METROPLAN BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

April 26, 2017

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of March 29, 2017
2. Approval of Financial Statement for March 2017
3. Agency Reports

TRANSPORTATION AGENDA

4. 2018 Unified Planning Work Program
5. Call for System Optimization Projects
6. Hwy 89 Corridor Study
7. Attrib and TAP Project Status and Obligations
8. 30 Crossing Update
9. Other Business to come before the Metroplan Board
10. Citizen Communications
ITEM 1. MINUTES OF THE MARCH 2017 BOARD MEETING
Minutes of the
Metroplan Board Meeting
March 29, 2017

Attending:

Mayor Art Brooke, City of Ward
Mayor Jill Dabbs, City of Bryant
Mayor Bill Cypert, City of Cabot
Mayor Sammy Hartwick, City of Greenbrier
Mayor Sam Higdon, City of Guy
Mayor Janie Lyman, City of Haskell
Mayor Mike Watson, City of Maumelle
Mayor Randy Holland, City of Mayflower
Mayor Joe Smith, City of North Little Rock
Mayor Mike Kemp, City of Shannon Hills
Mayor Virginia Young, City of Sherwood
Judge Barry Hyde, Pulaski County
Judge Jeff Arey, Saline County
Ms. Jessie Jones, Arkansas Highway & Transportation Department
Mr. Jared Varner, Rock Region Metro
Mr. Keith Keck, Hot Springs Village
*Mr. Jay Whisker, City of Jacksonville
*Mr. Tom Anderson, Faulkner County
*Mr. Jon Honeywell, City of Little Rock

*Indicates Proxy

Metroplan

Lynn Bell
Casey Covington
Timothy Miles
Cindy Segebarth
Allen Skaggs
Tab Townsell
Iris Woods

Guest

Stacy Akin, McClelland Engineers
Ben Browning, AHTD
Anushree, David, and Leigh Anna, Congressman French Hill’s Office
Barry Hass, citizen - City of Little Rock
Amy Heflin, FHWA
Richard Mays, citizen - City of Little Rock
Barbara Richard, Pulaski County Road & Bridge
Noel Oman, Arkansas Democrat Gazette
Doug Warner, City of Cabot
Kathy Wells, citizen – City of Little Rock
Approval of Minutes
A motion to approve the minutes of the March 2017 Board meeting was made by Mayor Holland, seconded by Mayor Hartwick and passed by the Board.

Approval of Financial Statements
A motion to approve the March 2017 Financial Statement was made by Mayor Smith, seconded by Judge Arey and passed by the Board.

Item 3. 2016 Metroplan Audit
Mayor Brooke noted to the Board that the 2016 Metroplan Audit was completed and that the auditors were present to give a report to the Board.

Mr. Townsell expressed to the Board that Metroplan has received a clean audit every year for the past 28 years with this year being no exception.

Mr. Townsell introduced Mr. Randy Milligan of Thomas and Thomas to the Board to present the audit.

Mr. Milligan stated to the Board that there were no significant findings to be noted in the 2016 audit.

With no questions from the Board, a motion to approve the audit was made by Mayor Dabbs, seconded by Mayor Watson and approved by the Board.

Item 4. Agency Reports

A. Metroplan Executive Director's Report
Mr. Townsell stated to the Board that there has been a good response from the Board on attending the AHTD Conference in Fayetteville on April 17th, 18th and 19th.

Mr. Townsell noted that if members had not contacted staff about going, they should do so as soon as possible to ensure their registration.
Mr. Townsell also noted that Metroplan will host a dinner for its members the night of the 17th or the 18th. Ms. Segebarth is working on the attendance and registration.

Mr. Townsell stated that there have been talks about putting in performance measures for MPOs surrounding transportation planning at the federal level. At this time they have been suspended while the impacts downstream are being reviewed.

Mr. Townsell further added that Metroplan expected to receive its federal certification review within the next month.

Also, there will be a public hearing on Hwy. 10 scheduled for Thursday, March 30th at Christ the King Church.

Mr. Townsell stated that he would let Ms. Jones give further details in her report.

Mr. Townsell stated to the Board that staff, the Cities of Little Rock, and North Little Rock are looking at the implementation of the Bike Share Program, which would incorporate various sites around the city to rent bicycles. The City of Conway has already examined this program and Mr. Townsell noted that if any of the other members were interested in the program they should contact staff.

Mr. Townsell noted that if Metroplan is the contract holder for the program it would be of no cost to Metroplan and would simply be the holder of the contract for the implementation for it.

Mr. Townsell asked that the Board approve Metroplan to be the contract holder for the Bike Share Program.

A motion to approve the action was made by Mayor Smith, seconded by Mayor Kemp and passed by the Board.

B. Rock Region METRO

Mr. Varner stated to the Board that since the last meeting Rock Region Metro has carried approximately 200,000 passengers and are looking for those numbers to expand.
Mr. Varner mentioned that within the upcoming week his staff would begin the annual process of reviewing its routes and looking at opportunities for any improvements in routes that are needed.

Mr. Varner noted that Rock Region is still on schedule to receive (7) new compressed air buses to be added to the fleet in the month of September. In addition there are also (12) new Links Paratransit that will be added in June. Also, there is a bid scheduled for the purchase of (12) bus shelters with solar powered lighting. These shelters will be purchased with TAP funds.

**C. Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department**

Ms. Jones stated to the Board that the Conference scheduled in April’s theme is “Multimodal Transportation Planning”.

Ms. Jones noted that Mr. Townsell and Mr. Jared Varner will be moderators at the conference. The conference will include sessions on technology, performance management, Federal Aid 101, and the Local Public Agency manual that the department has recently developed.

Ms. Jones also stated that the Highway Department has been in the process of updating its Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan. The draft of the plan is out for public comment at this time, which will close at the end of March.

Ms. Jones encouraged the Board to go to the AHTD website, review the draft and provide comment.

Ms. Jones noted that Mr. Townsell had mentioned that there is a series of public meetings to be held by AHTD. Also, there are several planning studies that will be coming up, the critical one being the Hwy. 89 project.

Ms. Jones further noted that on the legislative side, the funding for highways appears to be dead for the current session. At this time there is a bill in the Senate Revenue and Tax Committee that assigns most of the revenue generated from the internet sales tax to highways. The tax itself failed the day before the Metroplan Board meeting.

Ms. Jones also stated that AHTD would be renamed The Arkansas Department of Transportation. Act 707 of 2017 will go into effect 90 days after the legislative session ends. The department will then undergo
wholesale change as the signs and stickers wear out and will be replaced with new ones. At this time a new logo has not yet been approved. It will more than likely be designed “in house”.

Ms. Jones further added that the Governor signed legislature prior to the Metroplan meeting that would provide $75,000 per year to each of the seven regional intermodal transportation authorities to cover operations and a new grant program of $500,000 per year for the universities to study transportation issues. Act 705 will set up the funding for the study.

Ms. Jones noted that a bill to have the commission study speed limits and the raising of interstate speed limits to 75mph and highway speed limits to 65mph went up for a final vote in the house today. If it is passed the commission will begin a study of this issue.

TRANSPORTATION AGENDA

Item 5. Project Funding Allocations

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that there was an update to Item 5 that was provided to staff the day before the meeting adding an additional project to the item.

Mr. Covington stated that in the case of the first project, Kanis Road, this was a project that was funded in 2015. Pulaski County had this project ready to go.

Mr. Covington noted that in a typical funding cycle, at the end of the federal physical year, we receive an allocation of additional funding and this must be placed on a project that is ready to go. Since Pulaski County had this project ready to go, a portion of the project was funded in 2015 and with additional funding in 2016. They are now ready to finish the project and had asked that the remainder of the funding be provided. A letter for this request was included in the Board packet.

