ARDOT Job 061705

BRYANT PKWY. EXTENSION (S)

Environmental Assessment



February 2021

This Environmental Assessment becomes a Federal Document when evaluated, signed, and dated by the responsible Federal Official.



U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration Arkansas Department of Transportation



BRYANT PKWY. EXTENSION (S)

ARDOT Job 061705; F.A.P. Number STPU-9061(14)

Environmental Assessment

Submitted pursuant to: The National Environmental Policy Act 42 U.S.C. §4322(2)(c) and 23 C.F.R. §771

Submitted by:

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

and

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Prepared by:

Garver, North Little Rock, Arkansas

The following people may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Randal Looney FHWA 700 W. Capitol, Room 3130 Little Rock, AR 72201-3298 (501) 324-6430 John Fleming ARDOT P.O. Box 2261 Little Rock, AR 72203-2261 (501) 569-2281

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, this Environmental Assessment describes the proposed project to provide an extension of Bryant Parkway in the City of Bryant. The analysis did not identify any significant adverse environmental impacts and identified Alternative B as the Preferred Alternative.

Comments should be directed to:

Mail: Garver Attn: Jon Hetzel 4701 Northshore Drive North Little Rock, AR 72118

Email: PublicInvolvement@GarverUSA.com

This Environmental Assessment is also available for review online at: <u>http://www.arkansashighways.com/</u>

Randal Looney Environmental Coordinator Federal Highway Administration

February 9, 2021

Date of Approval



Dean A. McMath

Dean A. McMath Regional Environmental Programs Manager Federal Aviation Administration

February 9, 2021

Date of Approval



Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

Materials can be provided in alternative formats: large print, Braille, or audiotape for people with disabilities by contacting ARDOT's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR 72203, or at the following email address: joanna.mcfadden@ardot.gov. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact the ARDOT through the Arkansas Relay Service at 7-1-1.

Title VI

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. The ARDOT public involvement process did not exclude any individuals due to income, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability. For questions regarding the ARDOT's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR 72203, or at the following email address: joanna.mcfadden@ardot.gov.

A federal agency may publish a notice in the Federal Register, pursuant to 23 USC §139(I), indicating that one or more federal agencies have taken final action on permits, licenses, or approvals for a transportation project. If such notice is published, claims seeking judicial review of those federal agency actions will be barred unless such claims are filed within 180 days after the date of publication of the notice, or within such shorter time period as is specified in the federal laws pursuant to which judicial review of the federal agency action is allowed. If no notice is published, then the periods of time that otherwise are provided by the federal laws governing such claims will apply.

Table of Contents

| 1.0 | Purpose and Need | 7 |
|------|--|----|
| 1.1 | Introduction | 7 |
| 1.2 | Project Background and Existing Conditions | 7 |
| 1.3 | Need for Project | 9 |
| 1.4 | Project Purpose | 13 |
| 1.5 | Agency Coordination | 13 |
| 2.0 | Alternatives | 14 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 14 |
| 2.2 | Alternatives Removed from Further Consideration | 16 |
| 2.3 | Alternatives Carried Forward for Evaluation in this EA | 17 |
| 3.0 | Environmental Impacts and Mitigation | 21 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 21 |
| 3.2 | Resources Not Present | 25 |
| 3.3 | Land Use and Zoning | 25 |
| 3.4 | Air Quality | 29 |
| 3.5 | Endangered and Threatened Species and Other Wildlife | 31 |
| 3.6 | Hazardous Waste | 32 |
| 3.7 | Section 6(f) Resources | |
| 3.8 | Section 4(f) Resources | |
| 3.9 | Cultural Resources | |
| 3.10 | Noise | 40 |
| 3.11 | Community | 41 |
| 3.12 | Visual Quality | 42 |
| 3.13 | Wetlands and Surface Waters | 43 |
| 3.14 | Floodplains | 47 |
| 3.15 | Indirect and Cumulative Impacts | 50 |
| 4.0 | Results and Recommendations | 53 |
| 4.1 | Preferred Alternative | 53 |
| 4.2 | Commitments and Mitigation Measures | 54 |
| 4.3 | Required Permits | 55 |

| 4.4 | Public Involvement | .55 |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----|
| 4.5 | Concluding the NEPA Process | .55 |
| 5.0 | References | .55 |

List of Tables

| Table 1: | Alternatives Comparison Matrix | .16 |
|----------|--|-----|
| Table 2: | VMT Comparison from CARTS Travel Demand Model | .30 |
| Table 3: | Habitat Summary of USFWS Federally Listed Species within the APE | .31 |
| Table 4: | Risk Evaluation of each REC Site for Build Alternatives. | .35 |
| Table 5: | Wetland and Stream Habitat Present | .44 |
| Table 6: | Summary of Impacts | .53 |

List of Figures

| Figure 1: Project Location within City of Bryant, Saline County, Arkansas | 8 |
|---|---------|
| Figure 2: Projected Changes in Traffic Volumes Due to the Bryant Parkway Extension | 11 |
| Figure 3: City of Bryant Bike/Pedestrian Plan (2017) | 12 |
| Figure 4: Alternatives Presented to the Public and Project Constraints | 15 |
| Figure 5: Alternative B | 18 |
| Figure 6: Alternative D | 20 |
| Figure 7: Vicinity, Historical Land Use, and Photograph Location Map | 24 |
| Figure 8: Draft Airport Land Use Map | 26 |
| Figure 9: City Zoning within the APE | 27 |
| Figure 10: Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) Sites Associated with Build Alter | natives |
| Figure 11: Alcoa 40 Park Land Swap | |
| Figure 12: Alcoa 40 Park Disturbances | 38 |
| Figure 13: Wetland and Stream Impacts for Alternative B | 45 |
| Figure 14: Wetland and Stream Impacts for Alternative D | 46 |
| Figure 15: Floodplains and Floodways Present in the APE | 48 |
| Figure 16: Floodway Improvements Required for Both Alternative B and Alternative D | 49 |

List of Appendices

- Appendix A Agency and Tribal Coordination
- Appendix B Proposed Roadway and Bridge Details
- Appendix C Threatened and Endangered Species Assessment
- Appendix D Initial Site Assessment
- Appendix E Section 4(f) De Minimis Evaluation
- Appendix F Cultural Resources
- Appendix G Traffic Noise Analysis
- Appendix H Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) and Wetland Delineation Report
- Appendix I Public Involvement

1.0 Purpose and Need

1.1 Introduction

The City of Bryant, Arkansas, in cooperation with the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), is proposing to extend Bryant Parkway (Pkwy.) from Shobe Road to Highway (Hwy.) 183. The FHWA is a funding agency and the lead federal agency under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and the FAA is acting as a cooperating agency. This proposed roadway would improve the flow of traffic and emergency vehicle response time between the south side of Bryant and the northeast side of Bryant by providing an alternate route to the heavily congested Hwy. 183 (also designated as Reynolds Road). The project would also provide enhanced connectivity, mobility, and development potential for the Saline County Regional Airport (SUZ or Airport). **Figure 1** shows the project extent and general location of Bryant within Saline County.

1.2 Project Background and Existing Conditions

Located approximately 20 miles southwest of Little Rock via Interstate 30 (I-30), the City of Bryant, Arkansas is considered a part of the Little Rock Metropolitan area. According to Metroplan, the area's Metropolitan Planning Organization, the City of Bryant is one of the fastest growing communities in the state. With a 2000 Census population of 9,764, a 2010 Census population of 16,688, and an estimated 2018 population of 20,665, the population of the City of Bryant has more than doubled since the year 2000. The City of Bryant is a member of Metroplan and has adopted the Central Arkansas Transit Authority's 20-year long-range transportation plan for central Arkansas. The transportation plan, in combination with the City's continuous population growth, has led the City of Bryant to develop the Bryant Pkwy. corridor.

On August 9, 2016, the citizens of Bryant approved a City bond refinancing that included several Bryant Pkwy. projects. The City considers Bryant Pkwy. to be a strategic investment that would allow traffic to move more quickly and efficiently to the eastern and southern areas of Bryant.

The existing Bryant Pkwy. corridor (Figure 1) is an approximately 2.1-mile long south to north minor arterial. The corridor's southern terminus dead-ends at Shobe Road and the northern terminus is at the intersection of Hilldale Road and Hilltop Road, approximately 0.9 mile north of I-30. Where Bryant Pkwy. crosses over I-30, it is connected to the interstate by on/off ramps to a one-way interstate frontage road. The proposed Bryant Pkwy. Extension project, which is the focus of this EA, would begin near the intersection of Shobe Road and Bryant Pkwy. and extend south on new alignment to the southern terminus of the Bryant Pkwy. corridor at the southern edge of the Bryant city limits near the intersection of Hwy. 183 and Hill Farm Road. This proposed project is also referred to as the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project (Project 2). Construction of the portion of the existing Bryant Pkwy. corridor that begins near Shobe Road and connects to the Raymar Road overpass at I-30 (Exit 124) was completed in September 2019 and is referred to as Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1). Construction of the portion of the Bryant Pkwy. corridor that begins near the Raymar Road overpass and extends north to Hwy. 5 was completed in 2013.



Figure 1: Project Location within City of Bryant, Saline County, Arkansas

Construction of the portion of the Bryant Pkwy. corridor that begins at Hwy. 5 and ends at Hilldale Road was completed in August 2018.

The existing Bryant Pkwy. typically consists of two 10-foot wide travel lanes separated by a grass median with curb and gutter at the inside edge of lane, a 10-foot wide left-turn lane at intersections, 4-foot wide paved outside shoulders, and a 12-foot wide bike/pedestrian trail along the west side of the road. There is a 35 miles per hour (mph) posted speed limit along this segment of roadway. Hwy. 183 is a four-lane roadway with a center turn lane and paved shoulders between I-30 and Boone Road. Between Boone Road and SW 4th Street, Hwy. 183 is a four-lane roadway with paved shoulders. From SW 4th Street south and beyond the project area, Hwy. 183 is a two-lane roadway with paved shoulders. There is a 50-mph posted speed limit along this segment of roadway with the exception of those areas within school zones. Shobe Road is a two-lane roadway with an east-bound left turn lane at the intersection of the existing Bryant Pkwy., no shoulders, and a 30-mph posted speed limit.

