

APPENDIX C: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Figure 2

WELCOME

**CITY OF CONWAY
NOTICE OF PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.)(S)
FAULKNER COUNTY
JULY 10, 2000**

HOW THIS MEETING WORKS:

1. Please register your attendance at the Registration table.
2. Gather information, view the displays, and ask questions *at your own pace and convenience*. Personnel are on hand to assist you by answering questions about the project and providing pertinent information.
3. If you wish to make an oral statement about the project you may have your comments recorded on tape at the recording station set up at the meeting. A representative for the City of Conway will be there to record your statement.
4. Please take a minute to fill out a short questionnaire regarding the proposed project. When finished you may leave it in the drop box at the meeting, or mail it to the address on the back of the questionnaire. Thank you for your comments.

∴ REMEMBER ∴

Please record your comments in writing or on tape so that they will be considered a part of this public meeting.

*Thank You For Your Attendance and Participation
In This Public Information Meeting*

GENERAL INFORMATION

This packet has been prepared to provide an overview about the study being conducted to develop a route for the Conway Bypass. Information has been included pertaining to the proposed study area, environmental issues, and what's next. Additional information on each of these topics is available at the meeting or by contacting Garver Engineers in Little Rock.

Public meetings are held to inform the public about the study and to solicit public input into the study process. Hopefully this will insure that project locations and designs are consistent with public expectations and the highest possible goals and objectives. One of the primary goals of this meeting is to provide a medium for free and open discussion in the study process and to assist in the identification of issues that merit special attention. In order to successfully accomplish this goal, we need your cooperation and participation. The City hopes to make you familiar with the proposed study area and give you an opportunity to express your opinions concerning upcoming route locations and designs.

Over the years, the state, federal, and local governments have worked closely together in the building of our highways and in the overall improvement of our transportation system. The federal government is concerned about providing a modern transportation system to serve the nation as a whole, and of course, your City and the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department are working to provide the best possible system of streets and highways for residents of the City of Conway.

These interests have resulted in a closely coordinated effort between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS), and the City of Conway. This joint involvement in the project development process is more than just a funding arrangement, however. The location and design to be proposed by the City of Conway will be subject to the approval of the AHTD, FHWA and CARTS. All policies, procedures, and activities involved in the study and development of this project must comply with all federal and state laws and regulations.

Persons wishing to submit written statements or other exhibits in place of, or in addition to, oral or written statements made at the public meeting may submit them to Garver Engineers. Comments will be received until Friday, July 21, 2000. The address is:

Garver Engineers
1010 Battery Street
P.O. Box 50
Little Rock, AR 72203-0050
Attn: Conway Loop

Telephone: 501-376-3633
Fax: 501-372-8042
Email: conwayloop@garverinc.com

Figure 2

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.) (S)
FAULKNER COUNTY



INTRODUCTION AND NEED

The City of Conway, in order to help facilitate the flow of traffic, is proposing to develop an urban arterial. This study will identify an environmentally acceptable route location and propose a design for development of the arterial.

The City of Conway remains one of the fastest growing communities in the State. Since 1990, growth has escalated at a 6.90% annualized rate based on identified housing starts and utility connections within the corporate limits. Faulkner County is likely to increase to nearly 144,000 persons by the year 2010 with approximately 6 out of 10 persons residing within the City of Conway.

The City of Conway is expected to grow to 43,650 persons by the end of this year and is projected to reach nearly 63,000 people over the next 15 years, a net increase from 1995 of about 29,000 persons. Average annualized housing starts since 1991 have approximated 628 units annually, exclusive of manufactured housing. Four out of 5 starts since 1991 were recorded as single-family construction. Should current trends continue over the next few decades, the City of Conway will absorb on average roughly 530 single-family units and 135 multi-family units annually. Over the next 15 years, a net increase in population for the City of Conway is expected to be approximately 28,450 persons. This population increase will continue to generate a substantial demand for new housing of all types resulting in an expansion of the urbanized area and an increase in the need for improved traffic capacity.

The City of Conway in 1994 employed an engineering firm to research and develop an application for a revision of the control of access at locations on Interstate 40. Two locations were identified. One location is near mile point 122 north and west of the City and the other location is near mile point 131 south of the City, Garver Engineers, supported by CH2M HILL, has been employed by the City of Conway to pick up where earlier studies ended and complete the route planning process.

Figure 2

STUDY AREA

The City of Conway will conduct corridor and route studies to select an arterial route to connect Interstate 40 west of the city to Interstate 40 south of the city. The study area for the new arterial is defined approximately by:

From I-40 South of Round Mountain to Lollie Road – Beginning at I-40 near an intersection with Highway 89 and Interstate 40 proceeding west to Lollie Road south of Round Mountain. The segment proceeds west through primarily undeveloped areas.

From Lollie Road to I-40 - Beginning near the intersection of Lollie Road and SH60 this portion of the study area proceeds north along proposed SH 319 and continues to I-40. The segment would pass to the west of Cadron Ridge.

From I-40 North of Round Mountain to Lollie Road – Beginning at I-40 north of Round Mountain proceeding west to Lollie Road. This area proceeds through small residential and proposed residential areas, intersecting Sturgis Road, Wasson Road and Old Military Road before reaching Lollie Road at an area near Donnell Ridge Road.

Hogan Lane from Round Mountain to I-40 – Beginning at an area south of Donnell Ridge this portion of the study area proceeds north along McNutt Road and Hogan Lane, across SH 64, and continues to I-40.

Examples of highway concepts that will be considered include:

- A freeway with fully controlled access and interchanges at major street intersections.
- An urban divided parkway with access provided only at intersections with major cross streets.
- A divided arterial with limited access throughout.
- Other concepts.

Additional consideration will include a control of access policy, plan for phased development, and the location and dimension of sidewalks.

Figure 2

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Environmental studies will be conducted and documentation will be prepared according to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). The purposes of NEPA are to determine the environmental impacts of proposed government actions that may have significant impacts to the human and natural environment and develop measures to mitigate and to minimize those impacts. NEPA also requires full public disclosure of these impacts and to provide the public and organizations the opportunity to provide input into the process.

Identification and delineation of wetlands will be completed early in the planning process in order to avoid, minimize, or mitigate potential impacts to wetlands within the project area. Potential wetland areas exist south and west of the City of Conway.

Impacts to wildlife including Threatened and Endangered Species within the study area, will be evaluated. Coordination with state and federal agencies with jurisdiction over these resources will be conducted.

A review of potential locations where hazardous waste/substances occur in the study area was conducted by searching agency records. There are several sites located in the study area that may require more detailed assessment when corridors are more closely defined.

Floodplains represent a major development constraint in the City of Conway. Floodplains are those areas along or around watercourses that may be inundated by a 100-year flood (a one-percent chance of flooding in any given year). All segments of the project area are likely to cross floodplains. Careful planning, design and construction will minimize impacts to floodplains that could contribute to increased erosion and degradation of water quality (also increasing the flood elevation). Coordination will be conducted with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and other state and local government agencies.

The study area contains areas of agricultural land, some of which may be considered prime farmland. If farmlands designated as "Prime" are found within the study area, they may be eligible for special protection under the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Archeological or historic resources within the study area have been identified by conducting record searches. Additional field investigations will be conducted when specific routes are identified.

Other environmental aspects will be evaluated. Input on the importance of the environmental aspects mentioned above as well as those identified by the public and organizations is critical to this process.

Figure 2

WHAT'S NEXT

To date we have identified several known constraints that will limit the area available for planning a route. We are now in the process of seeking input from the public and organizations concerning potential routes and types of roads. The next step will be to consider constraints and obtain public input as part of the process to identify corridors and routes for evaluation. The evaluation will include environmental acceptability, technical feasibility, and cost-effectiveness.