Mr. Covington stated that in addition, a project request from the City of Little Rock was added for Napa Valley and a safety project that was completed by the city. It was discovered that a utility bill submitted five years ago had not been paid
Therefore Mr. Covington noted that Resolution 17-06 asks that an additional $326,000 be allotted to complete the Kanis Bridge project and Resolution 17-07 would add $128,000 for the Napa Valley project to be closed from the utility standpoint.

A motion to approve Resolution 17-06 was made by Mayor Holland, seconded by Judge Hyde and passed by the Board.

A motion to approve Resolution 17-07 was made by Mayor Smith, seconded by Mayor Dabbs and passed by the Board.

**Item 6. Unified Planning Work Program**

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that Ms. Susan Dollar would provide the Board with an update for the UPWP.

Ms. Dollar stated to the Board that the UPWP is comprised of the work schedule of projects that will be done in the upcoming year.

Ms. Dollar noted that included in the Board packet is the narrative draft task list portion of the UPWP. The additional text will be provided later. The UPWP has been streamlined and the document was reformatted for a more reader-friendly document.

Ms. Dollar also noted that a task completion section was added this time because the projects are a continuous work in progress.

Ms. Dollar also stated that there will be an update to the CARTS Travel Demand Model and the Long Range Plan.

Ms. Dollar noted that the full document will be available for public comment in April and the finalized will be available July 1st.

**Item 7. Call for System Optimization Projects**

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that the call for System Optimization Projects was announced to the Board at the February Metroplan Board meeting.

Mr. Covington noted these projects included smaller projects such as intersection improvements, signal projects, multimodal, and bike projects. This is an attempt to provide some distribution of funds throughout
Central Arkansas including jurisdictions that have not received funding recently.

Mr. Covington stated that the letters of interest for these projects are due by April 26th. The letters need to include some basic information on the project, a general description of the project, the current status of the project, and an estimate of funding that is being requested. Once staff has received all letters of interest and they are reviewed a final application process will follow.

Mr. Covington stated that if anyone needs assistance, staff would be available to help with the application process.

**Item 8. Planning Studies Update**

1. **CARTS Travel Demand Model Upgrade**

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that the next report would update the Metroplan Planning Studies within the UPWP.

Mr. Covington stated that the first project is the CARTS Travel Demand Model upgrade, which is the primary tool used by Metroplan for transportation planning. It is used to assess the impact on land use, changes on future travel patterns, and traffic growth. The tool has been maintained and funded by Metroplan and AHTD and has been used to assist in their corridor studies.

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that the model has not be updated since 2002-2004 and is now outdated with travel patterns from the early 2000s. Metroplan has included the update of the model into the budget in the amount $400,000, which is an 80/20 match with $80,000 from Metroplan and $320,000 in federal funds. Staff worked with AHTD to develop a scope of work and select an engineer. Currently the cost is $550,000 with a gap of about $150,000. Furthermore, staff has asked AHTD to partner with Metroplan on this cost, but AHTD has not been able to commit to this financial commitment. AHTD has provided staff with some traffic counts and other staff support on the model.

Mr. Covington stated that staff recommendation is to move forward with an initial phase of the project at $400,000 with a $150,000 gap still in place that would come in later. If the state is unable to provide this match
at a later date, then staff would have to look at Metroplan sources later this year or early next year to complete the project.

A motion to move forward with the updating of the CARTS Travel Demand Model was made by Mayor Dabbs, seconded by Mayor Watson and passed by the Board.

2. Hwy. 89 Corridor Study
Mr. Covington stated to the Board that the Hwy 89 study is a joint project between Metroplan and AHTD to upgrade the highway from Cabot to Mayflower and to the west of Conway, with a connection from Jacksonville up to the new facility.

Mr. Covington stated that the Hwy 89 task force still comprised of local officials, as well as state and federal officials and representatives of the Air Force Base, requested that AHTD partner with Metroplan on the Hwy 89 study. Garver had been selected conduct and develop a scope work. They are currently developing the final cost of the study for approval by the Board.

Mr. Covington noted that a kickoff meeting is scheduled to occur within about 2 – 3 months. This will be brought back to the Board once this is done.

3. Manage Lane (HOT Lane) Study
Mr. Covington stated to the Board that the Manage Lane Study is a partnering agreement between Metroplan and AHTD, and is a study of the freeway system as requested to study options for adding capacity in ways other than general purpose lanes. Staff has reviewed several studies of various ways to implement this type of system.

Mr. Covington stated that this is a critical component as one of the alternatives to be analyzed in developing the Long Range Plan. There are three components to be addressed with the study a continuation of current policy, a freeway build type policy and a manage lane policy. It is expected that the study will begin to be developed in late 2017.

Ms. Jones inquired as to what would be the anticipated timeframe for receiving sufficient information to be put into the CARTS model for the manage lane study?

Mr. Covington stated that there are two parts to consider. A letter of interest should be issued this spring to move the process along, and a
short-list done to develop a more specific scope of work. Over the summer a contract will be drawn up to finalize everything.

Mr. Covington noted that based upon the action of the Board it is expected that the final will be available within the first couple of months of 2018. Therefore a call for qualifications will be issued during spring and finalized by the summer.

### Item 9. Attrib and TAP Project Status and Obligations

Mr. Covington stated to the Board that several projects are moving as planned since being implemented in February.

Mr. Covington stated that TAP programs included in the Board must be ready for obligation by September.

Mr. Covington noted that the Railgrade Separation in Jacksonville will be the last railgrade separation to be developed with construction beginning in 2019. Staff is working to acquire an engineer and utilities and right-of-way.

Mr. Covington also commented on the Jump Start Programs that had been funded through the HUD grant. There are six projects with the City of Bryant being ahead of schedule with a final design to be prepared this summer. The other projects are still in the design phase. Final signatures are expected on the Conway project by the end of the day allowing for obligation later on this year. All remaining projects will be under design by the end of the year.

Mr. Covington stated that staff will be requesting the 20% match from the jurisdictions as soon as the contracts are signed.

Finally Mr. Covington noted that the Adaptive Signal projects will begin development within the next few months.

### Item 10. 30 Crossing Update

Mr. Covington stated that the RPAC met on April 14th with the primary discussion centered on the public outreach efforts. There are some requirements for public engagement consisting of the 30-day public
comment period, legal notices, and advertising on social media, all with Spanish translations.

Mr. Covington noted that a significant modification to the plan was the approval of the exception of the 6-lane policy with a change of the plan to major widening.

Mr. Covington noted that included in the Board packet is a list of the recommendations from the RPAC on the public outreach strategy.

Mr. Covington stated that Mr. Townsell would inform the Board of potential options a public meeting and future discussions by the Board.

Mr. Townsell stated that from his times a Board member it was easy to forget that board decisions were more than just a rudimentary check off of approval. Board members tended to forget that could say “no” on any issue, as large as this 30 Crossing issue is and with widespread knowledge that the Metroplan has the right to say “no, there will be some people who will ask and expect the Metroplan Board to say “no”. If we had to make this decision, we would want to personally hear comments from all sides before making that decision. In practice, the public should be given a hearing, face to face, in front of the decision makers.

Mr. Townsell stated that he would recommend that the Board, at the beginning of the public comment period, participate in a forum where the public can address the Board directly to express their views.

A motion to authorize the outreach proposal was made by Judge Hyde, seconded by Mr. Varner and passed by the Board.