1.3 Need for Project

As identified in the Bryant Parkway I-30 to Shobe Road Traffic Study, the population of Bryant is growing rapidly. The significant population increase has caused the city to outgrow its current infrastructure, including Hwy. 183, which is the City's only north/south arterial corridor, resulting in a need for enhanced connectivity and mobility. Additionally, enhanced infrastructure access to SUZ is needed to accommodate future planned and projected growth.

In 2017, a feasibility study was developed to assist the City in determining a preferred alternative to connect Bryant Pkwy. Project 1 (which terminates at Shobe Road) to Hwy. 183. The study also further documented the project need, which is summarized below. This feasibility study is incorporated by reference only but is available upon request.

Mobility

The exit from I-30 onto Hwy. 183 is Bryant's primary entrance. Incoming traffic, combined with numerous schools' traffic located along Hwy. 183 (Figure 1), causes high traffic volumes along the corridor and results in traffic congestion. The ARDOT traffic data indicates that the northern portion of Hwy. 183 near I-30 sees an average of 26,000 vehicles per day (vpd). Further south in the heart of Bryant's downtown area, ARDOT traffic data indicates that Hwy. 183 sees an average of 18,000 vpd. The vpd rates are expected to continue growing.

According to a corridor study of south Hwy. 183 completed by ARDOT in 2018, high traffic volumes result from the multiple Bryant School District facilities, numerous residences, commercial areas, and the Airport along Hwy. 183. This study also states that the lack of an arterial grid system through Bryant results in a high number of traffic signals along Hwy. 183 and an inefficient transportation system. According to an Interchange Justification Report completed by ARDOT in 2016 for the construction of the I-30 on/off ramps onto Bryant Pkwy., I-30 is also negatively affected by the lack of a second arterial that continues both north and south from the interstate. As a single north-south arterial, Hwy. 183 creates a bottleneck and reduces the redundancy of the transportation network. An additional north-south arterial would address this deficiency.

Additionally, Hwy. 183 has the only Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) overpass in the city. The lack of a secondary grade separated crossing over the UPRR delays emergency vehicle response times to the eastern half of the city. Traffic congestion caused by these deficiencies and the high volume of traffic on Hwy. 183 increases travel times and emergency vehicle response time, especially during peak hours; thus there is a vital need for a second north-south arterial within the City of Bryant.

Based on Metroplan's Central Arkansas Regional Transportation Study (CARTS) Model, a new north-south corridor connecting I-30 to Hwy. 183 at the south end of the city is projected to reduce traffic volumes on Hwy. 183 by 7% to 22% during the opening year, and 11% to 27% during the design year of 2040 when compared to the no-build scenario. A regional traffic impacts map depicting these areas of reduced traffic volumes is shown in **Figure 2**. Traffic volumes are presented in Average Daily Traffic (ADT), which is an estimate of the average number of vehicles passing a specific point on a connection or roadway on an average day. Benefits from these reduced traffic volumes on Hwy. 183 would include the following:

- A reduction in traffic delays and a reduction in travel times along the Hwy. 183 corridor
- A reduction in emergency vehicle response times along the Hwy. 183 corridor
- A potential reduction in crash rates along the Hwy. 183 corridor due to reduced traffic congestion
- Reduced travel times for vehicles traveling from I-30 to Hwy. 183 south of Bryant

Connectivity

In addition to reducing traffic volumes on Hwy. 183, an alternate north-south route would enhance connectivity to a number of critical facilities and residences in the southern and eastern areas of Bryant. The Airport, Hill Farm Elementary, Bryant Junior High School, a newly constructed fire station, Alcoa 40 Park, and a number of residences and industries would directly benefit from a new north-south arterial connecting existing Bryant Pkwy. to Hwy. 183. This would provide the following benefits:

- Additional route for emergency vehicle traveling to east Bryant
- Enhanced access from I-30 to SUZ
- Enhanced ingress/egress for schools on Hill Farm Road and Hwy. 183
- Enhanced access for industries located in southeast Bryant
- Enhanced connectivity for residents located in south and east Bryant

Additionally, there is a need to provide a bicycle connection between the southern half of Bryant and Hwy. 5, which is a designated bicycle route between Saline and Pulaski Counties. A major component of this needed connection would be safe bicycle access across the UPRR. Only one grade separated bicycle/pedestrian crossing of the UPRR within the City of Bryant currently exists and is located on Hwy. 183. As shown in the City of Bryant Master Bike and Pedestrian Plan, there is a need to extend the existing Bryant Pkwy. trail to the south and construct trail access across the railroad in order to connect residences, parks, schools, and downtown for pedestrians and bicyclists. See **Figure 3** for the planned trails within the project area.



Figure 2: Projected Changes in Traffic Volumes Due to the Bryant Parkway Extension



Figure 3: City of Bryant Bike/Pedestrian Plan (2017)

Economic Growth and Increased Access

The additional connectivity and increased access that an alternate north-south route would provide increases the potential for economic growth in the eastern and southern areas of the City. Undeveloped land along the Bryant Pkwy. corridor would have increased potential for development due to direct access to a minor arterial street and enhanced access to I-30, Hwy. 183 south of Bryant, and SUZ.

Enhanced infrastructure access to SUZ is needed to accommodate future planned and projected growth as documented in SUZ's airport master plan. The 2019 airport master plan shows a steady progression for use of SUZ with a projected increase of 29% in annual operations between 2016 and 2036. The FAA Terminal Area Forecast estimated that 45,500 total operations (departures or arrivals) occurred at the airport in 2016, and the Airport reported that approximately 74 aircraft were based at SUZ that same year. Currently, SUZ only has public roadway access to the western half of the airport. The airport's master plan describes a concept plan to provide public access to approximately 220 acres of undeveloped land on the eastern half of the airport. This would allow for a future eastern taxiway and additional aeronautical and industrial development. Providing public roadway access to the eastern half of the airport outside of the limits of the Runway Protection Zone (RPZ), which would be a costly undertaking for the Airport. A new roadway extending south from Shobe Road and crossing the UPRR north of the RPZ would provide SUZ with a feasible means to access and develop the eastern half of the airport property.

1.4 **Project Purpose**

The purpose of the proposed project is to:

- increase vehicular and pedestrian connectivity from existing Bryant Pkwy. to Hwy. 183
- provide greater mobility and connectivity to schools, parks, residences, and industries in the southern and eastern parts of the city
- reduce traffic congestion and travel delays on Hwy. 183
- provide a public road giving access to the north end of SUZ to allow for future development opportunities
- reduce emergency vehicle response time to the eastern half of the city by providing a secondary grade separated crossing over UPRR
- provide a critical component of the City of Bryant Master Bike and Pedestrian Plan

1.5 Agency Coordination

The following agencies were consulted during the preparation of this EA:

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
- Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)—No response was received

- Arkansas Department of Health (ADH)
- Arkansas Department of Parks, Heritage, and Tourism (ADPHT)
- Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP)
- Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission (ANHC)
- Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment's Division of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
- Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC)-No response was received
- Arkansas Game and Fish Commission (AGFC)—No response was received

FHWA consulted with the following Tribes during the preparation of this EA:

- Caddo Nation—No response was received
- Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma—No response was received
- Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians—No response was received
- Muscogee (Creek) Nation-No response was received
- Osage Nation—No response was received
- Quapaw Nation
- Shawnee Tribe—No response was received
- Tunica-Biloxi Tribe of Louisiana, Inc.-No response was received
- United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma

Agency and Tribal coordination letters are provided in Appendix A.

2.0 Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

This section provides an overview of the original project alternatives considered and describes the alternatives evaluated in detail by this EA. As shown in **Figure 4**, five original Bryant Pkwy. Extension project alternative alignments (Alternatives A-E) were developed and presented to the public (see public involvement in **Section 4.4**). Figure 4 shows other features described in Chapter 3. Each of the five alternatives pass through airport property and include the following actions:

- Begin at the intersection of Shobe Road and the existing Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1) and terminate near Hill Farm Road or County Road 1.
- Typical sections of the new road, pedestrian and bicycle trail, and bridge structure over Crooked Creek and the UPRR would be the same for all build alternatives.
- Two-lane open shoulder facility with 10-foot wide driving lanes and 4-foot wide shoulders.
- An average 125-foot wide right-of-way (ROW), where required.

A No Action Alternative was also evaluated. NEPA requires including a "No Action" alternative in environmental analysis. Although it does not meet the project's purpose and need, the No Action Alternative provides a baseline against which the other alternatives can be compared.



Figure 4: Alternatives Presented to the Public and Project Constraints

Traffic volumes were analyzed using traffic data from the ARDOT and travel demand outputs from the CARTS developed by Metroplan (Garver Feasibility Study, 2017). Compared to the No Action Alternative, all five build alternatives (Alternatives A-E) would alleviate traffic on Hwy. 183 by providing an alternate north-south route through the City.

Design details of the proposed roadway and bridge are provided in Appendix B.

2.2 Alternatives Removed from Further Consideration

Each alternative was initially evaluated based on a number of constraints including: floodplain and/or floodway impacts, biological impacts, land disturbance, major utilities, the likelihood of contamination from hazardous materials, connectivity to SUZ, connectivity to Hill Farm Elementary and Bryant Junior High School, and encroachments into existing and future SUZ RPZs and the Alcoa conservation easement. Some of these constraints are shown in Figure 4 and an alternative comparison matrix is presented in **Table 1**.

| Impacto | Alignment Alternatives | | | | |
|---|------------------------|----|---|----|----|
| Impacts | Α | В | С | D | E |
| Conservation Esmt. Encroachment | | | | | |
| Airport RPZ Encroachment | | | | | |
| Airport Connectivity | | | | | |
| Connectivity to Adjacent Schools | | | | | |
| Land Disturbance | | | | | |
| Hazardous Materials | | | | | |
| Biological Impacts | | | | | |
| Floodplain Impacts | | | | | |
| Wetland Impacts | | | | | |
| Stream Impacts | | | | | |
| Major Utilities | | | | | |
| Park Impacts | | | | | |
| Airport Perimeter Road Impacts | | | | | |
| Noise Impacts Based on Screening | | | | | |
| Total Good/Low or No Impacts | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Total Fair/Moderate Impacts | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 10 |
| Total Poor/High Impacts | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Rating System: Good/Low or No Impact Fair/Moderate Impact Poor/High Impact | | | | | |

| Table 1: | Alternatives | Comparison | Matrix |
|----------|--------------|------------|--------|
|----------|--------------|------------|--------|

Table 1 indicates that Alternative C has the highest number of negative impacts (five in total rated as poor/high) with the greatest being the large amount of land disturbance and tree clearing that would be required on the east side of airport property. Given that Alternative C would require substantially more impacts compared to any of the other alternatives in order to achieve the same

goal, this alternative was removed from further consideration and is not carried forward as an alternative in this EA.

