroughly examined the impact that this expansion will have on this area... not even to mention the historic neighborhoods of Hanger Hill and Quapaw! Reasonable alternatives have NOT be adequately investigated.</p>	Mary Ellen Kubit	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-15, K-13, K-7, K-14, K-10, N-3, N-2

	<p>The areas under the interstate highway in the River Market are frequently very inhospitable and are very dangerous. I am very concerned that the highway expansion will cause additional, unfair burdens to the City of Little Rock and the Street Car Rock Region Metro service. It is inappropriate for the DOT to make decisions that will leave Rock Region Metro and the city of Little Rock holding bag of DOT related expenses.</p> <p>Another concern is the trend of property values typically drop in areas surrounding large highway expansions. We've just had an appraisal of our residence. And, I greatly concerned that this value will not hold steady during the construction and the post construction opening. Who will compensate business owners and residential property owners when our values are lost due to all of the environmental impacts. I've spoken to many business owners in the River Market District who are very concerned about the loss of parking, and the loss of business to our neighborhood. In fact, Zin Wine Bar recently closed on River Market Ave, citing the pending highway expansion as a decision to close their business and expand the suburban location. This is very concerning to the neighborhood.</p> <p>I'm also quite concerned that the DOT is out of date in it's modeling and it's approach to mass transportation. As larger cities and urban areas move away from massive highway expansion, Arkansas is going in the opposite direction. With the drastic changes coming with self driving cars, and drone delivery services, right around the corner, the DOT must take these issues into account in their evaluation and modeling.</p> <p>I'm also quite concerned about how the DOT seemed to strong arm the Metroplan board into this decision. The threat of withholding funds, did not service the people of this region, especially when there was a clear higher ratio of AGAINST comments from the public to the Metroplan. The comments of the public have consistently not been taken as seriously as I believe they should have been. There has been clear opposition from residents in the immediate area of the expansion through public comments periods and through social media, op-eds, and community meetings.</p> <p>I want to make it clear that I am for the replacement of the bridge; I am for even added a lane in each direction, and creating more safe on and off ramps. As someone who travels this exchange every rush hour to commute to Conway for work, I experience these issues first hand. In the five years of my community, my average travel time across this stretch is frequently under five minutes. Only twice, in five years, have I been caught in what I consider massive traffic-- during a snow storm and during one accident-- when it took me over 20 minutes to just cross the bridge. I will gladly take these two inconveniences over five years! I am NOT in support of the 6 lane, with 4 c/d lanes plan. This is too large, too expensive, and has too much environmental impact on the various neighborhoods and community immediately surrounding the expansion.</p> <p>Again, I implore the DOT to listen to the concerned citizens and residents of the area who have grave concerns on how this expansion will directly impact our homes, our neighborhoods and our children. In fact, I think the DOT has not acknowledged the change in demographics from these areas-- from strictly commercial 20 years ago to thriving residential neighborhoods. And, that is what we are-- a thriving neighborhood! But, now, we're also a neighborhood with grave concerns.</p>				
283	<p>I have a master's degree in urban studies from the University of Chicago. I grew up in Cleveland OH and know the importance of effective urban planning. The boulevard concept through LR and NLR with diverting I-state traffic to I-440 would be the best way to preserve the best essence of LR & NLR and using an existing road - I-440 - to its highest and best use. The emphasis should be on improving an urban environment and not building roads to strangle the life out of community space.</p>	DAVID F KERN	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-1, H-4, I-9

284	I am in support of the 30 Crossing plan. As a commuter driving in and out of Little Rock every day, I see first hand how important adding commuter and shoulder lanes will be for the interstate. It will provide safety for the community and prevent accidents from occurring.	Natalie Mahoy	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
285	I strongly call for NOT expanding 1-30. The impact of the increase in traffic in the River Market area, tourists, pedestrians, and bicyclists will be terrible. The River Market area and the Arkansas River Trail, which have attracted bicyclists to be downtown in Little Rock, are the unique strengths of the City. Any modifications in traffic flow MUST consider tourism, pedestrians, and bicyclists.	Michael Anders	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-13
286	Having worked in the downtown area for a few months now, I am definitely in favor of this project and making our downtown area greener, safer, and quieter. As someone who is considering buying property downtown in the next year, I think this project could really increase value for property in the area and become more "family friendly".	Ritika Gann	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
287	This will totally elevate the downtown climate. I am very excited to see Little Rock grow into such a great city!	Alix Fiorino	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
288	I am deeply concerned about the effects the proposed I-30 widening project will have on the city I love. It seems clear that while the latest impact study from ARDOT took many factors into account, the impact of those factors altogether was not assessed comprehensively. More troubling is the obvious lack of investment in walkable, bikeable streets. This plan does not address the future construction necessary for actually alleviating congestion on I-30, and instead puts the onus on city streets to handle a greater flow of traffic. ARDOT needs to invest in a long-term plan that prioritizes the safety and livelihood of people and businesses already thriving downtown, instead of giving quicker commutes to those living outside of the city, just so they can take their business and money back to the suburbs.	Jared Rickman	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-13, J-2, K-13, I-5
289	As someone who lives and works in downtown, I would love to see this project come to life. This would not only be a safer alternative to what we have now, but would also create a more livable area for downtown residents.	Addison Hurst	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
290	I am very excited about the 1-30 Crossing Project in Little Rock. As a commuter, I am excited that the plan will make traffic much smoother downtown, as well as the parks that will be installed. We have so many great businesses and non-profits in Little Rock, and I think it will be great to have a venue/space for community events.	Hannah Hitchcox	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
291	As someone who grew up here, then moved away for 12+ years to live in Los Angeles and Denver, CO; I am thrilled to see initiatives like this one in our city of Little Rock! This change could add so much value to the attractiveness of the city, especially our downtown. Having more greenspace and the ability to hold community events such as Yoga on the green deck, concerts, art festivals, etc. would be a huge benefit. Also having a safer walking space and lower traffic noise is a plus to someone like myself and coworkers who spend much of our days downtown. I fully support the I-30 corridor change, and look forward to seeing a better space and efficiency for our city!	Ashley Steele	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
292	My husband commutes to Little Rock daily. In my opinion, this project is a boondoggle that will create more problems than it will solve. Focusing more on public transit, walkability, trolleys and shuttles and bicycle lanes, while sending commercial transportation in strategic re-direction, is my hope for the future of Central Arkansas.	Beverly Parkinson	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-7, H-6, J-2

