Regional Transportation Plan

2017 Update

Mo-Kan

An Economic & Community Development Organization

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Goals & Objectives 1

Map 1: Study Area

Chapter 2: Population and Employment 13

Map 2: Regional Population Density
Maps 3a-3g: Targeted Special Groups
Map 4: Employment Centers
Map 5 Population Change

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities 25

Map 6: Regional Transportation Assets
Map 7a: Total Vehicle Volume
Map 7b: Total Truck Volume
Map 8: Bridge Condition
Map 9: Off System Bridge Map
Map 10a: Andrew County Roads and Off-system Bridge Map (inside cover)
Map 10b: Buchanan County Roads and Off-system Bridge Map (inside cover)
Map 10c: Clinton County Roads and Off-system Bridge Map (inside cover)
Map 10d: DeKalb County Roads and Off-system Bridge Map (inside cover)
Insert: Transit Schedule
Map 11: City Transportation Maps (27)
Map 12: Regional Railroad Map

Chapter 4: Existing Transportation Management 28

Map 13: Signalized Intersections

Chapter 5: Identified Needs 29

Map 14: Identified Needs
Map 15a: Identified Needs, Andrew
Map 15b: Identified Needs, Buchanan
Map 15c: Identified Needs, Clinton
Map 15d: Identified Needs, DeKalb

Chapter 6: Future Project Plan for 10 Years 62

Insert: Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Descriptions
Insert: Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Maps

Chapter 7: RTP for 10 Years 63

Map 16: Top Ranking Needs
Map 17a: Top Ranking Needs, Andrew
Map 17b: Top Ranking Needs, Buchanan
Map 17c: Top Ranking Needs, Clinton
Map 17d: Top Ranking Needs, DeKalb

Chapter 8: Financing 66

Insert: MoDOT Financial Snapshot

Chapter 9: Plan Implementation

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Regional Transportation Plan

Background on the planning organization

Mo-Kan Regional Council is an economic and community development organization serving county and municipal governments in four Missouri counties, two Kansas counties and one municipality in a non-member Kansas County: Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton, and DeKalb counties in Missouri; Atchison and Doniphan counties in Kansas; and Morrill municipality in Brown County, Kansas.

The concept of a regional council stemmed from the need to pool area resources for the purpose of securing professional services for counties and municipalities. One such service lacking at the time of conception was that of planning services for land use and zoning. Legislation providing for this pooling of effort was enacted in Kansas and Missouri in the 1950's and 60's. In 1957, Kansas authorized County Zoning and Planning Commissions, which could either employ a Zoning Officer or in the less populous counties contract for consulting services. In 1966, Missouri designated twenty areas permitted to pool planning resources. Included in the Missouri pooling zone were Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb (ABCD) counties.

The ABCD Regional Planning Commission was chartered in February 1968. In June of 1968, the Doniphan County, Kansas Planning and Zoning Commission sought membership with the Missouri Commission to create synergy in the outlying St. Joseph Metropolitan area. Consequently, permission was granted to create the Mo-Kan Bi-State Planning Commission whose name changed five years later to the entity we now know as Mo-Kan Regional Council. Immediately seeing the value in the regional planning commission, the City of Atchison sought and was granted membership in November of 1968. Kansas membership increased with the addition of Atchison County and the City of Horton in 1974. In 1984, the cities of Hiawatha and Morrill also elected to join, with the City of Valley Falls joining them in 2013.

Over the course of time, member governments developed a wider range of needs other than that of long-range planning. The organization began providing services such as grant procurement and administration, offset printing and cartography, and has continued to broaden its scope of services over the years.

The voting membership of the Mo-Kan Regional Council consists of 32 people, 16 each from Missouri and Kansas. Kansas members are named directly to the Council by Doniphan and Atchison counties and the municipalities of Atchison and Morrill. Missouri members are first named by the counties and municipalities to the ABCD Regional Planning Commission. This group then holds a caucus by county to name the 16 who will be the Mo-Kan Regional Council voting members from Missouri. The Council and the Commission meet simultaneously each month to transact council business.

Since 1996, Mo-Kan has partnered with the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) to perform both short-term and long-term transportation planning in Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties. These planning activities, as set forth by MoDOT and administered by a Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), help to ensure all residents of northwest Missouri have access to a safe, efficient transportation system. The TAC meets quarterly to provide direction with regards to local planning initiatives and to provide a forum for communication between elected officials, state transportation staff and the general public with regards to transportation planning activities. Mo-Kan can provide a wide variety of transportation planning tools, such as transportation mapping, GIS services and traffic counters.

The area being reviewed for this study consists of Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties in the Missouri portion of Mo-Kan Regional Council (See Map 1 at the end of the chapter). Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties each have unique attributes consisting of history, geography and transportation that create the region known as Mo-Kan.

History

Andrew County

Andrew County was part of the Platte Purchase of 1836, which was relinquished by the Sac, Iowa, and Fox Native American tribes to the state of Missouri by treaty. Positioned between the Missouri River and the original western border of the state, the county was viewed as having considerable land opportunities, and, like most of the land included in the Platte Purchase, was well adapted to agriculture. These characteristics started a wave of people from Kentucky and Tennessee to the area in 1844, with the majority of them choosing to settle near timberlands and mill sites. Andrew County incorporated on January 29, 1841, and was named after the seventh president of the United States, Andrew Jackson. The county seat was founded in 1841, and at that time was called Union. In June of 1841, it was re-named to Savannah out of courtesy for Samuel Crowley, who was a member of the first county court and had a love for his native city of Savannah, Georgia.