Additionally, two other alternatives were removed from further consideration. Alternative A was removed from further consideration due to its encroachment in the Alcoa conservation easement. The Alcoa conservation easement is deed restricted and development in this area is prohibited unless allowed by the grantor, Alcoa. Initial correspondence with Alcoa explored options to mitigate for the encroachment on the deed restricted area, such as fill-only construction with no excavation, or perimeter fences along both sides of the roadway, but ultimately Alcoa denied the request for exemption, rendering this alternative not viable. Alternative E was removed from further consideration due to its encroachment into the existing Runway 2 RPZ. After an official request to the FAA for feedback on the feasibility of constructing the parkway along the Alternative E route and through the RPZ, FAA responded that they did not recommend this action, since the process would be costly and time consuming, and could ultimately be rejected by the FAA. Safety concerns (RPZ encroachment) were also identified by the public during the public meeting (details provided in Section 4.4). One individual expressed preference for Alternative B, stating other alternatives greatly endanger the public due to their close proximity and location relative to the south end of the Airport runway. Alternatives B (which has the fewest negative impacts) and D were retained and are further evaluated in this EA.

2.3 Alternatives Carried Forward for Evaluation in this EA

Alternative B, Alternative D, and the No Action Alternative are being carried forward for evaluation in this EA and each is detailed below.

<u>Alternative B</u>. Alternative B begins at the existing Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1) and Shobe Road intersection and extends south crossing Crooked Creek and the UPRR. Alternative B then enters airport property and travels south, staying between the western boundary of SUZ and the runway, avoiding the Runway 20 Existing and Ultimate RPZs, subdivisions, planned locations for future airport hangars, existing airport hangars, and the electrical substation. In order to provide enhanced access to SUZ, a new airport entrance road is proposed between Bryant Pkwy. and the airport terminal building (see **Figure 5**). Once leaving airport property, Bryant Pkwy. would continue south on a city-owned parcel of land then tie into the north end of Mustang Trail, a roadway recently constructed by the Bryant School District for access to their bus maintenance facility. From there, Bryant Pkwy. would continue south on Mustang Trail, which would later be renamed to Bryant Pkwy., until its direct connection with Hill Farm Road 0.37 mile east of the intersection of Hwy. 183 and Hill Farm Road. This alternative is 2.57 miles long and has a total estimated planning, engineering, and construction cost of \$18.2 million.

Alternative B satisfies the purpose and need of the project. The proposed typical sections of this alternative are shown in Appendix B and the layout is shown in Figure 5. Alternative B includes:

• Construction of a bridge spanning Crooked Creek and the UPRR (see Appendix B for design details).



Figure 5: Alternative B

- Clearing/grubbing and grading of approximately 40 acres for 2.5 miles of roadway construction, including two 10-foot wide driving lanes and 4-foot wide shoulders within a variable width (125-foot average width) proposed ROW with a proposed speed limit of 35 mph.
- Construction of a shared-use trail beginning near the southeast corner of Alcoa 40 Park, extending south approximately 2.2 miles, and ending at the terminus of the existing shared-use trail on the east side of the north end of Mustang Trail.
- Widening of Crooked Creek and excavation of the floodway in three areas in order to mitigate for the minor obstruction of flow caused by bridge piers within the floodway. The floodway is 351 feet wide so spanning the entire floodway is cost prohibitive.
- Installation of new airport security fence, where required, along the east side of the proposed Bryant Pkwy., and construction of a 0.10-mile new airport entrance road located immediately west of the airport terminal.
- Intersection improvements at Hill Farm Road and Alternative B and restriping of Mustang Trail (see Appendix B for design details).

Alternative B would require the City to purchase roadway ROW from SUZ, which would require the Airport to submit documentation to the FAA to release the land from federal obligations. Details regarding land use are provided in **Section 3.3**.

<u>Alternative D</u>. Alternative D begins as Alternative B does, but after spanning the UPRR and entering airport property, Alternative D avoids the future (and existing) RPZs by routing along their east side (**Figure 6**). Alternative D then travels immediately southwest and outside of the Alcoa conservation easement and E-40 Pit deed restriction boundaries (details on these features are provided in **Section 3.6**). Similar to Alternative B, this alignment provides potential access for any future industrial development on the land east of SUZ. Alternative D then ties into County Road 1, travels around multiple ponds, and terminates 0.36 mile east of the intersection of County Road 1 and Hwy. 183. This alternative is 4.20 miles long and has a total estimated planning, engineering, and construction cost of \$23.5 million.

Alternative D also meets the purpose and need for the project. The proposed typical sections of this alternative are the same as Alternative B. The layout is presented in Figure 6. This alternative involves the following features:

- Construction of a bridge spanning Crooked Creek and the UPRR (same as for Alternative B).
- Clearing/grubbing and grading of approximately 35 acres for 4.2 miles of roadway with the same typical sections, speed limit, and bridge details described above for Alternative B.
- Construction of a shared-use trail beginning near the southeast corner of Alcoa 40 Park, extending south approximately 0.26 mile, and ending just south of the proposed bridge.
- Floodway improvements involving widening the creek and floodway excavation (same as for Alternative B).
- Alternative D would not involve construction/modification of an airport access road or the airport perimeter road but would install airport security fencing where required.



Figure 6: Alternative D

Similar to Alternative B, Alternative D would require the City to purchase roadway ROW from SUZ, which would require the Airport to submit documentation to the FAA to release the land from federal obligations. Details regarding land use are provided in **Section 3.3**.

<u>No Action Alternative</u>. The No Action Alternative does not meet the purpose or need for the project in that it does not reduce traffic congestion on Hwy. 183 or provide an alternative north-south travel corridor through Bryant. Motorists would continue to utilize the existing roadway system (primarily Hwy. 183) to travel north to south through the City. Furthermore, by taking no action, safety and response time of emergency vehicles would not be improved as no grade separation (bridge over the creek and UPRR) would be constructed. The No Action Alternative also would not construct a bike/pedestrian trail over Crooked Creek and UPRR and would not provide a direct connection to SUZ or grant easier access to I-30.

3.0 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

3.1 Introduction

This section describes the existing environmental conditions of the Area of Potential Effect (APE), which consists of approximately 1,521 acres, and describes the anticipated environmental impacts of the project. As shown in Figures 1 and 4, the APE is located east of downtown Bryant and almost entirely within SUZ-owned property. The photographs presented in this section from the project vicinity depict current conditions within the APE and the areas potentially affected. **Figure 7** shows the location where each photograph was taken.



P1. View looking south along the east edge of Alcoa 40 Park. The proposed roadway will be located in the tree line shown on the left side of the photograph.



P2. View from Shobe Road looking east at the intersection of Shobe Road and the proposed Bryant Parkway.



P3. Forested wetlands near Crooked Creek, north of the UPRR.



P4. Crooked Creek and adjacent unpaved utility road.



P5. Union Pacific Railroad.



P7. Landscape near E. edge of airport property. View to SW toward runway.



P9. Typical view from southern half of airport property.



P6. Gravel SUZ perimeter road near the RPZ. Perimeter fence visible on left.



P8. Typical vegetation & upland habitats W. of airport terminal & hangars.



P10. Tailings pond, asphalt plant, & approx. location of insecticide disposal site.



Figure 7: Vicinity, Historical Land Use, and Photograph Location Map

3.2 Resources Not Present

Environmental resources that are not present within the APE are not described in detail in this section or discussed further. There are currently no concerns for the following resources within the APE:

- Coastal Zone Resources
- Environmental Justice
- Farmlands

The remainder of this Chapter is organized by resource topic, with the impacts of the evaluated alternatives combined under resource headings. This analysis, although brief, is a summary of indepth evaluation of these respective resource impacts associated with Alternatives B and D. The No Action Alternative is retained to satisfy the requirements of NEPA and provide an environmental baseline for the development alternatives. Between February 23, 2018 and November 9, 2018, letters were sent to applicable local, state, and federal agencies to assess the level of environmental consequences based on the purpose and need of the project. Refer to **Section 1.5** and Appendix A for additional details regarding agency coordination.

3.3 Land Use and Zoning

Saline County has established a zoning ordinance (Ordinance No. 2002-077) to limit the height of objects around SUZ. This policy supports airport compatible land use and airspace protection and aligns with the Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 "civil airport imaginary surfaces".

Existing land uses within the APE primarily consist of the SUZ facilities and airfield. Other existing land uses within and adjacent to the APE include the UPRR, Alcoa 40 Park, undeveloped and wooded areas, two public schools (one within the APE and one adjacent to the APE), a fire station, surge ponds (i.e., three old tailings ponds), an asphalt plant, and adjacent residential neighborhoods. While no residential areas are within the APE, Cherry Creek subdivision is located immediately south of Shobe Road and directly east of the north end of the APE. Hidden Forest subdivision is also located along the west edge of the APE, north of the airport hangars. Portions of the APE (those areas north of the UPRR) are zoned O-S (Open Space, Parks). Zoning information was obtained from the City of Bryant's Official Zoning Map, the planning area of which ends approximately 0.25 mile south of the APE. **Figure 8** depicts land uses for the airport and **Figure 9** shows the various city zoning districts present within the APE.

Figure 8: Draft Airport Land Use Map





Figure 9: City Zoning within the APE

County parcel data and the ALP provided by the airport was utilized in determining compatible land use impacts (Figure 8). Alternatives B and D are located on land owned by the City of Bryant, the Bryant School District, or SUZ and spans UPRR tracks near the north end of the project. Additionally, Alternative D is located on land owned by Reynolds Metal Company.