293	<p>My Husband, Rick, and I have been pleased with the ways that the downtown Little Rock has become a more bike and pedestrian friendly community, and we are concerned that the proposed expansion will undo so much of the progress that has been made.</p> <p>* SAFETY We are very concerned that the proposed expansion of the I-30 corridor will increase in car volume will turn the Downtown and the Rivermarket areas into a highway. Both areas are heavily trafficked areas for people on bikes or people walking. Arkansas is #13 in worse state for pedestrians and #3 for worse states for cyclists.</p> <p>* TOURISM The Downtown and Rivermarket areas are also high tourism areas. Tourism accounts for almost 2 billion of Pulaski County's income and we know that these two areas of the city are high in tourist attractions. The new I-30 will divide Little Rock's most visited tourist destination (Clinton Library) from the place where tourists spend money (Rivermarket). The I-30 corridor could also create an unwelcoming corridor due to high traffic, increase in noise and unsafe conditions.</p> <p>* REVITALIZATION There has been a huge effort to revitalize downtown with new business and the addition of the Creative Corridor. I can not image walking a street with 15,000 cars on it to access a business downtown. The I-30 widening will cause pedestrian activities to become unsafe and unwelcoming. Businesses downtown will likely take the hit.</p> <p>* BIKESHARING The city of Little Rock has taken huge measures to bring an amazing Bike Share program to Little Rock in the Spring of 2019. We know from other cities that Bike Share is so important to tourism and the growth. Bikeshare's focal area is centered within the I-30 area of impact; I-30 traffic could kill it due to high traffic volumes and unsafe infrastructure.</p>	Ann Owen	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2, I-5, K-13, K-5, K-15
294	<p>Why doesn't the city or state emulate other states who are successful at road and freeway success especially, when every five years there are harsh conditions like winter weather and huge commercial trucks worsening the roads!</p>	Marty W. Burton	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, G
295	<p>I think this development will be amazing for the Little Rock community! Little Rock is growing rapidly and this will give Little Rock so much opportunity. Wider streets, more outdoor space, what an exciting update!</p>	Abigail Grossman	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
296	<p>I have spent time reviewing the Environmental Assessment issues by ARDOT and attended the public hearing on July 12, 2018. After careful consideration, I strongly object to the ARDOT proposal for widening I-30 in Little Rock. The massive structure proposed by ARDOT will result in long-term negative consequences for Little Rock and Arkansas. Better solutions are available.</p> <p>1) The focus on widening has failed to consider alternatives such as increased investment in public transportation, the addition of a bridge at Chester Street, or the boulevard approach.</p> <p>2) The freeway widening will not solve congestion problems. It only moves the problems down the road. I understand the cost of removing this congestion would run up to \$4 billion. These directly related costs were not included in the Environmental Assessment. Public transportation and dispersing traffic by improving and increasing alternative routes are more effective and efficient longterm solutions.</p> <p>3) The Environmental Assessment seems to assume economic benefit to Little Rock without supporting evidence or the inclusion of negative impacts to the emerging new development in East Village, the recent blossoming of Downtown, or the preservation of nearby historic areas such as 9th Street.</p> <p>4) Where are the major considerations for the many who travel daily to UAMS, VA, Children's Hospital,</p>	Mary Henthorn	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-7, H-6, H-3, H-1, I-12, K-5, I-9

	and the State Capitol? This massive freeway is the wrong approach. My children and grandchildren will experience more negative consequences than positive from this structure.				
297	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>Attached please find comments regarding the 30 Crossing Project submitted by the Junior League of Little Rock. A hard copy has also been mailed to the address listed on the ARDOT citizen comment form.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>[SEE PDF]</p>	Kim Logue - Junior League of Little Rock	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-13, J-2, K-7
298	<p>Little Rock is a stagnant city. We do not attract business as they do not see us as modern and innovative. If we pour more concrete through the middle of the city I believe the city will die. Thriving cities are tearing out their freeways. So please stop this project. We need excellent public transportation for our citizens.</p> <p>Having to own a car to get to work and shopping is keeping individuals and families in poverty.</p> <p>It is fiscally irresponsible to fund this 7.3-mile project to the detriment of the highway department's responsibility to adequately maintain existing state roads</p> <p>The Arkansas highway department is responsible to maintain ~16,000 miles of state roads. They publicly acknowledge a maintenance deficit in excess of \$100 million a year. Yet they continue to want to build new roads when they don't have sufficient funds to maintain existing roads. Somehow they need to be made to meet current road maintenance needs before adding new roads.</p>	Katherine West	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, H-8, I-6, L
299	I absolutely think this would benefit Little Rock for the better. As the capitol city, the new changes would bring positive fresh energy; Little Rock has been waiting for.	Mandy Wilkinson	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
300	I support the ARDOT favored configuration of 30 Crossing. Much public comment and input has been made and incorporated and it is time to implement.	Hugh McDonald	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
301	I am in favor of AR DOT's preferred configuration (6 lanes with split diamond interchange) for the 30 crossing project. This provides the best combination of badly needed green space and pedestrian safety.	Gordon Silaski	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
302	I support the plan to make the 30 Crossing area safer and more beautiful. I first saw Little Rock when in college, driving from my home state of Texas on my way to Missouri, and I remember being surprised at how big the city looked from the I-30 bridge. That was almost 40 years ago, and I now see that bridge daily from the downtown Little Rock office in which I work. I've made my home and reared my sons here, and I want others to drive through and have the same reaction I did...but more safely, with less traffic and with an even more beautiful view.	Dana Berry	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
303	The 1-30 Crossing seems to be a step backward in promoting our state as the "bicycle hub" of the south. After revitalizing the downtown areas of Central AR (more like a resurrection), this extensive project will send people back to the "burbs" quicker than ever before. Which is great if you are trying to kill an area. My experience with economic development through the LEAD AR program taught me to make areas "a destination" and bike and pedestrian friendly. That's good for communities and citizens and will attract industry. I'm against this project as designed and hope someone will listen!	Gracia Stroud	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, J-2
304	I am a cyclist in LR and am limited in my ability to bike in and to many places due to the lack of safety and few bicycle lanes. The comments below specifically address all of my concerns and wishes. I am in complete support of BACA in their requests. They truly do speak to the safety of all concerned. As a nurse of 39 years, I have seen many unnecessary accidents due to too many cars and unclear paths	Pam de Gravelles	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2, I-5, K-13, K-5, K-15