Early settlers were divisive during and after the Civil War. Through the duration of the Civil War era, Savannah saw a vast amount of violence and destruction, largely due to the fact that both northern and southern factions routinely met on the square and set up camps in the area. Battles took place along Hackberry Ridge west of Savannah, and famous men like Joseph Hart and William "Bloody Bill" Anderson rode through the region. After the Civil War, the emergence of railroad lines provided the opportunity for several towns to develop, businesses to grow and the population to increase. The St. Joseph-Savannah Interurban Line was established in 1911, providing the availability of automobiles. From its incorporation to present day, Savannah has been a resource for civic, mercantile and agricultural endeavors. Besides Savannah, historical towns in Andrew County include Fillmore, Rochester, Amazonia (Nodaway City), Whitesville, Bolckow, Rosendale, Empire Prairie, Nodaway Station and Elizabethtown.

Buchanan County

The first non-Native American settlers in Buchanan County were fur traders who trapped along the Missouri River in the late 1700s. The river provided not only an abundant home for fur-bearing animals but also a relatively accessible and dependable means of transportation. Lewis and Clark passed through this area in the summer of 1804 as they explored the newly obtained Louisiana Purchase territory. On July 4, 1804, President Jefferson's Corps of Discovery celebrated the birth of the country in what is today Lewis and Clark Village, located on the east bank of the Missouri River in southwest Buchanan County. The early Native American settlers included the Kanza, Iowa, Sac, Fox, Delaware, Kickapoo and a few Pottawatomie Tribes. The area west of the then-western border of the state of Missouri and east of the Missouri River was granted to the Native American tribes in residence by the Prairie-du-Chien treaty with the French government, the landholders before the advent of the Louisiana Purchase. By June 1836, the treaty was amended to extinguish Indian claims to land in northwest Missouri. The federal government paid the resident tribes of Native Americans $7,500 for the six counties of the Platte Purchase, as it is now known.

In 1837, President Van Buren declared the Platte Region an extension of the State of Missouri and open for settlement. Settlers from Virginia and Kentucky blossomed as the frontier grew even further westward. Businesses sprang up in St. Joseph supplying the pioneers that traveled westward, and they served the growing communities down the Missouri River. After the Platte Purchase, Buchanan County was organized in 1838 and was later named for President James Buchanan. President Buchanan signed the bill authorizing the State of Missouri to annex the Platte Purchase on June 7, 1836. The Missouri legislature agreed to accept the federal option on December 16, 1836. The resident Native American tribes of the Sacs and Foxes had agreed to the terms for the relinquishment of their lands on September 17, 1836, and on March 28, 1837.

Clinton County

The history of Clinton County commenced on January 2, 1833, by an act of State legislature. Clinton County was named after DeWitt Clinton, the distinguished Governor and Statesman of New York.

The earliest settlements were made nearest to Clay County. For some time previous to the organization of the county, there were no trading posts, stores, mills or blacksmith shops. The early settler was compelled to get his supplies from the Missouri River. Smith's (now Smithville) was the nearest mill for northern Clay County and all of Clinton County. The pioneers had no trouble in supplying their tables with wholesome food, for the groves and prairies alike abounded with game.

In 1826, the first settlers in the territory, now Clinton County, were William Castile who lived on the creek, which today bears his name, and Hiram Smith, a hunter whose cabin stood about the center of what is now Jackson Township. The first courthouse was built in Plattsburg (then called Springfield) in 1834. Also in 1834, the first Land Office was established in Plattsburg for the county of northwest Missouri. Judge James H. Birch was its first register and E.M. Samuel the first receiver.

When the Mexican War began in 1846, Clinton County was only 13 years old, but its people shared the war spirit that prevailed in western Missouri. In the Civil War, there was the same division among the people of Clinton County that prevailed in so many counties of Missouri, though there was less violence and bloodshed than occurred in Clay and Platte Counties. In the year of 1857, the Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad was completed. By the 1870's, four railroads were operating in the county.

DeKalb County

The history of DeKalb County started when the Council Bluff Trace, a post road opened by the U.S. Army in 1823 from Liberty, Missouri, to Fort Atchison, Nebraska, ran through the county. Samuel Vesser, a French Canadian, who had a cabin north of the present site of Stewartsville in 1824, is thought to have been the first resident of the county. Settlers from Kentucky and Tennessee settled this area mainly in the late 1820's.

In January 1843, an act of the Legislature was passed establishing the boundaries of DeKalb County, and in February 1845, an act was passed providing for the organization of the county. The county was named after foreign-born Johann Kalb (known as Baron de Kalb) who was a member of the French Army and general in the American Revolution.

James T. Blair, Jr., inaugurated governor of Missouri in 1957 and formerly lieutenant governor from 1949 to 1957, was born in Maysville. His father was a Missouri Supreme Court judge from 1915 to 1924.

