

**PROCEDURES FOR  
NEW OR REVISED  
FREEWAY ACCESS  
IN ARKANSAS**

March 2004

# **PROCEDURES FOR NEW OR REVISED FREEWAY ACCESS IN ARKANSAS**

March 2004

Prepared by  
Joint QIP Team on New/Revised Access Control on Freeways  
  
Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department  
Arkansas Division Office of the Federal Highway Administration

Prepared 2/24/04

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
Basis of Policy and General Requirements .....	1
<b>Policy Applicability</b> .....	2
Actions Requiring AHTD Access Approval .....	2
Actions Requiring FHWA Access Approval.....	2
Actions Not Requiring FHWA Access Approval.....	3
<b>Policy Requirements</b> .....	4
<b>Operational Analysis</b> .....	7
<b>Procedure for Approval Request</b> .....	9
Step 1. General Concept Review .....	9
Step 2. Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review .....	11
Step 3. Final Review and Approval.....	12
 <b>Appendices</b>	
Definitions .....	A-1
New or Revised Access Proposal by the AHTD .....	B-1
New or Revised Access Proposal by Another Entity .....	C-1

# INTRODUCTION

This report explains the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy for new or revised Interstate access proposals and establishes procedures for applying that policy. The FHWA policy was originally issued in 1990 and then revised in February 1998. Section 111 of Title 23, United States Code (23 USC 111) requires that proposed new or revised Interstate access must be approved by the FHWA before such access modifications can be made.

While the FHWA policy applies to new or revised access points to the Interstate System, the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD) and the Arkansas Division Office of FHWA have jointly agreed to apply the policy to all fully access-controlled freeways in Arkansas regardless of the source(s) for funding the changes. The policy applies to all Federal, State, and local government agencies and private entities that propose and/or finance projects for new or modified access. Further, the FHWA policy does not imply that the AHTD is relinquishing its authority over any part of the State Highway System.

## **Basis of Policy and General Requirements**

The Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have a substantial investment in the fully access-controlled freeways in Arkansas. The freeway system in Arkansas makes up less than 5% of the 16,000-mile State Highway System but carries approximately 35% of the vehicle miles of travel and serves as the backbone of the System. Because any access modification can potentially affect the ability of the freeway system to effectively and safely accommodate travel, adequate control of access is critical to providing the highest levels of service on the freeway system. Therefore, although additional access points can be justified in specific instances, it is the policy of the AHTD to minimize the addition of new access points to the freeway system.

The spacing of adjacent interchanges has a pronounced effect on the operation of freeways. As a rule, the minimum interchange spacing is one mile in urban areas for both Interstate Highways and non-Interstate freeways. In rural areas, the minimum interchange spacing is three miles for Interstate Highways and two miles for non-Interstate freeways. Therefore, where the distance between adjacent interchanges will be less than these minimum spacings (measured between intersecting roads), the FHWA and the AHTD will require thorough documentation of all reasonable alternatives and must approve a finding that no feasible alternatives exist.

The FHWA approval of new or modified access constitutes a Federal action and therefore requires a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review of the impact of the proposal. Access modifications will only be approved after an analysis of the purpose, need and feasibility of the proposal and any reasonable alternatives based on traffic demand in the opening year and throughout the 20-year design period. The AHTD and the FHWA have determined that the approval procedure will be a three-step process that consists of (1) General Concept Review, (2) Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review, and (3) Final Review and Approval. All of these are discussed in detail later in this document. Concurrence in (2) Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review and (3) Final Review and Approval is valid for a three-year period based upon the original scope and purpose of the proposal.

## POLICY APPLICABILITY

An access point is defined as an entrance or exit point on the freeway mainline, including “locked gate” access. For example, a diamond interchange configuration has four access points. A proposal to revise or modify the existing access or the interchange configuration is considered a change even though the number of actual points of access may not change. For example, replacing one of the direct ramps of a diamond interchange with a loop or changing a cloverleaf interchange into a fully directional interchange is considered an access modification.

All proposals for additional or modified access must comply with Federal regulations, policies, and applicable design standards (e.g., AASHTO’s *A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, and AASHTO’s *A Policy on Design Standards - Interstate System*) as well as AHTD policies and practices. Exceptions to these regulations, policies, and design standards must be documented and are subject to the approval of the AHTD and the FHWA. Final project designs are subject to review and approval by the AHTD, and the FHWA if applicable.

