
Table of Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE	2
1.2.1	Background	2
1.2.2	Previous Studies	2
1.2.3	Court Decision and Implications for the Lead and Cooperating Agencies	3
1.2.3.1	Summary of Plaintiff’s Concerns Raised in Court Case “City of Dardanelle vs. U.S. Corps of Engineers”	3
1.2.3.2	Addressing Plaintiff’s Concerns Raised in Court Case “City of Dardanelle vs. U.S. Corps of Engineers”	4
1.2.4	DEIS	5
1.2.5	SDEIS	5
1.2.6	SDEIS SUMMARY AND ORGANIZATION	6
1.2.7	FEIS SUMMARY AND ORGANIZATION	7
2.0	PURPOSE AND NEED	9
2.1	INTRODUCTION	9
2.2	PROPOSED ACTION	9
2.2.1	Proposed Action	9
2.2.2	Proposed Action Components	9
2.3	PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	11
2.3.1	Economic Development via New Jobs and Higher Wages	11
2.3.2	Improved Transportation Capacity and Competitiveness	12
2.3.2.1	Advantages of Trucks	13
2.3.2.2	Advantages of Rail	14
2.3.2.3	Advantages of Water Transportation	14
2.3.2.4	Advantages of Intermodal Facilities	16
2.3.3	Efficient Modal Transfers	21
2.4	NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION	21
2.4.1	Determining the Need	21
2.4.1.1	Study to Improve Freight Transportation in Arkansas	21
2.4.1.2	Industry Experts, Port Operators, and Economic Development Professional Interviews	22
2.4.2	Need for the RVIF	22
2.4.2.1	Need for More Slackwater Harbors in the State of Arkansas	22
2.4.2.2	Need for an Integrated Regional Economy	24
2.4.2.3	Need to Promote Social and Economic Growth by Creating Higher Wage Jobs	25
2.4.2.4	Need for Large Industrial Sites with Access to Multimodal Transportation	30
2.4.2.5	Need for Additional Freight Capacity	30
2.4.3	Summary of Needs for RVIF	32
2.5	BENEFITS OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	32
3.0	ALTERNATIVES	33
3.1	DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVES – INTRODUCTION	33
3.2	ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS STUDY	35
3.2.1	Alternative Screening Criteria	35
3.2.2	Other Alternative Analysis Considerations	37
3.2.3	Analysis of Potential Alternatives	38

3.3	SUPPLEMENTAL DATA USED IN THE ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS DECISION- MAKING PROCESS	39
3.4	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF THE ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS STUDY	42
3.5	Preferred Alternative - Green Alternative	47
3.6	No Action Alternative	51
3.7	Other Alternatives Evaluated in Detail in the SDEIS	51
3.7.1	North Dardanelle (Red) Alternative	51
3.7.2	Bend (Purple) Alternative	52
3.8	Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Detailed Analysis in the DEIS and sdeis.	52
3.8.1	Pittsburgh Road (Yellow) Alternative	52
3.8.2	Keener Cove (Blue) Alternative	53
3.8.3	New Hope (Pink) Alternative	54
3.8.4	Atkins Bottoms (Orange) Alternative	55
3.8.5	Blackwell Bottoms (Black) Alternative	55
3.8.6	Morrilton (Brown) Alternative	56
4.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	57
4.1	INTRODUCTION	57
4.1.1	Affected Environment	57
4.1.2	Environmental Consequences	58
4.1.2.1	Direct vs. Indirect Impacts	60
4.1.2.2	Significance	61
4.1.3	Cumulative Impacts	62
4.1.3.1	Definitions Used in Cumulative Analysis	62
4.1.3.2	Cumulative Impact Geographic Area of Analysis	62
4.1.3.3	Past and Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	63
4.2	LAND USE AND INFRASTRUCTURE	63
4.2.1	Affected Environment	63
4.2.2	Consequences	63
4.2.2.1	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the No Action Alternative	63
4.2.2.2	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	63
4.2.2.2.1	Direct Impacts	63
4.2.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	64
4.2.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	65
4.2.2.2.4	Mitigation	67
4.2.2.3	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the Red Alternative	69
4.2.2.4	Potential Land Use and Infrastructure Consequences of the Purple Alternative	69
4.3	FARMLAND, SOILS, AND PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	70
4.3.1	Affected Environment	70
4.3.2	Consequences	70
4.3.2.1	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the No Action Alternative	70
4.3.2.2	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	70
4.3.2.2.1	Direct Impacts	70
4.3.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	72
4.3.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	73