The following map is included at the end of this chapter:

- Map 1: Map of Area

Geography

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Andrew County has a total area of 435 square miles; of that, 430 square miles is land, and five square miles is water. The topography of Andrew County is level to steep, with an equal distribution of timber and prairies, with bottoms and uplands. Soils in the uplands are mostly developed in loess. They are very fertile, mostly silty sands from alluvium. Andrew County is located approximately 65 miles north of Kansas City (measured from Savannah) and 120 miles south of Omaha, Nebraska. The area is served by Federal Interstate Highway (I-29) and has numerous state highways. The Missouri River flows west of the area and forms the border between Kansas and Missouri. Rail, truck, barge and air transportation is readily available. Savannah, the county seat of Andrew County, is located at 39°56'28" North, 94°49'51" West.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, Buchanan County has a total area of 415 square miles; of that, 410 square miles is land, and five square miles of surface water. Buchanan County is located approximately 55 miles north of Kansas City (measured from St. Joseph) and 130 miles south of Omaha, Nebraska. The area is served by Interstate Highways (I-29 and I-229) and numerous federal and state highways. The Missouri River flows through the area and forms the border between Kansas and Missouri. Rail, truck, barge and air transportation are readily available. St. Joseph, the county seat of Buchanan County, is located at 39°47' North and 94°55' West. At 1,000 feet above sea level, Buchanan County is 400 feet above Chicago, and 600 feet above St. Louis.

Clinton County is landlocked, bordered by DeKalb County to the north, Buchanan and Platte Counties to the west, Clay County to the south and Caldwell and Ray Counties to the east. Clinton County encompasses 419 square miles and lies upon Pennsylvanian-Age bedrock. The clay found throughout the area is common clay and shale, and thin limestone makes up the sand and gravel deposits. Coal-bearing strata underlie the area. The topography consists of moderately dissected plains.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, DeKalb County has a total area of 424 square miles. It is bound on the north by Gentry County; east by Daviess and Caldwell County; south by Clinton County; and west by Andrew and Buchanan Counties. Maysville, the county seat of DeKalb County, is located at 39°53' North and 94°21' West. At 900 feet above sea level, DeKalb County is 300 feet above Chicago and 500 feet above St. Louis.

The four Missouri counties Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton, and DeKalb all border each other creating the Missouri portion of the Mo-Kan service region. The four counties create a total area of 1,693 square miles. The majority of the area is made up of land, with a low percentage of water completing the remaining area.

Connection to the Planning Framework

Transportation infrastructure is an important part of the state's well-being and it is affected by decisions made in the public and private sectors. Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) recognizes it must work with other state and federal agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning commissions, local organizations, businesses and communities and the general public to address issues that affect the transportation decision-making process.

With all planning organizations, needs identification and project prioritization processes will continue to be developed cooperatively. These processes will be based on the previously identified transportation investment goals and other important considerations.

Separate needs identification and project prioritization processes for the state highway and bridge system will be developed for maintenance and operations, rehabilitation and reconstruction and major project activities. These processes will be developed in coordination with MoDOT's transportation partners and used to add projects to future Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (STIPs).

Federal and state laws establish different working relationships between MoDOT and various public entities.

Connection to the Missouri Department of Transportation LRTP

The LRTP (Long Range Transportation Plan) sets the overall transportation policy and tone for Missouri. MoDOT collaborates with the metropolitan planning organizations, regional planning commissions, local officials, the general public and other stakeholders to facilitate the LRTP development. This sets the vision for Missouri's transportation system and defines transportation goals that can take Missouri toward that vision.

Because they are established with broad public support, the LRTP goals will form the foundation of this Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In the planning process, these basic goals will be refined to fit the unique nature of the region. This includes prioritizing goals and defining broad transportation strategies to help identify transportation needs to effectively meet the highest priority goals.

The statewide significant needs and priorities established in the RTPs will feed directly back into the statewide LRTP updates. Updates will take place approximately every five years. As these updates take place, the link between the plans will grow stronger.

Planning Process Used to Develop Plan

Safe and efficient transportation systems require highly coordinated planning between federal, state and local officials, centered on focus areas such as system preservation, safety, sustainable development and the movement of goods. Federal Highway Administration (FHA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regulations grant local governments the opportunity to be involved in the statewide transportation planning process. MoDOT has a documented planning process to collect and analyze the input of local government officials. This process of regional transportation planning should give rural concerns a greater voice in state funding allocations.

Regional Planning Commissions (RPCs) play a vital role in ensuring that all relevant parties have a voice in Missouri's transportation planning process. The RPCs contribute in many ways to the overall planning effort with activities including coordination with local, state and federal elected officials, town hall meetings and transportation forums, informational transportation press releases and the promotion of transportation-centric policies and programs.

Mo-Kan Regional Council works in partnership with MoDOT to ensure effective transportation planning occurs in its service area. Utilizing its Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC), Mo-Kan facilitates two-way communication between the state and local elected officials. The TAC oversees all transportation planning completed by Mo-Kan, and annually prioritizes new transportation needs for possible inclusion on future STIPs.