The result of the studies will be reported in a Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS will be distributed for public and agency review and the public will be given the opportunity to review the alternatives and comment on the DEIS at a public hearing. Comments received during the DEIS comment period and at the public hearing will be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). After additional public and organization review and comment, the preferred alternative will be finalized and a Record Of Decision (ROD) written and submitted for FHWA approval. Approval of the ROD will finalize the study process. Final design for construction and right-of-way acquisition can not occur until after the ROD is approved and signed .

The public hearing for the DEIS is expected to occur in mid-2001 and the signed ROD is expected in mid-2002.

CONCLUSION

The information presented at this meeting is preliminary and is the best indication of what the City of Conway is planning at this time. We are still very early in the process. Alternative locations and design features have not been set at this time. The City is sensitive to the concerns of the citizenry and those concerns will be considered as preliminary alternatives are developed.

In order for the best route and design to be selected, the City of Conway needs your input. Please take the time to look over the information being presented and give your opinion, either tape-recorded or in writing. Comments will be taken at this meeting, or they can be mailed to the address found on page two of this packet.

Your attendance and participation in this meeting is greatly appreciated.

**City of Conway
Conway City Hall**

1201 Oak Street .: Conway, Arkansas .: 72032 .: Phone: 501-450-6100

**PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.)(S)
JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
FAULKNER COUNTY**

On Monday, July 10, 2000 a public informational meeting was held concerning the Conway Bypass. The meeting was held from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. at the Conway Chamber of Commerce located at 900 Oak Street in Conway.

The attendance for the meeting was approximately 120 people from various geographical areas inside and outside the city limits of Conway. As citizens arrived for the meeting they were asked to sign in (Figure 1) and then received a packet including an informational handout (Figure 2) and a questionnaire (Figure 3).

Of those in attendance, there were 47 people who completed the questionnaire at the meeting, 6 people who have completed the questionnaire and mailed it to Garver Engineers, and 3 people who have completed the questionnaire on-line from the Conway Planning Department's web site.

The responses to the questionnaire have been tabulated on the attached tables. Table 1 shows a summary of all of the responses, Table 2 shows the three streets listed as being the most often traveled, and Table 3 shows the four most often listed concerns regarding the project.

Statistics from the questionnaire:

Number who live inside the city limits:	24	
Number who live outside the city limits:	32	
Average miles driven (inside city limits):	30	
Average miles driven (outside city limits):	40	
Travel to LR regularly (inside city limits):	10 out of 24	(42%)
Travel to LR regularly (outside city limits):	19 out of 32	(59%)
Include bike lanes (inside city limits):	8 out of 24	(33%)
Include bike lanes (outside city limits):	11 out of 32	(34%)
Include sidewalks (inside city limits):	8 out of 24	(33%)
Include sidewalks (outside city limits):	12 out of 32	(38%)

Figure 1

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>PHONE NUMBER</u>
Gary Amaral	120 Pine Valley Road	470-0821
Raymond Porter	139 Round Mountain Road	329-3005
Suzee Cia	231 Round Mountain Road	327-2240
Ellen Fitzgerald	218 Round Mountain Road	450-7354
Kent Burns	24 Mountain Valley Lane	329-8751
Ruth Castleberry	2 Beaver Ridge Road	327-8446
Lyle Johnson	197 Old Military Road	327-5785
Marj Alspaugh	80 North Drive	470-3662
Jim Alspaugh	80 North Drive	470-3662
Matt Zajac	417 Scenic Hill Road	470-4595
Henry Zimmerebner	2990 Pheasant Road	327-7182
Valerie Hohenberger	48 Crestview Road	470-3114
Kathy Grace	75 Grace Lane	329-5094
Kathy Zajac	417 Scenic Hill Road	470-4595
Dwight & Louise Witcher	30 Windwood Loop	329-8261
Kathy Peery	2705 Arrow Smith	327-7710
Daniel Mallory	#5 Pine Mountain Drive	470-1065
Edward Day	62 Mountain Valley Lance	327-9184
George Doty	1923 Clifton Street	327-7265
Kurt & Robin Kueter	2218 Louvenia	327-9367
Jeff & Krista Quinn	7 Windwood Loop	505-8474
Steve Simon	13 Bud Chuck	796-8466
Bud Hines	362 Pippin Post	450-7918
Mitch Hart	575 Harkrider	327-2121
Michael Sichmeller	29 Mountain View Road	470-3591
Trinity Smith	945 Knights Drive	336-8356
Lea Anne Smith	945 Knights Drive	336-8356
Sandra Austin	50 Airport Road	470-1109
Robert & Tanya Downey	176 Wasson Road	329-5192
David Drollinger	55 Rocky Gap Road	470-3347
Gary & Cindy Holliman	4 Havens Lane	327-9696
Bob Schaefers	3885 Prince Street	329-9381
Leon & Virginia Henderson	789 Trey Lane	329-6525
Helen Benafield	40 Ed Speaker Road	329-5673
Mike & Roxanne Ferd	8 Crawford Lane	327-1045
Charles Smith	12 Butterfield Trace	327-5547
Richard Collins	14 Deerwood	327-0333
John Tooke	118 Eve Lane	327-1776
Billy Bob French	18 ShadyPoint Drive	470-0706
H.H. Wade	20 ShadyPoint Drive	470-0710
Christy & Mark Sutherland	31 Tucker Creek Road	329-4158
Kay Weatherly	257 Scenic Hill	470-0888
Osborne	140 Scenic Hill	470-3128
James Lemley	1 Pine Bluff Road	470-0967
John Smith	5205 Wescon Lane	327-5787
Twig Satterfield	P.O. Box 1080	450-2795
Ronnie D. Brewer	26 Happy Valley Drive	329-4199
Steven Cockrum	210 Pickwicket	513-9105
Ronnie Hall	100 East Robins	450-6165
David Davis	15 Belair Drive	470-1723

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>	<u>PHONE NUMBER</u>
Judy Davis	15 Belair Drive	470-1723
J. Scott Stevenson	1809 Cleveland Ave.	450-9804
Dan Brewer	5051 Dave Ward	450-6346
Connie Friant	159 Scenic Hill	470-1128
Joyce H. Hutchinson	315 Scenic Hill	470-9653
Renee McMilley	68 Crestview Road	470-1002
Wanda & John Wilson	35 Mt. View Road	470-1996
John Purtle	6291 Prince	450-0066
Greg Nabholz	3575 Cutter Ridge Road	513-4047
Bob McCormack	1910 Amos Drive	327-5705
Ron Edgmon	#7 Mill Pond Road	329-2738
Randy Glenn	21 Hilton Road	327-3421
JT Wofford	1927 Tyler Street	327-8141
Rebecca McGraw	565 Ingram	513-2605
Dale & Linda Smith	23 Pine Bluff Road	470-9267
Larry J. Brewer	26 Happy Valley Drive	329-4199
Mark Sutherland	31 Tucker Creek	329-4158
Ike Salater	511 Round Mountain Road	329-7888
John D Thompson	3160 Boone Drive	513-0135
Rhonda Thompson	3160 Boone Drive	513-0135
Michael & Patricia Wilson	3520 Bay Berry	336-8474
Douglas Thorpe	84 Round Mountain Road	329-9218
G.R. Bohannan	218 Pine Valley Road	470-1925
Mayor Frank Pearce	P.O. Box 69 Mayflower, AR 72106	470-1337
Gaylon Womack	88 Hidden Valley	470-0020
Jim Baker	136 Round Mountain Road	336-9140
Tondra Love	32 Pine Valley	470-3821
Jim Barr	10 Redbud Drive	327-4028
Don & Earlene Jones	105 Scenic Hill	470-0766
Joe	Jeffery Sand Co. – Hwy 319	945-4161
Anne Avant	228 Scenic Hill	470-0138
Mary Jane Huddleston	53 Pine Valley Drive	470-3791
Renee Hunter	Log Cabin	
Lyn Malbrough	AHTD – Env.	569-2285
Don B. Bradley, III	3740 Marleigh Drive	329-1449
Brenda Gray	3640 Butterfly	
Jim Beal	1811 Jefferson	336-9321
Andy Coelter	73 Richland Hills Drive	327-1170
	4303 Hwy 60E	759-2543
Roger Lewis	3190 Cleburne Cov.	329-3418
Vickie Mullins	137 North Drive	470-9577
Casper Zimmerebner	3875 Ledbetter Drive	329-0877
Ellean Cleveland	521 Trey Lane	327-2325
Kimmie Cleveland	521 Trey Lane	327-2325
Pearline Davis	468 Lee Andrew Lane	329-5166
Artis Davis	468 Lee Andrew Lane	329-5166
Ivan Jones	105 Scenic Hill Road	

Conway Bypass (P.E.) (S)
Job 080174, FAP HDP-9501 (1)
Faulkner County
Public Information Meeting

QUESTIONNAIRE

Do you live Inside or Outside the Conway City Limits?

