

Prepared by:



Federal Highway
Administration



River Valley Regional
Intermodal Facilities
Authority

and



Arkansas State Highway
and Transportation
Department

In cooperation with:



Little Rock District,
U.S. Army Corps of
Engineers

River Valley Intermodal Facilities

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

February 2006



**River Valley Intermodal Facilities
Pope County, Arkansas
Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

Submitted pursuant to: 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)
49 U.S.C. 303
23 U.S.C. 138

by the
U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration
and the
Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department

3/8/06
Date


Chairman, River Valley Intermodal Facility Authority

3/13/06
Date


Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department

3/13/06
Date


Federal Highway Administration

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

Randal J. Looney
Environmental Specialist
700 West Capitol Avenue, Room 3130
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3298
(501)324-6430

Sid Brain
Chairman, River Valley Intermodal Facility Authority
708 West Main Street
Russellville, Arkansas 72801
(479)858-6555

This is a project to construct an intermodal facility in Pope County, Arkansas. The River Valley Intermodal Facility Authority seeks to establish intermodal facilities to promote economic development, transportation capacity, competitiveness, and job creation in the Arkansas River Valley.

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE.....	1-1
-----	-----------------------------------	-----

SECTION 2: PURPOSE AND NEED

2.1	INTRODUCTION	2-1
2.2	PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION.....	2-4
2.3	NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-4

SECTION 3: ALTERNATIVES

3.1	PROJECT AREA AND POTENTIAL ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS.....	3-1
3.1.1	Introduction.....	3-1
3.1.2	General Location	3-1
3.2	ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS	3-1
3.2.1	Alternative Screening Criteria	3-1
3.2.2	Analysis of Potential Alternatives	3-2
3.2.3	Discussion of Alternatives Considered But Determined Not Viable	3-5
3.2.3.1	Pittsburg Road (Yellow) Alternative.....	3-5
3.2.3.2	Bend (Purple) Alternative	3-5
3.2.3.3	Kenner Cove (Blue) Alternative.....	3-6
3.2.3.4	New Hope (Pink) Alternative	3-7
3.2.3.5	Atkins Bottoms (Orange) Alternative	3-8
3.2.3.6	Blackwell Bottoms (Black) Alternative	3-9
3.2.3.7	Morrilton (Brown) Alternative.....	3-9
3.2.4	Discussion of Alternatives Considered and Determined Viable	3-10
3.2.4.1	North Dardanelle (Red) Alternative	3-10
3.2.4.2	Russellville Bottoms (Green) Alternative	3-11
3.3	SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE EIS	3-14
3.3.1	Description of Alternatives	3-14
3.3.1.1	No Action Alternative.....	3-14
3.3.1.2	North Dardanelle (Red) Alternative	3-14
3.3.1.3	Russellville Bottoms (Green) Alternative	3-15

SECTION 4: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

4.1	INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.1.1	Affected Environment.....	4-1
4.1.2	Environmental Consequences	4-2
4.1.2.1	Direct vs. Indirect Impacts	4-2
4.1.2.2	Significance	4-2

4.1.3	Cumulative Impacts	4-3
4.1.3.1	Definitions Used in Cumulative Analysis	4-4
4.1.3.2	Past and Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions.....	4-7
4.2	LAND USE AND INFRASTRUCTURE.....	4-12
4.2.1	Affected Environment.....	4-12
4.2.1.1	Land Use Planning and Zoning	4-12
4.2.1.2	Highway and Roadway Network.....	4-14
4.2.1.3	Railroads.....	4-17
4.2.1.4	Utilities	4-17
4.2.2	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-18
4.2.3	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-18
4.2.4	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the Green Alternative .	4-20
4.2.5	Mitigation	4-20
4.3	FARMLAND, SOILS, AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	4-21
4.3.1	Affected Environment.....	4-21
4.3.2	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	4-22
4.3.3	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-22
4.3.4	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the Green Alternative	4-24
4.3.5	Mitigation	4-25
4.4	SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT	4-25
4.4.1	Affected Environment.....	4-25
4.4.1.1	Population and Housing	4-25
4.4.1.2	Neighborhood and Community Cohesion.....	4-26
4.4.1.3	Public Services	4-26
4.4.1.4	Environmental Justice.....	4-26
4.4.2	Potential Social Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	4-28
4.4.3	Potential Social Consequences of the Red Alternative.....	4-28
4.4.4	Potential Social Consequences of the Green Alternative	4-29
4.4.5	Mitigation	4-30
4.5	RELOCATION	4-30
4.5.1	Affected Environment.....	4-30
4.5.2	Potential Consequences of Relocation of the No Action Alternative.....	4-30
4.5.3	Potential Consequences of Relocation of the Red Alternative.....	4-31
4.5.4	Potential Consequences of Relocation of the Green Alternative	4-31
4.5.5	Mitigation	4-32
4.6	ECONOMIC.....	4-32