TAC Members

NAME	REPRESENTING	TITLE
Bob Caldwell	Andrew County	Presiding Commissioner
Sarah Miller	Andrew County	County Clerk
Don Dillman	Andrew County	Mayor – City of Savannah
Dan Hausman	Buchanan County	Citizen Member
Bob Burnett	Buchanan County	Citizen Member
Johnnie Hoggatt	Buchanan County	Citizen Member
Drew Bontrager	Clinton County	Public Works Director- City of Cameron
Wade Wilken, Jr.	Clinton County	Presiding Commissioner
vacant	Clinton County	
Illah Marie Pulley	DeKalb County	Citizen Member
vacant	DeKalb County	
Ruth Ross	DeKalb County	County Assessor

The Mo-Kan Regional Transportation Plan was completed with the assistance of several different stakeholders. The commissions of Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties were all directly solicited to provide long range transportation needs for the region. Each commission provided a comprehensive list of needs for inclusion in the RTP. After needs identification, the Mo-Kan TAC began the process of prioritizing the potential projects based on regional significance, effective usage of the public funds and impact. Finally, Mo-Kan staff, in cooperation with each county, various state agencies and the Missouri Spatial Data Information Service, created a number of spatial analyses and transportation maps to support the plan.

Goals and Objectives

The following goals and objectives have and will continue to be used as a guide in the development of the Mo-Kan Regional Transportation Plan. The Mo-Kan TAC, MoDOT and the Mo-Kan Regional Council developed the goals and objectives as a result of a collaborative effort. As with any planning process, these goals should only be considered a starting point for the development of the Regional Transportation Plan. As more public input is sought and the plan continues to take shape, the goals and objectives will likely be amended to reflect current transportation trends and regional needs.

GOAL 1:

Provide a fully functional road, bridge and highway transportation network to facilitate the efficient, effective movement of goods, services and people throughout Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties.

Objectives:

1.2 Improve existing infrastructure by maintaining state highways, lettered routes and other transportation assets.

1.3 Prioritize high-volume traffic routes for rehabilitation and reconditioning, and consider upgrading those routes with the highest traffic volume.

1.4 Continue a bridge assessment program, and repair/replace bridge components (deck, sub structure, superstructure) as needed.

1.5 Ensure transportation system is accessible to all citizens of the region.

GOAL 2:

Promote local alternatives to automobile transportation to reduce negative impacts on the regional environment, reduce congestion and improve the health of the region's citizens.

Objectives:

2.1 Promote the construction and use of public hiking/biking trails both within and between local communities.

2.2 Support and assist in the development of pedestrian-friendly roadways and communities.

2.3 Encourage continued support and expansion of public transit assets, including OATS and The Ride bussing networks.

2.4 Maintain and expand regional freight alternatives, including air, rail and barge.

GOAL 3:

Provide a safe transportation network throughout the region and promote safe driving habits by motorists.

Objectives:

3.1 Participate in local safety initiatives, including the joint MoDOT / Missouri Highway Patrol pro gram Blueprint for Roadway Safety to reduce the number of fatalities on local roadways.

3.2 Work with local and state agencies and private citizens to reduce the number of vehicle collisions with deer and other animals.

3.3 Provide and continually reassess safety-related signage and roadway visibility.

3.4 Encourage the passage of a primary seatbelt law in the State of Missouri.

3.5 Continue working with local and state first responders to provide for rapid, safe response to emer gent situations on the region's roadways.

GOAL 4:

Utilize existing transportation infrastructure and develop new assets to promote economic development across the region.

Objectives:

4.1 Maintain and increase the efficiency of the region's transportation networks to better facilitate the movement of goods and services.

4.2 When developing transportation expansions, plan for those that minimize impacts to the economic potential of local communities and businesses.

4.3 Incorporate local and regional land use plans, comprehensive development plans, and population forecasts in making transportation decisions.

4.4 Provide timely information on the resources available for transportation enhancements with regard to economic development.

Goal 5:

Ensure a transparent planning process that is accessible to all citizens within the region, encourages public participation, and complies with all state and federal regulations.

Objectives:

5.1 Include the region's citizens in all phases of developing plans related to transportation, including the Regional Transportation Plan.

5.2 Inform the general public about upcoming planning initiatives and ensure access to all interested stakeholders.

5.3 Approach transportation planning from a regional standpoint, involving interested parties from not only the local impact area, but also the region as a whole.

Map 1

Mo-Kan Regional Transportation Network

Roadways Maintained by the Missouri Department of Transportation

Mo-Kan Regional Transportation Plan, Map 1
This map created by Mo-Kan Regional Council. Sept. 2005
Not intended for legal purposes. Copyright 2005. All Rights Reserved.

Chapter 2: Population and Employment

Population

According to the 2010 Census, the Missouri counties in the Mo-Kan region experienced an increase of population from the 2000 Census. Andrew County showed a population of 17,291, a 4.8 percent increase from the 16,492 in 2000. Buchanan County increased 3.7% in population from 85,998 in 2000 to 89,201 in 2010. Clinton County experienced a significantly higher increase rising 9.3% from 18,979 to 20,743. DeKalb County had the largest percent increase in population at 11.2%. The population in 2000 was 11,597 and grew to 12,892 in 2010.

The 2015 Census population estimates reflect a minor loss in population for Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb counties and a minor gain in population for Andrew County. However, all four counties have experienced a population gain from 2000, as the table below shows. While many rural counties struggle with population loss, these four counties have experienced minor growth.