The applicant must follow all NEPA and other applicable federal regulations such as the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act and should consider environmental and social impacts during the project development process. The NEPA process must be completed before final access approval can be given. Compliance with NEPA procedures may precede or follow a determination of engineering acceptability and feasibility.

### **Actions Requiring AHTD Access Approval**

**All proposals for changes to access must first be submitted to the AHTD for consideration. The AHTD will coordinate with the FHWA for actions requiring FHWA approval.**

### **Actions Requiring FHWA Access Approval**

- New interchange construction.
- Major modification of an existing interchange (i.e., adding new ramp(s), removing ramp(s), changing the interchange configuration, completing basic movements at a partial interchange).
- New partial interchange or new ramps for any purpose (tourist information centers, rest areas, weigh stations, connections to frontage roads, etc.).
- Locked gate access to/from the main lanes (i.e., access to adjacent properties by non-AHTD personnel via locked gate).
- Abandonment of ramps or interchanges.

- Decreasing the length of any deceleration lane or acceleration lane on any existing ramp to less than the applicable design standard. This type of proposal will also require FHWA approval of a design exception.
- Increasing the length of an off-ramp deceleration lane or on-ramp acceleration lane, if the adjacent freeway ramps are at a distance less than 1.0 mile away from this location (measured between physical gore areas).

### **Actions not Requiring FHWA Access Approval**

- Adding left or right turn storage lanes and through travel lanes at the crossroad end of ramps.
- Relocating or shifting the existing on-ramp or off-ramp termini (i.e., moving the ramp end which connects with the crossroad or relocating the off-ramp or on-ramp gore point along the freeway mainline).
- Widening existing on-ramps or off-ramps to provide auxiliary lanes or extended acceleration or deceleration lanes.
- Adding an auxiliary lane between two adjacent interchanges by connecting the entrance and exit ramps.
- Increasing the length of an off-ramp deceleration lane or on-ramp acceleration lane, if the adjacent ramp exists at a distance (measured between physical gore areas) more than 1.0 mile.
- Adding or modifying traffic signals or channelization at the ramp termini with crossroad.
- Adding or modifying the signing and striping of a freeway on-ramp or off-ramp as long as the geometric features are not changed.
- Locked gate access for right-of-way maintenance (i.e., access via locked gate from the adjacent property to the highway right-of-way, but not to the main lanes, for the purpose of mowing the part of the right-of-way that is outside the area that is typically mowed by the Department).

The AHTD and the FHWA Division Office will jointly determine the applicability of this policy to any unusual circumstances not specifically listed above.

## POLICY REQUIREMENTS

The FHWA policy states that new or revised access points to the existing Interstate System should meet eight specific requirements. The AHTD and the Arkansas Division of the FHWA have determined that a new or revised access point on any fully access-controlled freeway must also meet these requirements, as shown below:

1. Existing Facilities: *The existing interchanges and/or local roads and streets in the corridor can neither provide the necessary access nor be improved to satisfactorily accommodate the design-year traffic demands while at the same time providing the access intended by the proposal.*

The intent of this requirement is to demonstrate that an access point is needed for regional traffic needs and not to solve local system needs or problems. The freeway facility should not become part of the local circulation system but should be maintained as the main regional and interstate highway it was intended to be.

In the case of adding a new interchange or new ramp(s), consideration should first be given to whether existing or proposed roads parallel to the freeway facility could be used as connections to existing adjacent interchanges in lieu of adding a new interchange or ramp.

2. Transportation System Management: *All reasonable alternatives for design options, location, and transportation system management type improvements (such as ramp metering, mass transit, and HOV facilities) have been assessed and provided for if currently justified, or provisions are included for accommodating such facilities if a future need is identified.*

The intent is to assure that all reasonable alternatives, including improvements to the existing local roads and streets in lieu of new access, have been fully considered.