Mr. Covington stated that at the end of April there will be a draft plan amendment brought to the Board for review and feedback. The RPAC suggested that the amendment be a generalized amendment not specific to any one area. As part of the amendment, projects should be addressed that will be impacted directly by the I-30 Crossing. These will be examined at the April meeting.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.
ITEM 2. FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR MARCH 2017
### METROPLAN
**Little Rock, Arkansas**

**Balance Sheet**

**March 31, 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3/31/2017</th>
<th>12/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assets:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash in Bank</td>
<td>2,026,654.92</td>
<td>1,841,401.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts Held for Others</td>
<td>77,015.39</td>
<td>127,666.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Deposit</td>
<td>517,657.92</td>
<td>517,466.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTS Infrastructure Bank</td>
<td>1,179,781.33</td>
<td>1,239,684.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receivables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R - Federal Grants &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>846,476.64</td>
<td>603,567.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R - Administrative Fees &amp; Other</td>
<td>1,602.62</td>
<td>2,607.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R - Due from CARMA</td>
<td>74,944.45</td>
<td>72,459.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/R - City Project Match</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Assets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>16,421.07</td>
<td>17,733.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; Equipment</td>
<td>81,345.57</td>
<td>56,246.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets:</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,821,899.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,478,833.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3/31/2017</th>
<th>12/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19,106.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Salaries</td>
<td>17,994.44</td>
<td>35,090.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Leave &amp; P/R Withholdings</td>
<td>27,652.15</td>
<td>36,104.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amounts Held for Others</td>
<td>77,015.39</td>
<td>127,667.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due to Other Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unearned Revenue - CARTS</td>
<td>1,179,781.33</td>
<td>1,239,684.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>(1,909.14)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,300,534.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,457,652.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3/31/2017</th>
<th>12/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted Net Assets</td>
<td>2,985,837.41</td>
<td>2,985,837.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Net Assets</td>
<td>195,054.00</td>
<td>195,054.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue (Expense)</td>
<td>340,474.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Equity:</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,521,365.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,180,891.41</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3/31/2017</th>
<th>12/31/2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities and Equity</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,821,899.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,638,543.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Budget 2017</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Sources - General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,625.00</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Sources - Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$ 192,995.34</td>
<td>871,847.00</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STP</td>
<td>$ 1,435.82</td>
<td>864,390.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>1,736,237.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contributions - Dues</td>
<td></td>
<td>470,975.49</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metroplan Match per budget is the Indirect Expense Total</td>
<td>$ 155,316.39</td>
<td>435,443.00</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Contributions - General</td>
<td></td>
<td>358.95</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Income - General</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income - General</td>
<td></td>
<td>436.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Contributions - Special</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,201.10</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td>882,444.85</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>2017 Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>$ 159,960.98</td>
<td>$ 72,011.16</td>
<td>$ 231,972.14</td>
<td>1,012,542.00</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe</td>
<td>$ 31,223.47</td>
<td>$ 14,518.19</td>
<td>$ 45,741.66</td>
<td>292,879.00</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 191,184.45</td>
<td>$ 86,529.35</td>
<td>$ 277,713.80</td>
<td>1,305,421.00</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMA Salaries</td>
<td>$ 26,297.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 26,297.48</td>
<td>118,509.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARMA Fringe</td>
<td>$ 5,206.70</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 5,206.70</td>
<td>24,847.00</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 31,504.18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 31,504.18</td>
<td>143,356.00</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile Expense</td>
<td>$ 2,220.00</td>
<td>$ 2,000.00</td>
<td>$ 4,220.00</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships/Subscriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Professional Membership</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 851.00</td>
<td>$ 851.00</td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions &amp; Publications</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Membership</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 529.00</td>
<td>$ 529.00</td>
<td>6,500.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 6,062.87</td>
<td>$ 6,062.87</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance - General</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,000.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal / Accounting</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 17,150.00</td>
<td>$ 17,150.00</td>
<td>28,500.00</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating/Maintenance/Technology Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Operating</td>
<td>$ 3,784.35</td>
<td>$ 762.26</td>
<td>$ 4,546.61</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance / Repair</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,111.24</td>
<td>$ 1,111.24</td>
<td>12,995.00</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 9,358.91</td>
<td>$ 9,358.91</td>
<td>59,240.00</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,329.62</td>
<td>$ 2,329.62</td>
<td>21,000.00</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Agreements / Office Equipment</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,829.38</td>
<td>$ 2,829.38</td>
<td>10,644.00</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 384.15</td>
<td>$ 384.15</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Printing</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,468.00</td>
<td>$ 2,468.00</td>
<td>11,000.00</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>$ 850.00</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
<td>$ 1,350.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 8,750.01</td>
<td>$ 8,750.01</td>
<td>35,000.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,475.10</td>
<td>$ 4,475.10</td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel/Training</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,703.92</td>
<td>$ 7,703.92</td>
<td>40,000.00</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Expense</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 821.57</td>
<td>$ 821.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractual/Direct Charges</td>
<td>$ 1,794.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,794.77</td>
<td>865,583.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 231,337.75</td>
<td>$ 155,316.39</td>
<td>$ 386,654.14</td>
<td>2,655,239.00</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Revenue (Expense)</td>
<td>$ 340,474.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Local Contributions - Dues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Contributions - Dues</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget Spent to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Saline County</td>
<td>$45,030.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Pulaski County</td>
<td>$44,852.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Lonoke County</td>
<td>$20,487.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Grant County</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Faulkner County</td>
<td>$37,231.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Alexander</td>
<td>$2,669.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Austin</td>
<td>$1,875.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Bauxite</td>
<td>$448.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Benton</td>
<td>$28,227.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Bryant</td>
<td>$15,353.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Cabot</td>
<td>$21,874.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Cammack Village</td>
<td>$707.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Conway</td>
<td>$54,195.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Greenbrier</td>
<td>$4,330.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Guy</td>
<td>$523.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Haskell</td>
<td>$3,671.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - Hot Springs Village</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Jacksonville</td>
<td>$26,095.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Little Rock</td>
<td>$44,510.49</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Lonoke</td>
<td>$3,905.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Maumelle</td>
<td>$15,790.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Mayflower</td>
<td>$2,055.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Mount Vernon</td>
<td>$133.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of North Little Rock</td>
<td>$57,320.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Shannon Hills</td>
<td>$2,892.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Sheridan</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Sherwood</td>
<td>$27,161.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Traskwood</td>
<td>$477.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Vilonia</td>
<td>$3,510.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Ward</td>
<td>$3,742.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Wooster</td>
<td>$791.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues - City of Wrightsville</td>
<td>$1,945.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $470,975.49

**Year To Date Dues**

March 31, 2017

$606,307.00

0.78
ITEM 3. AGENCY REPORTS

A. Metroplan Executive Director’s Report
   Certification Review, Hot Springs Village Visit, Regional Showcase

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

B. Rock Region METRO

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

C. Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
ITEM 4. **2018 Unified Planning Work Program**

**SUMMARY**

Metroplan maintains the CARTS Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which is a list of transportation planning activities and agreed upon processes conducted by Metroplan, the AHTD, and Rock Region METRO within the CARTS area for a given year. The UPWP details the proposed planning work program by task, agency roles and responsibilities, and budgets necessary for Metroplan, AHTD, and Rock Region METRO to undertake during State FY 2018 (July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2018).

The major focus of Metroplan’s 2018 work program includes updating the CARTS Travel Demand Model, baseline reports for federally required performance measures, and initial phases of an update to *Imagine Central Arkansas*. Metroplan and AHTD will jointly participate and assist consultants with planning for 30 Crossing, Hwy 89 Corridor Study, and regional managed lane study. Rock Region METRO's work plan will focus on short-range transportation planning activities and continued implementation of *Move Central Arkansas*.

The 2018 UPWP is included as an attachment in the notice of meeting.

**Action Needed:** Motion to approve release of the draft FY2018 CARTS UPWP document for 30-day public comment.
ITEM 5. CALL FOR SYSTEM OPTIMIZATION PROJECTS/VARIOUS CARTS ATTRIB PROJECTS

SUMMARY

Letters of Interest for CARTS System Optimization Projects should be submitted to Metroplan Staff by April 26th (Board meeting day) for consideration of funding during federal fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

Letters of Interest must include the following information:

- Project Name
- Project Description
- Current Status
- Project phases and funding amount for which federal funding is requested

Metroplan staff will summarize the submittals at the May Board Meeting. A full application will also be available during the May meeting.
ITEM 6.  Hwy 89 Corridor Study

SUMMARY

In April 2016, the Hwy 89 Task Force, which is composed of local officials, state and federal representatives, and the Little Rock Air Base, sent a letter to the Arkansas Highway Commission requesting a study of the Hwy 89 corridor from Cabot/Jacksonville to Mayflower and west to Conway. In September 2016, the Metroplan Board approved a partnering agreement with the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department to fund 50% of the corridor study.