For both Alternatives B and D, several approvals would be needed from SUZ and FAA to acquire ROW along their routes within the existing SUZ property. Both alternatives would require the final alignment to be shown on SUZ's Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and approved by FAA. Both alternatives would also require a Land Release Request to be submitted to the FAA for review and approval before the land needed for roadway ROW could be released from airport obligation and sold to the City of Bryant. Some of the preliminary FAA approvals for Alternative B are already in place. As part of a separate initiative which was conducted independently of the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project, SUZ hired Morrison-Shipley to prepare a Master Plan Update (MPU) and ALP update for the airport. Both of these planning documents were completed and conditionally approved by FAA in November 2019. The MPU narrative discusses the planned Bryant Pkwy. Extension improvements and the expected benefits to SUZ. The ALP update indicates the preliminary alignment and ROW for Alternative B. As part of the ALP update, FAA reviewed and conditionally approved the airport's plan to reclassify the western portion of SUZ property from aeronautical use to non-aeronautical use. This conversion is shown on SUZ's Land Use Map (Figure 8). The proposed alignment for Alternative B stays within this non-aeronautical use area. Since only non-aeronautical use land can be sold and used for non-aviation purposes, this would allow the airport to sell a portion of this land to the City for roadway ROW as long as it meets all other FAA Land Release requirements. Another ALP update showing the final alignment for Bryant Pkwy. along with Land Release Request documentation would need to be submitted to FAA for review, comment, and approval prior to FAA allowing the land to be sold to the city for the construction of the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project.

The alignment for Alternative D goes through aeronautical land use areas as defined on SUZ's Land Use Map (Figure 8). Since only non-aeronautical use land can be sold and used for non-aviation purposes, the land needed for Alternative D ROW would have to be converted to non-aeronautical use and this conversion would have to be reviewed and approved by FAA. Additionally, an ALP update showing the final alignment for the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project along with Land Release Request documentation would need to be submitted to FAA for review, comment, and approval prior to FAA allowing the land to be sold to the City for the construction of Bryant Pkwy.

UPRR owns the ROW along the railroad tracks. The proposed Bryant Pkwy. bridge would span these railroad tracks and would require a joint use agreement to be executed within the limits of the bridge crossing UPRR ROW for either build alternative. The preliminary bridge layout and the preliminary limits of the joint use agreement were submitted to UPRR in November 2018 and January 2019. UPRR returned comments on the bridge layout and joint use agreement. All comments were addressed, and the preliminary plans were approved by UPRR. Final plans and an executed Joint Use Agreement would be required prior to construction.

Entergy has an easement with the SUZ for their overhead transmission lines that run along the northwest side of the Airport property. An Encroachment Agreement would need to be executed between the City and Entergy prior to construction for either build alternative. The City has been in coordination with Entergy and a draft encroachment agreement has been prepared and is pending execution.

Both Alternatives B and D would temporarily disturb Alcoa 40 Park to achieve proposed improvements, but these impacts do not constitute a land use change. Neither build alternative would impact protected airspace or zones such as the RPZ and Part 77 surfaces. Additionally, an airport security fence would be installed between either of the build alternatives and the Airport's Air Operations Area.

Overall, no land use compatibility impacts are anticipated that would create the need for mitigation of Alternative B, Alternative D, or the No Action Alternative. Estimated ROW acquisition is as follows:

- Alternative B would require a total of approximately 29.3 acres of ROW acquisition, which includes 0.3 acre from the southeast corner of the Bryant School District property due to the intersection improvements at Hill Farm Road and 29.0 acres from SUZ. In order to expedite the Land Release process should Alternative B be identified as the Selected Alternative, a preliminary working draft of the Land Release Request for Alternative B was submitted to SUZ and FAA for review in December 2019 and comments were received in March 2020. The City has been working closely with SUZ and FAA to get review and conditional approval of some of the above-mentioned planning documents for Alternative B was reviewed and approved by SUZ then was submitted to FAA in August 2020 for review and comment/approval.
- Alternative D would require a total of approximately 58.4 acres of ROW acquisition; this
 includes 1.7 acres of ROW acquisition from the southeast corner of the Bryant School
 District property due to roadway improvements at County Road 1, 54.1 acres of ROW
 acquisition from SUZ, and 2.6 acres of ROW acquisition from Reynolds Metal Company.
 If Alternative D is identified as the Selected Alternative, the City would need to resubmit
 the appropriate planning documents to SUZ and FAA in order to gain the necessary
 approvals for this route.
- The No Action Alternative would require no ROW acquisition

3.4 Air Quality

The proposed project is located in an area designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as being in attainment for all the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS).

While construction for Alternatives B or D would result in temporary, localized, impacts to air quality due to emissions from construction equipment, these air quality impacts are considered negligible. Moreover, any temporary air quality impacts would be minimized by the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as treating excavated areas with water, covering

haul trucks, maintaining construction vehicles appropriately, using reduced speeds, suspending certain construction activities during high wind conditions, and covering graded areas with stabilizing materials. Overall, no substantial air quality impacts associated with Alternative B, Alternative D, or the No Action Alternative are anticipated during construction.

For each alternative in this EA, the amount of mobile source air toxics (MSAT) emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled (VMT), assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. Because the VMT estimated for the No Action Alternative is higher than for either of the build alternatives, higher levels of MSAT are not expected from either of the build alternatives compared to the No Action Alternative. Refer to **Table 2**. In addition, because the estimated VMT under both of the build alternatives are nearly the same, varying by less than 0.02%, it is expected there would be no appreciable difference in overall MSAT emissions among the two alternatives. Also, regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as a result of the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by over 90% from 2010 to 2050 (Updated Interim Guidance on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents, FHWA, October 12, 2016). Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in virtually all locations.

| Alternative | Length (miles) | VMT |
|---------------|----------------|-----------|
| Alternative B | 2.57 | 5,588,191 |
| Alternative D | 4.20 | 5,586,922 |
| No Action | 0.00 | 5,589,779 |

 Table 2: VMT Comparison from CARTS Travel Demand Model

Source: CARTS 2050 TDM

Under each alternative there may be localized areas where VMT would increase, and other areas where VMT would decrease. Therefore, it is possible that localized increases and decreases in MSAT emissions may occur. The localized increases in MSAT emissions would likely be most pronounced along the new roadway sections that would be built west of the airport under Alternative B, and east of the airport under Alternative D. However, even if these increases do occur, they too will be substantially reduced in the future due to implementation of EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations.

In sum, under both build alternatives in the design year, it is expected there would be reduced MSAT emissions in the immediate area of the project, relative to the No Action Alternative, due to the reduced VMT associated with more direct routing, and due to EPA's MSAT reduction programs.

3.5 Endangered and Threatened Species and Other Wildlife

The USFWS listed three threatened or endangered species as potentially occurring within the APE, which include the following three bird species: Eastern Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis spp. jamaicensis*), Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), and the Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*). A habitat assessment was conducted at the site in October 2018 and **Table 3** lists the habitat present in the alternative footprints. Some of the emergent wetlands impacted by Alternatives B and D may contain suitable habitat for the Eastern Black Rail. There is no critical habitat located within the APE. The official Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) list provided by the USFWS and the habitat assessment conducted for the APE with regards to the federally listed threatened/endangered species are provided in **Appendix C**.

| Species Habitat Requirements | | Habitat Present within Alternative Footprints |
|--|---|--|
| Eastern Black Rail (Laterallus jamaicensis spp. jamaicensis) Proposed | Eastern black rails occupy wetlands and marshes in areas of moist soil or shallow flooding. They require dense vegetative cover that allows movement underneath the canopy, such as rushes, sedges, and grasses. Water must stay shallow (0-3cm) during breeding season, as bicher water levels can flood | A total of approximately 0.12 acre of emergent wetlands would be impacted by Alternative B. These wetlands could contain suitable habitat for the rail. However, based on the scope of the project, distance from known occurrences, and small sizes of individual wetland patches (ranging from 0.01 to 0.11 acre), species impacts are considered to be minimal and unlikely. |
| Threatened | nests and drown chicks. The species is likely a vagrant in Arkansas, passing through during migration. | wetland would be impacted by Alternative D. This wetland could contain suitable habitat for the rail. However, based on the scope of the project and distance from known occurrences, species impacts are considered to be minimal and unlikely. |
| Red Knot | | |
| (Calidris canutus rufa) | Red knots are usually found along mudflats associated with reservoirs. | No mudflats or reservoirs occur within or adjacent to the project site. |
| Threatened | | |
| Piping Plover(Charadrius melodus)Threatened | | No sandbars of major rivers, salt flats, or reservoir mudflats occur within or adjacent to the APE. No suitable habitat surrounding Crooked Creek, which is a relatively small perennial watercourse present within the APE, was observed. |

Table 3: Habitat Summary of USFWS Federally Listed Species within the APE

While no suitable habitat was observed within the APE for the Red Knot or the Piping Plover, according to the preliminary effects determination provided in the Consistency Letter generated by utilizing the Arkansas Determination Key, the proposed project has a May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) determination for all 3 species. These effect determinations become

applicable when the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative submits them as a request to the USFWS to rely on the Arkansas Determination Key in order to satisfy the agency's consultation requirements for this project. For additional details, refer to Appendix C. Concurrence and project clearance will be obtained from USFWS for the Selected Alternative prior to construction.

The ANHC searched their Inventory Research Program files for any of the rare plants and animals, outstanding natural communities, natural or scenic rivers, and other elements of special concern to determine if any such species or communities occur within or near the APE. ANHC found no records indicating reference to any of these resources of concern; however, they did provide Saline and Pulaski County Element lists. The Saline County list identified four species records as occurring within 1 mile of the proposed project and 27 species records occurring within 5 miles. The Pulaski County list identified two species records occurring within 5 miles. Additionally, the records review revealed no occurrences of federally listed species within 1 and 5 miles of the proposed project. Correspondence from ANHC can be found in Appendix C. The AGFC was also contacted (on February 23, 2018) during the course of this EA. No response to date has been received from AGFC.

Based on site visits and review of species habitat requirements, potential habitat occurs within the APE for the state-listed plant species identified below.