Figure 2.1 Population Changes from 2000 to 2015 in the ABCD Region

Population	AndrewCounty	BuchananCounty	Clinton County	DeKalbCounty
2015	17,296	89,100	20,609	12,687
Change from 2000 to 2015	+4.87%	+3.61%	+8.59%	+9.40
2010	17,291	89,201	20,743	12,892
Change from 2000 to 2010	+ 4.84%	+3.7%	+9.3%	+11.17%
2000	16,492	85,998	18,979	11,597

(Source: http://www.census.gov/topics/population.html)

The City of St. Joseph, located in Buchanan County, is the largest city in the Mo-Kan region with a population of 76,596. The population grew 3.52% from the 2000 Census which recorded a population of 73,990. The City of Cameron, located in Clinton County, experienced a population boom in 2000, with the opening of the Crossroads Correctional Center in 1997 and the addition of other non-manufacturing and distribution firms. Its current population is 9,836, which is 18.33% more than the 2000 population of 8,312. The figure below shows the population density from the 2010 Census data within Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb Counties.

Figure 2.2

Employment Forecast

The Mo-Kan region was not spared from the effects of the recession, with the number of unemployed rising from 3,304 in 2000 to 4,833 in the 2010 Census. Each of the counties in the region saw considerable increases in the number of their residents who are unemployed: Andrew County went from 257 to 623; Buchanan County went from 2,467 to 3,220; Clinton County went from 421 to 732; and DeKalb County 159 to 258, as shown in Figure 2.3.

Figure 2.3

1.1.1 Population Age 16 Years and Over in the 1.1.2 Civilian Labor Force, 2000-2010									
Area Summarized		**Civilian Labor Force for Persons 16 Years and Over**							
County		**Civilian Labor Force**		**Change 2000-2010**		**Total Employed**		**Change 2000-2010**	
FIPS Code		**2010**	**2000**	**Number**	**Percent**	**2010**	**2000**	**Number**	**Percent**
	Mo-Kan Region	69,172	63,603	5,569	8.8	64,399	60,299	4,040	6.7
29003	**Andrew County**	9,417	8,410	1,007	12.0	8,794	8,153	641	7.9
29021	**Buchanan County**	43,999	41,498	2,501	6.0	40,779	39,031	1,748	4.5
29049	**Clinton County**	10,720	9,513	1,207	12.7	9,988	9,092	896	9.9
29063	**DeKalb County**	5,036	4,182	854	20.4	4,778	4,023	755	18.8

Source: USDC, Bureau of Census, 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 3 and 2010 American Community Survey, 5-Year Estimates

Despite the major economic upheaval between 2000 and 2010, the distribution of workers in the Mo-Kan region across the different occupation classes remained very close to the distribution between 1990 and 2000. For 2000, Mo-Kan region sales and office staff was at 25.8%, following close behind the management professionals who employ 27.5% of the workforce. In 2010, these occupations were still ranked two and one in the region respectively, but the gap between them widened somewhat. Management professionals now make up 29% of the Mo-Kan workforce while sales and office workers make up 24.5%. Despite a statewide decline in manufacturing jobs, the Mo-Kan region continues to boast a significant industrial workforce, despite a slight reduction since 2000. Mo-Kan manufacturing industry consists of production, transportation and material workforce which was at 17.6% in 2010, down from 18.1 percent in 2000. This trend could be related to the fact that St. Joseph is located along the Missouri River, which makes for easy transportation of goods.

As of 2010, the Mo-Kan Region as a whole has 17% of the employee labor force working in a service occupation: Andrew County has 15.6%, Buchanan County 17.7%, Clinton County 18.0%, and DeKalb County 21.3%, as shown in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.4

Distribution of Employed Civilian Labor Force by Occupation, 2010							
Area Summarized		Employed					
County			Occupations				
FIPS Code		Total Employed	Management Professional and Related	Service	Sales and Office	Construction	Production Transportation and Material
	Mo-Kan area	64,339	29.0	17.7	24.5	11.2	17.6
29003	**Andrew County**	8,794	31.4	15.6	22.9	14.0	16.2
29021	**Buchanan County**	40,779	29.2	17.7	25.0	9.7	18.4
29049	**Clinton County**	9,988	26.1	18.0	25.2	14.0	16.6
29063	**DeKalb County**	4,778	29.0	21.3	21.7	13.0	14.9

Source: USDC, 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Within the four county region, Andrew and Clinton counties have the highest percentages of construction workers with 14% each. In addition, Clinton County is absorbing the majority of urban sprawl from Kansas City, while Andrew County is experiencing growth from those living in smaller towns and commuting to St. Joseph, which could account for the construction need.

Even though the number of jobs and those employed in the region has decreased between 2000 and 2010, the number of those having to commute outside of their home county or home state have remained relatively stable. 34.8% of Missourians in the workforce commute outside of their home county, 1.8% higher than 2000's 33%. Andrew County, which had the region's highest percentage of out-of-county commuters in 2000 at 72.7%, saw an increase to 73.7%. Clinton County's percentage did not change between 2000 and 2010, remaining at 66.4%, while DeKalb County's percentage dropped 3% to 56%. Buchanan County, because it houses a regional trading center (St. Joseph), had the lowest amount of out-of-county commuters at 14.4%.