Working with AHTD, a scope of work has been developed for the project that will present recommendations for phased improvements along the corridor that collectively provide for a continuous arterial route connecting Hwy 67, I-40, and western Conway. The study will focus on three major segments.

1. Mayflower to Cabot - Upgrade portions of existing State Hwy 89 and attend to the current discontinuous portion of State Hwy 89 from Hwy 107 to the Faulkner County Line.
2. Conway to Mayflower - Upgrade and possible realignment of portions of State Hwy 89, Lollie Road, and Sand Gap Road, resulting in an improved connection between west Conway and I-40 and offering better access to the new airport.
3. New Interchange and Connecting Road - Provide a new break in access on US 67 (in the vicinity of Coffelt Road) with roadway connection to the Hwy 89 Corridor.

Garver Engineers has been selected to conduct the Corridor Study. The project scope has been provided to Task Force members for comment. A final contract and notice to proceed is expected in May. A kickoff meeting will be scheduled after the Notice to Proceed is issued.

Staff requests approval of the Metroplan Board to authorize payment for 50% share of the project up to $110,000 ($88,000 Federal, $22,000 Local). This amount is based upon the estimate provided by Garver and is available within the Metroplan 2017 Budget.

Action Needed: Motion to approve Resolution 17-8.
RESOLUTION 17-8

CENTRAL ARKANSAS REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY (CARTS)

Hwy 89 Corridor Study

WHEREAS, Metroplan is the officially designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Little Rock-North Little Rock-Conway metropolitan area; and

WHEREAS, the MPO is charged with the responsibility of developing and administering Unified Planning Work Program for the Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study,

WHEREAS, a study of the Hwy 89 Corridor is included in the 2018 Unified Planning Work Programs,

WHEREAS, the Metroplan and AHTD entered into a project agreement to jointly participated and fund a Hwy 89 corridor study in October 2016,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for central Arkansas, the Metroplan Board of Directors, hereby authorizes payment of 50% of the project share up to $110,000 ($88,000 Federal, $22,000 Metroplan).

Duly adopted this twenty-sixth day of April 2016.

SIGNED: ______________________

Art Brooke, President
Mayor, City of Ward

ATTEST: ______________________

Jim Baker, Secretary
Judge, Faulkner County
ITEM 7. ATTRIB AND TAP PROJECT STATUS AND OBLIGATIONS

SUMMARY

Following is the update for projects scheduled for obligation in 2017. Staff continues to monitor these projects to ensure that Metroplan is able to meet its obligation requirements for federal fiscal year 2017. The status of projects will be reviewed at the Board meeting.
## Project Obligation FY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STP CARTS Apportionment</th>
<th>$10,519,166</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP CARTS Apportionment</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CARTS Apportionment</td>
<td>$11,239,166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 Obligation Authority (TAP and STP>200K) $10,677,208

**April Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Obligation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas River Trail</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Survey: Topsis surveying is done but we are still verifying some property lines particularly with the railroad. Hydraulics: We just sent the request for FEMA to send us the current floodplain model which may take several weeks to get a response on. Structural: We have started developing the structural model for the trusses in a program called STADD and gathering information to begin developing our plan set. Civil: This work has not begun yet but will begin with developing a site plan and a schematic alignment (establishing the horizontal and vertical geometry) once we firm up property lines and have a little more information on what is in the current floodplain model. SHPO: We do not have any new information to share with SHPO at this point so no new coordination has occurred in the last month. Plans ready for Phases 1, 2 and 3 by June of this year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old River Bridge (Saline County)</td>
<td>$296,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levy Trail</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ward Drive TAP</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
<td>Public meeting set for May 4th. 50% Plans under review by AHTD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt Rd Sidewalks (Little Rock)</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>The 30% plans were submitted to AHTD on April 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackman/River Street Sidewalks (Benton)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>The Project agreement is complete and signed by both parties, final design work is underway &amp; we have submitted the SHPO letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewood Drive Sidewalks (Maumelle)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Street Sidewalks (Cabot)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Awaiting authorization from AHTD to bid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Road/Hwy 294 Sidewalks (Jacksonville)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso Rd and Burns Trail (Sherwood)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>50% Plans Submitted this week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pike Avenue Ped Improvements</td>
<td>$112,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop Road Railgrade - Design (Jacksonville)</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>RFQ Early May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTS Planning</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Agreement under development by AHTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARTS Model Upgrade</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>Contract going through final edits following AHTD Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hwy 89 Corridor Study</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>Scope being finalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Wide Hot Lane Study</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>RFQ to be issued in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock 12th Street Jump Start Design</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>Consultants make edits per AHTD comments on Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower Jump Start Design</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>Project scope still being determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLR JFK Jump Start Design</td>
<td>$414,000</td>
<td>Consultants make edits per AHTD comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLR Jump Start Design Levy Design</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>Consultants make edits per AHTD comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maumelle Blvd ASCT</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>Vendor Contract going through final review before being sent to AHTD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University ASCT</td>
<td>$550,000</td>
<td>RFP issued to ASCT Vendor, Vendor reviewing plans for any modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Ward Drive ASCT</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Contract Submitted to AHTD on 4/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham St Jump Start (Conway)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>Design Contract Awaiting AHTD Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds Jump Start (Bryant – Includes TAP)</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>Public Meeting held on March 9th on Proposed Improvements, 90% Plans to be submitted for review of AHTD, City of Bryant, and Metroplan by April 7th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ready to go Projects

- **McCain Railgrade Separation** $40,973: Project is under construction, completion is expected during the summer.
- **Maryland Road** $2,650,000: Design, Environmental and ROW Completed, Waiting on utilities for Relocations Plans

### Obligated Projects

- **Conway Markham St Jump Start Design** $283,963: Submitted on 4/5/2017, Awaiting FHWA
- **Kanis Bridge** $319,805: Submitted on 4/5/2017, Awaiting FHWA
- **Napa Valley** $128,781: Submitted on 4/5/2017, Awaiting FHWA
ITEM 8.  30 CROSSING UPDATE

SUMMARY
On April 19th, the Regional Planning Advisory Council (RPAC) met and reviewed the proposed amendment language and microsimulation model results used to inform the amendment. After significant discussion, the Council recommended that the amendment be released for public comment. The amendment lists three adjacent segments of freeway which have been identified by Metroplan staff as necessary for the 30 Crossing corridor to operate with minimal congestion resulting from adjacent freeways that would impact operations and safety. The listing is not an endorsement of those other improvement projects, but a recognition that the desired operational improvements in the 30 Crossing corridor can only be achieved with additional investments beyond this project. Because there is not a current commitment by the Arkansas Highway Commission to fund those additional projects, they are listed in a new section in the plan as illustrative projects. RPAC members recommended that this information be made available to the Metroplan Board and general public when considering the plan amendment and effect of the project. The RPAC also vigorously stated that this recommendation should not be viewed or taken as an endorsement of the proposed amendment.

Metroplan staff will be available 30 minutes before the Board Meeting to review posters displaying results of modeling runs used to support the amendment and illustrative project selection.

Public Hearing
A public hearing has been scheduled on the proposed amendment for 6:00 pm, on May 17th at the Ron Robinson Theatre located at 100 River Market Avenue in the Little Rock River Market District. Metroplan staff will make a short presentation and then comments will be taken from the public at the hearing. Board members are encouraged to attend. The notice of the comment period will also include a summary of the project and role of Metroplan in the process.

Regional Planning Advisory Council Motion - Recommend release of the following amendment to Imagine Central Arkansas for public consideration and comment. (The RPAC explicitly states that this is neither an endorsement nor support for the amendment).

