CAP Overview

Overview
35 projects in 19 corridors

Widening Projects

Funded through ½-cent sales tax
Design Status

Design

29 projects in design or have completed design
5 Projects Under Construction

- **Bella Vista Bypass** (Hwy. 549)
  - Est. Comp: Mid ’16

- **Hwy. 365 - I-430** (I-40)
  - Est. Comp: Mid ’16

- **Hwy. 412 - Wagon Wheel Road** (I-49)
  - Est. Comp: Early ’17

- **Hwy. 71B - Hwy. 412** (I-49)
  - Est. Comp: Early ’17

- **Springdale Bypass** (Hwy. 412)
  - Est. Comp: Late ’18
CAP Overview

30 Crossing

It is approximately 6.7 miles in length and extends through portions of Little Rock and North Little Rock in central Arkansas.

The corridor extends:

• along I-30 from I-530 to the south and I-40 to the north
• along I-40 to its interchange with US 67 in North Little Rock
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs (Problems)</th>
<th>Purpose (Solutions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>To improve mobility on I-30 and I-40 by providing comprehensive solutions that improve travel speed and travel time to downtown North Little Rock and Little Rock and accommodate the expected increase in traffic demand. I-30 provides essential access to other major statewide transportation corridors, serves local and regional travelers and connects residential, commercial and employment centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Safety</td>
<td>To improve travel safety within and across the I-30 corridor by eliminating and / or improving inadequate design features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Functional Roadway Deficiencies</td>
<td>To improve I-30 roadway conditions and functional ratings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigational Safety</td>
<td>To improve navigational safety on the Arkansas River Bridge by eliminating and / or improving inadequate design features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural and Functional Bridge Deficiencies</td>
<td>To improve I-30 Arkansas River Bridge conditions and functional ratings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Purpose & Need listed in no particular order. Purpose & Need developed in coordination with Project Partners (Cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock, Pulaski County, and Metroplan), the Technical Work Group, and the public.*
Navigational Safety

I-30 Bridge

Junction Bridge

Main Street Bridge

Clinton Bridge

Pier Obstruction in Navigation Channel

170-Foot Reduced Channel

300-Foot Navigation Channel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY GOALS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve opportunity for east-west</td>
<td>Enhance mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve local vehicle access to downtown</td>
<td>Connect bicycle/pedestrian friendly facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock and North Little Rock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodate existing transit and</td>
<td>Minimize roadway disruptions during construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>future transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize river navigation disruptions</td>
<td>Follow through on commitment to voters to improve I-30 as part of the Connecting Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during/after construction</td>
<td>Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimize opportunities for economic</td>
<td>Avoid and/or minimize impacts to the human and natural environment, including historic and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>archaeological resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustain public and agency input and</td>
<td>Improve system reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support for the I-30 corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximize I-30 cost efficiency</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study Goals listed in no particular order. Study Goals developed in coordination with Project Partners (Cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock, Pulaski County, and Metroplan), the Technical Work Group, and the public.
Coordination & Meetings

Project Partners
• Regular meetings with the city mayors, county judge, FHWA, Metroplan, and AHTD.

Technical Work Group (TWG)
• 35+ agencies (local, state, federal) provide technical input and expertise. Three coordination meetings held.

Stakeholder Meetings
• Coordination meetings are held with local groups with an interest or located within the study area.

Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)
• Pulaski County, Little Rock, and North Little Rock have each appointed four citizens to provide feedback on options being studied.

Visioning Workshops
• Pulaski County, Little Rock, and North Little Rock have each appointed citizens to the 30-member group. The first workshop was in November.
Project Partners

With AHTD and FHWA serving as lead agencies, local community officials provided expertise and input to help govern the project.
Technical Work Group (TWG)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invited Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ark. Natural Heritage Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ark. Waterways Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Little Rock - Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Little Rock Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing &amp; Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Little Rock School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Dept. of the Interior - National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordination Meetings

Coordination meetings are being held with business owners, political representatives, community groups and senior staff of local agencies who are adjacent to the project area.

- Argenta Boosters
- North Little Rock City Board
- NLR Kiwanis Club
- Downtown Little Rock Partnership
- Clinton Foundation
- Little Rock Chamber of Commerce
- Central Arkansas Transit Authority
- Little Rock Chamber of Commerce – Fifty for the Future
- Little Rock Historic District Commission
- Coalition of Greater Little Rock Neighborhoods
- Little Rock City Board
- Park Hill Neighborhood Association
- FUMC Lent Lunch Series
Stakeholder Advisory Group (SAG)

Pulaski County, Little Rock, and North Little Rock each appointed four citizens to the group.

Appointed by the city mayors and county judge, members provide local perspective to areas of interest within the community during project development.

Jerome Green—Shorter College
Stephanie Streett—Clinton Foundation
Sandra Brown—Verizon Arena Board
Bruce Moore—Little Rock City Manager
Visioning Workshop

First Visioning Workshop
This first Visioning Workshop invited appointed stakeholders in the community to provide input and prioritize their ideas for the I-30 corridor.

Purpose
This included insight into preserving and enhancing aesthetic, historic, and community resources.