	<p>for pedestrians and cyclists. Please think safety of the public as a whole when making your decision.</p> <p>1. The astronomical increase in cars will basically make Downtown and the Rivermarket areas like a highway. Both areas are heavily trafficked areas for people on bikes or people walking. These will no longer be safe activities due to the high volume of vehicular traffic being funneled into those areas. Arkansas is #13 in worst state for pedestrians and #3 for worst states for cyclists. Why make it more unsafe?</p> <p>2. The Downtown and Rivermarket areas are also high tourism areas. Tourism accounts for almost 2 billion of Pulaski County's income and we know that these two areas of the city are high in tourist attractions. The new I30 will divide Little Rock's most visited tourist destination (Clinton Library) from the place where tourists spend money (Rivermarket). The I30 corridor could also create an unwelcoming corridor due to high traffic, increase in noise and unsafe conditions.</p> <p>3. There has been a huge effort to revitalize downtown with new business and the addition of the Creative Corridor. I can not image walking a street with 15,000 cars on it to access a business downtown. The I30 widening will cause pedestrian activities to become unsafe and unwelcoming. Businesses downtown will likely take the hit.</p> <p>4. The city of Little Rock has taken huge measures to bring an amazing Bike Share program to Little Rock in the Spring of 2019. We know from other cities that Bike Share is so important to tourism and the growth. Bikeshare's focal area is centered within the I-30 area of impact; I-30 traffic could kill it due to high traffic volumes and unsafe infrastructure.</p> <p>5. Below are specific requests addressed in the Quapaw Report Requests (Quapaw Quarter Report, pgs. 4-16):</p> <p>1) Don't expand I-30 capacity</p> <p>2) If ArDOT DOES expand I-30 capacity, bikes should be accommodated not only within the I-30 right of way but within the I-30 area of impact (protected bike lanes, off-street trails, Quapaw Quarter Report, (pgs. 4-9))</p> <p>3) BikePed accommodations should include the MacArthur Park trail (pgs. 9-16 of Quapaw Quarter Report).</p>				
305	<p>Please do not widen I-30. Widening I30 at its current location will make it so much harder for downtown Little Rock to be a more walkable, bikable, enjoyable place. I work downtown just by the RiverMarket. As it is, downtown area already has more traffic than it can handle and is currently not near safe enough for people to bike or walk as it could be. People even have to walk over the current highway off and on ramps as it is. We need pedestrian-safe areas and dedicated bicycle lanes that traffic cannot encroach on. We need to find ways to reroute that traffic away from the heart of the city.</p> <p>Please don't make it worse. We need to find a way to keep the air healthy (not increase pollution) and make downtown a safer, livable, walkable, bikable, community space.</p>	Jennifer Li Mathers	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-5, K-13, K-15,
306	<p>I am opposed to the expansion of I 30 downtown. Please reroute outside of the city. It will overshadow and suppress the river market businesses and Clinton museum.</p>	Elizabeth Speck-Kern	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, H-4
307	<p>I think that the expansion is a great way to promote safety while also making Little Rock look nicer</p>	Laura Hollingsworth	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q

308	I am not in favor of this project, as I feel strongly that it will disrupt positive strides to create a more livable downtown and East Corridor. Our population density and traffic congestion do not warrant this project at this time.	Anna Beth Gorman	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, K-15
309	I am in favor of ArDOT's preferred configuration for 30 Crossing, the six lanes plus c/d lanes with split-diamond interchange. The plan adds green space to the downtown core and increases pedestrian connectivity, which will be beneficial to downtown residents, businesses, and visitors, and simultaneously increases vehicular safety.	Greg Purtle	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
310	I work downtown and feel this would greatly benefit the area.	Katy Bartlett	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
311	Forest Hills remains adamantly opposed to the currently proposed I-30 plan for expansion. We believe if implemented, the downstream effect will have the potential to devastate the neighborhoods south of I-630. We demand a detailed and extensive environment impact study, with a concentration/focus on air quality now and the impact the proposed construction will have on all neighborhoods that are near it if built as proposed.	Rohn Muse	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-12, K-8, K-12
312	This is a terrible idea, a waste of money and resources, and will further divide the city. Please do not let it go through.	Dan Shelton	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9
313	I am in support of the expansion of I-30. I would like to suggest that there be a very strong emphasis on making this all look beautiful. Make the bridge something to behold, include lighting and art under the bridge. Make green space that would work well in a city. There are cities all over the country that have made infrastructure beautiful. ARDOT did this with the Big Rock exchange. Once again I support the expansion and replacement of the I30 running through North Little Rock and Little Rock. Just include art and make it something to use daily and enjoy looking at.	Rushton	7/27/2018	Web Form	K-6
314	Changing the name from Highway Dept to Dept of Transportation does not fool anyone. You are motivated only by the prospect of pouring more concrete and building more highways. Your plan gives no consideration in your analysis to mass transit, bikes, alternative modes of transportation, new technologies and evolving changes in society. Other cities are tearing down central city highways. Your plan is short-sighted business as usual. I am opposed to it.	Glenn Nishimura	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-6, H-7, I-6, K-10, H-8, I-9
315	As a longterm business owner in the River Market District (18 years with Stickyz Chicken Shack and 12 years with Rev Room) we are very concerned that we will need to move our business out of the area due to the disruption of traffic flow. I know we are only one voice, but our concerns are significant enough in our world to make relocation a necessary consideration.	Chris King	7/27/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15, M
316	Having considered the proposals that have been over the past several months, I favor ArDOT's preferred configuration for the 30 Crossing which is six lanes plus contributor/ distributor lanes with a split diamond interchange.	Byron Eiseman	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q