Action Needed: Board Motion to release Imagine Central Arkansas plan amendment for 30 Crossing for public comment
Proposed Amendment Language
Following is Imagine Central Arkansas amendment for 30 Crossing. Changes or additions to Imagine Central Arkansas are shown in red. The amendment is consistent with the Metroplan Board’s approval of a waiver of the region’s 6 through lane maximum policy, Metroplan requirements for defining an integrated Metropolitan Transportation System, and the request from AHTD.

Modification to Table 7-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRMTP #</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CA0602</td>
<td>Interstate 30/40</td>
<td>I-530 (South Terminal)</td>
<td>Hwy 67</td>
<td>Capacity Improvements and Reconstruction (5)</td>
<td>$631.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA and at the request of AHTD, the Metroplan Board will consider a TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required. (Revised for TIP only)

Addition to Section 7.5.1 Freeways

**Illustrative Projects Linked with 30 Crossing (CA0602)**

Three freeway segments have noticeable impacts on or will be impacted by the proposed 30 Crossing improvements. Improvements to these corridors would be necessary (given the modeling assumptions) to avoid forming bottlenecks, which will impact traffic operations and safety within the 30 Crossing corridor. These projects are listed as illustrative as there has been no financial commitment to their construction by the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department. Improvement projects would be subject to individual corridor and environmental studies.

**Capacity Improvements**

1. Interstate 30 - I-530/I-440 (South Terminal) to 65th Street
2. Interstate 30 - 65th to I-430
   - After widening to 65th
3. Interstate 630 - I-30 to University
   - Congestion impacts on I-630 are greater with 6+C/D Lane Alternatives

**FHWA Definition of Illustrative Project**

*Illustrative project* means an additional transportation project that may be included in a financial plan for a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP if reasonable additional resources were to become available.

Following is the staff write-up on the development of the plan amendment and a letter from AHTD regarding improvements to adjacent freeways, which may be necessary to maximize the improvements proposed within the 30 Crossing Corridor.
Mr. Tab Townsell  
Executive Director, Metroplan  
501 West Markham Street  
Little Rock, AR 72201  

Dear Mr. Townsell:

Reference is made to the upcoming amendment to Metroplan’s long range transportation plan – Imagine Central Arkansas (ICA).

Currently the 30 Crossing project (Job CA0602) Improvements are listed in the ICA as “Operational Improvements and Reconstruction.” All reasonable action alternatives being evaluated in the ongoing National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process would require major widening along the Interstate 30 corridor. Therefore, it is requested that the Metroplan Board of Directors proceed with a Plan amendment at this time to add “Major Widening” to the project’s Improvements and to remove the footnotes in the ICA.

As part of this amendment, Metroplan staff has asked for a statement from the Department regarding future improvements that may be needed on adjacent freeways in order to maximize the improvements being proposed for the 30 Crossing corridor. These areas of possible future improvement are Interstate 30 from the South Terminal to 65th Street and Interstate 630 from Interstate 30 to the West. Please accept the following statements as the Department’s response to this request by Metroplan staff.

- **Interstate 30 from the South Terminal to 65th Street** – The Department currently has a project programmed (Job BB0619) to reconstruct Interstate 30 from 65th Street to the South Terminal. The Department is also currently studying the Interstate 30 corridor from the South Terminal to Benton to determine what modifications can be made to improve mobility on that corridor. The development of construction plans for BB0619 has been placed on hold pending the results of the Interstate 30 corridor study. Once the results of this study are available, the Department will determine what changes to the scope of Job BB0619 may be needed in order to address the mobility issues on Interstate 30 from 65th Street to the South Terminal.

- **Interstate 630 from Interstate 30 to the West** – The Department does not currently have plans to improve Interstate 630 from Interstate 30 to the west. Due to current and anticipated mobility concerns on the corridor, the Highway Commission has provided approval for a future study of this portion of Interstate 630; however, a date has not yet been set for this study to commence. Upon completion of this future study and completion of any project specific NEPA processes resulting from the findings of the study, the Department may implement improvements on Interstate 630 as funding becomes available.
As part of the ongoing NEPA process, the Department has performed traffic modeling simulations on all reasonable alternatives currently being considered as part of the 30 Crossing project. Although improved mobility is an important part of the project's Purpose and Need statement, complete elimination of congestion in an urban corridor as complex as this is often not feasible and is not a goal of this project. Rather, the project seeks to mitigate the congestion in the corridor in the most effective way possible within the limitations that exist for the project. Consequently, all reasonable alternatives currently being evaluated begin to show some level of congestion during peak traffic hours at certain locations in the corridor prior to the design year of 2041.

Although traffic modeling does show congestion returning to the corridor by the design year of 2041, the improvements proposed in the 30 Crossing project will provide a significant improvement over the congestion that would occur if no improvements are made. In addition, the proposed improvements would ensure that this critical portion of the Central Arkansas Freeway System is built in such a way to be able to maximize the benefits of any future improvements made to adjacent portions of the system.

With this information I am confident a Plan amendment can be drafted to add "Major Widening" to the CA0602 Type of Work description and to remove the footnotes from the project. I am also confident a TIP amendment for the same purpose can immediately follow.

Please advise if additional information is needed.

Sincerely,

Scott E. Bennett, P.E.
Director of Highways and Transportation

c: Highway Commission
   Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer
   Deputy Director and Chief Engineer
   Assistant Chief Engineer – Planning
   Program Management
   Transportation Planning and Policy
   Public Information
   Design Build Project Director
   Connecting Arkansas Program Administrator
   FHWA – Arkansas Division
   Metroplan Board of Directors
   Casey Covington, CARTS Study Director
Subject: Imagine Central Arkansas Amendment for 30 Crossing
For: Regional Planning Advisory Council and Metroplan Board of Directors
Provided: April 21, 2017
From: Metroplan Staff

BACKGROUND

30 Crossing is a major freeway reconstruction project through the core of Little Rock and North Little Rock. This project is unique within Arkansas, due to its location through the downtown of a major U.S. city, overall cost, scale of improvements proposed, potential impacts to communities, and the opportunity to reconnect neighborhoods that were separated during the original construction of the freeway. For the past three years, the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department (AHTD), together with Federal Highway Administration, the Cities of Little Rock and North Little Rock, Pulaski County, and Metroplan, have evaluated alternatives and environmental impacts of proposed improvements to Interstates 30 and 40 from I-530/I-440 to Hwy 67. That process is still ongoing.

In June 2016, AHTD sent a letter to Metroplan’s Board of Directors, requesting that the Board abolish the region’s six-through-lane maximum policy. The letter stipulated that if the Board was unwilling to abolish the policy outright, then AHTD requested that an exception to the policy be granted specifically for the 30 Crossing project. Metroplan and AHTD staff determined that the most appropriate and timely action was to consider a waiver for 30 Crossing and review the policies and investment strategies as part of the upcoming Long-Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan update. A waiver of the six-lane freeway policy for 30 Crossing was approved by the Metroplan Board in August 2016.

This memo is for use in drafting a proposed amendment to Imagine Central Arkansas for 30 Crossing. It includes consideration of impacts to adjacent freeway segments and a discussion of alternatives for consideration during the update of Imagine Central Arkansas.

Imagine Central Arkansas

The 30 Crossing project is currently listed in Imagine Central Arkansas as.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRMTP #</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CA0602</td>
<td>Interstate 30/40</td>
<td>I-530 (South Terminal)</td>
<td>Hwy 67</td>
<td>Operational Improvements and Reconstruction (5)</td>
<td>$646.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Specific type of work will be determined through the NEPA process. Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA and at the request of AHTD, the Metroplan Board will consider a LRMTP and TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required. Total cost includes all phases to allow the project to be delivered by the Design-Build-Finance method. 2019-2023 funding reflects payback of $100 Million borrowed with interest ($115 payback).
AHTD REQUEST FOR AMENDMENT

The Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department has requested an amendment to Imagine Central Arkansas to reflect the current alternatives under consideration for 30 Crossing.