3. Operational Analysis: *The proposed access point does not have a significant adverse impact on the safety and operation of the freeway facility based on an analysis of current and future traffic. The operational analysis for existing conditions shall, particularly in urbanized areas, include an analysis of sections of the freeway to and including at least the first adjacent existing or proposed interchange on each side. Crossroads and other roads and streets shall be included in the analysis to the extent necessary to assure their ability to collect and distribute traffic to and from the interchange with the new or revised access points.*

The intent of this requirement is to assure that sufficient operational analyses are made to determine the impact of the revised or new access on the freeway operation. For consistency, the current edition of the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Highway Capacity Manual should be used for the analysis. (An entire section on operational analysis is provided later in this report and discusses the items that should be analyzed.) The operational impact on the freeway between the proposed new/revised access and the adjacent existing interchanges on either side is a critical item that must be analyzed. The analysis may need to extend farther along the freeway and include additional existing interchanges if necessary to establish the extent and scope of the impacts. This could be critical in urban areas with many closely spaced interchanges. The spacing between interchanges must safely accommodate weaving, diverging and merging maneuvers and good directional signing.

4. Access Connections and Design: *The proposed access connects to a public road only and will provide for all traffic movements. Less than "full interchanges" for special purpose access for transit vehicles, for HOV's, or into park and ride lots may be considered on a case-by-case basis. The proposed access will be designed to meet or exceed current standards for Federal-aid projects on freeways.*

The intent of this requirement is that, except in the most extreme circumstances, all interchanges should provide for all basic movements. Partial interchanges usually have undesirable operational characteristics. If circumstances exist where a partial interchange is considered appropriate as an interim design, then commitments should be made to providing the ultimate future design such as purchasing necessary right-of-way during the initial project stage. Special purpose access for HOV's, for transit vehicles, or for park and ride lots should be treated as special cases and the movements to be provided decided on a case-by-case basis.

5. Transportation Plans: *The proposal considers and is consistent with local and regional land use and transportation plans. Prior to final approval, all requests for new or revised access must be consistent with the metropolitan and/or statewide transportation plan, as appropriate, and the applicable provisions of 23 CFR Part 450 and the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93.*

The proposal must include a discussion as to how the proposal fits into the transportation plan for the area and, if it is to be a future addition to the current plan, how it may affect the current plan (e.g., air quality conformity). Although requests for engineering and operational approval of access may be made prior to being included in transportation plans, final approval cannot be given if the project is not included in the appropriate plan (e.g., the metropolitan area's Long Range Plan or the local Master Street Plan). The metropolitan planning organization (MPO) should be included in the approval process to ensure that coordination with the metropolitan planning process is a part of the normal project development process.

6. Comprehensive Freeway Network Study: *In areas where the potential exists for future multiple interchange additions, all requests for new or revised access are supported by a comprehensive freeway network study with recommendations that address all proposed and desired access within the context of a long-term plan.*

The intent of this requirement is to cause sufficient review and coordination so as not to have piecemeal consideration of added access and to avoid future conflict as much as possible with other proposed access points. It is usually best to consider all proposed changes in access for an area at the same time. If a new or revised interchange is being proposed and another new or revised adjacent interchange is being planned and/or programmed, then both changes should be analyzed together. The expectation here is that any proposal is considered in view of currently known plans for transportation facilities and/or land use planning and is especially important when several new interchanges are anticipated.

7. Coordination with Transportation System Improvements: *The request for a new or revised access generated by new or expanded development demonstrates appropriate coordination between the development and related or otherwise required transportation system improvements.*

The intent of this requirement is to assure that highway facilities are developed in an orderly and coordinated manner to serve the public. Therefore, when private development is clearly the driving force behind the need for access, it is only reasonable that the State, local governments and the developer work closely together in order to develop the access to achieve mutual benefits with minimal adverse impact on the freeway. When extensive private development will occur over several years, stage construction for the access modification should be considered. As a condition of final approval, the developer may be required to have certain parts of the local circulation system in place before ramps can be constructed or opened to traffic. Coordination and cooperation are essential where a developer has agreed to fund or perhaps even construct access at the same time the AHTD is planning or is already in the process of improving that particular section of the freeway route to ensure compatibility.