4.6.1	Affected Environment.....	4-32
4.6.2	Potential Economic Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-33
4.6.3	Potential Economic Consequences of the Red Alternative.....	4-33
4.6.4	Potential Economic Consequences of the Green Alternative	4-36
4.6.5	Mitigation	4-36
4.7	PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLIST CONSIDERATIONS.....	4-36
4.7.1	Affected Environment.....	4-36
4.8	AIR QUALITY	4-37
4.8.1	Affected Environment.....	4-37
4.8.1.1	Regulations.....	4-37
4.8.1.2	Existing Ambient Air Quality.....	4-38
4.8.1.3	Carbon Monoxide Microscale Analysis	4-38
4.8.2	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-38
4.8.3	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-39
4.8.4	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the Green Alternative.....	4-39
4.8.5	Mitigation	4-40
4.9	NOISE	4-40
4.9.1	Affected Environment.....	4-40
4.9.1.1	Regulations.....	4-40
4.9.1.2	Noise Assessment Guidelines	4-41
4.9.1.3	Measured Noise Levels	4-43
4.9.1.4	Estimated Existing and Projected Noise Levels	4-45
4.9.2	Potential Noise Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-46
4.9.3	Potential Noise Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-46
4.9.4	Potential Noise Consequences of the Green Alternative.....	4-46
4.9.5	Mitigation	4-46
4.10	WATER QUALITY	4-48
4.10.1	Affected Environment.....	4-48
4.10.2	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-49
4.10.3	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-49
4.10.4	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the Green Alternative	4-51
4.10.5	Mitigation	4-51
4.11	WETLANDS	4-52
4.11.1	Affected Environment.....	4-52
4.11.2	Potential Wetlands Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	4-57
4.11.3	Potential Wetlands Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-57
4.11.4	Potential Wetlands Consequences of the Green Alternative	4-57
4.11.5	Mitigation	4-58
4.11.5.1	Avoiding Impacts.....	4-58
4.11.5.2	Minimizing Impacts	4-59

4.11.5.3	Impact Compensations	4-60
4.12	WATER BODY MODIFICATION AND WILDLIFE	4-60
4.12.1	Affected Environment.....	4-60
4.12.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Water Bodies and Wildlife	4-64
4.12.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Water Bodies and Wildlife	4-64
4.12.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative on Water Bodies and Wildlife	4-66
4.12.5	Mitigation	4-67
4.13	FLOODPLAINS	4-67
4.13.1	Affected Environment.....	4-67
4.13.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative to Floodplains	4-70
4.13.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative to Floodplains	4-70
4.13.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative to Floodplains	4-73
4.13.5	Mitigation	4-75
4.14	COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION	4-76
4.14.1	Affected Environment.....	4-76
4.14.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Navigation.....	4-78
4.14.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Navigation.....	4-78
4.14.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative on Navigation	4-79
4.15	THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES.....	4-80
4.15.1	Affected Environment.....	4-80
4.15.1.1	Federal-Listed Threatened and Endangered Species	4-80
4.15.1.2	Arkansas State-listed Species.....	4-83
4.15.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	4-84
4.15.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	4-85
4.15.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	4-85
4.16	CULTURAL RESOURCES	4-86
4.16.1	Affected Environment.....	4-86
4.16.1.1	Historical Resources	4-87
4.16.1.2	Archaeological Resources	4-88
4.16.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Cultural Resources	4-88
4.16.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Cultural Resources	4-89
4.16.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative on Cultural Resources	4-90
4.16.5	Mitigation	4-90
4.17	HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES	4-90