Figure 2.5

Workers Commuting Outside County of Residence, 2000-2010							
				Percent of Total Workers		Change 2000-2010	
FIPS Code	County	Total Workers 16 and Older 2010	No. of Workers Commuting Outside County of Residence 2010	2010	2000	Number of Workers	Percent of Workers
29	1.1 Missouri	2,752,405	801,884	29.1	28.0	64,480	2.5
29003	Andrew	8,669	6,339	73.7	72.7	491	5.7
29021	Buchanan	40,238	5,790	14.4	9.3	-174	-.4
29049	Clinton	9,639	6,396	66.4	66.4	513	5.3
29063	DeKalb	4,746	2,241	56.0	56.3	115	2.4

Source: 2000 Decennial Census, Summary File 3 and 2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

According to the 2010 - 2014 Census Estimates, two of the four counties in our region have average commuting times shorter than the state average of 23.1 minutes: Andrew County com-muters travel an average of 22.2 minutes on their way to work while Buchanan County com-muters travel an average of 17.4 minutes. DeKalb County is just slightly higher than the state average at 24.6 minutes for the average time to work, while Clinton County has the highest average commute time at 25.2 minutes.

Median Household Income

Andrew County

Andrew County's median income for a household in 2014 (estimated) was $53,986 and in 2010 was $57,406. The median earnings in 2010 for males working full-time year-round was $47,060 versus $32,656 for females; the per capita income for the county was $24,009. While the percentage of families in poverty dropped from the 2000 Census to 6.1%, most other poverty figures increased. In 2010 7.5% of the population was below the poverty line, including 7.7% of those under age 18 and 9.0% of those ages 65 and over.

Buchanan County

Buchanan County's median income for a household in 2014 (estimated) was $44,971 and in 2010 was $44,181. The median earnings in 2010 for males working full-time year-round was $40,614 versus $31,056 for females; the per capita income for the county was $21,638. Poverty rates rose considerably, with 9.7% of families and 16.5% of the population were below the poverty line, including 22.7% of those under age 18 and 8.7% of those ages 65 and over.

Clinton County

Clinton County's median income for a household in 2014 (estimated) was $53,361 and 2010 was $53,234. The median earnings in 2010 for males working full-time year-round was $51,343 versus $32,139 for females; the per capita income for the county was $24,629. Clinton County experienced a rare drop in poverty rates, with the rate of families in poverty dropping 2.3% from the 2000 Census to 5% of families and the percent of population under the poverty line dropping one percentage point to 9.8%. The number of children under the age of 18 in poverty dropped 12 percent to 8% while the number of people 65 years and over living in poverty dropped to 5.6% from 12.70% in the 2000 Census.

DeKalb County

DeKalb County's median income for a household in 2014 (estimated) was $44,936 and in 2010 was $43,898; with the median income for a family was $53,803. The median earnings in 2010 for males working year-round at full-time was $37,055 while the median earnings for females working year-round at full-time was $30,957; the per capita income for the county is $16,916. Poverty rates dropped for the most part in DeKalb County. Approximately 8.3% of families are living below the poverty line, which is a decrease 1.1% from the 2000 Census, and the percentage of people living in poverty dropped from 10.8% in 2000 to 9.5% in 2010. The poverty rates of children under the age of 18 and individuals 65 and over have also decreased to 7.9% and 9.7% respectively.

The state of Missouri's median household income for 2010 was $46,262 and the population below poverty was 14%. Similar to 2000, we have a situation where two counties' median household incomes were below the state median and two were above. However, only one county had a higher percentage of the population in poverty than the state, which is an improvement over the year 2000, where two of the region's counties had higher poverty rates.

Figure 2.6

Poverty Percentages in the ABCD Region

	Families in Poverty		People in Poverty		Under 18 in Poverty		65 and Over in Poverty	
	2000	2010	2000	2010	2000	2010	2000	2010
Andrew	6.4	6.1	8.2	8.5	10.5	7.5	8	11.4
Buchanan	8.5	9.7	12.2	14.6	15	21.8	9.6	8.4
Clinton	7.3	5	9.3	8.3	11.3	8	12.7	9.2
DeKalb	7.2	6.1	10.8	9.5	10.8	9.5	15.2	14.1

Figure 2.7

Median Household Income in the ABCD Region

	2000	2010	2010-2014 estimates
Andrew	$40,688	$57,406	$53,986
Buchanan	$34,704	$44,181	$44,971
Clinton	$41,624	$53,234	$53,361
DeKalb	$31,654	$43,898	$44,936
Missouri	$37,934	$46,262	$47,764

(Source: 2000 Census, 2010 American Community Survey Five-Year Estimates)

The following maps are included at the end of this chapter:

- Map 2: Population Density
- Map 3a: Poverty Map (those persons under 185% of poverty), Real
- Map 3b: Elderly Map (those persons aged 65 years and older), Real
- Map 3c: Disabled Map (as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau), Real
- Map 3d: Disadvantaged Populations Map
- Map 4: Employment Centers
- Map 5: Population Change

Map 2

Population Density, Mo-Kan Region
by block, as determined by the 2010 U.S. Census
Andrew County
Bolckow
Rea
Fillmore
Rosendale
Savannah
Amazonia
Country Club
Cosby
Union Star
DeKalb County
Weatherby
Amity
Maysville
Clarksdale
St. Joseph
Stewartsville
Cameron
Osborn
Easton
Agency
Turney
Gower
Rushville
De Kalb
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Buchanan County
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Trimble
Holt
Clinton County
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Local roads
County Boundary
Incorporated Community
1 Dot = 20 people
0
5
10
20
Miles
Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Routes 09/2015
U.S. Census, 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 3A

Income Below Poverty Level Last Twelve Months

by block group, as determined by 2014 American Community Survey*

*Disabled person estimates were taken from the U.S.Census American Community Survey 2010 - 2014 5-year Estimates. It should be noted that the estimates reported in the survey are based on sampling techniques and assiciated with a margin of error.