Attendees
Invited 30 participants representing Little Rock, North Little Rock and Pulaski County.
# Public Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **PM #1** August 2014 | • PEL Introduction  
  • Study Area  
  • Alternative Screening Process  
  • Public Comment on Purpose and Needs, and Study Area Constraints |
| **PM #2** November 2014 | • Universe of Alternatives  
  • Preliminary Alternatives |
| **PM #3** January 2015 | • Level 2 Screening Results  
  • Reasonable Alternatives |
| **PM #4** April 2015 | • Level 3 Screening Results  
  • PEL Recommendation(s) |
Universe of Alternatives

- Highway Build (14)
- I-30 Arkansas River Bridge (3)
- Other Modes (10)
- Congestion Management (10)
- Non-Recurring Congestion (5)
Level 1 Screening

Level 1 screening eliminated 5 alternatives

38 alternatives moved on to Level 2 screening
Level 2 Screening

Level 2 screening eliminated 8 alternatives

30 alternatives moved on to further screening
# Basic Scenarios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | 6     | No Additional Lanes (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | No Main Lane Widening |
| 2        | 8     | Main Lane Widening (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | 3 Main Lanes + 1 Main Lane Widening (each direction)  
           |       | Collector/Distributor (C/D) Roads (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | 3 Main Lanes + 1 C/D Lane Widening (each direction) |
| 3        | 10    | Main Lane Widening (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | 3 Main Lanes + 2 Main Lane Widening (each direction)  
           |       | Collector/Distributor (C/D) Roads (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | 3 Main Lanes + 2 C/D Lane Widening (each direction) |
| 4        | 12    | Main Lane Widening (With Complementary Alternatives)  
           |       | 3 Main Lanes + 3 Main Lane Widening (each direction) |
Collector / Distributor

What is a Collector/Distributor?

- C/D lanes are separated from main lanes by a barrier
- C/D lanes parallel and connect the main lanes of a highway with interchange ramps
- C/D lanes operate at lower speeds than main lane speeds and higher speeds than frontage road speeds
I-30 – 10 Lanes with Downtown Collector/Distributor Roads
2041 Traffic Showing the Morning Peak Hour 7:15-8:15 a.m

Public Meeting April 16, 2015
ConnectingArkansasProgram.com
Speed Profiles

8-LANE C/D (2041)

8-LANE GP (2041)

10-LANE C/D (2041)

Assumes other improvements outside the PEL Study Area.
Level 3 Screening

Level 3 screening tested the three Reasonable Alternatives and No Action against project goals and objectives.
Recommendation

The study team proposed that the 10-Lane with Downtown C/D be advanced to NEPA as the PEL Recommendation.
PEL to NEPA Transition

- Air quality
- Indirect and cumulative impacts
- Intersection (Cantrell / 2nd / Cumberland)
- I-30 Bridge construction phasing
- East-West connectivity
- Bike/pedestrian access
- Vissim of new layouts
PEL to NEPA Transition

(continued)

- Field work on environmental
  - 4(f)
  - Wetlands
  - Cultural resources
- Cooperating & participating agencies
- Funding / project segmentation
- Visioning Workshop #2
- SAG and Project Partners meetings
Draft Schematic – I-40 & Hwy. 67
Draft Schematic – NLR & I-40
Draft Schematic – NLR & I-40
Draft Schematic – LR & I-630
Draft Schematic – Highway 10
Traffic to/from South
Proposed Movements
Downtown Little Rock
Proposed Traffic to/from South
Design-Build Delivery

Project delivery system involving a single contract between the project owner and a design-build contractor covering both the final design and construction of a project.
Design-Build Delivery

Design-Build delivery is a good delivery method for projects in which:

- Scope is large and complex
- Environmental activities are typically underway or complete
- Innovations are desired
- Project delivery schedule is a critical issue
DB vs. DBB Schedule Comparison

**Design-Build Delivery**
- Concept Planning
- Select Design-Build
- Preliminary Design
- Final Design and Project Clearance
- Construction

**Design-Bid-Build Delivery**
- Concept Planning
- Preliminary Design
- Select Engineer
- Final Design and Project Clearance
- Construction

**Associated Time Savings**
- More Extensive Contractor Input
- Extensive Contractor Input
- Minimal Contractor Input
What is Fixed Price – Best Design?

Fixed Price – Best Design is a method that establishes a maximum amount of funds available to the contractors bidding to win the contract.

Contractors are scored on, among other things, how much they can build for the dollars available.

This method encourages innovation and motivates contractors to provide high quality, time savings, and additional improvements while delivering all project goals and requirements.
Fixed Price – Best Design

**Fixed Price – Best Design**

**Encourages Innovation and Maximizes Budget**

**Regular Delivery Method Results**

| Contractor | A + C + D = $$$ |

**Fixed Price – Best Design Results**

| Contractor 1 | A + B + C + D = $$$ |
| Contractor 2 | A + B + C + D + F = $$$ |

= Build Options

= Budget
## Schedule Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA0602</td>
<td>Interstates 30/40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interstate 530 – Highway 67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PEL
- Planning and Environmental Linkages study

### Environmental & Schematic
- NEPA clearance
- 20% - 30% schematics

### Design-Build Procurement
- D-B guidelines and procedures update
- RFQ development, response, evaluation, and short list
- RFP development, response, evaluation, and selection

### Design and Construction
- Final design
- Construction
Questions/Comments?

CAP and 30 Crossing Website
- ConnectingArkansasProgram.com
- 30Crossing.com

Phone and Email

Contact us at (501) 255-1519
or email at Info@ConnectingArkansasProgram.com