317	<p>As a resident and worker in the River Market District, I am writing against the expansion of I-30 as currently planned, especially the expansion of Second and Third Streets.</p> <p>As a young professional, I love living and working in downtown Little Rock. Seeing the positive changes in the downtown's development, since I moved here six years ago makes living here enjoyable.</p> <p>I'm concerned this particular expansion plan of I-30 would do nothing but negatively impact Little Rock's development. In particular, expanding and encouraging traffic flow through Second and Third Streets will severely hurt the residences and businesses located there, which have contributed so much to the success of the River Market District.</p> <p>If this plan moves forward, Little Rock looks less desirable to stay long-term when other cities are strengthening their downtown cores.</p> <p>Vibrant downtowns entice people to stay, and this expansion will make Little Rock unattractive to young professionals.</p>	Shannon Marie Lausch	7/27/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15
318	[SEE PDF]	John O. Hedrick	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
319	<p>Hello, Please see the attached document for Preserve Arkansas's comments on the 30 Crossing Environmental Assessment. Thank you, Rachel Patton</p> <p>[SEE PDF]</p>	Rachel Patton	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
320	<p>I am against the current design regarding the Widening of I-30 through Downtown LR and NLR. The money is not there, nor will this plan enhance those sections of these cities. Downtown Little Rock is just coming into its own and doesn't need to be destroyed buy unnecessary widening of the lanes.</p> <p>The environmental impact will cause pollution affecting individuals who live near the interstate. Increased pulmonary health issues due to exhaust and increased noise will cause auditory problems, all interfering with the quality of life. You have received multiple reports that offer better solutions that will not destroy communities like I-630 did. I do not want my money used to increase harm to those living in LR or NLR or destroy neighborhoods. I am against the current plan for this project.</p>	Lynn Christie	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, K-5, K-15, K-8, K-2
321	<p>One downgrade of service I see in this design is 13th Street east of I-30 no longer has convenient access to I-40 west or 107 North. In fact, there is no access to I-40 west or 107 North anywhere north of Broadway Street. It seems another flyover ramp from Locust Street north of 19th street to the I-40 west/107 north ramps would solve that problem for northbound. This might also help with traffic leaving Verizon events. Instead of that traffic having to come all the way back down to Broadway, they could use Bishop Lindsey to go north on Locust.</p>	William McFadden	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
322	[SEE PDF]	Jodi A. Barnes	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
323	<p>I am not in favor of sprawl. I personally cringe at the idea of commuting 30 minutes, 45 minutes, or more to go back and forth to work daily. HOWEVER, Little Rock failed for decades to attract workingclass families and many of those families have instead chosen to live outside of Little Rock, outside of Pulaski County even.</p> <p>I understand that the Arkansas Department of Transportation serves all Arkansans, not just Little Rock, and not just some people in Little Rock. The way government works, the solution should be one that helps the majority of constituents, not the minority.</p> <p>As I understand it, the Interstate Highway System was established, exactly as the name suggests, to promote transportation between states. The fact that it became used by commuters is as much a failure</p>	Jeff Yates	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q

	<p>by local communities, regions, and states as any other reason. Given all the above, I find it completely logical to support the proposed 30 Crossing design that allows for the local traffic to be served by some lanes while providing other lanes for the through traffic. I ask that ArDOT proceed carefully yet with deliberate speed to complete this project. Those that oppose this plan might better serve the community by focusing their efforts on creating environments that encourage more urban living and greater use of transportation other than the private automobile. Perhaps if they do such things, by the time the new bridge is obsolete maybe the next replacement can be an even smaller cross section. (And, PLEASE DO NOT give the land to the City of Little Rock to in turn give away for private profit. The City of Little Rock has, sadly, proven to be a bastion of crony capitalism for decades.)</p>				
324	[SEE PDF]	Paul Dodds / Urban Frontier LLC	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
325	<p>I am apposed to the current proposed lane expansion of I30. Downtown Little Rock has made tremendous improvements over the past 20 years (it is unrecognizable from the sad state it was in the 90's). The River Market is thriving and East Village is blossoming into a thriving district as well. This large scale highway expansion threatens to derail the progress that downtown has been striving for. I see no logical reason why the tens of thousands of interstate travelers who have no desire to visit downtown Little Rock cannot simply use another corridor - expand I-440 and send the commercial traffic and interstate travelers that route leaving the I-30 crossing improvement at a smaller scale to accommodate only local traffic and Little Rock visitors.</p>	Georjena Selva	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, H-4, K-5, K-15
326	<p>I am against moving forward on the 30 Crossing project. The impact of construction and changed traffic patterns on local businesses has not been fully assessed. It has been well documented that interstates cutting through downtowns are a deterrent to economic growth in those towns. It was proven when I-30 and I-630 were built. They divide our city causing rises in crime and poverty. As car ownership numbers and miles driven numbers diminish with new generations, the proposed "need" for projects like this is unwarranted. As interstates like this encourage flight from the city which decreases local tax bases need to maintain other city infrastructure, safety, and educational needs, we shouldn't be rewarding those who flee but encouraging them to move into the city, closer to where they work.</p>	Joe Jacobs	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-6, K-10, I-10, K-5, K-15, M
327	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed widening of the I-30 Bridge crossing into downtown Little Rock. I have reviewed several studies and comments both for and against and conclude that the proposed expansion is n overwhelmingly bad idea. Please consider alternative plans instead, such as a new bridge from NLR connecting with Chester Street in Little Rock, which makes much more sense. I commute daily into Little Rock from the Morgan community and have no problem crossing the bridge. I ccasionally experience a slow down during rush hour. Sometimes it adds a minute or two to my commute. I enjoy living in Morgan but it was my choice. I and others living out here should not be entitled to shave a few minutes time crossing the bridge at the expense of destroying the integrity of downtown Little Rock. Maintaining and building the vitality of the River Market and surrounding areas is far too important.</p>	Bill Rahn	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-3, I-9, I-11, K-5, K-15

328	I am against continuing with the current plans presented by the Arkansas Department of Transportation on the 30 Crossing project. Not enough research has been done to the economic impact of this project on small businesses in the area both during the construction and resulting from traffic flow changes.	Joe Jacobs	7/27/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15
329	Please do not expand the lanes for I-30. The Environmental Assessment (EA) does not adequately consider the impact of increased traffic volume on east-west city streets throughout the project area. The EA does not address the impact of I30 Crossing on the Metro Streetcar system. I don't agree with the approach taken by the ADOT.	Jennifer Herron	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-15, K-14
330	I have reviewed all of the proposals that have been submitted over the past months. I travel through the 30 Crossing corridor every day and believe that the currently proposed plan is the best of those that have been presented. The goals of accommodating the growth in traffic counts as well as mitigating the effects on the associated neighborhood spaces have been well thought out. The common park spaces will greatly enhance the city spaces in the corridor. The Rivermarket area will be well enhanced, particularly by adding the green space and potentially lowering traffic counts through the Cumberland, President Clinton intersection, which has become more and more troublesome with increased pedestrian usage. Thank you so much for all of the thoughts and efforts that have gone into the project. --- Now, if we could just get the construction done in about 6 months.....	John Rogers	7/27/2018	Web Form	Q
331	[SEE PDF]	Rachel Patton	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
332	The I 30 Crossing will not improve downtown LR, which should be one of the considerations in how it goes forward. It will also require additional freeway construction in the future, further endangering neighborhoods and people. Do no more than is necessary for public safety.	Muriel Storrie	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-12, K-5, K-15
333	I am an avid bicyclists who do enjoys riding in the River Trail almost monthly. Our bike group has a monthly ride on the River Trail in place on our Mont schedule of rides. Afterward we ride our bikes over to the Flying Saucer for lunch. Our group do enjoys being able to ride s an in the River Market area	Shir Lee Wilson	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2