If inside, which part of Conway do you live in? North, South, East, or West.

If outside, which side of Conway do you live? North, South, East, or West.

How many miles do you drive a day on average?

Please list the three streets that you travel regularly.

Do you work or travel regularly to the Little Rock Area?

In your opinion what are the primary areas of concern to be addressed in selecting a location for a new bypass?

What do you think the City of Conway should be most concerned about regarding this project?

What should be the posted speed limit?

Should bike lanes be included?

Should sidewalks be included?

Do you see the proposed project having special or unusual impacts on the City of Conway? (economic, environmental, social, or other) Please explain.

Do you know of any archeological sites, Native American burial sites, old cemeteries, family burial plots, or historic sites (i.e., Civil War, churches, schools, or community settlements) in the project area? If yes, please discuss with available personnel or provide a contact telephone number and person for further correspondence.

Do you know of any factors such as wetlands, springs, or endangered species that may limit this project?

If you would like to be added to the mailing list for future project information, please provide your name and mailing address.

Table 1

Inside or Outside City	Inside Which Part	Outside Which Part	Miles Driven Daily	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	LR Travel Regularly	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Speed Limit	Bike Lanes	Sidewalks	Unusual Impacts	Historical Sites	Factors to Limit Project	Mailing List	General Comments
1	Inside	e	15	Harkrider	Oak	Front	no	protecting farmland	noise	traffic	sprawl	55	yes	yes	decrease in farmland	-	-	no	yes
2	Inside	n	20	Harkrider	Tyler	Morningside	no	traffic	-	-	-	55	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	no
3	Inside	s	15	Sturgis	Hwy 365	Hwy 64	no	access	traffic	cost	-	55	no	no	increase taxes	-	-	yes	yes
4	Inside	s	35	Richland Hills	Hilton Drive	Donaghey	yes	access	homes	-	-	55	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no
5	Inside	se	10	College	Hwy 60	Reedy	no	homes	businesses	traffic	-	55	no	no	economic	wetlands	-	no	no
6	Inside	sw	100	Hwy286	Hwy64	Hwy 60	yes	homes	property values	-	-	65	no	no	economic	-	-	yes	no
7	Inside	sw	10	Bruce	Ingram	3rd Ave	no	access	time frame	-	-	55	no	no	growth	-	-	yes	yes
8	Inside	sw	75	Hwy 60	Hwy 365	Oak	yes	cost	access	growth	financing	55 - 70	no	maybe	growth	-	-	no	yes
9	Inside	sw	10	Hwy 60	Donaghey	Harkrider	no	location	Environmental Impact	economy	-	60 - 65	no	no	economic	-	-	no	no
10	Inside	w	20	Salem	Hwy 60	Oak	yes	Accessibility	Environmental Impact	Cost	-	60 - 65	no	no	growth	-	-	yes	yes
11	Inside	w	12	College	Donaghey	Harkrider	no	homes	property values	location	cost	-	yes	yes	increase traffic	Round Mountain cemetery	-	yes	yes
12	Inside	w	20	Wasson	Millpond	Hwy 60	no	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	traffic movement	-	-	no	no
13	Inside	w	15	Tyler	Donaghey	Harriston	no	relocations	air pollution	cost	-	60	yes	yes	growth	-	-	yes	yes
14	Inside	w	5	Washington	Tyler	Harriston	no	traffic	bike path	growth	-	-	no	no	-	-	-	yes	yes
15	Inside	w	70	Donaghey	Hwy 60	College	yes	access	freeway design	time	-	65	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no
16	Inside	w	30	Salem	College	Caldwell	yes	access	traffic	-	-	55	no	no	-	-	-	no	yes
17	Inside	s	15	Millpond	Wasson	Donaghey	no	traffic	access	-	-	45	yes	yes	economic	-	flooding	no	no
18	Inside	s	25	Hwy 365	Hwy 60	Round Mountain	yes	traffic	environment	-	-	-	-	-	environmental	yes	wildlife	yes	yes
19	Inside	s	20	Stermer	Salem	College	no	access	scenic route	-	-	50 - 55	no	no	-	-	-	yes	yes
20	inside	w	10	Hwy 60	College	Harkrider	yes	traffic	-	-	-	70	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no
21	Inside	w	25	Reedy	Hwy 60	College	no	location	time	-	-	55	no	no	-	-	-	no	no
22	Inside	w	25	Hogan	Tyler	Hwy 64	yes	access	traffic	-	-	40	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	no
23	Inside	w	80	College	Hogan	Hwy 60	yes	access	environment	time	-	55	yes	yes	-	yes	-	yes	yes
24	Inside	w	10	Hogan	College	Prince	no	cost	Environmental Impact	construction	-	45 - 55	yes	yes	growth	-	-	yes	yes
			Average			yes	10					yes	8	8			yes	16	13
						no	14					no	14	13			no	8	11