4.3.2.2.4	Mitigation	74
4.3.2.3	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the Red Alternative	75
4.3.2.4	Potential Farmland, Soils, and Physical Environment Consequences of the Purple Alternative	76
4.4	SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT	76
4.4.1	Affected Environment.....	76
4.4.2	Consequences.....	76
4.4.2.1	Potential Social Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	76
4.4.2.2	Potential Social Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	76
4.4.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	76
4.4.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	77
4.4.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	78
4.4.2.2.4	Mitigation	80
4.4.2.3	Potential Social Consequences of the Red Alternative.....	80
4.4.2.4	Potential Social Consequences of the Purple Alternative	81
4.5	RELOCATION	81
4.5.1	Affected Environment.....	81
4.5.2	Consequences.....	81
4.5.2.1	Potential Relocation Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	81
4.5.2.2	Potential Relocation Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	81
4.5.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	81
4.5.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	82
4.5.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	82
4.5.2.2.4	Mitigation	83
4.5.2.3	Potential Relocation Consequences of the Red Alternative.....	83
4.5.2.4	Potential Relocation Consequences of the Purple Alternative	84
4.6	ECONOMIC.....	84
4.6.1	Affected Environment.....	84
4.6.2	Consequences.....	84
4.6.2.1	Potential Economic Consequences of the No Action Alternative	84
4.6.2.2	Potential Economic Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	85
4.6.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	85
4.6.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	87
4.6.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	89
4.6.2.2.4	Mitigation	91
4.6.2.3	Potential Economic Consequences of the Red Alternative.....	91
4.6.2.4	Potential Economic Consequences of the Purple Alternative	92
4.7	PEDESTRIAN and BICYCLIST CONSIDERATIONS.....	92
4.7.1	Affected Environment.....	92
4.8	AIR QUALITY	92
4.8.1	Affected Environment.....	92
4.8.2	Consequences.....	93
4.8.2.1	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the No Action Alternative	93
4.8.2.2	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	93
4.8.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	93
4.8.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	94
4.8.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	94
4.8.2.2.4	Mitigation	96
4.8.2.3	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the Red Alternative	97
4.8.2.4	Potential Air Quality Consequences of the Purple Alternative	97

4.9	NOISE	98
4.9.1	Affected Environment.....	98
4.9.2	Consequences.....	98
4.9.2.1	Potential Noise Consequences of the No Action Alternative	98
4.9.2.2	Potential Noise Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	98
4.9.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	98
4.9.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	98
4.9.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	98
4.9.2.2.4	Mitigation	99
4.9.2.3	Potential Noise Consequences of the Red Alternative	101
4.9.2.4	Potential Noise Consequences of the Purple Alternative	101
4.10	WATER QUALITY	101
4.10.1	Affected Environment.....	101
4.10.2	Consequences.....	101
4.10.2.1	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the No Action Alternative	101
4.10.2.2	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	101
4.10.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	102
4.10.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	103
4.10.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	105
4.10.2.2.4	Mitigation	107
4.10.2.3	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the Red Alternative	108
4.10.2.4	Potential Water Quality Consequences of the Purple Alternative	109
4.11	WETLANDS.....	109
4.11.1	Affected Environment.....	109
4.11.2	Consequences.....	109
4.11.2.1	Potential Wetlands Consequences of the No Action Alternative.....	109
4.11.2.2	Potential Wetland Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative	110
4.11.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	110
4.11.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	111
4.11.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	111
4.11.2.2.4	Mitigation	112
4.11.2.3	Potential Wetland Consequences of the Red Alternative	114
4.11.2.4	Potential Wetland Consequences of the Purple Alternative.....	115
4.12	WATER BODY MODIFICATION, WILDLIFE, AND VEGETATION	115
4.12.1	Affected Environment.....	115
4.12.2	Consequences.....	115
4.12.2.1	Potential Water Body, Wildlife, and Vegetation Consequences of the No Action Alternative	115
4.12.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative on Water Bodies, Wildlife, and Vegetation.....	115
4.12.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	115
4.12.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	116
4.12.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	117
4.12.2.2.4	Mitigation	119
4.12.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Water Bodies, Wildlife, and Vegetation.....	120
4.12.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Water Bodies, Wildlife, and Vegetation.....	121
4.13	FLOODPLAINS	121
4.13.1	Affected Environment.....	121