<p>334</p>	<p>The cumulative effects of traffic noise need to be addressed. I would certainly agree with the EA's assertion on indicated epage 3973/3992 that traffic noise is not declining, but as submitted in other documents, traffic noise is expected to increase in all the alternatives, even beyond the increases which occurred when these interstates were constructed. Therefore the cumulative effects of traffic noise do need to be addressed. --The temporal start date of 1985 for the cumulative effects analysis is much too late; it must be set to the date at which the first interstate construction in the area began. The deleterious effects of the interstates in greater Little Rock began with the construction of the interstates. "The temporal study period is from 1985 to 2041. The temporal start date of 1985 was selected to follow the year when the last section of I-630 was completed and open to the public." indicated epage 3974/3992</p>	<p>Dale Pekar</p>	<p>7/27/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>R</p>
<p>335</p>	<p>To Whom It May Concern: The 30 Crossing Environmental Assessment: ArDOT Job NO. CA0602 fails to address several impacts that will cause significant harm to the area's environment and future development. The document talks about increasing vehicle flow in, out and through the Little Rock/North Little Rock downtown area, however doesn't sufficiently address the impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>Impact: Encourages sprawl and lessens viability of downtown. The project of widening the Interstates would encourage sprawling growth in the region, and thus, give people less of a reason to go to the urban core for anything other than work or things they have to do. The economic benefits stated in the assessment would be lessened because more people would choose to live further out of town, thus increasing the development of suburban growth and sprawl. This development would mean more people would choose to do things further outside the urban core. The history of the construction of I-630 bares this out.</p> <p>Impact: Sprawl's impact on the environment. This also resulted in more sprawl, which creates more impact on the landscape and to the environment. This is another aspect this assessment doesn't account for. The greater sprawl created by the interstate growth encourages people to move further out of town because for several years after the interstate is expanded, people will be able to reduce their commute time. However, as more people move out of town and others move further out of town, the Interstates will fill up with traffic again. With more people commuting from further away, more impact will be placed on our environment including that of: more air pollution; more fuel consumption, meaning more environmental stress to the world in obtaining, refining and delivering it (which also includes social and political impacts); increased pressure on global warming; more resources used in maintaining the expanded roads: a larger impact on the wildlife, making even a larger barrier to their movement and shrinking their already limited habitat.</p> <p>Impact: Larger financial responsibility. The larger interstate would also create a larger financial responsibility for maintenance. This assessment does not explain where the funds will come from this larger financial burden. ArDOT is currently in need of finding money to maintain the highway system right now. Where are the funds for this larger burden going to come from?</p> <p>Impact: Loss of walk-ability, bike-ability, safety and character in a thriving and growing district. Much of the redevelopment of the downtown area is a result of the increased walk-ability and bikeability of the area and the impacts of the proposed 30 Crossing project to this region isn't accounted for in this assessment. The 30 Crossing project is projected to increase vehicle traffic numbers into the River Market District, and increase the road sizes of streets that currently have the highest pedestrian traffic in the metro area. This assessment doesn't accurately address the impacts on pedestrians, cyclists, businesses</p>	<p>Mike Sprague</p>	<p>7/27/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>I-13, L, J-2, K-13</p>

	<p>and residents of the area. One of the appealing things about a dense urban district like the River Market is that once you are there, whether as a visitor or a resident, is that you can then walk, or bicycle to many different locations and not have to get back in a vehicle and drive just to hunt down a parking spot. With increased vehicle traffic in the area, barriers, like a four-lane road proposed for 2nd Street and increased traffic would discourage people from going further. Cyclists would be further reduced to those who were brave or were risk-takers. The momentum of the district's development would be slowed. This would be happening to the area of Little Rock that not only has the highest bicycle-pedestrian traffic, however it is also the area that likely has the highest value per square foot and largest tax ROI in the city. It is also the district that visitors rave about after going to conferences because of the walk-ability and excitement of the area, not because they can drive their car through the area faster.</p> <p>Impact: Addition of a discouraging and dangerous barrier to pedestrian and bicycle traffic in the River Market. A four-lane 2nd Street would further isolate areas of the River Market and make it more dangerous, which was also not addressed in this assessment. Although the street would have stoplights with crosswalks, the crossing itself would discourage folks from making the trip across it. Also, a four-lane road is inherently a dangerous road for pedestrians because of the weaving nature of traffic on them and from when a car stops for a pedestrian and a car in the other lane passes the stopped car and doesn't see the pedestrian.</p> <p>Impact: East-west pedestrian and bicycle traffic barrier. The assessment says the project would benefit the east-west pedestrian mobility of the area, however it fails to show how the proposed actions would outweigh the the discouraging environment of creating a large multi-stoplight, 15-lane (including the frontage roads) crossing. Many large roads in suburban development have stoplights with crosswalks, however that does not make them encouraging, inviting or safe. The result of this means that the only people that walk and cross the large streets are those who have no other choice. This will be highly detrimental to the development of the area.</p> <p>In conclusion, this environmental assessment doesn't address major impacts that will significantly affect the environment, economics and viability of the region.</p>				
336	<p>This assessment appears to ignore the overwhelming evidence suggesting an ever-expanding interstate system inevitably leads to more traffic and, consequently, more congestion, thus spurring the construction of even more interstate lanes and attendant infrastructure. Further, as a Little Rock resident and part owner of a small, downtown Little Rock business, I find the myopic quest to move more and more citizens of bedroom communities in, out, and through this city--as opposed to providing residents and visitors with safe and appealing infrastructure suitable for bicyclists, pedestrians, and those with different abilities--to be contrary to the long-term interests of Little Rock, not in keeping with the supposedly-holistic nature of the Metroplan, and, ultimately, incredibly shortsighted. No forward-looking city is seriously considering such outdated infrastructure plans, and I would encourage ArDot and Metroplan to reconsider this regressive highway design, and invest our tax money instead on an infrastructure plan that will keep Little Rock on par with other dynamic cities in the South and elsewhere.</p>	Matthew Mcnair	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-9, I-10, K-5, K-15
337	<p>The Resource Study Area must be expanded to include other affected communities. Table 2-2 makes clear that the outlying communities have been affected the most by the quicker access times afforded by the interstates. It is likely that areas beyond these boundaries would likely also be affected. I can offer my personal submission that when I located to Little Rock around the year 2000 that a real estate agent tried to get me to locate to Conway! Searcy, Conway, Bauxite, Benton, Bryant have all been affected by the interstates and need to be included in the analysis. I can also share that two of my colleagues in Little Rock, out of an office of about twelve people, actually commuted daily from Pine Bluff.</p>	Dale Pekar	7/27/2018	Web Form	R