	Inside or Outside City	Inside Which Part	Outside Which Part	Miles Driven Daily	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	LR Travel Regularly	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Speed Limit	Bike Lanes	Sidewalks	Unusual Impacts	Historical Sites	Factors to Limit Project	Mailing List	General Comments		
1	Outside	-	ne	25	Hwy 65	Harkrider	Bruce	no	relocations	growth	access	-	45 - 55	no	yes	economic	-	flood plains	no	no			
2	Outside	-	s	20	Harkrider	Washington	Oak	yes	sprawl	-	-	-	-	-	-	rural life	-	-	yes	yes			
3	Outside	-	s	45	Hwy 365	Harkrider	-	yes	personal property	landowner rights	-	-	55	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no			
4	Outside	-	s	10	Hwy 365	Sturgis	Harkrider	yes	homes	wetlands	noise	landowner rights	55	no	no	cellphone towers	-	-	no	yes			
5	Outside	-	s	70	Sturgis	Hwy 365	Harkrider	yes	homes	growth	safety	quality of life	-	yes	-	-	-	-	yes	yes			
6	Outside	-	s	80	I-40	-	-	yes	environment	-	-	-	70	yes	yes	noise	-	-	yes	no			
7	Outside	-	s	20	Sturgis	Wasson	-	yes	convenience	noise	time	-	50	no	yes	-	sevier tavern	-	yes	no			
8	Outside	-	s	20	Harkrider	Hwy 60	-	no	growth	-	-	-	45	yes	yes	growth	-	-	yes	no			
9	Outside	-	s	200	Hwy 65	Hwy 60	Donaghey	yes	homes	property values	-	-	65	no	no	economic	yes	wildlife	yes	no			
10	Outside	-	s	5	Scenic Hill	Sturgis	Hwy 365	no	noise	traffic	cost	wildlife	-	no	no	-	cemetery	-	yes	no			
11	Outside	-	s	20	Sturgis	Donaghey	Hwy 65	yes	homes	access	-	-	55 - 60	yes	yes	economic	-	-	yes	yes			
12	Outside	-	s	20	Harkrider	Oak	Hwy 64	no	water supply	traffic	speed limits	noise	45	no	no	economic	-	-	yes	no			
13	Outside	-	s	5	-	-	-	no	traffic	-	-	-	45	no	no	traffic	-	-	yes	no			
14	Outside	-	s	50	North Drive	Airport	Main St (M)	yes	rural living	homes	-	-	-	-	-	environmental	-	-	no	yes			
15	Outside	-	s	20	Sturgis	Pine Valley	Airport	no	homes	personal property	-	-	-	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no			
16	Outside	-	s	100	Round Mountain	Sturgis	Hwy 365	yes	location	-	-	-	60	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no			
17	Outside	-	s	60	Scenic Hill	Hwy 365	Hwy 89	yes	traffic	growth	rural living	-	-	-	-	rural life	-	-	yes	yes			
18	Outside	-	s	50	-	-	-	yes	services of other	-	-	-	60	no	no	-	-	-	yes	no			
19	Outside	-	s	25	Wasson	Hwy 65	Sturgis	no	location	-	-	-	-	no	no	-	-	gold creek	yes	no			
20	Outside	-	s	15	Sturgis	Wasson	Donaghey	no	location	-	-	-	-	no	no	growth	-	-	yes	no			
21	Outside	-	s	75	Oak	Harkrider	Sturgis	yes	quality of life	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	no	no			
22	Outside	-	s	15	Pine Mountain	Hwy 365	I-40	yes	location	loss of revenue	property values	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	yes	no			
23	Outside	-	sw	15	Lee Andrews	Prince	Hwy 60	no	homes	traffic	-	-	45 - 60	yes	yes	growth	yes	-	yes	no			
24	Outside	-	sw	15	Hwy 60	Prince	Oak	no	-	-	-	-	40 - 45	no	no	downtown decline	-	-	yes	no			
25	Outside	-	sw	100	Oak	Harkrider	Hwy 64	yes	cost	traffic	-	-	45	no	no	growth	-	-	yes	yes			
26	Outside	-	w	20	Hwy 60	Prince	-	yes	homes	traffic	-	-	60	yes	yes	growth	cemetery near river	-	yes	no			
27	Outside	-	w	50	Hwy 60	Prince	-	yes	traffic	-	-	-	50	no	no	-	-	-	yes	yes			
28	Outside	-	w	5	Hwy 60	Nutters Chapel	Salem	no	populated areas	Environmental Impact	home	increase traffic	-	yes	yes	-	cemetery section 28	-	yes	no			
29	Outside	-	w	10	Sturgis	Stanley Russ	Hwy 365	yes	-	-	-	-	40	yes	yes	social	-	-	yes	no			
30	Outside	-	se	20	Hwy 365	Sturgis	Industrial Blvd.	yes	least resistance	time	-	-	55	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	no			
31	Outside	-	s	10	Harkrider	Farris	Bruce	no	environment	rural living	homes	-	55	yes	yes	environmental	-	-	yes	yes			
32	Outside	-	w	20	Scenic Hill	Sturgis	Stanley Russ	no	-	-	-	-	40	yes	yes	-	-	-	no	no			
Average				38	yes				19					yes	11	12					yes	27	9
					no				13					no	16	14					no	5	23

	Inside or Outside City	Inside Which Part	Outside Which Part	Miles Driven Daily	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	Streets Traveled Regularly	LR Travel Regularly	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Areas of Concern	Speed Limit	Bike Lanes	Sidewalks	Unusual Impacts	Historical Sites	Factors to Limit Project	Mailing List	General Comments	
1	Inside	s	-	10	Donaghey	Wasson	Harkrider	no	right-of-way	allow growth	time	-	-	50	yes	yes	economic	-	-	no	no	
2	Inside	w	-	25	Hogan	Irby	Harkrider	yes	location	Cadron Ridge	noise	homes	homes	55	yes	yes	divide community	no	-	yes	yes	
3	Inside	w	-	20	Hwy 60	Hogan	Salem	no	farmland	-	-	-	-	50	no	no	-	no	wetlands	yes	yes	
4	Inside	w	-	25	College	Harkrider	Oak	no	access	cost	time	-	-	55	no	no	-	-	-	no	no	
5	Inside	w	-	25	Hogan	Hwy 60	Prince	yes	homes	access	environment	-	-	55	no	no	growth	no	-	no	no	
6	Inside	w	-	25	Irby	Meadowlake	Salem	yes	route	access	cost	-	-	55	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	no	
7	Inside	w	-	10	Harkrider	Washington	Prince	yes	Convenience	time	-	-	-	50	yes	yes	-	-	-	yes	no	
8	Inside	w	-	25	College	Donaghey	Faulkner	yes	access	congestion	-	-	-	45	no	no	economic	-	-	no	no	
9	Outside	-	s	10	Old Military	Salem	Tyler	no	noise	rights of homeowners	-	-	-	70	no	no	sprawl	-	-	yes	yes	
10	Outside	-	s	10	Old Military	Salem	Tyler	no	homes	environment	-	-	-	65	no	no	-	yes	wildlife	no	yes	
11	Outside	-	s	15	Stugis	Hwy 365	Harkrider	yes	people	environment	rural life	sprawl	sprawl	55	yes	yes	-	yes	wildlife	yes	yes	
12	Outside	-	s	50	Old Military	Nutter Chapel	Salem	no	homes	safety	access	-	-	-	no	no	growth	no	no	yes	no	
13																						
14																						
15																						
16																						
17																						
18																						
19																						
20																						
21																						
22																						
23																						
24																						
25																						
26																						
27																						
28																						
29																						
30																						
			Average	21			yes	6						yes	5	5			yes	7	5	
							no	6						no	7	6			no	5	7	

Table 2

Streets Traveled Regularly									
Residents of Conway				Nonresidents of Conway					
Street Name	First	Second	Third	Total	Street Name	First	Second	Third	Total
Hwy 60	4	6	3	13	Sturgis	7	5	2	14
College	5	3	3	11	Harkrider	4	4	3	11
Harkrider	3	1	5	9	Hwy 365	3	4	3	10
Donaghey	2	3	2	7	Hwy 60	4	2	1	7
Hogan	4	2	0	6	Oak	2	1	2	5
Salem	2	1	2	5	Hwy 65	2	1	1	4
Tyler	1	3	0	4	Prince	0	4	0	4
Oak	0	1	3	4	Salem	0	2	2	4
Hwy 365	1	2	0	3	Scenic Hill	3	0	0	3
Wasson	1	2	0	3	Old Military	3	0	0	3
Hwy 64	0	1	2	3	Donaghey	0	1	2	3
Prince	0	0	3	3	Wasson	1	1	0	2
Millpond	1	1	0	2	I-40	1	0	1	2
Washington	1	1	0	2	Nutter Chapel	0	2	0	2
Irby	1	1	0	2	Stanley Russ	0	1	1	2
Reedy	1	0	1	2	Airport	0	1	1	2
Hairston	0	0	2	2	Hwy 64	0	0	2	2
Sturgis	1	0	0	1	Bruce	0	0	2	2
Stermer	1	0	0	1	Tyler	0	0	2	2
Richland Hills	1	0	0	1	Round Mountain	1	0	0	1
Hwy 286	1	0	0	1	Pine Mountain	1	0	0	1
Bruce	1	0	0	1	North Drive	1	0	0	1
Ingram	0	1	0	1	Lee Andrews	1	0	0	1
Hilton Drive	0	1	0	1	Washington	0	1	0	1
Meadowlake	0	1	0	1	Pine Valley	0	1	0	1
Round Mountain	0	0	1	1	Farris	0	1	0	1
Morningside	0	0	1	1	Main St. (M)	0	0	1	1
Front	0	0	1	1	Industrial Blvd.	0	0	1	1
Caldwell	0	0	1	1	Hwy 89	0	0	1	1
3rd Ave	0	0	1	1					
Faulkner	0	0	1	1					