AHTD Request:

- Add "Major Widening" to the project description
- Remove the Footnote

(5) Specific type of work will be determined through the NEPA process. Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA and at the request of AHTD, the Metroplan Board will consider a LRMTP and TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required. Total cost includes all phases to allow the project to be delivered by the Design-Build-Finance method.

Metroplan staff, with the input of AHTD, has developed a draft amendment for the consideration of the Metroplan Board. It is anticipated that an amendment will be released for public review and comment in April, and a vote taken on its approval by the Metroplan Board on June 28.

A subsequent TIP amendment will be considered as a single alternative emerges from the NEPA phase.

AMENDMENT LANGUAGE - ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

Federal regulations say that the Metropolitan Transportation Plan shall include "Existing and proposed transportation facilities that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, ..." Metroplan has identified two freeway corridors for which traffic operations are expected to appreciably impact or be impacted by the 30 Crossing proposed improvements. This includes I-30 west of the corridor and I-630 west of the corridor. This determination was made from the results of modeling completed by AHTD, a system analysis completed by Metroplan, and review of existing and forecast traffic volumes. Before an amendment can be referred to the public, it must be determined if improvements to any of these corridors should be included.

A series of graphs follow showing the impact of various alternatives for 30 Crossing on traffic flow. Each graph should be read as follows.

Understanding Congestion Charts - Description

Four charts are provided to depict the estimated future traffic for the 30 Crossing project. Each separate chart shows the modeling for traffic flow in one direction in either the morning or evening phase of the daily commute. There are charts for morning southbound and morning northbound and for evening southbound and evening northbound.

These charts are made up of the separate graphs showing the various roadway design configurations arranged by interim year 2021, interim year 2026, the 2041 design year, and the design year plus ten (10%)
more traffic. Each separate graph shows the traffic flow for one roadway design in the indicated year in the direction and time of day represented by its particular chart.

All the graphs are arranged in columns by the year modeled and by roadway design along rows. In this manner, the performance of the various roadway designs for each year of modeling can be compared against each other in a column. Likewise, the graphs for a single roadway design are arranged in a row across the adjacent columns. The performance of a single roadway design can be compared against itself, side by side, through each of the modeled years.

The graphs depicted on these charts can be read in the following manner: the horizontal axis represents time of day, while the vertical axis depicts different segments from north to south. On the vertical axis, the top of each graph depicts the I-67 corridor at McCain Boulevard. The bottom depicts the I-30 corridor at 65th Street. The rest of the corridor is arrayed in order along the vertical axis: I-67 to I-40, through the North Terminal onto I-30, across the Arkansas River, past I-630 to the South Terminal, and on to 65th Street.

The best way to read each graph is to proceed from left to right, by time of day. Thus, you can start at the earliest interval on the far left of each chart. This is typically 5:45 AM for the morning charts, and 3:45 PM for the afternoon charts.

For example, for southbound morning traffic, tracing a line from top to bottom you get a snapshot of traffic conditions along the corridor at a single moment in the morning rush hour. Since southbound traffic travels from the top of the chart to the bottom, you can see where congestion starts and where it stops at that single time in the morning rush. Moving the line rightward advances you to the next moment in time, and then the next, and so on. By moving left to right you can see how congestion worsens, improves or stays the same at different points along the corridor.

The same can be done with the northbound traffic charts except the traffic is traveling from the bottom of the chart to the top.

A Reader’s Understanding of Heat Maps.

These graphs are called “Heat Maps.” Reading each graph is complex. Think of it this way, every driver sees congestion in a single “moment.” It starts in one spot and loosens up in another spot. The roadway is congested between those two points because car speeds are slow. Another driver fifteen minutes later in the same direction probably experiences slow speeds in different spots. In each rush hour, congestion grows larger in the corridor and lessens in the corridor as the clock moves through the day. These graphs attempt to “map” the experience of all drivers moving in one direction in the corridor at every moment of time in one picture.

To build a mental understanding of what is happening with each graph, imagine sending a driver through the corridor at the top of any hour and then mapping where the driver experiences slower speeds. Send another driver through the corridor one minute later and map where they experienced slower speeds. Then send more drivers through the corridor, one at every minute thereafter for an hour, mapping each driver’s results separately. Then if you placed all the maps from each of the sixty-one drivers side by side in the order they started, the area of congestion (slower car speeds) during that hour of the commute would take shape on your graph. Congestion would spread along the roadway as shown on one axis of the graph and it would spread through time along the other axis.

Instead of seeing congestion in a single moment as a single driver does, heat maps show what congestion ALL drivers going the same direction in the commute phase would experience at every moment in time.
Travel speeds are reflected by the following colors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed (mph)</th>
<th>Colors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-70</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-20</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following disclaimer on modeling graphics is provided at the request of AHTD.

**AHTD Disclaimer:**
Traffic modeling graphics provided by AHTD to Metroplan staff, per their request, are in draft status and are intended for generalized informational purposes only. These graphics have not received a final review by AHTD or FHWA staff and are therefore subject to change upon review. AHTD believes generalized statements derived from these graphics can be used to inform the Plan amendment process but AHTD does not endorse the use of these graphics as supporting documentation due to their draft status. Any use of these graphics as supporting documentation is done at the sole discretion and risk of Metroplan staff.

The 2041 AM Southbound No-Build alternative is shown in the following chart. Traffic congestion begins at the Arkansas River at 6:30 am and quickly extends beyond the model limits at Hwy 67/167 and McCain Blvd. Continuous congestion is depicted within the corridor until the model expires at 2:30 pm.

2041 AM Southbound No-Build

*Source: AHTD - Draft
These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.

The following are selected runs showing the impact of various 30 Crossing Build Alternatives on I-30 and I-630. **The results of all model runs are included within Appendix A.**
**I-30 South Terminal to 65th Street**

The most noteworthy bottleneck forming outside the 30 Crossing corridor is I-30 west of the south terminal (I-30, I-440, and I-530). This bottleneck is expected to occur both inbound (impacting inflow) in the morning and outbound in the afternoon.

This bottleneck become apparent in the opening year (2021) at the merge of I-30 with I-440/I-530 with the 6 lane C/D options. The single point urban interchange reflect congestion only on I-440 and I-530, while the split diamond alternative reflects a larger backup on I-30. (See charts below)

*Source AHTD: Draft. The widening of I-30 to 65th is not included in the 2021 models. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.*

By 2026, the bottleneck has a considerable impact on the operations of I-30 in both of the 6 lane C/D options. Congestion is predicted to occur with the single point urban interchange alternative that extends from the south terminal over the Arkansas River, while the split diamond alternative shows congestion occurring from the south terminal to the north terminal. (See charts below)
2026 PM Southbound 6-Lane with C/D Single Point Urban Interchange

2026 PM Southbound 6-Lane with C/D Split Diamond

*Source: AHTD - Draft. The widening of I-30 to 65th is not included in the 2026 models. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.
Traffic congestion is shown in the 8 lane alternatives to extend from the south terminal to near the Arkansas River in the 2026 models. (See chart below)

2026 PM Southbound 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange

*Source: AHTD - Draft. The widening of I-30 to 65th street is not included in the 2026 models. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.

To reduce the impact of congestion occurring at the south terminal, the widening of I-30 from the south terminal to 65th Street is assumed in the 2041 models. This results in the bottleneck moving to the 65th Street interchange. In the 6 lane C/D options, the bottleneck that occurs at 65th is predicted to begin at 3:15 pm and extend to the Arkansas River at its maximum around 5:45 pm. The bottleneck disperses by 7:00 pm. (See chart below)

2041 PM Southbound 6-Lane with C/D Split Diamond

*Source: AHTD - Draft. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.