8. Status of Planning and NEPA: *The request for new or revised access contains information relative to the planning requirements and the status of the environmental processing of the proposal.*

The intent of this requirement is to confirm and report information relative to the status of the planning and NEPA processes in regard to the access request. Final approval may only be granted after the NEPA process is completed. The development of final plans, right-of-way acquisition, and physical construction may only begin after approval of the environmental document and the final approval of the access change.

## OPERATIONAL ANALYSIS

The operational analysis of the proposed access must clearly demonstrate that no or only minimal adverse impact to the safety and operation of the freeway facility will occur. The methodology from the current TRB Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) or the current version of the Highway Capacity Software (HCS) should be used to perform the needed engineering analyses. The operational analysis should use traffic data based on the opening year and a design year 20 years from the date when the project is scheduled to be completed and opened to traffic.

The operational impact on the freeway between the proposed new/revised access and the adjacent existing interchanges on either side must be analyzed. The analysis should be extended as far along the mainline and include as many existing interchanges as is necessary to establish the scope of the impacts. This could be critical in urban areas with many relatively closely spaced interchanges. The spacing between interchanges must safely accommodate weaving, diverging, and merging maneuvers, and also allow for understandable signing.

The engineering analysis must include all of the following, unless otherwise jointly agreed to by the AHTD and the FHWA:

- Existing Peak Hour Volumes: Plan view map with ramps, freeway through lanes and crossroads labeled with existing “AM Peak Hour” and “PM Peak Hour” volumes.
- Opening Year and Design Year Build Peak Hour Volumes: Plan view map with ramps, freeway through lanes and crossroads labeled with the Opening Year and Design Year Build “AM Peak Hour” and “PM Peak Hour” volumes.
- Summary of Operational Analyses: Preferably, a table listing the “Freeway LOS”, “Ramp LOS”, “Weave LOS”, and “Crossroad LOS” for the corresponding Existing AM/PM Peak Hour, Opening Year and Design Year No-Build AM/PM Peak Hour, and Opening Year and Design Year Build AM/PM Peak Hour for the appropriate freeway through lane sections, on-ramps, off-ramps, and weave areas and for the crossroads.
- Existing Peak Hour Levels of Service: Plan view map with ramps, freeway through lanes, and crossroads labeled with calculated Existing “AM Peak Hour Level of Service” values and “PM Peak Hour Level of Service” values.
- Opening Year and Design Year No-Build Peak Hour Levels of Service: Plan view map with ramps, freeway through lanes, and crossroads labeled with calculated Opening Year and Design Year No-Build “AM Peak Hour Level of Service” values and “PM Peak Hour Level of Service” values.
- Opening Year and Design Year Build Peak Hour Levels of Service: Plan view map with ramps, freeway through lanes, and crossroads labeled with calculated Opening Year and Design Year Build “AM Peak Hour Level of Service” values and “PM Peak Hour Level of Service” values.
- Basic Freeway Segments Analyses of Existing Conditions.

- Basic Freeway Segments Analyses of the Opening Year and Design Year No-Build Conditions.
- Basic Freeway Segments Analyses of the Opening Year and Design Year Build Conditions.
- Ramp Junction Analyses of Existing Conditions.
- Ramp Junction Analyses (including queue analysis) of the Opening Year and Design Year No-Build Conditions.
- Ramp Junction Analyses (including queue analysis) of the Opening Year and Design Year Build Conditions.
- Weave Area Analyses of Existing Conditions.
- Weave Area Analyses of the Opening Year and Design Year No-Build Conditions.
- Weave Area Analyses of the Opening Year and Design Year Build Conditions.

## PROCEDURE FOR APPROVAL REQUEST

This approval procedure is a three-step process that consists of (1) General Concept Review, (2) Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review, and (3) Final Review and Approval. All proposals for new or revised access must include sufficient supporting information to allow an independent evaluation of the request and ensure that all pertinent factors and alternatives have been appropriately considered in accordance with the Policy Requirements beginning on page 4. Concurrence in (2) Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review and (3) Final Review and Approval is valid for a three-year period based upon the original scope and purpose of the proposal.

The FHWA Headquarters (Washington Office) is the approving authority for the following types of Interstate access proposals after an appropriate review by the Division Office. Review and approval authority for these access proposals on non-Interstate freeways rests with the FHWA Division Office.