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 3B

Persons Over the Age of 65

by block group, as determined by 2014 American Community Survey*

Legend

Persons Over the Age of 65

- 4 - 95
- 96 - 150
- 160 - 200
- 210 - 310
- 320 - 620

Route

- Interstate Highway
- U.S. Highway
- State Highway
- County Boundary
- Incorporated Community

0 5 10 20 Miles

*Disabled person estimates were taken from the U.S.Census American Community Survey 2010 - 2014 5-year Estimates. It should be noted that the estimates reported in the survey are based on sampling techniques and assiciated with a margin of error.

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 3C

Disabled Persons

by block group, as determined by 2014 American Community Survey*

*Disabled person estimates were taken from the U.S.Census American Community Survey 2010 - 2014 5-year Estimates. It should be noted that the estimates reported in the survey are based on sampling techniques and assiciated with a margin of error.

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 3D

Disabled Persons

by block group, as determined by 2014 American Community Survey*

*Disabled person estimates were taken from the U.S.Census American Community Survey 2010 - 2014 5-year Estimates. It should be noted that the estimates reported in the survey are based on sampling techniques and assiciated with a margin of error.

Map 4

Employment Centers 2016
Mo-Kan Region
Andrew County
Bolckow
Rea
Fillmore
Rosendale
DeKalb County
Union Star
Savannah
Amazonia
Country Club
Cosby
Amity
Maysville
Weatherby
Clarksdale
Stewartsville
Osborn
Cameron
Easton
Agency
Turney
Gower
Rushville
De Kalb
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Buchanan County
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Trimble
Holt
Clinton County
Country Club
St. Joseph
Agency
Employee Size
501 - 3500
251 - 500
101 - 250
51 - 100
21 - 50
20
County Boundary
Incorporated Community
0
3.75
7.5
15
Miles
Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Routes 09/2015
U.S. Census, 2010 & 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
ReferenceUSA Business Database 06/2016.
Not intended for legal purposes
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 5

Population Change, 2000 - 2010
by block, as determined by the 2010 U.S. Census
Andrew County
Bolckow
Rea
Fillmore
Rosendale
DeKalb County
Union Star
Savannah
Amazonia
Cosby
Country Club
Amity
Maysville
Weatherby
Clarksdale
St. Joseph
Stewartsville
Cameron
Osborn
Easton
Agency
Turney
Gower
Rushville
De Kalb
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Buchanan County
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Trimble
Holt
Clinton County
Country Club
St. Joseph
Agency
Population Change
Lost more than 50 persons
Lost 11 to 50 persons
Lost or gained 10 persons or fewer
Gained 11 to 50 persons
Gained more than 50 persons
County Boundary
Incorporated Community
0
3.75
7.5
15
Miles
Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Routes 09/2015
U.S. Census, 2010 & 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities

Transportation

Sufficient and reliable transportation is essential to a successful community and overall region. Residents and businesses depend on accessibility within the modes of transportation to adequately move traffic and transport goods. The counties within Mo-Kan's region have access to multiple modes of transportation providing economic lineage to local residents, businesses and surrounding communities.

Annually, Mo-Kan and the two neighboring regional planning commissions within MoDOT's Northwest District meet to discuss short-term and long-term transportation goals and objectives. The activities are compiled in the Transportation Work Plan and passed through three different groups for approval. First, the Mo-Kan Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) reviews the plans, then passes it on to Mo-Kan Regional Council's Board of Directors for evaluation. Finally, MoDOT approves the projects on a state level. This information is compiled into a five-year planning document called the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP). The overall goal of this process is to ensure the safety and efficiency of the region's transportation system for all drivers and passengers.

The process of determining transportation needs in Kansas is different than in Missouri. Priorities and project ideas are gathered during regional information workshops and hearings. That information is then sent to Topeka, KS, where large public hearings are held and transportation decisions are finalized by Kansas Department of Transportation.

Roadways

Federal interstates, federal highways, state highways, county roads and local streets make up an intricate combination of roadways that serve the Mo-Kan region. Interstate 29 and 35 provide north and south transportation access while Interstate 229 serves the urban St. Joseph area. U.S. Highway 36 serves as the main route for east-west transportation. The option for upgrading this route to interstate status has been discussed. The only new major construction project in the region started on the folded diamond interchange on U.S. Highway 36 near the St. Joseph city limits. It is expected to be completed in mid to late 2017.

U.S. Highway 59 provides an alternative route to the western side of the Kansas City area. U.S. Highways 71, 73, 159 and 169 are other highways providing north-south access throughout the region.

Only one major highway, U.S. Highway 36, runs through Doniphan County, passing through the cities of Troy, Elwood and Wathena. Other highways in the county include K-7, K-20, K-120, K-136, K-137 and K-238. Atchison County operates with three major highways including two north to south routes, U.S. Route 59 and U.S. Route 73. The other major highway is U.S. Route 159, a secondary route of U.S. Route 59, which is a major agricultural corridor for Atchison County. Other minor highways in Atchison County include K-7, K-9 and K-116.