4.13.2	Consequences.....	122
4.13.2.1	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative to Floodplains	122
4.13.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative to Floodplains	122
4.13.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	122
4.13.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	123
4.13.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	123
4.13.2.2.4	Mitigation	123
4.13.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative to Floodplains	123
4.13.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Floodplains.....	124
4.14	COMMERCIAL NAVIGATION.....	124
4.14.1	Affected Environment.....	124
4.14.2	Consequences.....	124
4.14.2.1	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Navigation	124
4.14.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative on Navigation	125
4.14.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	125
4.14.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	125
4.14.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	125
4.14.2.2.4	Mitigation	127
4.14.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Navigation.....	127
4.14.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Navigation.....	127
4.15	THREATENED and ENDANGERED SPECIES	128
4.15.1	Affected Environment.....	128
4.15.2	Consequences.....	128
4.15.2.1	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	128
4.15.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	128
4.15.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	128
4.15.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	128
4.15.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	129
4.15.2.2.4	Mitigation	129
4.15.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	130
4.15.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Threatened and Endangered Species.....	130
4.16	CULTURAL RESOURCES	130
4.16.1	Affected Environment.....	131
4.16.1.1	Archaeological Resources	132
4.16.1.2	Architectural Resources	135
4.16.1.3	Native American Resources.....	136
4.16.2	Consequences.....	137
4.16.2.1	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Cultural Resources	138
4.16.2.1.1	Direct Impacts.....	138
4.16.2.1.2	Indirect Impacts	138
4.16.2.1.3	Cumulative Impacts	138
4.16.2.1.4	Mitigation	140
4.16.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative on Cultural Resources	140

4.16.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	140
4.16.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	141
4.16.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	142
4.16.2.2.4	Mitigation	143
4.16.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Cultural Resources ...	144
4.16.2.3.1	Direct Impacts.....	144
4.16.2.3.2	Indirect Impacts	145
4.16.2.3.3	Cumulative Impacts	145
4.16.2.3.4	Mitigation	146
4.16.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Cultural Resources	146
4.16.2.4.1	Direct Impacts.....	146
4.16.2.4.2	Indirect Impacts	146
4.16.2.4.3	Cumulative Impacts	147
4.16.2.4.4	Mitigation	147
4.17	HAZARDOUS WASTE SITES	147
4.17.1	Affected Environment.....	147
4.17.2	Consequences.....	147
4.17.2.1	Potential Consequences of the No Action Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	147
4.17.2.2	Potential Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	148
4.17.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	148
4.17.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	148
4.17.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	148
4.17.2.2.4	Mitigation	150
4.17.2.3	Potential Consequences of the Red Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites .	151
4.17.2.4	Potential Consequences of the Purple Alternative on Hazardous Waste Sites	151
4.18	VISUAL IMPACTS	151
4.18.1	Affected Environment.....	151
4.18.2	Consequences.....	151
4.18.2.1	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the No Action Alternative	151
4.18.2.2	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the Green (Preferred) Alternative .	152
4.18.2.2.1	Direct Impacts.....	152
4.18.2.2.2	Indirect Impacts	152
4.18.2.2.3	Cumulative Impacts	152
4.18.2.2.4	Mitigation	153
4.18.2.3	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the Red Alternative	154
4.18.2.4	Potential Visual Impact Consequences of the Purple Alternative	154
4.19	Summary of environmental impacts	155
5.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACT SUMMARY	163
5.1	INTRODUCTION	163
5.2	SUMMARY OF CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	163
5.2.1	Arkansas River Navigation Project.....	164
5.2.1.1	No Action Alternative	164
5.2.1.2	Green (Preferred) Alternative	164
5.2.1.3	Red Alternative	164
5.2.1.4	Purple Alternative	164
5.2.2	Industrial Development in the Arkansas River Bottoms Near Russellville.....	165