The 8 lane alternatives reflect congestion occurring between 65th Street and the south terminal from 3:15 pm to 6:30 pm. Traffic is metered out of downtown in this alternative due to congestion on I-30 northbound. (See chart following page)
Potential Projects

To reduce the impact of these bottlenecks, I-30 would need to be widened between the South Terminal and 65th Street before completion of 30 Crossing improvements. In the longer term widening would need to be extended west of 65th Street.

I-630 West of Corridor

The second major bottleneck that impacts traffic operations within the 30 Crossing corridor is I-630. In the 6 lane C/D alternatives the number of westbound I-630 travel lanes merge from six lanes to three between I-30 and the Broadway exit. To reduce congestion, widening of I-630 was assumed as part of the modeling runs completed for the Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study. This assumption was removed during the NEPA phase and, therefore, not reflected in the following charts. In the 8 lane alternative, traffic is metered elsewhere within the corridor and the impact to I-630 is less.

This bottleneck occurs in the 2021 opening year model. While much of the congestion is contained to I-630, it extends onto a half mile segment of I-30 from 7:30 am to 8:15 am. (See chart below)
By 2026 the bottleneck caused by I-630 extends into North Little Rock and lasts from 7:15 am to 8:45 am. Travel speeds on I-30 between I-630 and the Arkansas River range from 10 to 30 mph during this timeframe. (See chart below)

2026 AM Southbound 6-Lane with C/D Split Diamond

*Source: AHTD - Draft. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.

By 2041, this bottleneck has grown in significance and extends from I-630 onto I-30, I-40, and Hwy 67, where it reaches beyond McCain Blvd, a distance of 5+ miles. Congestion now begins at 7:00 am and extends until 10:00 am. (See chart below)

2041 AM Southbound 6-Lane with C/D Split Diamond

*Source: AHTD - Draft. These results not yet reviewed by FHWA.

In the 8 lane alternative, a bottleneck forms at the Hwy 67 and I-40 interchange, metering traffic into the corridor. By metering traffic into the corridor, a bottleneck is not shown on I-630 in the 8 lane alternatives in either the build or future year models. Major congestion in this alternative is contained to Hwy 67 as shown in the 2041 single point urban interchange model on the following page.
Potential Projects

Widening and operational improvements to I-630 would be necessary to reduce the impact of the I-630 bottleneck on I-30. With the widening of I-630 between Baptist Hospital and University scheduled to begin in 2017, it is reasonable to believe that improvements would be proposed for the remainder of the corridor. The timing of widening will depend on the congestion level that the region and AHTD is willing to accept on both the I-630 and I-30 corridors as well as financial resources.

I-40, I-440, I-530, and Hwy 67

Peak hourly volume estimates for I-40, Hwy 67, I-440 and I-530 suggest that all would operate at or under capacity after improvements are made in the 30 Crossing corridor. With traffic being able to successfully enter and exit 30 Crossing, the direct impact of 30 Crossing is significantly less on these freeways. Therefore, inclusion of I-40, I-440, I-530 and Hwy 67 in the plan amendment is not proposed.

However, population growth within these and other freeway corridors, or if level of service D is to be achieved, will require the consideration of additional infrastructure investments in the planning horizon. Long-term freeway system strategies to be considered as part of the upcoming update of the Long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plan are discussed on pages 12 and 13 of this document.
OPTIONS FOR 30 CROSSING MTP AMENDMENT

The following options have been developed for consideration by the Regional Planning Advisory Council (RPAC) and Metroplan Board. The RPAC will be asked to recommend an option for the Board to refer for public comment. For options that require additional funding for auxiliary improvements outside the 30 Crossing corridor limits, action by the Highway Commission to commit funding to these projects is suggested before inclusion in the financially constrained Long-Range Metropolitan Transportation Plan - Imagine Central Arkansas. Otherwise projects would be listed as illustrative.

FHWA Definition of Illustrative Project

Illustrative project means an additional transportation project that may be included in a financial plan for a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP if reasonable additional resources were to become available.

AHTD Request – Add “Major Widening” to the descriptive language of the project and remove footnote.

Metroplan staff advises retaining portions of the footnote that pertain to the TIP process and the MPO's final approval as part of it, which reads as follows:

(5) Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA, the Metroplan Board will consider a TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the TIP amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required.

OPTION 1 – AHTD Request + add the widening of I-30 between the south terminal interchange and 65th Street. Project to be shown as illustrative until financial commitment from the Highway Commission is received, project would then be added to the financially constrained plan.

FHWA staff has provided an opinion that the widening of I-30 to 65th Street should be part of the financially constrained plan, since it is included in the micro-simulation modeling.

OPTION 2 - Option 1 + selected improvements to I-30 between 65th and I-430, based on findings of the I-30 Corridor Study, currently in process. Projects to be shown as illustrative until financial commitment from the Highway Commission is received, project(s) would then be added to the financially constrained plan.

Dependent on selection of a 6+CD Lane Alternative

OPTION 3 – Option 1 + Option 2 + add widening and operational improvements to I-630 from I-30 to University Avenue to eight lanes. Projects to be shown as illustrative until financial commitment from the Highway Commission is received, project(s) would then be added to the financially constrained plan.
Proposed Amendment Language

Following is Imagine Central Arkansas amendment for 30 Crossing. Changes or additions to Imagine Central Arkansas are shown in red. Language will be modified based upon the amendment option selected and is consistent with the Metroplan Board’s approval of a waiver of the region’s 6 through lane maximum policy.

Modification to Table 7-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LRMTP #</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Cost (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>CA0602</td>
<td>Interstate 30/40</td>
<td>I-530 (South Terminal)</td>
<td>Hwy 67</td>
<td>Capacity Improvements and Reconstruction (5)</td>
<td>$631.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) Following the selection of a single alternative from NEPA and at the request of AHTD, the Metroplan Board will consider a TIP amendment to reflect the final project. Approval of the amendment by the Metroplan Board will be required. (Revised for TIP only)

Addition to Section 7.5.1 Freeways

**Illustrative Projects Linked with 30 Crossing (CA0602)**

Three freeway segments have noticeable impacts on or will be impacted by the proposed 30 Crossing improvements. Improvements to these corridors would be necessary (given the modeling assumptions) to avoid forming bottlenecks, which will impact traffic operations and safety within the 30 Crossing corridor. These projects are listed as illustrative as there has been no financial commitment to their construction by the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department.

Improvement projects would be subject to individual corridor and environmental studies.

**Capacity Improvements**

1. Interstate 30 - I-530/I-440 (South Terminal) to 65th Street
2. Interstate 30 - 65th to I-430
   - After widening to 65th
3. Interstate 630 - I-30 to University
   - Congestion impacts on I-630 are greater with 6+C/D Lane Alternatives

FHWA Definition of Illustrative Project

*Illustrative project* means an additional transportation project that may be included in a financial plan for a metropolitan transportation plan, TIP, or STIP if reasonable additional resources were to become available.
**Long-term Freeway System Strategies for MTP 2045 Update**

The CARTS Freeway System Analysis and LRMTP Impact of the CA0602 I-30 Corridor CAP Improvements identified a significant portion of the area’s freeway network that would require widening or other improvements to operate with minimal congestion during peak periods.

For a majority of those corridors, 30 Crossing is expected to have a negligible direct impact and, therefore, should not be considered a result of 30 Crossing. However, the policies and transportation strategies emanating from 30 Crossing discussions and resulting adjacent improvements are likely to have a prominent effect on future construction projects for these corridors.

The following scenarios are proposed for analysis as part of Metroplan's update to Imagine Central Arkansas, scheduled to begin in earnest in late 2017.