- Open-ground whitlow-grass (Draba aprica)
- Small-head pipewort (*Eriocaulon koernickianum*)
- Whorled nut-rush (Scleria verticillata)

Of the above state-listed species of plants, no significant impacts to these species are anticipated as a result of Alternative B, Alternative D, or the No Action Alternative. No rare, unique, or irreplaceable habitats would be impacted by the project. Similar adjacent habitats, which would remain undisturbed, would continue to provide habitat for the area's flora and fauna.

No impacts to migratory birds would occur as a result of the Alternative B, Alternative D, or the No Action Alternative.

3.6 Hazardous Waste

Based on an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) for hazardous waste conducted for the project, brief interviews, federal and state regulatory databases, and site visits, several sources of hazardous materials are present within and adjacent to the APE. Many of these "recognized environmental condition" (REC) sites are from historic mining operations (Figure 7). A copy of the ISA is provided in **Appendix D** and contains an evaluation of each REC site and relevant documents concerning the hazardous materials research and regulatory records.

Sites 1 and 2 in **Figure 10** are Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) American Cyanamid Company sites located within the APE south of the airfield and near the edge of a large tailings pond. This RCRA site is permitted and monitored for the disposal of corrosive materials. The location of this site was determined to consist of two historic burial pits for Thimet Zinophos

insecticide. In 1990, the Environmental Site Assessment conducted for American Cyanamid revealed evidence that the chemical buried at the sites may have migrated beyond the original marked boundaries of the burial pits. These samples were taken 28 years ago, and it is reasonable to assume that further transport has occurred.

Research also identified an area within the APE near the east edge of airport property referred to as the "E-40 pit" (Site 3 in Figure 10) and identified by regulatory records as the Reynolds Mining/Metals Company. The E-40 pit is a historical bauxite mining pit that has two significant deed restrictions associated with it. These deed restrictions were attached to the land sale when SUZ purchased the land from Reynold Metals Company in 2002. The first restriction was the E-40 pit deed restriction due to hazardous materials under the surface and the second deed restriction created a conservation easement. The boundary line applicable to this deed restriction, which is also the presumed limits of this hazardous site, is shown in Figure 10.

A third site of concern (Site 5 in Figure 10) within the APE is the asphalt plant located south of the airfield. This site, which is identified as McGeorge Contracting Company, is a currently operational mobile hot mix asphalt plant. This site is listed in the DEQ database for containing regulated, underground and aboveground petroleum storage tanks.

Other sites of concern are the historic tailings ponds (Sites 6-9 in Figure 10) identified throughout the APE. Known substances mined in this area include bauxite and syenite. Although field reconnaissance revealed no discernable evidence of hazardous materials on the ground surface of these areas, their long history as tailings ponds may result in the potential for concentrated quantities of heavy metals and/or other unknown substances. Risk associated with each "recognized environmental condition" (REC) site is outlined below in **Table 4**.

Agency consultation letters were sent to DEQ requesting notification of any issue or concerns they may have regarding the proposed project. On October 12, 2020, DEQ replied and identified the Reynolds Metals Research and Development (R&D) landfill as an additional potential environmental concern located near the project. The approximate location of this site is shown in Figure 10 and the DEQ consultation letter is provided in Appendix A.

Risk analysis considered the alternative's distance from the REC site, the history and type of REC site, and the REC site's elevation relative to the proposed alternative. Table 4 below shows a summary of each REC site and their risk evaluations for Alternatives B and D, and Figure 10 shows the location of each REC site.

If hazardous materials are identified, observed, or accidentally uncovered during construction, work would be halted, and the appropriate entities would be notified. Prior to resuming construction, the type of contaminant and extent of contamination would be identified. If necessary, a remediation and disposal plan would be developed. All remediation work would be conducted in conformance with the DEQ, EPA, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations.





- Alternative B has the potential to encounter one REC site (REC Site 9), which is a historic tailings pond that may pose a moderate risk to the project.
- Alternative D has the potential to encounter 11 REC sites (REC Sites 1, 3, and 5-13), which include sites associated with insecticide disposal, mining, and registered storage tanks (RSTs). Alternative D is also in close proximity to the Reynolds Metals R&D Landfill site. These sites may pose risks to the project that range from low to high.
- The No Action Alternative would not disturb any soils or remove any existing vegetation.

| Sito | | | Distance from Alternative; El | | |
|------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| No | Facility/Site Name | REC Type | Relative to Alternative; Risk Level | | |
| NO. | | | Alt. B | Alt. D | |
| 1 | Amorican Cyanamid Co | Insocticido Disposal | 1,815 ft; Lower; | 290 ft; Equal; | |
| 1 | American Cyanamic Co. | Insecticide Disposal | None | Mod. to High | |
| 2 | Amorican Cyanamid Co | Incocticido Disposal | 1,480 ft; Lower; | 1,055 ft; Lower; | |
| 2 | American Cyanamic Co. | Insecticide Disposal | None | None | |
| 3 | Reynolds Mining/Metals | Mining | 1,773 ft; Higher; | 7 ft; Higher; | |
| 5 | Co. (E-40 Mine) | Ivining | None | High | |
| 1 | Granite Mountain Quarry | PST* & Mining | 5,503 ft; Higher; | 1,502 ft; Higher; | |
| - | Plant #3 | RST & Minning | None | None | |
| 5 | McGeorge Contracting Co | RST* & Mining | 2,049 ft; Lower; | 805 ft; Higher; | |
| 5 | Medeolige Contracting Co. | | None | Low | |
| 6 | Known Historic Tailings | Mining | 3,120 ft; Lower; | 68 ft; Equal; | |
| 0 | Ponds | | None | Moderate | |
| 7 | Known Historic Tailings | Mining | 3,348 ft; Lower; | 0 ft; Equal; | |
| ' | Ponds | | None | High | |
| 8 | Known Historic Tailings | Mining | 3,260 ft; Lower; | 147 ft; Lower; | |
| | Ponds | | None | Moderate | |
| 9 | Known Historic Tailings | Mining | 146 ft; Higher; | 341 ft; Equal; | |
| | Ponds | | Moderate | Low | |
| 10 | Potentially Contaminated | Mining & Insecticide | 1,328 ft; Lower; | 4 ft; Lower; | |
| | Ponds | Disposal | None | High | |
| 11 | Potentially Contaminated | Mining & Insecticide | 3,360 ft; Lower; | 24 ft; Equal; | |
| | Ponds | Disposal | None | Moderate | |
| 12 | Potentially Contaminated | Mining & Insecticide | 3,546 ft; Lower; | 59 ft; Equal; | |
| 12 | Ponds | Disposal | None | Moderate | |
| 13 | Potentially Contaminated | Mining & Insecticide | 4,255 ft; Lower; | 360 ft; Equal; | |
| .0 | Ponds | Disposal | None | Low | |
| N/A | Reynolds Metals R&D | Landfill | 4,198 ft; Higher; | 128 ft; Higher; | |
| | Landfill | Eanom | None | Low | |

Table 4: Risk Evaluation of each REC Site for Build Alternatives.

*RST - Registered Storage Tank

3.7 Section 6(f) Resources

One city-owned, public park (Alcoa 40 Park) is located immediately adjacent to the northwest end of the APE and Shobe Road (Figure 4 and **Figure 11**). This roughly 40-acre Park includes softball fields, a pee-wee football/multipurpose field, a restroom facility, dog park, meeting room, a paved parking lot, field lighting, fencing, dugouts, press boxes, and bleachers. The property was donated to the City by the Alcoa Corporation in 1978.

According to ADPHT, Alcoa 40 Park received a Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) grant in the past, which qualifies the Park as a Section 6(f) resource.

The proposed roadway for the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project was anticipated to impact 2.42 acres of the Park property. In order to mitigate for these impacts, the City replaced those 2.42 acres with 5.94 acres of undeveloped land located southeast of the original Park boundary (Figure 11). The new acreage will remain encumbered in perpetuity for public outdoor recreation purposes. This land swap was approved in October 2018 and the ADPHT approval letter is located in Appendix A.

As shown in **Figure 12**, Alternatives B and D would temporarily disturb approximately 0.12 acre of Alcoa 40 Park as a result of slope grading during construction of the roadway. Additionally, approximately 0.18 acre of the southern portion of Alcoa 40 Park would be excavated in order to improve the floodway. Details on floodway excavation is provided in **Section 3.14**.

All disturbances to the 6(f) property would be temporary in nature and these areas would still be available for Park use after temporary disturbances are complete. Additionally, the limits of the permanent roadway ROW would not extend into the 6(f) Park property. ADPHT is aware of the two small land disturbance areas described above and stated that there appears to be no permanent disturbance to, or compromise of, this public recreation resource. ADPHT also stated that so long as the disturbance is temporary and that no 6(f)-encumbered land is permanently compromised by the resulting structure, which is the case, they have no issue with the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project going forward at this time. Correspondence with ADPHT is provided in Appendix A.

- Alternatives B and D have identical temporarily ground disturbances to a 6(f) resource (totaling to 0.3 acre), which have been approved by the ADPHT.
- The No Action Alternative would not impact Alcoa 40 Park.



Figure 11: Alcoa 40 Park Land Swap



Figure 12: Alcoa 40 Park Disturbances

3.8 Section 4(f) Resources

Alcoa 40 Park is also a Section 4(f) resource because it is a city-owned, public park. Details on this Park are provided in **Section 3.7**.

Identical, minor and temporary impacts to Alcoa 40 Park would occur as a result of Alternatives B or D. As shown in Figure 12, Alternatives B and D would temporarily disturb approximately 0.12 acre of Alcoa 40 Park as a result of slope grading during construction of the roadway. The limits of the permanent roadway ROW would not extend into the Park property. Additionally, approximately 0.18 acre of the southern portion of Alcoa 40 Park would be excavated in order to improve the floodway. Details on floodway excavation is provided in **Section 3.14**.

A Section 4(f) *de minimis* evaluation, which is provided in **Appendix E**, was conducted to assess potential impacts. The land disturbance required by the proposed project does not affect any existing Park facilities or usage.

No substantial impacts to visual quality associated with the build alternatives are anticipated as the Park is currently adjacent to Shobe Road. Some trees would remain between the proposed Bryant Pkwy. and the Park and also between Bryant Pkwy. and the adjacent residential subdivision. No screening level Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) threshold noise impacts to the Park are anticipated. Details on this noise impacts are provided in **Section 3.10**.