<p>338</p>	<p>Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT)</p> <p>The residents of the Wright Avenue Neighborhood Association, Inc. (WANA) are rather apprehensive about the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) I-30 expansion (and I-630) and requests a full Environmental Impact Statement offering a clear explanation on how all this interstate-building will impact our historic neighborhoods.</p> <p>Located in heart of Little Rock Arkansas, the Historic Wright Avenue Neighborhood boasts of being home to the largest collection of historic homes within the City of Little Rock. The neighborhood is bounded south side of 17th Street on the north, Roosevelt Road on the south, Dr Martin Luther King Jr on the east, and Thayer Street on the west. Although the neighborhood is diverse, it is predominantly African American and spans age, gender, and varying income brackets. Our neighborhood earned national recognition and was awarded Neighborhood of the Year Award (2nd place) in the Social Revitalization category for our Annual Movies on the Boulevard event—a free community outdoor movie with free concession.</p> <p>Traditionally highways divide cities and destroy neighborhoods--particularly predominantly African American neighborhoods. Ninth Street was a thriving successful African American business and entertainment district in Little Rock from the 19th century through the early 20th century. This closeknit self-sufficient African American community had all the services needed in the once booming Ninth Street business corridor. By 1959, the thriving business district reached over 100 businesses including doctors, dentists, drug stores, hospital, grocery stores, jewelers, hotels, taxis, theaters barbers, beauty shops, service stations, tailors, restaurants, colleges, churches, and more. Despite segregation, the Ninth Street business community provided jobs and created a high level of selfreliance. Neighborhoods face ongoing neglect and stillborn investment.</p> <p>Building Interstate 630 contributed to the decline of the thriving Ninth Street business district; it plowed through the middle of the vibrant close-knit self-sufficient African American community—dividing and destroying the neighborhood. There is aftermath from this type of devastation.</p> <p>Across the country, cities have embraced the funds, mostly funded by Federal Highway Act, to build roads that disproportionately displace and destroy the once vibrant successful African American communities. In addition to the destruction of Little Rock’s Ninth Street and neighborhoods south of I-630, highways have destroyed inner cities such as Birmingham Alabama, Charlotte (Brooklyn) North Carolina, Dallas(Oak Cliff) Texas, Jacksonville Florida, Baltimore Maryland, Detroit Michigan, Richmond Virginia, Syracuse New York, etc. The list goes on and on. Example after example the story is the same. The inner city becomes underserved while the federally funded highways are built to accommodate people who leave the heart of the city driving home to the suburbs.</p> <p>I have read your Environment Assessment including the Community Impact Technical Report and appendices. More detail is necessary. For example, specifically what are you saying in this excerpt from your report...”The direct displacement and relocation or alteration of homes, businesses or public facilities may lead to indirect effects such as changes to neighborhood cohesion, neighborhood stability, the local economy, access to specific services or products, recreation patterns at public facilities and cultural values. As previously described, the majority of the proposed improvements will take place within existing ROW. The proposed project would potentially result in six residential displacements for all Action Alternatives.”</p> <p>Your Environment Assessment inadequately explains the impact of your proposed changes to the neighborhood. I saw the addresses of the displaced commercial businesses. What are the addresses of the proposed residential property owners being displaced? Which properties will require alterations and what type of alterations? What are the displaced residents’ racial, gender, and age makeup? Which proposed displaced properties are African American property owners? How many renters? Do you classify landlord properties as businesses? Your plan indicates you have relocation assistance for businesses. With what percentage of the relocation cost will you assist? Your assessment estimates 75 jobs will be displaced. Do</p>	<p>Wright Avenue Neighborhood Association, Sheila Miles</p>	<p>7/27/2018</p>	<p>Web Form</p>	<p>R</p>
------------	---	--	------------------	-----------------	----------

	<p>you pay the businesses' employees during the transition time? What is your plan to help sustain displaced businesses? What is your plan to assist these individuals find employment if jobs are lost? You reached out to the city to get their opinion about the proposed changes. What are the opinions of each of the proposed displaced property owners and business owners? Bike lanes and parks are insignificant when the basic needs are of residents are stripped away.</p> <p>In your report, you stated ARDOT will assist displaced residents under the Uniform Act. Your research estimates the residential appraised values range from \$29,200 to \$53,500; however the sales histories range from \$47,000 to \$147,000. This doesn't add up. Your appraised values are approximately 40% - 60% less than market value. What appraiser did you use? If a house cost \$47,000 and you propose to pay your appraised value of \$29,200, the basic needs of the resident are not being met. Are you going to pay dislocated residents based on your extremely low appraised values or the sales/market values?</p> <p>A family member recently experienced the impact of an ARDOT highway expansion, and it was not a pleasant one. The property owners directly affected were mostly low-income senior citizens with no mortgage and fixed incomes. The ARDOT staff bullied and intimidated these elderly owners who would not agree to low-ball offers. Staff was disrespectful and would use the verbiage 'you people' when the owners refused to comply. I observed an ARDOT staff member yell at a senior citizen who asked a question. This was a classic example of "don't question me, just follow along and comply". The WANA board and membership voted to submit public comments. We are requesting a full Environmental Impact Statement offering a clear explanation on how all this interstate-building will impact our neighborhoods.</p> <p>Sheila Miles, President Wright Avenue Neighborhood Association, Inc smtmiles@aol.com (501) 944-1827</p> <p>McVey, J. (2015, March). Life on the Line: a History pin Tour of Little Rock's West Ninth Street. Retrieved from www.dighist.org/2015/03/life-on-the-line-a-historypin-tour-of-little-rocks-west-ninthstreet/.</p>				
339	<p>The Cumulative Effects Report does not present a balanced picture as on indicated epage 3978.</p>	Dale Pekar	7/27/2018	Web Form	R
340	<p>Since I had to wait till the very end of the comment period to submit this, I'll have to be much shorter than I wanted to be. I moved from midtown Little Rock to Jacksonville two years ago; my prior comments are still in the public record, and I stand behind the parts that haven't been discarded already, including my proposal that the 30 Crossing bridge be named for Maya Angelou. Indeed, the park space created next to the CALS Main Library, whose prototype carried her name even though it was rejected as she was then still living, makes it even more appropriate that the bridge and/or park be named for Ms. Angelou, since the Southwest Trail crossing in this area was the inspiration for her poem "On the Pulse of Morning" at President Clinton's first inauguration. (That should be confirmable by Dr. Patricia W. McGraw, a retired UCA and former UALR professor and a member of the Arkansas Black Hall of Fame, who told me 25 years ago that Ms. Angelou told her that at the inauguration.) I fully support the Preferred Alternative and urge you NOT to give in to the "boulevard nuts" and their stupid "induced demand" (or as I call it, "Field of Dreams") traffic theories, recycled from the fight against widening I-30 to Benton many years ago. Though sometimes traffic does increase beyond projections after a freeway expansion, IMO that is better described as "repressed demand" due to the poor freeway. The "boulevard nuts" have tried other stuff in the past, including calling it a "tunnel to Cabot" (disproved by a spot in the Preferred Alternative that actually gives I-30 *fewer* thru lanes than present, not to mention actual traffic flow) and even stealing</p>	Richelle Brittain	7/27/2018	Web Form	R