Table 3

Areas of Concern		Residents of Conway						Nonresidents of Conway					
		Concern	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Total	Concern	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Total
access	11	4	0	0	0	15	homes / relocations	11	1	2	0	14	
traffic	5	3	2	0	0	10	traffic	3	5	0	0	8	
cost	2	1	4	1	0	8	noise	2	1	1	1	5	
time	0	3	4	0	0	7	environment	2	3	0	0	5	
environmental impact	0	6	1	0	0	7	rural living	1	1	2	0	4	
homes / relocations	5	1	0	1	1	7	growth	1	3	0	0	4	
location	4	0	1	0	0	5	location	4	0	0	0	4	
growth	0	1	2	0	0	3	access	0	1	2	0	3	
noise	0	1	1	0	0	2	landowner rights	0	2	1	0	3	
property values	0	2	0	0	0	2	property values	0	1	1	0	2	
protecting farmland	2	0	0	0	0	2	time	0	1	1	0	2	
construction	0	0	1	0	0	1	safety	0	1	1	0	2	
economy	0	0	1	0	0	1	cost	1	0	1	0	2	
financing	0	0	0	1	1	1	quality of life	1	0	0	1	2	
sprawl	0	0	0	1	1	1	sprawl	1	0	0	1	2	
air pollution	0	1	0	0	0	1	personal property	1	1	0	0	2	
bike path	0	1	0	0	0	1	increase traffic	0	0	0	1	1	
businesses	0	1	0	0	0	1	speed limits	0	0	1	0	1	
freeway design	0	1	0	0	0	1	wildlife	0	0	0	1	1	
scenic route	0	1	0	0	0	1	loss of revenue	0	1	0	0	1	
congestion	0	1	0	0	0	1	wetlands	0	1	0	0	1	
convenience	1	0	0	0	0	1	convenience	1	0	0	0	1	
right-of-way	1	0	0	0	0	1	least resistance	1	0	0	0	1	
							populated areas	1	0	0	0	1	
							services of other communities	1	0	0	0	1	
							water supply	1	0	0	0	1	

Streets Traveled Regularly				
Inside City				
1		2		3
College	5	Hwy 60	6	Harkrider
Hogan	4	College	3	College
Hwy 60	4	Donaghey	3	Hwy 60
Harkrider	3	Tyler	3	Oak
Donaghey	2	Hogan	2	Prince
Salem	2	Hwy 365	2	Donaghey
Bruce	1	Wasson	2	Hairston
Hwy 286	1	Harkrider	1	Hwy 64
Hwy 365	1	Hilton Drive	1	Salem
Irby	1	Hwy 64	1	3rd Ave
Millpond	1	Ingram	1	Caldwell
Reedy	1	Irby	1	Faulkner
Richland Hills	1	Meadowlake	1	Front
Stermer	1	Millpond	1	Morningside
Sturgis	1	Oak	1	Reedy
Tyler	1	Salem	1	Round Mountain
Washington	1	Washington	1	
Wasson	1			

Streets Traveled Regularly				
Outside City				
1		2		3
Sturgis	7	Sturgis	5	Harkrider
Harkrider	4	Harkrider	4	Hwy 365
Hwy 60	4	Hwy 365	4	Bruce
Hwy 365	3	Prince	4	Donaghey
Old Military	3	Hwy 60	2	Hwy 64
Scenic Hill	3	Nutter Chapel	2	Oak
Hwy 65	2	Salem	2	Salem
Oak	2	Wasson	2	Sturgis
I-40	1	Airport	1	Airport
Lee Andrews	1	Donaghey	1	Hwy 60
North Drive	1	Farris	1	Hwy 65
Pine Mountain	1	Hwy 65	1	Hwy 89
Round Mountain	1	Oak	1	I-40
Wasson	1	Pine Valley	1	Industrial Blvd.
		Stanley Russ	1	Main St. (M)
		Washington	1	Stanley Russ
				Tyler

Areas of Concern									
Inside City									
1	2		3		4				
access	11	Environmental Impact	6	cost	4	cost	4	cost	1
homes / relocations	5	access	4	time	4	financing	4	homes / relocations	1
traffic	5	time	3	growth	2	homes / relocations	2	homes / relocations	1
location	4	traffic	3	construction	2	sprawl	2	sprawl	1
cost	2	property values	2	economy	1		1		
protecting farmland	2	air pollution	1	environment	1		1		
convenience	1	bike path	1	location	1		1		
right-of-way	1	businesses	1	noise	1		1		
		congestion	1						
		cost	1						
		freeway design	1						
		growth	1						
		homes / relocations	1						
		noise	1						
		scenic route	1						

Areas of Concern									
Outside City									
1	2		3		4				
homes / relocations	11	traffic	5	access	2	increase traffic	2	increase traffic	1
location	4	Environmental Impact	3	homes / relocations	2	landowner rights	2	landowner rights	1
traffic	3	growth	3	rural living	2	noise	2	noise	1
environment	2	landowner rights	2	cost	1	quality of life	1	quality of life	1
noise	2	access	1	noise	1	wildlife	1	wildlife	1
convenience	1	homes / relocations	1	property values	1				
cost	1	loss of revenue	1	safety	1				
growth	1	noise	1	speed limits	1				
least resistance	1	personal property	1	time	1				
personal property	1	property values	1						
populated areas	1	rural living	1						
quality of life	1	safety	1						
rural living	1	time	1						
services of other communities	1	wetlands	1						
sprawl	1								
water supply	1								

Conway Bypass Location Studies

Public Information Meetings

Monday, April 23, 2001

4 – 7 p.m.

Ellen Smith Elementary School

Tuesday, April 24, 2001

4 – 7 p.m.

Mayflower Middle School

Four Alternative Routes will be presented to the public for review and comment. A map has been placed on the Conway Planning Department Website (www.conwayplanning.org) showing the preliminary location of these alternatives.

WELCOME

**CITY OF CONWAY
PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING
JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.)(S)
FAULKNER COUNTY
APRIL 23, 2001 & APRIL 24, 2001**

HOW THIS MEETING WORKS:

1. Please register your attendance at the Registration table.
2. Gather information, view the displays, and ask questions *at your own pace and convenience*. Personnel are on hand to assist you by answering questions about the project and providing pertinent information.
3. If you wish to make an oral statement about the project you may have your comments recorded on tape at the recording station set up at the meeting. A representative will be there to record your statement.
4. Thank you for your comments.

∴ REMEMBER ∴

Please record your comments in writing or on tape so that they will be considered a part of this public meeting.

*Thank You for Your Attendance and Participation
In This Public Information Meeting*

GENERAL INFORMATION

This public meeting is being held to inform the public about the study and to solicit public input into the study process. Hopefully this will insure that project alternatives and designs are consistent with public expectations and the highest possible goals and objectives. One of the primary goals of this meeting is to provide a medium for free and open discussion in the study process and to assist in the identification of issues that merit special attention. In order to successfully accomplish this goal, we need your cooperation and participation. The City hopes to make you familiar with the proposed preliminary alternatives and give you an opportunity to express your opinions concerning the route locations and designs.

Over the years, the state, federal, and local governments have worked closely together in the building of our highways and in the overall improvement of our transportation system. The federal government is concerned about providing a modern transportation system to serve the nation as a whole, and of course, your City and the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department are working to provide the best possible system of streets and highways for residents of the City of Conway.

These interests have resulted in a closely coordinated effort between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS), and the City of Conway. This joint involvement in the project development process is more than just a funding arrangement, however. The location and design to be proposed by the City of Conway will be subject to the approval of the AHTD, FHWA and CARTS. All policies, procedures, and activities involved in the study and development of this project must comply with all federal and state laws and regulations.