4.17.1	Affected Environment.....	4-90
4.17.2	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	4-95
4.17.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	4-95
4.17.4	Potential Consequences of the Green Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	4-95
4.17.5	Mitigation	4-96
4.18	VISUAL IMPACTS	4-96
4.18.1	Affected Environment.....	4-96
4.18.2	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the No Action Alternative	4-96
4.18.3	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the Red Alternative	4-97
4.18.4	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the Green Alternative.....	4-97
4.18.5	Mitigation	4-97
4.19	REQUIRED PERMITS.....	4-98
4.20	RELATION OF SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	4-98
4.21	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES.....	4-98
4.22	CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS.....	4-99

SECTION 5: ACRONYMS

SECTION 6: REFERENCES

SECTION 7: PREPARERS

APPENDIX A: AGENCY COORDINATION RESPONSES

APPENDIX B: RESPONSES FROM PUBLIC REGARDING INFORMATION PRESENTED AT THE MARCH 15, 2005 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT MEETING

APPENDIX C: COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

Table	Page
2.1 ARV Population and Percent Change, 1990-2003	2-5
2.2 ARV, Various Employment Measures, 2002	2-5
2.3 ARV Average Weekly Earnings for 2002	2-6
2.4 ARV Unemployment November 2004	2-6
3.1 Screening criteria utilized to determine viability of alternatives considered	3-2
4.1 Analysis area for each resource category considered in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS.....	4-5
4.2 Primary reasonably foreseeable future projects considered as part of the Cumulative Impacts Analysis for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS	4-9
4.3 Additional trucks estimated to be generated by the River Valley Intermodal Facilities project	4-17
4.4 Minority and low-income populations in the River Valley Intermodal Facilities region.....	4-27
4.5 Summary of National and Arkansas primary ambient air quality standards.....	4-37
4.6 FHWA noise abatement criteria (NAC) hourly A-weighted sound level – decibels (dBA)	4-43
4.7 Noise measurement results within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-43
4.8 Existing and projected noise levels within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-45
4.9 Estimated functional values for wetlands present in the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-56
4.10 Wetland impacts from the Red and Green Alternatives for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS	4-58
4.11 Surveyed Cross-Section Locations within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-70
4.12 Floodplain Analysis of the Red Alternative for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-71
4.13 Floodplain Analysis of the Green Alternative for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area	4-73
4.14 Comparative Statement of Traffic (Thousand Short Tons) on the MKARNS	4-77
4.15 Freight Traffic on the MKARNS by Commodity, 2002	4-78
4.16 Federal Threatened and Endangered Species in Pope County, Arkansas.....	4-80
4.17 Elements of Special Concern Identified by The Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission for Pope County, Arkansas	4-83
4.18 Summary of EDR report for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area.....	4-92

Figure	Page
2.1	Map of the River Valley Intermodal Facilities general project area location..... 2-2
2.2	Map of the River Valley Intermodal Facilities project area..... 2-3
3.1	Overview map of alternative locations considered for inclusion in the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS 3-4
3.2	Location and conceptual layout of the Red Alternative for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS3-12
3.3	Location and conceptual layout of the Green Alternative for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS3-13
4.1	Current land use within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area.....4-13
4.2	Existing infrastructure within the proposed River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area.....4-15
4.3	Location of noise receptors within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area4-42
4.4	Locations of noise measurement sites within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area4-44
4.5	Locations of streams and wetlands within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area4-54
4.6	The 100-year floodplain within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area.....4-68
4.7	Potential bald eagle habitat within the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS project area4-82