- New freeway-to-freeway interchange
- Major modification of freeway-to-freeway interchange
- New partial interchange or new ramps to/from continuous frontage road that create a partial interchange
- New freeway-to-crossroad interchange located in a Transportation Management Area (TMA)

The FHWA Division Office is the approving authority for other types of access proposals to Interstate and non-Interstate freeways such as the following:

- New freeway-to-crossroad interchange **not** located in a TMA
- Modification of existing freeway-to-crossroad interchange
- Completion of basic movements at partial interchange
- Locked gate access
- Abandonment of ramps or interchanges
- Decreasing the length of any deceleration lane or acceleration lane on any existing ramps
- Increasing the length of an off-ramp deceleration lane or on-ramp acceleration lane, if the adjacent freeway ramp exists at a distance equal to or less than 1.0 mile away from this location (measured between physical gore areas)

Where FHWA is mentioned in the following steps, the agency is involved only with those proposals that require FHWA approval and other proposals where the AHTD requests the involvement of the FHWA, although typically it would not be involved.

### Step 1. General Concept Review

The purpose of the first step is to obtain agency opinion on the viability of an access proposal at an early stage prior to the sponsor investing significant time and resources into a more detailed design and operational analysis. The conceptual information that is required at this point will be reviewed in light of the intent of current policy on page 4. Officials of the AHTD, the FHWA, the MPO (if applicable) and the entity proposing the access modification should meet as early as possible in order to avoid unnecessary effort or rework on the part of the proposing entity. The following information should be discussed at the informal meeting and included in the eventual submission of the appropriate number of copies of the

General Concept Review proposal to the AHTD Chief Engineer.

- ✓ A clear description of the location and type of proposed new or modified access. Maps and schematic diagrams should be included to clearly describe the proposal and should include (as applicable): project limits, adjacent interchanges, and proposed interchange configuration(s) on a current aerial photograph on a designated scale where one inch equals no more than 200 feet showing travel lanes, ramps to be added, ramps to be removed, and collector/distributor roads. A second aerial photograph on a designated scale where one inch equals no more than 500 feet should also be provided as applicable to show the arterial road network within the area of influence. See Policy Requirement 4.
- ✓ Purpose and need for the new or revised access points (e.g., why it is needed, what are the intended benefits). See Policy Requirement 1.
- ✓ The background or supporting information that further explains the basis for the proposal (e.g., new highway proposed, planned private developments, known political support, etc.). See Policy Requirements 5 and 7.
- ✓ Determination of whether the interchange is within a Transportation Management Area (TMA).
- ✓ Any known issues of concern or controversy (e.g., environmental issues, public opposition, etc.). See Policy Requirement 8.
- ✓ A description of the design alternatives considered (e.g., diamond interchange, single-point, directional ramps, etc.). See Policy Requirement 2.
- ✓ General cost estimate of the work, proposed funding sources (e.g., private development, local funds, State or Federal-aid funds) and implementation schedule.
- ✓ Relationship and distance of the interchange to adjacent interchanges and the ability to provide adequate signing. The spacing of adjacent interchanges has a pronounced effect on the operation of freeways. As a rule, the minimum interchange spacing is one mile in urban areas for both Interstate Highways and non-Interstate freeways. In rural areas, the minimum interchange spacing is three miles for Interstate Highways and two miles for non-Interstate freeways.
- ✓ Opening Year and Design Year average daily traffic (ADT) volumes and design hour volumes (DHV) for mainline, ramp, and crossroad traffic.

If the AHTD and FHWA concur in the general concept, the Chief Engineer will notify the entity proposing the access modification. **It is important to note that the concurrence of the AHTD and FHWA in the proposal only indicates that the general concept may be feasible and worthy of further evaluation without any commitment to final approval.**

## Step 2. Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review

Once the AHTD and the FHWA provide written concurrence with the general concept, the next step would be the consideration of the engineering and operational acceptability. The purpose of this step is to thoroughly evaluate the specific operational effects of the proposal. The appropriate number of copies of the proposal must accompany the request to the AHTD Chief Engineer. The proposal and the supporting documentation must demonstrate that a reasonable analysis has been performed and that safety and traffic operations along the freeway will not be adversely affected by the proposed new or revised access. The following information, building on the information provided during the General Concept Review, should address these topics in more detail:

- ✓ A clear description of the location and type of proposed new or modified access. Maps, schematic diagrams, and proposed functional design plans should be provided to clearly describe the proposal and should include (as applicable): project limits, adjacent interchanges, proposed interchange configuration(s) on a current aerial photograph on a designated scale where one inch equals no more than 200 feet, travel lane and shoulder widths, ramps to be added, ramps to be removed, ramp radii, ramp grades, acceleration lane lengths, deceleration lane lengths, taper lengths, auxiliary lane lengths, “taper” or “parallel” type exit ramps, truck climbing lanes, and collector/distributor roads. Existing and proposed right of way and control of access limits are also needed. A second aerial photograph on a designated scale where one inch equals no more than 500 feet should also be provided as applicable to show the arterial road network within the area of influence.
- ✓ Purpose and need for the new or revised access points (e.g., why it is needed, what are the intended benefits).
- ✓ Any background or supporting information that further explains the basis for the proposal (e.g., new highway proposed, planned private developments, known political support, etc.).
- ✓ Determine whether the interchange is within a Transportation Management Area (TMA).
- ✓ Any known issues of concern or controversy (e.g., environmental, public opposition, etc.).
- ✓ A description of the design alternatives considered (e.g., diamond interchange, single-point, directional ramps, etc.).
- ✓ Estimated costs of the project, the proposed funding sources (e.g., private development, local funds, State or Federal-aid funds) and implementation schedule.
- ✓ Relationship and distance of the interchange to adjacent interchanges and the ability to provide adequate signing. The spacing of adjacent interchanges has a pronounced effect on the operation of freeways. As a rule, the minimum interchange spacing is one mile in urban areas for both Interstate Highways and non-Interstate freeways. In rural areas, the minimum interchange spacing is three miles for Interstate Highways and two miles for non-Interstate freeways. Where the distance between adjacent interchanges is less than these minimum spacings (measured between intersecting roads), the

FHWA and the AHTD will require thorough documentation of all reasonable alternatives and must approve a finding that no feasible alternatives exist. Opening Year and Design Year ADT and DHV for mainline traffic volumes, ramp volumes, crossroad volumes, and intersection turning movements. See Policy Requirement 6.

- ✓ Any necessary design exceptions from currently adopted AASHTO Interstate design standards.
- ✓ A summary chart showing the Level of Service results from the operational analyses. See Policy Requirement 3.
- ✓ The need for additional traffic signalization and signing (if applicable).
- ✓ Safety issues regarding the existing conditions and proposed alternatives.

**A written finding of Engineering and Operational Acceptability should be received prior to the initiation of Step 3. This finding is valid for a three-year period based upon the original scope and purpose of the proposal.**

### **Step 3. Final Review and Approval**

The purpose of this final step is to ensure that the completed design complies with the proposal reviewed in Steps 1 and 2 and that all NEPA and other statutory regulatory requirements have been met. The appropriate number of copies of the supporting documentation must accompany the request. At a minimum, the submission should include copies of the final design and right of way plans for construction and include or reference documents submitted in Steps 1 and 2 as well as the NEPA document. AHTD will recommend approval of the access change to FHWA in its final submission for approval.

**The Final Review and Approval is valid for a three-year period based upon the original scope and purpose of the proposal.**

## APPENDIX A

### DEFINITIONS

The **design plans** referenced in Step 3 would be the information needed to identify all modifications to the roadway system resulting from the proposed new or revised access including typical sections; plan and profiles; cross sections; pavement marking and signing plans; signal plans; and any other information that would be needed for constructing the proposed modifications.

**Locked gate access for right-of-way maintenance** refers to access granted by the Department to the adjacent property owner for access to the highway right-of-way, but not the main lanes, for the purpose of mowing the part of the right-of-way that is outside the area that is typically mowed.

**Locked gate access to/from the main lanes** refers to specific access rights granted by the Department, with FHWA approval, to allow non-AHTD personnel access to an adjacent property.