- As detailed above, Alternatives B and D would have identical *de minimis* impacts to Alcoa 40 Park.
- The No Action Alternative would not impact to Alcoa 40 Park.

3.9 Cultural Resources

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 requires that an initial review be made in order to determine if any properties in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are within the APE. The U.S. National Park Service (NPS) is responsible for maintaining the NRHP, and the Department of Arkansas Heritage is responsible for implementing the National Historic Preservation Act within the state. The NPS listed 18 properties in Saline County on the NRHP. None of these properties are located within or adjacent to the APE.

On April 18, 2018, the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program responded to the agency consultation letter concerning the project and stated that the proposed undertaking would have a No Effect determination on historic properties and that no cultural resource surveys are required. However, with the project being on new location, the SHPO clearance is not sufficient from a cultural resources standpoint. Therefore, a Phase I cultural resources survey that included shovel tests was conducted for Alternative B. No historic properties were identified. The survey report documenting the results of the survey, quantifying impacts to historic properties, and stating recommendations was submitted to the SHPO for review. As no historic properties were identified, a recommendation of no further work was submitted to the SHPO. On January 10, 2021, SHPO concurred with a finding of no historic properties affected. Cultural resource information is provided in **Appendix F**.

On December 8, 2020, FHWA initiated consultation with Native American tribes. Two responses (from the Quapaw Nation and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma) were received (see Appendix A). Neither tribe/band anticipates the project will adversely impact any cultural resource or human remains but both ask that work cease immediately and they be contacted if artifacts or human remains are discovered during construction. In the event that Native American artifacts or human remains are encountered during construction, work will be stopped and the appropriate Native American tribe(s) will be contacted immediately.

3.10 Noise

Noise is considered as unwanted or excessive sound that is not desirable. Traffic noise effects occur primarily as a result of a vehicle's tires, engine and exhaust. These noises are measured in decibels (dB) in terms of A-weighted noise or dBA. Excessive noise can hinder speech, disrupt sleep, cause hearing loss and be an annoyance. As a result, criteria has been established to help protect the public from certain noise effects for federal-aid projects, which includes projects on new location. Federal-aid highways/roadways on new location are considered Type 1 projects and therefore require a noise analysis. The ARDOT's *Policy on Highway Traffic Noise Abatement* was utilized to determine potential noise impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following methodology provided in the ARDOT noise policy, a screening level noise analysis (screening analysis) was conducted for Alternatives B and D and the No-Action Alternative. Additionally, a detailed traffic noise analysis was conducted for Alternative B and the full report is provided in **Appendix G**. Traffic noise was evaluated using the Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5 software, which is one of two software versions mandated for use by the FHWA where a noise analysis is warranted.

The noise sensitive receptors (receptors) identified for the project area include a few scattered residences, portions of two subdivisions (Cherry Creek and Hidden Forest Subdivisions), and the Alcoa 40 Park. Residences are classified as NAC activity category B and public parks are classified as NAC activity category C land uses. The NAC noise impact level for both of these categories is 66 dBA. The screening analysis and traffic noise analysis utilized the 2040 future design year traffic volumes of ADT and Design Hourly Volumes (DHV) to determine the noisiest traffic hour for future anticipated sound levels.

For screening analysis purposes, the ARDOT noise policy requires determining noise levels within 4 dBA of the applicable NAC value (63 dBA for categories B and C). Screening analysis results indicated the 63 dBA threshold would not be reached outside of the proposed ROW; therefore, a detailed traffic noise analysis would typically not be warranted. However, it was determined that substantial noise level increases (\geq 10 dBA) had reasonable potential to occur. A detailed traffic noise analysis was therefore performed for Alternative B. Because of the partial shared alignment between Alternatives B and D near receptors, potential substantial increase impacts were considered similar between these alternatives. Alternative D extends further away from sensitive land uses as compared to Alternative B after diverging from the shared alignment with Alternative B.

The detailed traffic noise analysis indicated that no residential dwellings at the intersection of existing Bryant Pkwy. and Shobe Road would approach, meet, or exceed the 66 dBA noise impact level under future build conditions. No substantial noise level increases were predicted for Alternative B, Alternative D along the shared alignment, or the No Action Alternative. No residential dwellings are impacted under existing conditions. For the No Action Alternative, existing ambient noise levels would remain unchanged. Any future noise level increases would be attributable to an increase in traffic on surrounding roadways and development in the area.

No screening level NAC threshold noise impacts to public recreation features located within Alcoa 40 Park are anticipated as there would be lower speeds associated with Alternatives B and D at the intersection of Shobe Road. Shobe Road, an existing city street, is located adjacent to the north side of the Park; therefore, the noise environment would only change minimally. The noise analysis conducted for the project indicated traffic noise levels would not approach, meet or exceed the ARDOT NAC activity category C threshold of 66 dBA for facilities within the Park. Substantial impact criteria defined by ARDOT may be exceeded for portions of the Park; however, those areas are not currently considered public gathering areas. The traffic noise analysis report provided in Appendix G includes a noise level results comparison table for each alternative.

For either build alternative, potential noise level increases associated with construction equipment and delivery of supplies may temporarily occur. However, such increases would have minimal to minor adverse effects on land uses and activities in the project area.

3.11 Community

There are no residences located within the APE. However, there are residential neighborhoods located adjacent to the APE. Approximately 20% of the population within the area around the airport is estimated by the U.S. Census Bureau to consist of minorities. This value is below the state average of 27% for minorities. The median household income for the block groups within the APE, which range from \$47,019 to \$91,657, are well above the 2019 poverty guidelines (of \$25,750 for a family of four) established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Thus, there are no Environmental Justice (EJ) populations of concern for this project. Additionally, none of the alternatives evaluated in this EA would require residential or business acquisitions or relocations.

Two schools are located within or adjacent to the APE. Hill Farm Elementary is located immediately north of Hill Farm Road and adjacent to the APE. Access to this facility is provided by Hill Road and Hill Farm Road. Bryant Junior High School is located immediately south of Hill Farm Road and within the APE. Access to this facility is provided by Hill Farm Road and by County Road 1. Reduced speed limits in established school zones are used to manage pedestrian safety.

An FAA-approved perimeter security fence would be placed on the east side of the proposed ROW of Alternative B with gates at predetermined airport access points. This fence would provide public safety and security for the airport. Similarly, appropriately placed perimeter security fencing would be provided for Alternative D.

Neither of the alternatives would disrupt established communities or planned developments, essential community services, or travel patterns during construction. This is due to the existing city street connections carrying school and residential traffic to Hwy. 183 and other neighboring connecting streets.

Hill Farm Elementary is located immediately north of Hill Farm Road, and Bryant Junior High School is located immediately south of Hill Farm Road.

- Alternative B would route Bryant Pkwy. along the west side of the airport and then connect to Hill Farm Road. This could result in increased traffic along Hill Farm Road; however, a designated school zone serving both the elementary and the junior high schools would remain in place.
- Alternative D would route Bryant Pkwy. along the east side of the airport and then connect to County Road 1. This could result in increased traffic along County Road 1, which is also within a school zone serving Bryant Junior High School.
- The No Action Alternative would likely result in increased traffic and/or congestion on existing roadways due to increasing traffic volumes resulting from population growth.

3.12 Visual Quality

The project corridor includes some rolling hills with scattered industrial, commercial, and residential development. Most of the residences that are immediately adjacent to the north end of the APE, those on Cherry Creek Circle (in Cherry Creek subdivision), would have a partial view of Alternatives B or D once constructed, especially those residents that do not currently have privacy fencing in their backyard. A few of the residences on Pleasant View Court (in Hidden Forest subdivision) may also be able to see Alternative B once constructed, although all of these residents have privacy fencing. The remaining neighborhoods adjacent to the APE are blocked from view of Alternatives B or D by forested areas. Figure 5 shows the location of the two abovementioned subdivisions.

Light emissions within the APE primarily originate from SUZ. The airport is illuminated by various types of landside and airside lighting for buildings, access roadways, automobile parking areas, apron areas, and the runway. Alcoa 40 Park (adjacent to the north end of the APE with ballfield lighting for night games) and the two schools (near the southwest corner of the APE) also produce some light emission.

Both Alternatives B and D have the potential to result in minor visual impacts from the placement of a new roadway in close proximity to residential areas and Alcoa 40 Park, primarily as a result of tree removal and landscape grading. These elements would result in a noticeable reduction of trees and a change in view from the 11 adjacent residences of the Cherry Creek subdivision. However, as existing transportation facilities are already part of the visual landscape, minimal visual quality impacts are anticipated for these neighbors. Additionally, local planning and development guidelines would be taken into consideration during final design to ensure visual compatibility of the proposed project. The proposed pedestrian and bicycle trail alongside the north end of both Alternatives B and D would result in positive impacts as it would allow users to see more elements of the surrounding landscape and provide a view of Crooked Creek. Adverse impacts to overall visual quality are expected to be minimal as a result of the project.

- For Alternative B, impacts may be adverse for the 11 properties in the Cherry Creek subdivision, for Alcoa 40 Park, and potentially for a few residences in the Hidden Forest subdivision (which is located further south and west of Alternative B) for whom views of the roadway would become more prominent. No other neighbors are anticipated to have the ability to detect a change in landscape.
- For Alternative D, impacts may be adverse for the 11 properties in the Cherry Creek subdivision and for Alcoa 40 Park. Under Alternative D, the parkway would not come into close proximity to the Hidden Forest subdivision.
- The No Action Alternative would result in no changes in visual quality.

3.13 Wetlands and Surface Waters

An initial coordination letter to the USACE and a Wetland Delineation report were submitted on November 9, 2018. The wetland delineation study area was centered around Alternative B. As summarized in **Table 5**, a total of nine wetlands and portions of six streams were delineated within the study area for Alternative B. Wetlands located within the study area for Alternative B wetlands located within the study area for Alternative B. Wetlands located within the study area for Alternative B also contains a total of 1,814 linear feet of ephemeral drainages and 364 linear feet of one perennial stream (Crooked Creek). **Figure 13**, which identifies wetlands with a capital "W" followed by a numerical identifier and streams as "OW", shows the locations of these aquatic features. A field verification site visit by USACE was completed on January 31, 2019 and a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination (PJD) was issued for Alternative B on March 25, 2019. One of the originally identified streams (OW 1) was removed as a stream according to the USACE. An Approved Jurisdictional Determination is being requested based on the new Clean Water Act "Navigable Waters Protection Rule" that went into effect June 22, 2020. Refer to Appendix A regarding agency coordination and **Appendix H** for the wetland delineation report, details associated with each hydrologic feature, exhibits, and PJD.