	<p>my own comments in the Democrat-Gazette about Pine Bluff's Martha Mitchell "Expressway" (they ignore why I put "Expressway" in quotes -- it's mostly an example of building a boulevard where a freeway was needed, NOT a freeway destroying a neighborhood since it's not really a freeway). Their REAL purpose is to stop ALL freeway construction in Little Rock in a futile attempt to stop suburban flight, as the recent I-630 lawsuit proves. Don't give in!</p> <p>One last thing: Please review AGAIN the "dip" in North Hills just off the south end of its I-40 interchange, which floods every time Dark Hollow floods. The best, and possibly ONLY, way to eliminate it is to extend the southern end of 30 Crossing's interchange reconstruction right up to the NLR-built drainage ditch bridge. If that requires cooperation with NLR, so be it; you built parts of Big Rock in LR city right-of-way (i.e., the Financial Centre Parkway end of the Shackelford overpass).</p>				
341	<p>Please add the following as my comments. I have excerpted recognized experts to avoid any question regarding the source or validity of my concerns.</p> <p>Beyond the specifics of this project, my larger concern is the complete absence of academically prepared planners in your Planning unit (TPP). For contrast, please see TNDOT where Toks Omishakin M.U.R.P. is the Deputy Commissioner / Chief of Environment and Planning Toks.Omishakin@tn.gov Source: https://www.tn.gov/tdot/about/tdot-organizational-charts/chief-of-environment.html Source: https://nacto.org/person/adetokunbo-toks-omishakin/ Toks currently serves as vice chair of the AASHTO Council on Active Transportation, first convened in the fall of 2017.</p> <p>In 2011, Toks was appointed Assistant Commissioner and Chief of the Bureau of Environment and Planning at the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT). In this position, he guides TDOT's continued success in establishing transportation planning, policy, and performance and the necessary communication that is required with other governmental agencies, organizations, and the general public and legislative bodies. He is responsible for the bureau's administrative and project budget that exceeds \$250 million annually. He leads the activities of the divisions of Environment, Long-Range Planning, Project Planning and Multimodal Transportation Resources.</p> <p>Prior to joining TDOT, he served as the Director of Healthy Living Initiatives in the Office of Mayor – Karl Dean in Nashville, Tennessee. There he led efforts to develop a Complete Streets policy for Nashville and helped established a more balanced approach to transportation planning and design for the city. He was the Mayor's liaison to several council's and boards appointed to improve the built environment and livability of the city. Mr. Omishakin has been a speaker and presenter at several national and international conferences.</p> <p>He holds a Master's Degree in Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) with concentrations in transportation planning and urban design from Jackson State University, and a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering Technology from Mississippi Valley State University. His work has been published in The American Journal of Preventative Medicine and profiled in The Wall Street Journal, HBO Documentaries and Newsweek magazine. Mr. Omishakin is an active member of the American Planning Association, Association of Pedestrian & Bicycle Professionals and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Source: http://americawalks.org/about-us/leadership/adetokunbo-toks-omishakin/</p> <p>The contrast cannot be any clearer. TNDOT maintains a robust planning unit whose staff is dispersed across districts and actively engages in communities across the state to provide a full range of mobility options.</p> <p>The absence of any real long-range planning activity and ARDOT's total reliance on engineers in its planning efforts results in planning efforts that tend to be project specific and volumetric in the nature of the analysis performed. If delay were to no longer be the final answer to every question here, it is unclear</p>	Bud Laumer	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-10, I-13, K-10, I-6

	<p>what sort of measures would be applied. And yet, the trend across the nation is away from volume and delay and towards measures more familiar to members of the American Planning Association and the Congress for New Urbanism. Link: https://www.cnu.org/our-projects/cnu-ite-manual If you are successful in creating this urban divide in Little Rock, your project could easily and nearly immediately added to the list of Freeways without Futures Link: https://www.cnu.org/ourprojects/highways-boulevards</p> <p>Please consider comments offered by the Director of WSDOT sourced today from the AASHTO Journal: https://news.transportation.org/Pages/072018millar.aspx#.W1XWL6CGBNA.twitter WSDOT's Roger Millar: "We Must Become Stewards of the Transportation System" Roger Millar, secretary of the Washington Department of Transportation, sees many challenges ahead for state DOTs – especially as pressure on existing capacity keeps rising while the funding required to keep the state's transportation network ship-shape continues to shrink. "We like to talk about traffic congestion as an issue, but it is actually a symptom of a larger problem – and the problem is we don't provide affordable housing and transportation solutions," he explained during the keynote speech at the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials 2018 Joint Policy Committee meeting in Spokane, Washington, on July 18. "We have a rich list of transportation options for the rich that can afford to live in our cities – the rest are forced to drive. And they drive vehicles that often can't make the trip" because of the condition they are in, Millar said. Millar's comments came as the lead-in to a panel discussion among state DOT CEOs that included: Scott Bennett, director of the Arkansas DOT and chair of AASHTO's committee on planning. And building more capacity is fiscally out of the question anyway, he added. "We asked ourselves, what would it cost to solve traffic congestion? To be able to drive 60 mph on the interstate whenever we wanted to? We found out it would cost \$115 billion, or a \$2.20 to \$2.50 per gallon increase in the gas tax," Millar said. "So what we are talking about when try to solve congestion is something financially impossible to do. Congestion is not a failure on the state DOT's part – it is a problem we simply cannot solve," he emphasized. "And this does not address growth in the economy or capacity on other routes, for what happens at the end of ramp to a local road when you double or triple size of freeway?" Millar pointed out that managing demand on the system is the key. "Our biggest source of capacity in the system is reducing demand; getting more people to telework, travel at off-peak hours, and by making off-system travel improvements such as adding bike lanes changes demand on system," he explained. "That way we add capacity but only where it makes sense." I could go on here with examples from my experience working with John Norquist in Milwaukee, and dozens of other agencies, but time is running out on the comment period and I delayed sending this until after offering my resignation here at ARDOT.</p>				
342	<p>If getting across the river is such an issue then you need to look at another bridge downstream instead, because you have to think about people from midtown and west little rock too. I remember in one of your studies that said if you build a new bridge it would reduce the need for 10 lanes on I-30. What else would make sense is to complete the North Belt Freeway because I notice ever since the incompetent visionless Metroplan decided to take it off you decided to go with 10 lanes which majority of the people didn't want. Once the construction is said and done you need to make that green space into a parking lot because of the amount of traffic that you're pushing through downtown they are going to need a place to park. Please listen to people instead of corporations when we say this is too much and look at another alternative like a new bridge or a transit regardless of what your bias studies say. We need less engineering and more common sense because with common sense you would have looked at other alternatives to get around, the north belt freeway would be completed by now, you would put more lighting on our freeways instead relying on the cities and you would improve Interstate 30 by phases</p>	Alex Morgan	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-2, H-3, H-4, H-6, H-7, L