Persons wishing to submit written statements or other exhibits in place of, or in addition to, oral or written statements made at the public meeting may submit them to Garver Engineers. The address is:

Garver Engineers
1010 Battery Street
P.O. Box 50
Little Rock, AR 72203-0050
Attn: Conway Loop

Telephone: 501-376-3633
Fax: 501-372-8042
Email: conwayloop@garverinc.com

INTRODUCTION AND NEED

The City of Conway, in order to help facilitate the flow of traffic, is proposing to develop an urban arterial. This study will identify an environmentally acceptable route location and propose a design for development of the arterial.

The City of Conway remains one of the fastest growing communities in the State. Since 1990, growth has escalated at a 6.90% annualized rate based on identified housing starts and utility connections within the corporate limits. Faulkner County is likely to increase to nearly 144,000 persons by the year 2010 with approximately 6 out of 10 persons residing within the City of Conway.

The City of Conway is expected to grow to 43,650 persons by the end of this year and is projected to reach nearly 63,000 people over the next 15 years, a net increase from 1995 of about 29,000 persons. Average annualized housing starts since 1991 have approximated 628 units annually, exclusive of manufactured housing. Four out of 5 starts since 1991 were recorded as single-family construction. Should current trends continue over the next few decades, the City of Conway will absorb on average roughly 530 single-family units and 135 multi-family units annually. Over the next 15 years, a net increase in population for the City of Conway is expected to be approximately 28,450 persons. This population increase will continue to generate a substantial demand for new housing of all types resulting in an expansion of the urbanized area and an increase in the need for improved traffic capacity.

The City of Conway in 1994 employed an engineering firm to research and develop an application for a revision of the control of access at locations on Interstate 40. Two locations were identified. One location is near mile point 122 north and west of the City and the other location is near mile point 131 south of the City, Garver Engineers, supported by CH2M HILL, has been employed by the City of Conway to pick up where earlier studies ended and complete the route planning process.

ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENTS

Description of Alternative A

Alternative A will begin with a new diamond type interchange at approximately log mile 122 of Interstate 40 (I-40) at its north terminal with I-40. The interchange will provide access not only to the proposed route to the south, but also will provide a possible future connection to Arkansas Highway 25 (AR 25) to the north and east.

The route proceeds south from the proposed interchange towards U. S. Highway 64 (US 64) crossing Cypress Creek and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). A bridge will be required for Cypress Creek. The crossing of the UPRR will be grade separated to facilitate uninterrupted movement.

On the south side of US 64, a cut has been made through Cadron Ridge. The route will continue south along Hogan Road until reaching an intersection with Dave Ward Drive. This alternative continues southerly along McNutt Road until reaching Donnell Ridge. A cut through Donnell Ridge will be provided minimizing the impacts to existing homes and to Donnell Ridge Road that is located along the crest of the ridge.

Once through the ridge, the route will travel in a southerly direction along Old Military Road until an intersection with Nutters Chapel Road. After passing Nutters Chapel Road, the route turns east, southeast on new alignment, to avoid Hartje Cemetery and an established subdivision in the Belk Corner area. The route will cross an unnamed creek south of the intersection with Nutters Chapel Road where a bridge will be required.

The route continues southerly until the base of Round Mountain at which point the route turns easterly until reaching an intersection with Wasson Road. To the east of Wasson Road this alternative will cross Gold Creek twice at bridge sites before intersecting Sturgis Road just north of the existing Sturgis Road bridge over Gold Creek.

After the intersection with Sturgis Road, the route will turn southeasterly towards the Gold Creek Community. A grade separation is planned for Arkansas Highway 365 (AR 365) and the UPRR near the vicinity of the intersection of Round Mountain Road and AR 365.

The southern connection to I-40 will be provided by a trumpet type interchange near log mile 132. The trumpet type interchange will provide direction movements from the route to I-40. An indirect ramp connection is provided for AR 365.

Description of Alternative B

Alternative B will begin with a new diamond type interchange at approximately log mile 121 of I-40 at its north terminal with I-40. This location is approximately one mile west of the interchange that would serve Alternates A and D. The interchange will provide

access not only to the proposed route to the south, but also will provide a possible future connection to AR 25 to the north and east.

The route proceeds southerly from the proposed interchange US 64 crossing Cypress Creek and the UPRR. A bridge will be required for Cypress Creek. The UPRR will be grade separated to facilitate uninterrupted movement. The connection to US 64 will be provided through an indirect movement.

A new cut through Cadron Ridge will be required to provide for an acceptable design for the new roadway. The new cut will be west of the water tank on Cadron Ridge. Care will be required not to impact this structure. Upon crossing Cadron Ridge, the route will proceed on new alignment south towards the intersection of Tyler Street and Padgett Road.

Just south of the intersection with Tyler is Spencer Lake. Padgett Road runs near the east bank of the lake. Care to minimize impacts to the lake and to wildlife will be very important to the project. Padgett Road turns southeast for approximately one-quarter mile then turns south and continues to an intersection with Wescon Lane. The new route will continue until intersecting Prince Street.

Crossing Prince Street southeasterly, the route will be on new alignment and intersect with Lee Andrew Lane and Trey Lane. At which point the route will turn south on Trey Lane until the intersection with Dave Ward Drive.

Approximately one-half mile south of Dave Ward Drive the route on new alignment will turn south, southeast towards a crossing with Tucker Creek. The crossing of Tucker Creek will require a bridge structure. After crossing Tucker Creek, the route continues to the north side of Donnell Ridge.

A cut through Donnell Ridge will be provided minimizing the impacts to Donnell Ridge Road that is located along the crest of the ridge. After crossing Donnell Ridge, the route turns southeasterly towards a proposed bridge crossing for an unnamed creek. The new route will turn easterly between Bryant Lane and Tupelo. Upon crossing Old Military Road the route will join Alternate A and continue in an easterly direction.

Description of Alternative C

Alternative C will begin with a new diamond type interchange at approximately log mile 121 of I-40. This location is the same as the location that would serve Alternative B. The interchange will provide access not only to the proposed route to the south, but also will provide a possible future connection AR 25 to the north and east.

The location of this route is the same as that of Alternative B until intersecting Prince Street. The new intersection will be approximately 300 feet west of the existing intersection of Padgett Road and Prince Street.

After crossing Prince Street the route will traverse southwesterly towards the intersection of Dave Ward Drive and Lollie Road. The route will turn south along Lollie Road once through the intersection with Dave Ward Drive. It will continue along Lollie Road until Lollie Road turns west towards the Arkansas River.

Continuing south on new alignment, the route is located west of the Tupelo Bayou channel until crossing the bayou at a bridge site north of Cedar. After crossing Tupelo Bayou the route turns southeasterly and runs parallel to Cedar Ridge on north side for approximately two and one-half miles before Rocky Gap Road

The route will turn northeasterly near the east end of Cedar Ridge and will pass through a natural break between two ridges to make the final turn to the east towards the AR 89 and I-40 interchange.

The existing interchange at I-40 will have to be reconstructed with different ramp and bridge configurations to provide the capacity necessary to handle the expected demand for the proposed route. An indirect connection will be made to AR 365 and an overpass will be provided for the UPRR. This alternative accommodates the long-range plans prepared by the Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study in which AR 89 is developed as a primary arterial across the north side of Pulaski County.

Description of Alternative D

Alternative D will begin with a new diamond type interchange at approximately log mile 122 of Interstate 40 (I-40). This is the same location as the interchange that serves Alternative A. The interchange will provide access not only to the proposed route to the south, but also provide a possible future connection to Arkansas Highway 25 (AR 25) to the north.

The route proceeds south from the proposed interchange towards U. S. Highway 64 (US 64) crossing Cypress Creek and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). The crossing of UPRR will be grade separated to facilitate uninterrupted movement.

On the south side of US 64, a cut has been made through Cadron Ridge. The route will continue south along Hogan Road until reaching an intersection with Prince Street. Upon reaching Prince Street, the route turns southwesterly along existing Prince Street. One bridge site would be required on an unnamed creek near the intersection of Prince Street and College Avenue.