A desktop review of wetlands and surface waters for Alternative D indicates a total of nine wetlands and portions of two streams (shown in **Figure 14**) are within, or adjacent to, the footprint for Alternative D. Wetlands within the vicinity of Alternative D consist of four emergent wetlands totaling approximately 7.7 acres, two forested wetlands totaling approximately 2.6 acres, and three ponds totaling approximately 77.6 acres. Alternative D also contains 1,187 linear feet of one ephemeral stream and 364 linear feet of one perennial stream (Crooked Creek).

| Alternetive | Wetlands (acres)* | | | Streams (linear feet)** | | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|-----|------|-------------------------|-----|-----|-------|-------|
| Alternative | PEM | PFO | PUB | Total | Per | Int | Eph | Total |
| Alternative B | 0.6 | 3.8 | 0 | 4.4 | 364 | 0 | 1,814 | 2,178 |
| Alternative D | 7.7 | 2.6 | 77.6 | 87.9 | 364 | 0 | 1,187 | 1,551 |
| No Action | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 5: Wetland and Stream Habitat Present

* PEM - Emergent Wetland; PFO - Forested Wetland; PUB - Pond or Open Water Wetland ** Per - Perennial; Int - Intermittent; Eph - Ephemeral

For either build alternative, a Section 404 Individual Permit from the USACE would be required for the project as aquatic resource impacts exceed thresholds allowed under a Nationwide Permit. Wetland and stream impacts are not considered significant as unavoidable impacts would be mitigated through the purchase of wetland and stream credits from a USACE-approved mitigation bank.

- Based on the PJD received from USACE (Appendix H) and the wetland delineation conducted for Alternative B, these improvements would impact (primarily by fill) approximately 0.13 acre of emergent wetlands, 1.75 acres of forested wetlands, 1,324 linear feet of ephemeral drainage ways, and 364 linear feet of Crooked Creek (Figure 13). The majority of the impacts to wetlands and streams are anticipated to be permanent, including the widening of Crooked Creek by 15 feet to the south as required for floodway improvements. An estimated 17.6 wetland credits and 1,238 stream credits would be purchased from a mitigation bank to comply with Section 404 guidelines. The project is within the primary service area of five mitigation banks, four of which appear to have adequate wetland and stream credits available for purchase.
- Based on a desktop delineation of Alternative D, proposed improvements would impact approximately 0.51 acre of emergent wetlands and 1.69 acres of forested wetlands (Figure 14). Stream impacts are estimated to be identical to Alternative B. The number of required wetland and stream mitigation credits are estimated to be identical to Alternative B.
- The No Action Alternative would have no impact on wetlands or streams.

Temporary/short-term, minor, construction-related impacts to surface waters within the disturbed areas may occur. Best Management Practice (BMP) measures and specifications of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5370-10H would be implemented to avoid and/or minimize adverse construction activities on the airport-owned lands. A large site Construction Stormwater Permit (ARR150000) from DEQ, which requires a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), would be necessary for either build alternative.



Figure 13: Wetland and Stream Impacts for Alternative B



Figure 14: Wetland and Stream Impacts for Alternative D

A Short Term Activity Authorization (STAA) from DEQ would be obtained for each stream crossing. The appropriate Section 401 water quality certification also shall be obtained in conjunction with the required Section 404 permit. Both build alternatives would require STAAs, a Section 401 water quality certification, and a Section 404 permit.

Based on information provided by the ADH (Appendix A), there are no active wellhead protection areas or drinking water sources within 5 miles of the project area. No groundwater impacts are anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Neither Alternative B nor Alternative D is expected to impact any wells or groundwater resources. Project-specific BMPs and SWPPPs would be designed for the Selected Alternative to prevent or minimize the potential release of contaminants into surface waters and/or groundwater.

- Alternative B would disturb approximately 40 acres of land during construction and have only minor water quality impacts from stormwater discharges due to the implementation of BMPs.
- Alternative D would disturb approximately 35 acres of land during construction. This alternative would also implement BMPs and have similar water quality impacts as Alternative B.
- The No Action Alternative would not impact water quality, disturb any soils, or remove any existing vegetation.

3.14 Floodplains

Floodplains, as identified by FEMA, are present at each end of the APE. A total of 13.2 acres of floodplain/floodway associated with Crooked Creek occur at the north end of the APE. Of those 13.2 acres, 7.0 acres are designated as Regulatory Floodway (**Figure 15**). Additionally, 90.6 acres of floodplain (Zone A) associated with Hurricane Creek occur at the south end of the APE.

Both Alternatives B and D would impact approximately 0.62 acre of regulatory floodway and 1.28 acres of the 1% Annual Chance Flood Hazard area associated with Crooked Creek. These impacts include earthen embankment and concrete fill for bridge abutments and bridge piers. An additional 1.67 acres of the floodplain would be excavated for floodway improvements (**Figure 16**) associated with either build alternative.

A bridge configuration and a hydraulic model that meets the requirements of FEMA and the city's floodplain requirements has been developed as required by both build alternatives. The proposed bridge would cause the base flood elevation to be higher than existing conditions in locations upstream of the bridge. As a result, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) was submitted to FEMA to review the proposed project. The CLOMR was approved by FEMA in November 2019 (Appendix A). As part of FEMA's CLOMR process, public notifications and property owner letters were sent out prior to approval of the CLOMR to allow the public the opportunity to comment on the proposed floodplain changes. A copy of this notice is provided in **Appendix I**. A Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) would be submitted to FEMA following construction of the bridge and as-built surveys would be performed on the completed structure to ensure the bridge was constructed consistently with the CLOMR. If consistent, a LOMR would be issued by FEMA.



Figure 15: Floodplains and Floodways Present in the APE



Figure 16: Floodway Improvements Required for Both Alternative B and Alternative D

Additionally, design features for either build alternative may include placing drainage structures below temporary access roads in order to convey drainage under these roads. These features would be constructed near grade and would meet the City's drainage criteria for temporary roadway crossings within a Special Flood Hazard Area as well as Section 404 permit conditions.

Overall, the project would be designed to minimize adverse impacts to the floodplain's natural and beneficial values. Implementation of either Alternative B or Alternative D also would follow any local or state floodplain management plans, and coordination with the Local Floodplain Administrator would take place for concurrence of the grading plan and project approval.

- With regards to the floodplain associated with Crooked Creek, Alternative B and Alternative D would have identical impacts to floodplains, which are detailed above.
- Alternative D would have additional impacts (approximately 11 acres) to the floodplain associated with Hurricane Creek and would require coordination with the Local Floodplain Administrator and FEMA.
- The No Action Alternative would have no impact on floodplains and would not require a LOMR.

3.15 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

Indirect effects are reasonably foreseeable effects that may be caused by the project but would occur in the future or outside of the project area. Cumulative impacts are defined as the impact on the environment which results from the incremental direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other action (CFR 40 §1508.7).

Both Alternative B and D would have the potential for stormwater runoff due to ground disturbance during construction and, therefore, may temporarily cause indirect impacts to surface water quality. These temporary impacts would likely include increased rates of sedimentation in some areas or even sources of surface water pollutants such as petroleum or related pollutants from construction vehicles. However, BMP measures would be implemented as part of the design and construction of the project to avoid and/or reduce indirect impacts to surrounding resources resulting from stormwater runoff. The No Action Alternative would not result in any indirect impacts to surface water quality.

The Bryant Pkwy. Extension project may encourage additional development in SUZ's vicinity as the City of Bryant continues to grow. Zoning regulations are in place to ensure that new development is compatible with the surrounding environment. The additional connectivity and increased access provided by either build alternative would increase the potential for economic growth in the eastern and southern areas of the City of Bryant. Undeveloped land along the Bryant Pkwy. corridor would have increased potential for development due to direct access to a minor arterial street and enhanced access to I-30 and Hwy. 183 south of Bryant. However, the surrounding constraints (existing development, RPZs, and deed restricted areas) are anticipated to limit the extent of induced growth and any resulting impacts are not anticipated to be substantial

for either build alternative. The No Action Alternative would not result in any indirect impacts due to induced growth.

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects at SUZ and the surrounding vicinity were evaluated to determine the cumulative impacts on the environment as a result of these projects. The ALP, Airport Layout Drawing, Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and other sources were used to identify other projects occurring in the vicinity of the proposed project. The entire Airport has been developed within the last 12 years, which is the temporal limit established for past projects with regards to cumulative effects. Reasonably foreseeable actions are those planned to occur within the next 5 years.

Recent past actions include:

- Construction of SUZ in 2007 as a publicly owned and operated airfield. The current terminal building was constructed between 2014 and 2015. Hangars and other storage buildings were constructed on the airport between 2006 and 2009, with additional hangars and apron expansion occurring between 2008 and the present. The existing airfield configuration has remained unchanged since 2017. Environmental impacts included new ground disturbance, tree clearing, and some changes to the viewshed. Construction of SUZ received a FONSI from FAA in 2002.
- Construction of Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1), a 1-mile long roadway on new alignment that extends from Raymar Road south to Shobe Road. Environmental impacts included wetland and stream impacts, new ground disturbance, tree clearing, and some changes to the viewshed.
- Construction of Bryant Junior High School (an approximately 50-acre site) near the intersection of Hill Farm Road and Hwy. 183 within the APE. Impacts resulting from the development of this site were presumably minimal as no apparent wetlands or streams were impacted and very little tree clearing was required as much of the land previously functioned as pastureland.
- Construction of a fire station near the intersection of Hill Farm Road and Hwy. 183. Besides new ground disturbance, little to no environmental impacts appear to have resulted from the development of this previously-cleared site.
- Construction of Bryant Pkwy. from Hwy. 5 to Hilldale Road, which is located north of I-30 between Hwy. 5 and Hilldale Road/Hilltop Road intersection. This transportation project on new alignment was recently completed. Only minimal stream impacts occurred as a result of this project.