	instead of all at once because as a taxpayer who voted for this, I as well as every other taxpayer is outraged on how this CAP program turned out to be a sham when you said that this would be a FOUR LANE highway program not a 5 8 or 10 lane program and you are trying to spend majority of that money on this piece a crap of a boondoggle that majority of the people didn't want. SHAME ON YOU ARDOT!!! YOU HAVE SOLD US OUT!!!!				
343	Having lived in Little Rock most of my life, i have seen several successful and unsuccessful revitalization efforts. The plan to widen I-30 downtown would be detrimental to the city.	Elizabeth speck-kern	7/27/2018	Web Form	K-5, K-15
344	Don't expand I-30 capacity. I live downtown and this will be horrible for my community. One reason we all love it so much and why tourists love it is because the area is walkable and safe and comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists to get around. Please don't ruin the feel and charm of downtown my expanding I30.	Mitzi M. Griffin, Esq.	7/27/2018	Web Form	J-2, K-5, K-13, K-15
345	Studies have shown that expansions do not decreases traffic but create more traffic, increase noise, air and light pollution. We are responsible to create as much green space in the city as possible. Please be responsible and do not add more lanes disrupting downtown businesses and making it more impossible to cycle to work. Please explore other avenues to solve any bottle neck spots in the current route.	Karen Dipippa	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-10, J-2, K-2, K-8, K-11, N-1
346	<p>This whole process has been ridiculous!! The highway department has, from the beginning, known what it wants to do and has rolled over everyone to get their way. Note the overwhelming opposition to this proposed project from comments that seemingly are discarded. You plow ahead under the auspices of taking suggestions, yes, but when it comes to listening to those suggestions, no! I do not support this 6 lane highway with four lanes of connector distributors. Please just fix the bridge. Otherwise, use money to fix the existing miserable highway conditions. Can't we learn from history? The noise, the pollution, the plummeting property values, the extra traffic, etc. Is the highway department bent on re-ruining this city after the city has fought its way back to popularity, prosperity and relevance?</p> <p>Please don't do what Houston has done. When you build bigger and wider roads, you will attract more traffic, cause more congestion and for what? I commute both from downtown and back downtown each day, and it takes little more than twelve to fifteen minutes from mid-town. I was raised in Philadelphia, Detroit and Pittsburgh and whoever is complaining about traffic here has no concept of the reality of true urban congestion and navigating difficult rush hours. Besides, we have smart phones that help aid our navigation and provide several alternative routes.</p> <p>This project is wasted money, wasted time, wasted effort and for what? 5 or 6 minutes of travel time? I have little faith that these comments will do any good and, in fact, this is the first public forum I've ever commented about on-line. But, this is so important to me that I feel the need to do so.</p> <p>Please be forward thinking--have imagination-- imagine rail, self-driving cars and use the money to fix the pitiful roads you should be maintaining. Finally, the environmental impact of this expansion will be both unacceptable and devastating to all who live in the city. Further research and study must be done in which you truly consider alternative options. For once in the history of Arkansas, please don't put a self-serving project that will only negatively impact our city, our communities and many of our businesses in the way of smart choices.</p> <p>Please keep 3rd street as two lanes and keep the parking. Don't ruin this charming area.</p> <p>I'm ashamed of this whole mess!</p>	Brad Minnick	7/27/2018	Web Form	N-2, H-2, I-9, H-6, K-10

347	As someone who commutes through this area daily, I do not think adding capacity to I30 is a good idea. Please consider alternatives that divert traffic around this tourist and pedestrian area.	Eldon Eugene Pyburn	7/27/2018	Web Form	H-3, H-4
348	Mr. Hetzel, We are also submitting comments on letterhead. There didn't seem to be a way to include the formal letterhead when we submitted comments on your comments page. Please find attached. [SEE PDF]	Sheila Miles, Wright Avenue Neighborhood Association	7/27/2018	Written Comment	R
349	[SEE PDF]	M. Elaine Edwards, Corps of Engineers	7/27/2018	Comment Form	R
350	Please see the enclosed attachment. The attached is a petition signed by several residents that reside in the River Market Tower located at 315 Rock St. concerning the I-30 crossing. The signatories below are residential owners in the River Market Tower. We would like to voice our strong opposition to the proposed changes to 3rd Street between Cumberland and Interstate 30. The proposed changes include replacing stop signs with street lights, increasing traffic speeds, and increasing the traffic count from 4,200 to 11,000 on 3rd Street. It was also state that on-street parking may be eliminated. Eliminating the on-street parking will cause an undue burden to the merchants and restaurant owners on 3rd street for deliveries and patrons. Additionally, this will severely limit parking for visitor to the River Market Tower. The additional traffic and speeds will cause hazards to pedestrians. We enjoy the current walkability of our neighborhood. Please consider the potential devaluation to the residential properties of the River Market Tower, 300 Third, and Arkansas Capital Commerce Buildings. The investment of these three properties alone are more than \$100,000,000. See PDF	The Residential Owners of the River Market Tower	7/27/2018	Web Form	I-5, K-5, K-7, K-13, K-15
351	SEE PDF	Richard Mays		Website	R