The route will continue along Prince Street approximately one-quarter mile west of the intersection of Prince Street and Lee Andrew Lane. At which point the route will turn south on new alignment until the intersection of Lee Andrew Lane and Trey Lane. The route joins Alternate B at this location.

Upon crossing Old Military Road the route joins Alternative A and continues in an easterly direction.

WHAT'S NEXT

To date we have identified several know constraints that will limit the area available for planning a route. We are now in the process of seeking input from the public and organizations concerning potential routes and types of roads. The next step will be to consider constraints and obtain public input as part of the process to identify corridors and routes for evaluation. The evaluation will include environmental acceptability, technical feasibility, and cost-effectiveness.

The result of the studies will be reported in a Draft Environment Impact Statement (DEIS). The DEIS will be distributed for public and agency review and the public will be given the opportunity to review the alternatives and comment on the DEIS at a public hearing. Comments received during the DEIS comment period and at the public hearing will be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). After additional public and organization review and comment, the preferred alternative will be finalized and a Record Of Decision (ROD) written and submitted for FHWA approval. Approval of the ROD will finalize the study process. Final design for construction and right-of-way acquisition can not occur until after the ROD is approved and signed .

The public hearing for the DEIS is expected to occur in late-2001 and the signed ROD is expected in late-2002.

CONCLUSION

The information presented at this meeting is preliminary and is the best indication of what the City of Conway is planning at this time. We are still early in the process. The City is sensitive to the concerns of the citizenry and those concerns will be considered as alternatives are further developed and a preferred alternative selected.

In order for the best route and design to be selected, the City of Conway needs your input. Please take the time to look over the information being presented and give your opinion, either tape-recorded or in writing. Comments will be taken at this meeting, or they can be mailed to the address found on page two of this packet.

Your attendance and participation in this meeting is greatly appreciated.

City of Conway
Conway City Hall

1201 Oak Street .: Conway, Arkansas .: 72032 .: Phone: 501-450-6100

**PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING REPORT
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.)(S)
JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
FAULKNER COUNTY**

On Monday, April 23, 2001, a public informational meeting was held concerning the Conway Bypass. The meeting was held from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. at Ellen Smith Elementary School located at 1601 S. Donaghey Ave. in Conway.

The attendance for the meeting was approximately 70 people from various geographical areas inside and outside the city limits of Conway. As citizens arrived for the meeting, they were asked to sign in (Figure 1) and then received an informational handout (Figure 2).

Of those in attendance, 18 people (26%) submitted written comments during the meeting. The comments are attached as Appendix A. Fifteen comments listed a preferred alternate while three comments were general in nature. The preferred routes have been tabulated below.

Preferred Route:

Alternate A:	3	(20%)
Alternate B:	3	(20%)
Alternate C:	8	(53%)
Alternate D:	1	(7%)

**PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETING REPORT
CONWAY BYPASS (P.E.)(S)
JOB 080174, FAP HDP-9501(1)
FAULKNER COUNTY**

On Tuesday, April 24, 2001, a public informational meeting was held concerning the Conway Bypass. The meeting was held from 4:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. at the Mayflower Middle School located on Old Sandy Road in Mayflower.

The attendance for the meeting was approximately 20 people from various geographical areas inside and outside the city limits of Mayflower. As citizens arrived for the meeting, they were asked to sign in (Figure 1) and then received an informational handout (Figure 2).

Of those in attendance, four people (20%) submitted written comments during the meeting and one person who emailed comments following the meeting. The comments are attached as Appendix A. All four comments listed a preferred alternate. The preferred routes have been tabulated below.

Preferred Route:

Alternate A:	0	(0%)
Alternate B:	2	(40%)
Alternate C:	3	(60%)
Alternate D:	0	(0%)



CITY OF CONWAY
Office of the Mayor
Mayor Tab Townsell

September 7, 2004

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2004

Mr. Herbert J. Parker, P.E.
Vice President
Garver Engineers, Inc.
P.O. Box 50
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-0050

GARVER ENGINEERS

Re: Western Arterial Loop
Conway, Arkansas

Dear Mr. Parker;

The Conway City Council voted (7-1) at its August 18, 2004 meeting to request that Alternative A (Hogan Road Corridor) be developed as the preferred route for the Western Arterial Loop. This decision by the city council was based on extended deliberations which included the several public input sessions conducted by your firm and more recently on specific public input by citizens directly to the city council and discussion among the city council members. The more recent meetings included following:

- Consideration of the information presented and the recommendation of Alternative A by your firm to the Conway City Council at its June 8, 2004 committee meeting.
- Public comments received at public input secession held with the Conway City Council on June 15, 2004.
- City Council discussion of project at its June 22, 2004 meeting and August 10, 2004 meeting.

The opinion of the majority of the Council members is that this alternative, which has been a designated major arterial street route on the master street plan since the late 1980's, will best address the future transportation needs Conway. It is likely that portions of the other routes presented will be adopted as major arterial streets on the new Comprehensive Land Use Plan and will eventually develop as additional arterial routes. However, we would like you complete the project documents currently under contract to your firm with the focus on Alternative A so that federal funding for this alternative or portions of this alternative may be pursued.

Based on public input and city council comments received, please incorporate and address the following concerns in the final project documents:

- Increased noise levels generated by the project should not adversely impact the single family residences adjacent to the project. This should be specifically addressed along the boundary of the Sunderlin Park Subdivision on Hogan Road.

City Hall - 1201 Oak - Conway, AR 72032 501-450-6110



CITY OF CONWAY
Office of the Mayor
Mayor Tab Townsell

- If additional right of way is required in the vicinity of Sunderlin Park, the additional R.O.W. should be acquired from the eastern side and avoid adversely impacting the yard area of single family homes. Reduction in median widths, sidewalk buffer and other measures should be incorporated to avoid additional R.O.W. requirements that would reduce the yard area of single family homes or push the traveled lanes closer than 14 feet from the limits of the single family home yard area.
- Additional outfall storm drainage may be required to accommodate storm water from the existing Hogan Road area between Tyler and Prince Street.
- Any required widening of the cut thru Cadron Ridge along Hogan Road should leave the eastern side of the cut as is and widen the cut to the west.

Please call if you have questions or need additional information.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tab Townsell".

Tab Townsell

Garver Engineers, LLC

1010 Battery Street
P.O. Box 50
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-0050

501-376-3633
FAX 501-372-8042

www.garverengineers.com



MEETING MINUTES

To: James McAlister – Neighborhood Representative
Craig Cloud – Neighborhood Representative
Ronnie Hall – City of Conway
Mike Lynch – Garver Engineers, LLC
Todd Mueller – Garver Engineers, LLC

Date: May 10th, 2006

Location: Conway City Hall

RE: Conway Western Arterial Loop – McAlister Comments

Copies To: All Attendees
Randal Looney – FHWA
Lynn Malbrough - AHTD

On May 10th, 2006, a small group meeting was held at Conway City Hall to discuss comments concerning the Loop DEIS. The comments were formalized in James McAlister's memo to the mayor and city council, dated July 25, 2004. The Meeting was attended by James McAlister, Craig Cloud, Ronnie Hall, Todd Mueller and Mike Lynch. The following issues were discussed:

The traffic flow studies favoring Alternative A do not consider the proposed new airport. Proposed industrial park or the planned construction of a new I-40 interchange to replace the existing Exit 124. These new factors may change projected flows considerably and could point to a route further west or an alternative not yet specified.