**Urban area** refers to an urbanized area or an urban place as designated by the Bureau of the Census having a population of 5,000 or more and not within any urbanized area, within boundaries to be fixed by responsible State and local officials in cooperation with each other, subject to approval by the Secretary. Such boundaries shall encompass, at a minimum, the entire urban place designated by the Bureau of the Census.

**Urbanized area** means an area with a population of 50,000 or more designated by the Bureau of the Census, within boundaries to be fixed by responsible State and local officials in cooperation with each other, subject to approval by the Secretary. Such Boundaries shall encompass, at a minimum, the entire urbanized area as designated by the Bureau of the Census.

A **transportation management area (TMA)** is defined as an urbanized area with a current population more than 200,000 as determined by the latest census, or other area when the TMA designation is requested by the Governor and the MPO, and officially designated by the Administrators of the FHWA and FTA. As of 2003, there were two TMAs in Arkansas: the central Arkansas area and the West Memphis area.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **NEW OR REVISED ACCESS PROPOSAL BY THE AHTD**

Typically, the first step would be for the Planning and Research Division to convene a meeting of the following parties to informally discuss the proposed access modification as soon as the information included in Step 1 (General Concept Review) becomes available.

- FHWA
- City and County Officials
- MPO (if applicable)
- Roadway Design
- Planning and Research
- Environmental
- Right of Way
- Bridge
- Surveys
- District

The Planning and Research Division will be responsible for documenting the discussion at the meeting and proceed with completing all Step 1 requirements for submission by the Chief Engineer to FHWA.

After the AHTD and FHWA have agreed in the general concept, a job number will be assigned and the Planning and Research Division will include a note in the Staff Minutes to reflect that Step 1 has been completed.

At the appropriate time, the Chief Engineer will direct the Planning and Research Division to initiate Step 2 (Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review) and will direct the Environmental Division to initiate environmental handling (including the opportunity for public involvement, which should be offered prior to the completion of Step 2).

The Chief Engineer will recommend and transmit the Step 2 document to FHWA and the Planning and Research Division will note the approval status of Step 2 in the Staff Minutes.

Upon the satisfactory completion of Step 2, the Planning and Research Division will be responsible for providing all materials to the Chief Engineer for submission of Step 3 to FHWA (Final Review and Approval) and will make the appropriate notation in the Staff Minutes.

## APPENDIX C

### NEW OR REVISED ACCESS PROPOSAL BY ANOTHER ENTITY

Once Department staff becomes aware of a proposal by another entity to request an access modification on any freeway in Arkansas, the Planning and Research Division will convene a meeting of the following parties to informally discuss the proposed access modification as soon as the information included in Step 1 (General Concept Review) becomes available.

- The entity proposing the access modification
- FHWA
- City and County Officials
- MPO (if applicable)
- Roadway Design
- Planning and Research
- Environmental
- Right of Way
- Bridge
- Surveys
- District

The Planning and Research Division will be responsible for documenting the discussion at the meeting.

The entity proposing the access modification will proceed with completing all Step 1 requirements and transmit this documentation to the Chief Engineer.

The Chief Engineer will forward this documentation to FHWA for their review and concurrence.

After the AHTD and FHWA have concurred in the general concept, the Chief Engineer will notify the entity proposing the access modification. A job number will be assigned and the Planning and Research Division will include a note in the Staff Minutes to reflect that Step 1 has been completed.

The entity proposing the access modification will be responsible for completing Step 2 (Engineering and Operational Acceptability Review) **and the environmental handling (including the opportunity for public involvement, which should be offered prior to the completion of Step 2)** and transmitting that documentation to the Chief Engineer.

Once the Step 2 document is deemed satisfactory, the Chief Engineer will transmit the document to FHWA with a recommended action. Upon FHWA concurrence with the AHTD recommendation, the Planning and Research Division will be responsible for noting the approval status of Step 2 in the Staff Minutes and the Chief Engineer will notify the entity proposing the access modification.

Upon satisfactory completion of Step 2, the entity proposing the access modification will be responsible for submitting all materials for Step 3 (Final Review and Approval) to the Chief Engineer who will transmit the documentation and a recommendation for approval to FHWA. The Planning and Research Division will be responsible for the appropriate notation in the Staff Minutes.