Reasonably foreseeable future actions include:

 Construction of multiple on-site buildings, easement acquisition, and upgrading the Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS) at SUZ. These improvements (planned buildings consist of two T-Hangars, two corporate hangars, and a maintenance building), the easement acquisitions for Runway 02 RPZ, and the AWOS upgrade would have only minimal environmental impacts as there would be no new ground disturbance.

- Grading and construction of additional paved areas at SUZ. Improvements near the
 existing facilities include construction of a corporate access road with an expanded
 parking area, relocation of Taxiway B, extension of the runway and taxiway (phase I),
 expansion of the main apron (phase I), and RSA grading improvements. These future
 projects would require new ground disturbance, would result in minor changes to the
 landscape and viewshed, but are not anticipated to impact wetlands, streams, biological
 resources, or hazardous materials.
- Widening Hwy. 5 at two locations: from I-30 to Alcoa Road (approximately 1.5 miles) and from Hwy. 183 to the Pulaski County line (approximately 3.5 miles). Widening Hwy. 5 for a total of approximately 5 miles would require impacts to streams during culvert extensions or replacements and would also likely require new and/or temporary ROW. Additionally, wetlands and protected-species habitat may be impacted, and changes to visual resources are anticipated.
- Construction of the Bryant Pkwy. Roundabout at the Hilldale Road/Hilltop Road intersection, the north end of existing Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1). This transportation project would require little to no tree clearing and only minimal stream impacts.
- Construction of a shared-use trail through Alcoa 40 Park to connect the shared-use path constructed adjacent to the existing Bryant Pkwy. (Project 1) to the shared-use path proposed by this Bryant Pkwy. Extension project. The City received a Transportation Alternatives Program grant from Metroplan in February 2020 for the construction of this shared-use trail through the Park. Plans and NEPA documentation for this trail would be developed separately from this Bryant Pkwy. Extension project. The trail is planned to begin construction in early 2021. Environmental impacts would include new ground disturbance and may involve ephemeral stream impacts. Although construction of the trail would occur within a Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resource, the project would benefit the park and would not be considered a Section 4(f)/6(f) "use".

Overall, cumulative impacts of the recent past and reasonably foreseeable future actions, combined with impacts from Alternative B include increased runoff from additional paved surfaces and minor visual impacts. Additionally, temporary, short-term increases in ambient noise levels would occur during construction. However, these cumulative impacts are anticipated to be insignificant as they are minor and/or temporary. Thus, Alternative B would have only minor cumulative impacts on the surrounding natural or man-made environment. No adverse impacts are expected.

Cumulative impacts associated with Alternative D are similar to those of Alternative B but would have additional adverse impacts expected from encountering significantly more sites potentially containing hazardous materials.

The No Action Alternative would not result in any cumulative impacts.

4.0 **Results and Recommendations**

4.1 **Preferred Alternative**

Table 6 summarizes impacts of the alternatives for comparison purposes. Impacts associated with air quality, land use, community impacts, groundwater, and indirect and cumulative impacts are not presented in the table as these resource categories would incur negligible impacts and/or have no discernable differences between the build alternatives. Overall, the environmental analysis of the proposed project did not identify any significant impacts to the natural and social environment as a result of the build alternatives or the No Action Alternative.

Alternative B has been identified as the Preferred Alternative for the Bryant Pkwy. Extension project. Alternative B was identified as the Preferred Alternative for the project for the following reasons:

- Requires less risk regarding hazardous waste sites than Alternative D
- Requires less wetland impacts, floodplain impacts, and ROW acquisition than Alternative D
- Is outside all of the airport safety restricted zones and does not impact future SUZ development
- Travel distance between Shobe Road and Hwy. 183 is shorter than Alternative D which results in reduced travel times
- Best balances the benefits of the project to the overall project impacts
- Fully meets the purpose and need of the project

Overall, Alternative B would provide enhanced movement of traffic, pedestrians/bicyclists, and emergency vehicles around the City of Bryant, and would additionally provide improved access to SUZ.

| Resource Category | No Action Alternative | Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) | Alternative D |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| Protected Species | "No Effect" | "May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect" for 3 bird species | "May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect" for 3 bird species |
| Section 6(f) | None | 0.3 acre of temporary ground disturbances (ADPHT approval obtained) | 0.3 acre of temporary ground disturbances (ADPHT approval obtained) |
| Section 4(f) | No impacts | <i>de minimi</i> s impacts to Alcoa 40 Park | <i>de minimi</i> s impacts to Alcoa 40 Park |
| REC Sites Encountered* | 0 sites | 1 site | 8 sites |
| Approx. ROW Acquisition | 0 acres | 29.3 acres | 58.4 acres |

Table 6: Summary of Impacts

| Resource Category | No Action Alternative | Alternative B (Preferred Alternative) | Alternative D |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| Noise Impact | None | None | None |
| Visual Quality | No changes | Changes visible by 2 subdivisions | Changes visible by 1 subdivision |
| Water Quality Impact | None | Minor and temporary during construction | Minor and temporary during construction |
| Wetlands | 0 acres | 1.9 acres | 2.2 acres |
| Streams | 0 linear feet | 1,688 linear feet total | 1,688 linear feet total |
| Floodplains | 0 acres | 3.6 acres | 14.6 acres |
| Cost** | \$0 | \$18.2 million | \$23.5 million |

* Count of only those Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) Sites with a Moderate or High Risk. ** Total estimated planning, engineering, and construction cost

4.2 Commitments and Mitigation Measures

- Plans and specifications for any water and sewer utility relocations, etc., shall be submitted to and approved by the Engineering Section of the ADH prior to beginning construction.
- FAA approval of the Land Release Request and release of the ROW needed to construct Bryant Pkwy. will be obtained.
- An executed Joint Use Agreement with UPRR will be obtained prior to construction.
- Entergy Encroachment Agreement between the City and Entergy will be executed prior to construction.
- Work will be stopped and the appropriate Native American tribe(s) will be contacted immediately in the event that Native American artifacts or human remains are encountered.
- Concurrence and project clearance will be obtained from USFWS prior to construction.
- The Section 4(f) *de minimis* evaluation will be approved by FHWA prior to construction.
- If hazardous materials are identified, observed, or accidentally uncovered during construction, work will be halted, and the appropriate entities will be notified. Prior to resuming construction, the type of contaminant and extent of contamination would be identified. If necessary, a remediation and disposal plan will be developed. All remediation work would be conducted in conformance with the DEQ, EPA, and OSHA regulations.
- All borrow pits, waste areas, and work roads will be surveyed for historic properties when locations become available.
- Construction is to occur primarily during daylight hours.
- The City will complete and maintain a construction SWPPP and associated BMP measures throughout the duration of disturbance activities.

- A STAA from DEQ will be obtained for each stream crossing.
- A Section 404 Individual Permit from USACE and Section 401 water quality certification shall be obtained prior to construction. The appropriate quantity (to be determined by USACE) of wetland and stream credits will be purchased from a mitigation bank to comply with Section 404 guidelines. The project is within the primary service area of five mitigation banks, four of which appear to have adequate wetland and stream credits available for purchase.
- The City will comply with all federal, state, and local floodplain regulations, Executive Orders, and permitting requirements.
- A LOMR will be submitted to FEMA following construction of the bridge and as-built surveys will be performed on the completed structure to ensure the bridge was constructed consistently with the CLOMR. If consistent, a LOMR will be issued by FEMA.

4.3 Required Permits

- A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) stormwater discharge permit will be obtained from DEQ.
- A Section 404 Individual Permit will be obtained from USACE.
- Section 401 Individual Water Quality Certification will be obtained.
- Floodplain permit.

4.4 Public Involvement

A public meeting was held on April 26, 2018 at Hill Farm Elementary School in Bryant. Interested parties were able to ask additional questions and make comments on each of the five original proposed alignments. Nine formal comments were received. See Appendix I for details and a summary of comments received. At the time of the public meeting, a lead federal agency had not yet been determined.

As part of FEMA's CLOMR process, newspaper notifications and property owner letters were sent out in October 2019, prior to approval of the CLOMR, to allow the public the opportunity to comment on the proposed floodplain changes. A copy of this notice is provided in Appendix I.

4.5 Concluding the NEPA Process

If this EA is approved by the FHWA for public dissemination, a public hearing would be held. After a review of comments received from citizens, public officials, and public agencies as a result of the public hearing, a FONSI document would be prepared and submitted to the FHWA or the project would be recommended for an Environmental Impact Statement study if significant, unmitigable impacts are determined to be present. If FHWA issues a FONSI, it would identify the Selected Alternative and conclude the NEPA process.

5.0 References

Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT). 2016. Interchange Justification Report.

- Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT). 2018. Corridor Study for Bryant on Reynolds Road/Highway 183.
- Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT). 2018. Policy on Highway Traffic Noise Abatement.
- City of Bryant. 27 June 2017. City of Bryant Official Zoning Map. Ordinance 2017-14.
- City of Bryant. 2017. Bryant Master Bike and Pedestrian Plan.
- Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). 1994. 7 CFR § 657.5.
- Garver. 2001. Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Relocation of the Saline County Airport. 311 pages.
- Garver. 2017. Feasibility Study: Bryant Parkway Reynolds Road to Shobe Road. 37 pages.
- Garver. 2017. Traffic Study: Bryant Parkway I-30 to Shobe Road. 586 pages.
- Garver. 2019. Traffic Study: Bryant Parkway Hill Farm Road to Shobe Road. 219 pages.
- Metroplan. 2016. Web. www.metroplan.org
- Niche.com Inc. 2018. Largest School Districts in Arkansas. Web. https://www.niche.com/k12/search/largest-school-districts/s/arkansas/
- Saline County Planning Board. 2002. Ordinance No. 2002-077, Zoning Ordinance to Limit Height of Objects around the Saline County Airport. Available online at: https://www.salinecounty.org/plugins/show_image.php?id=127
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2018. American FactFinder. Web. https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2019. Web Soil Survey. Web. https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1994. 7.5 minute, 1:24,000 scale Bryant, Arkansas. Topographic Quadrangle Map.