The traffic volumes used to establish the purpose and need for the loop and to evaluate the DEIS alternatives were developed using a commonly accepted computer program that models traffic demand on a regional basis. Graphic and numeric values representing existing roadway layouts, traffic controls, land use patterns, and population (from census data) were entered into the program to model the existing transportation system. One of the data sets derived from the model was traffic volumes and existing traffic counts were used to calibrate the model. The model was then modified to include planned transportation features, planned land use patterns and projected population growth to forecast future traffic patterns and volumes. Although a specific airport or industrial park was not included in the model, planned land use patterns did account for future industrial areas in the western area of Conway. The location for Conway's future airport had not been established during development of the model but the traffic generated by the airport is not expected to be a significant factor.

Traffic volumes used in the DEIS did not include the full interchange at Highway 25. However, recent updated forecasts of traffic volumes at the planned Loop interchange with Interstate 40 (with the full Highway 25 interchange in place) indicate a substantial demand for each of the interchanges.

The greatest need for I-40 access is to the south, so that phase of the project should be given the highest priority. It may be possible to avoid widening Hogan Lane (which will surely involve widening the existing "cut") at all by extending (for example) Salem Road north to Highway 64. That may be possible without an expensive cut through the ridge and would surely provide considerable relief of traffic congestion.

It is expected the Loop would be constructed in phases. The first phase would probably be the new interchange with Interstate 40 at the south end of the project.

Roadways such as Salem Road are being used increasingly for arterial level traffic and may someday be extended north to Highway 64 W; however, for several years the City of Conway has designated Hogan Lane as the major north-south arterial route and has planned development accordingly. The traffic forecasts indicate the location of Hogan Lane also lends itself to meet the project purpose and need by successfully drawing traffic away from central areas if the city. Changing the planned function of streets such as Salem Road to carry a significant north-south traffic load, even though more traffic would naturally be moved in that direction, would have a tremendous impact on neighborhoods that have developed under land use plans that did not provide for the type of development that has occurred along Hogan Lane.

Current traffic volumes on Hogan Lane are high enough to justify widening to four lanes. It is likely the widening of Hogan Lane and the cut in Cadron Ridge will be necessary even if the Loop is connected to another route.

Resident must be fairly and equitably compensated for loss of property or devaluation of property values.

For the loop project to be eligible for federal funding (at any point of development) all right-of-way acquisition has to be made in accordance with the Uniform Property Acquisition and Relocation Act. This act provides for a rigid appraisal process and acquisition procedures.

The addition of more concrete and asphalt will exacerbate current Hogan Lane flooding.

All drainage designs for the final plans will be constructed in accordance with federal, state, and local ordinances and standards.

Ambient light levels (street lighting) into our homes will increase.

Lighting for the final plans will be designed in accordance with city of Conway requirements. Ambient lighting may decrease due to recent changes in city requirements for new development.

Noise levels will increase and must be abated. There should be no traffic signals near our homes to slow or stall traffic, allowing the noise to persist for longer intervals. There appears to be no enforcement of the existing noise ordinance for loud vehicles, a situation that should change now and be even more vigorously enforced with increased traffic flow.

Due to the length of time required for completion of the Loop increased traffic volumes will increase noise levels along Hogan Lane. It is difficult to determine how much of the traffic increase and associated noise would be directly related to implementation of the loop. The Federal Highway Administration and the Arkansas Highway Transportation Department have developed criteria for determining when and where noise abatement is appropriate. The criteria has been referenced and locations at which noise abatement may be appropriate were identified in the DEIS. Specific locations and design details will be determined during the preliminary engineering phase. Additional clarification of the design process, including provisions for public involvement in the process will be provided in the final EIS.

It is not expected that number of existing signalized cross road intersections with Hogan Lane would not be increased. The existing intersections would be reconfigured and the new layouts would provide for greater capacities and efficiencies. Noise levels at the intersections should not be significantly increased.

Safety of children will be compromised. The existing wall is flimsy and would need to be replaced with a substantial structure. If the existing wall is moved 15 feet to the west; for example, it will be within five feet of the Thaelke home.

The purpose of the existing wall is for visual separation between the residential area and Hogan Lane, not for safety except possibly preventing children from accessing traffic areas. The Loop would be designed to

provide for safety within the required right-of-way and if the existing wall is not located in the required right-of-way, the existing wall would not be replaced. The design of Hogan Lane would provide for greater traffic and pedestrian safety by separating travel lanes. Sidewalks will be provided on each side of the roadway and utility poles, fire hydrants, etc. will be located away from traffic. If a new wall should be required (either due to right-of-way requirements or for noise abatement), the wall would be designed to meet safety, structural and site drainage needs and would probably be designed with concurrence of the affected property owners.

There will be aesthetic impacts if traffic is moved closer to our homes.

The City of Conway Planning Department has shown Hogan Lane as a major north-south arterial for several years. A part of the past planning was to have developers provide space for the future widening of Hogan Lane. In the currently developed areas along Hogan Lane it is probable that the widening to accommodate the Loop will consist of adding travel lanes to each side of the existing roadway. Although additional right-of-way will be required at specific areas such as intersections or left turn lanes, in most cases the existing right-of-way will be adequate for this construction. The aesthetic impact of widening Hogan Lane is a somewhat subjective issue.

Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Randal Looney	(501) 324-6430	randal.looney@fhwa.dot.gov
Lynn Malbrough	(501)-569-2281	lynn.malbrough@arkansas.highways.com
Ronnie Hall, Conway	(501)450-6165	street@conwaycorp.net
Bert Parker, Garver Engineers	(501)376-3633	hjparker@garverengineers.com
Todd Mueller, Garver Engineers	(501)376-3633	temuller@garverengineers.com
Mike Lynch, Garver Engineers	(501)228-0513	mjenterprises@sbcglobal.net

Location: Conference Room A

CC: All attendees, Mayor Tab Townsell, Senator Gilbert Baker

Date: May 3, 2007

RE: Conway Western Arterial Loop – FEIS Progress Meeting
Attachments: Discussion Outline

A meeting was held at the offices of Garver Engineers to discuss the progress to date on the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Conway Western Arterial Loop (CWAL). The purpose of the meeting was to review actions resulting from the Draft EIS and to reach a consensus on the horizontal alignment that will be advanced to the FEIS. Secondly, the group focused on organizing a strategy for completing the FEIS and discussed the submittal of the General Concept Endorsement for the Break In Access document. Below is a summary of the discussions that took place during the meeting:

- Mike discussed the process and how we have progressed to Alternative A as the preferred alternative for the CWAL.
 - Consideration of Impacts
 - Costs
 - Public Meetings
 - Etc.
- Mike and Todd discussed the recent revisions to the CWAL due to wetlands, plants, and historic structures.
- Todd stated that the revisions to the alignment have reduced the impacted wetlands to 0.13 acres. Lynn stated that we would need the wetland permit as part of FEIS. He thought it would most likely be a nationwide 23 with the minimal acreage impacts.

- Todd passed out copies of the letters of acceptance from the Department of Arkansas Heritage on both the historic structures and plants.
- Mike asked the group for concurrence on the current alignment that was presented at the meeting. Randal and Lynn thought the geometry was acceptable and revisions had been made to minimize all impacts. Therefore, the alignment presented should be utilized in the FEIS as the horizontal alignment.
- In order to complete the Break in Access document, Todd stated that we need to update costs and get a letter of funding support for the project from Ronnie.
- Randal said to contact Brent Dather about the time frame for the review of the break in access document.
- Lynn stated that the FEIS should identify specific locations and make commitments to study the noise, but the actual noise study would be performed in the Final Design of the CWAL.
- The factors that affect the noise analysis are volume, speed, and truck traffic.
- The group concurred that air quality would be left as is and will go into the FEIS
- Randal stated that he thought he handled the tribal issues with the FEIS
- Randal and Lynn recommended that we go from this meeting to the completion of the FEIS. Lynn added that we should strengthen ideas about why it is the best alignment and the revisions that we made to minimize environmental impacts. He also said to make sure that we cover responses to comments from the DEIS. After we have Record of Division (ROD) the City of Conway can move ahead with decision of what portions of the project need to move onto final design.