5.2.2.1	No Action Alternative	165
5.2.2.2	Green (Preferred) Alternative	165
5.2.2.3	Red Alternative	165
5.2.2.4	Purple Alternative	165
5.2.3	Expansion of Soil and Gravel Excavation and Removal	166
5.2.3.1	No Action Alternative	166
5.2.3.2	Green (Preferred) Alternative	166
5.2.3.3	Red Alternative	166
5.2.3.4	Purple Alternative	166
5.2.4	Continuation of Agricultural Land Use	167
5.2.4.1	No Action Alternative	167
5.2.4.2	Green (Preferred) Alternative	167
5.2.4.3	Red Alternative	167
5.2.4.4	Purple Alternative	167
5.2.5	Increase Existing Arkansas River Commerce	167
5.2.5.1	No Action Alternative	167
5.2.5.2	Green (Preferred) Alternative	168
5.2.5.3	Red Alternative	168
5.2.5.4	Purple Alternative	168
5.2.6	Summary	168
6.0	MITIGATION SUMMARY	177
6.1	INTRODUCTION	177
6.2	MITIGATION SUMMARY OF THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE	177
6.3	MITIGATION SUMMARY OF THE GREEN (PREFERRED) ALTERNATIVE	177
6.3.1	Land Use and Infrastructure	177
6.3.2	Farmland	178
6.3.3	Social Environment	178
6.3.4	Relocation	178
6.3.5	Economic	178
6.3.6	Pedestrian and Bicyclist Consideration	178
6.3.7	Air Quality	179
6.3.8	Noise	179
6.3.9	Water Quality	179
6.3.10	Wetlands	180
6.3.11	Water Body Modification, Wildlife, and Vegetation	182
6.3.12	Floodplains	182
6.3.13	Commercial Navigation	182
6.3.14	Threatened and Endangered Species	182
6.3.15	Cultural Resources	182
6.3.16	Hazardous Waste Sites	183
6.3.17	Visual Impacts	183
6.4	MITIGATION SUMMARY OF THE RED AND PURPLE ALTERNATIVES	183
7.0	REQUIRED PERMITS	185
8.0	RELATION OF SHORT-TERM USES OF MAN'S ENVIRONMENT AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	187
9.0	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES	189
10.0	CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS	191
11.0	ACRONYMS	193
12.0	REFERENCES	197
13.0	PREPARERS	203

APPENDICES

- Appendix A SDEIS Public Hearing Summary and Response to Comments Received During the Formal SDEIS Public Review Period
- Appendix B U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District, River Valley Intermodal Facilities, Floodplain Analysis Report
- Appendix C Cultural Resources Programmatic Agreement and Work Plan

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Freight Shipments To, From, and Within Arkansas: 1998, 2010 and 2020	13
Table 2.2. Top Five Commodities Shipped To, From, and Within Arkansas by All Modes: 1998 and 2020	13
Table 2.3. Standard Modal Freight Unit Capacities	16
Table 2.4. Summary of Emissions – Grams per Ton-Mile	19
Table 2.5. Fatality and Injury Statistics by Mode	20
Table 2.6. Comparison of Large Spills Across Modes	20
Table 2.7. Arkansas River Valley: Population and Percent Change for Six County Region and State, 1990-2008.....	27
Table 2.8. Arkansas River Valley: Population and Percent Change for Most Populated Place in Each County, 1990-2008	27
Table 2.9. Arkansas River Valley: Employment Measures, 2010	28
Table 2.10. Arkansas River Valley: Average Weekly Earnings, 2010	29
Table 2.11. Arkansas River Valley: Annual Unemployment, 2011 (Not Seasonally Adjusted) ..	29
Table 3.1. Screening Criteria Utilized to Identify Reasonable Alternatives to be Considered in the Arkansas River Valley Environmental Impact Statement.	36
Table 3.2. Summary of Alternatives Analysis for Potential Build Alternatives of the River Valley Intermodal Facilities.....	45
Table 4.1. Wetland Impacts from the Green (Preferred) and Red Alternatives for the River Valley Intermodal Facilities EIS*.....	110
Table 4.2. Summary of Direct Impacts of the No Action, Green (Preferred), Red, and Purple Alternatives	156
Table 5.1. Summary of Cumulative Impacts of the No Action, Green (Preferred), Red, and Purple Alternatives.	169

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. U.S. Inland River System	15
Figure 2.2. Arkansas Commercially Navigable Waterways, Public Ports and Harbors	16
Figure 2.3. Comparison of Cargo Capacity	17
Figure 2.4. Comparison of Fuel Efficiency.....	18
Figure 2.5. Comparison of Emissions.....	19