**OPTION A – Maintain Metroplan’s Policy Regarding a Balanced Transportation System With Six Through Lane Maximum for Freeways**

This option keeps the current policy of a six-through-lane maximum for freeways within the CARTS Area, focusing on the development of a balanced multi-modal transportation network. Freeway improvements focus on interchanges, operational improvements, and maintenance and reconstruction activities. This option recognizes that the number of congested freeway segments would increase along with longer periods of peak freeway congestion, negatively impacting freight movement and system reliability. Spatial realignment is expected with households moving closer to jobs and/or jobs/businesses moving to the suburban fringe to reduce the time spent in traffic and increase access to transportation modal options. This option is financially constrained within the LRMTP timeframe; however, a fully developed multi-modal network requires additional funding.

**OPTION B - Repeal Policy on Maximum Number of Through Lanes for Freeways**

This option eliminates the current Metroplan Policy regarding through-lane maximums for freeways, and instead allows for additional widening at the discretion of AHTD. The transportation strategy would change from a focus on a balanced multi-modal network to one that focuses limited resources on freeways. This strategy would require the identification of significant additional resources for the plan to be financially constrained. Further, this option is expected to conflict with current sustainability goals and land use assumptions, which will require reconsideration of those assumptions and of the goals themselves.
OPTION C - Managed Lane and Travel Demand Management Scenario

This option focuses on managing traffic flow through managed lanes and travel demand management strategies instead of the addition of general purpose lanes. It would maintain the six-through-lane cap for general purpose lanes but would provide for additional managed lanes. This option envisions tolled managed lanes, introducing market forces to manage demand during peak traffic periods, providing for regional transit infrastructure (BRT), and offsetting some of the cost of capacity additions. Results of the Tolled Managed Lane Study would be used to inform the MTP 2045 update, including the financial feasibility of this alternative. Land Use assumptions and sustainability goals would have to be revisited with this scenario; however, its support of regional transit infrastructure (BRT) is consistent with Imagine Central Arkansas sustainability principles.
How to Read these Congestion Charts

Each chart shows changing traffic conditions for different times of day by location along the I-30 freeway corridor. The horizontal axis (y-axis) represents time of day, while the vertical axis (x-axis) depicts different segments from north to south ( Hwy 67/ McCain to south - I-30/65th Street). Each chart just shows one direction of travel (southbound or northbound).

The best way to read them is to proceed from left to right, by time of day. Thus, you can start at the earliest interval on the far left of each chart. This is typically 5:45 AM for the morning charts and 3:45 PM for the afternoon charts.

For example, for southbound morning traffic, tracing a line from top to bottom you get a snapshot of traffic conditions along the corridor at a single moment in the morning rush hour. Since southbound traffic travels from the top of the chart to the bottom, you can see where congestion starts and where it stops at that single time in the morning rush. Moving the line rightward advances you to the next moment in time, and then the next, and so on. By moving left to right you can see how congestion worsens, improves or stays the same at different points and times along the corridor.

The same can be done with the northbound traffic charts except the traffic is traveling from the bottom of the chart to the top.

8-Lane Alternatives

2021 8-Lane
Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)

2026 8-Lane
Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)

2041 8-Lane
B-Lane Single-Point Urban Interchange (2041)

2041 8-Lane + 10% Traffic
Sensitivity 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

Interim 8-Lane Split Diamond (2021)

Interim 8-Lane Split Diamond (2026)

6 + CD Alternatives (10+ Lanes)

2021 6 + CD-Lane
Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)

2026 6 + CD-Lane
Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)

2041 6 + CD-Lane
6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

2041 6 + CD-Lane + 10% Traffic
Sensitivity 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

Interim 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2021)

Interim 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2026)

Interim 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2041)

Source: AHTD Draft Modeling Results
These results are preliminary and subject to change.
How to Read these Congestion Charts

Each chart shows changing traffic conditions for different times of day by location along the I-30 freeway corridor. The horizontal axis (x-axis) represents time of day, while the vertical axis (y-axis) depicts different segments from north (top) - Hwy 412/McClellan to south (bottom) - I-530/109th Street. Each chart just shows one direction of travel (southbound or northbound). Each shows a single scenario (build alternative and year), such as “southbound AM, 6+CD lane split diamond, in 2041.”

The best way to read them is to proceed from left to right, by time of day. Thus, you can start at the earliest interval on the far left of each chart. This is typically 5:45 AM for the morning charts, and 3:45 PM for the afternoon charts.

For example, for southbound morning traffic, tracing a line from top to bottom you get a snapshot of traffic conditions along the corridor at a single moment in the morning rush hour. Since southbound traffic travels from the top of the chart to the bottom, you can see where congestion starts and where it stops at that single time in the morning rush. Moving the line rightward advances you to the next moment in time, and then the next, and so on. By moving left to right you can see how congestion worsens, improves, or stays the same at different points and times along the corridor.

The same can be done with the northbound traffic charts except the traffic is traveling from the bottom of the chart to the top.

8-Lane Alternatives

- **2021 8-Lane**
  - Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)
  - Interim 8-Lane Split Diamond (2021)

- **2026 8-Lane**
  - Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)
  - Interim 8-Lane Split Diamond (2026)

- **2041 8-Lane**
  - B-Lane Single-Point Urban Interchange (2041)
  - B-Lane Split Diamond (2041)

- **2041 8-Lane + 10% Traffic**
  - Sensitivity B-Lane Single-Point Urban Interchange (2041)
  - Sensitivity B-Lane Split Diamond (2041)

6 + CD Alternatives (10+ Lanes)

- **2021 6 + CD-Lane**
  - Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)
  - Interim 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2021)

- **2026 6 + CD-Lane**
  - Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)
  - Interim 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (28) (2026)

- **2041 6 + CD-Lane**
  - 6+ CD-Lane Single-Point Urban Interchange (2041)
  - 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2041)

- **2041 6 + CD-Lane + 10% Traffic**
  - Sensitivity 6+ CD-Lane Single-Point Urban Interchange (2041)
  - Sensitivity 6+ CD-Lane Split Diamond (2041)
How to Read these Congestion Charts

Each chart shows changing traffic conditions for different times of day by location along the I-30 freeway corridor. The horizontal axis (x-axis) represents time of day, while the vertical axis (y-axis) depicts different segments from north (top) to south (bottom). Each chart shows the direction of travel (southbound or northbound). The best way to read them is to proceed from left to right, by time of day. Thus, you can start to the left of each chart and 4:15 AM for the morning charts, and 3:45 PM for the afternoon charts.

For example, for southbound morning traffic, tracing a line from top to bottom you get a snapshot of traffic conditions along the corridor at a single moment in the morning rush hour. Since southbound traffic travels from the top of the chart to the bottom, you can see where congestion starts and where it stops at that single time in the morning rush.

The same can be done with the northbound traffic charts except the traffic is traveling from the bottom of the chart to the top.
How to Read these Congestion Charts

Each chart shows changing traffic conditions for different times of the day by location along the I-30 freeway corridor. The horizontal axis (x-axis) represents time of day, while the vertical axis (y-axis) depicts different segments from north (top) to south (bottom) along I-30/630 Street. Each chart shows one direction of travel (southbound or northbound). Each shows a single scenario (build alternative and year), such as “southbound AM 6+CD lane split diamond, 2041.”

For example, for southbound morning traffic, tracing a line from top to bottom you get a snapshot of traffic conditions at the earliest interval on the far left of each chart. This is typically 5:45 AM for the morning charts. For example, you can see where congestion occurs, improves or stays the same at different points and times along the corridor.

The best way to read them is to proceed from left to right, by time of day. Thus, you can start at the earliest interval on the far left of each chart. This is typically 5:45 AM for the morning charts, and 3:45 PM for the afternoon charts.

8-Lane Alternatives

2021 8-Lane
Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)

2026 8-Lane
Interim 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)

2041 8-Lane
B-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

2041 8-Lane + 10%
Sensitivity 8-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

6 + CD Alternatives (10+ Lanes)

2021 6 + CD-Lane
Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2021)

2026 6 + CD-Lane
Interim 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2026)

2041 6 + CD-Lane
6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)

2041 6 + CD-Lane + 10% Traffic
Sensitivity 6+ CD-Lane Single Point Urban Interchange (2041)