The two highway bridges crossing the Missouri River are the Pony Express Bridge (U.S. 36) and the Amelia Earhart Memorial Bridge (U.S. 59). The Amelia Earhart Bridge, which crosses the Missouri River at Atchison, KS, was replaced in 2012. The bridge is a four-lane, tied-arch structure that stretches over 2,500 feet. The bridge replacement was a $60 million, cooperative project between KDOT and MoDOT. The state highways within the Mo-Kan's region are primarily dual lane routes and efficient in handling the current and projected traffic volumes.

Motor Freight

Mo-Kan's regional transportation system receives services from over 50 general commodity interstate motor carriers. Yellow Freight Systems Inc., ABF, Roadway Express and FedEx Freight are all larger motor carriers providing carrier services to the Kansas City and Omaha areas. A number of small carriers are also in operation in the region. In 2014, FedEx opened a 67,000 sq. foot distribution center in St. Joseph.

Railroads

Burlington Northern – Santa Fe Company and the Union Pacific Railroad are the two major railroads serving Mo-Kan's region. The railroads are accompanied by three switching lanes, with the switching yards located in St. Joseph and Atchison. One rail spur serves Elwood, KS, a town five miles into Doniphan County.

Currently, there is no rail passenger service available to the region. Amtrak station is located in Kansas City. A rail passenger route from Kansas City to Omaha has been discussed, which would give St. Joseph access, but a service like this would require significant public financial support.

Airports

Rosecrans Memorial Airport, Cameron Memorial Airport, Amelia Earhart Airport and Hiawatha Municipal Airport make up the public airports in Mo-Kan's region.The largest, Rosecrans, provides airfreight service to the St. Joseph area and is home to the Missouri Air National Guard. Cameron Memorial is located in Cameron, Mo., the Amelia Earhart is located in Atchison, Kan. and the Hiawatha Municipal is located in Hiawatha, KS. All are public airports offering general aviation service. The Kansas City International Airport (KCI), which offers air passenger service, is located about 30 miles south of St. Joseph.

Public Transportation

The region consists of three public transportation systems. Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton and DeKalb have access to the Organized Alternative Transit System (OATS), a not-for-profit organization offering specialized transportation for residents throughout the region.

The Ride, a local bus system, provides service within the City of St. Joseph and Elwood, KS. One regional bus system provides transportation from St. Joseph to KCI and downtown Kansas City.

The public transportation system in Kansas operates differently than in Missouri. The state is divided into 15 coordinated transit districts (CTD). One district within the CTD offers services to the two Kansas counties in Mo-Kan's region, Atchison and Doniphan. The Guidance Center and Project Concern, Inc., serves Atchison County, and the Doniphan County Services and Workskills and the Doniphan County Transport serve Doniphan County. While the KDOT oversees all the counties, each county has a local contact agency to manage the day-to-day operations.

A total of nine taxi firms are scattered throughout the region with six in St. Joseph, two in Atchison and one in Cameron. Reviews show that a majority of customers are requesting taxis to and from health care facilities. Other organizations throughout the region provide forms of public transportation, but the ones highlighted above are the primary systems throughout the Mo-Kan counties.

Waterways and Ports

The Mo-Kan region is located along the Missouri River, which offers barge transportation access. As a port district, the St. Joseph Port Authority, located at Missouri River Mile 448, is classified as a political subdivision of the State. The building of a public terminal on a 15-acre tract of land near the U.S. 36 Bridge is one of the projects completed after the Port Authority began operating commercially in 2002. In 2015, equipment was added to unload bulk product from barges to trucks. The terminal provides transfers between inter-modal transportation resources. Coiled wire rod, steel products, grain, molasses, dry bulk, fertilizer and salt are among the resources funneled through the St. Joseph facility. Existing manufacturing firms, especially metal fabricators, have found that a more competitive cost product results from utilizing barge transportation.

The following maps and document are included at the end of this chapter:

- Map 6: Regional Transportation Assets
- Map 7a: Average Traffic Volume
- Map 7b: Commercial Traffic Volume
- Map 8: Bridge Condition
- Map 9: Port Authority
- Map 10a: Andrew County Roads & Off System Bridges
- Map 10b: Buchanan County Roads & Off System Bridges
- Map 10c: Clinton County Roads & Off System Bridges
- Map 10d: DeKalb County Roads & Off System Bridges
- Insert: City Transportation Maps
- Insert: Transit Schedule, OATS

Map 6

Regional Transportation Assets
Mo-Kan Region
County Boundary
Incorporated Community
Andrew County
DeKalb County
Buchanan County
Clinton County
Bolckow
Rea
Fillmore
Rosendale
Union Star
Savannah
Amazonia
Country Club
Cosby
Amity
Maysville
Weatherby
Clarksdale
St. Joseph
Stewartsville
Cameron
Osborn
Easton
Agency
Turney
Gower
Rushville
De Kalb
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Trimble
Holt
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Local roads
Other Assets
Airports
Bridges
Ports
Railroads
Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Routes 09/2015
U.S. Census, 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes
0
4.25
8.5
17
Miles
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 7A

Average Daily Traffic
Mo-Kan Region

Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Planning Data 2013
U.S. Census, 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 7B

Commercial Volume by Direction

Mo-Kan Region

Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Planning Data 2013
U.S. Census, 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 8

Bridge Condition, Mo-Kan Region

as determined by component rating

Minimum Bridge Rating*

- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9

County Boundary

Incorporated Community

0 5 10 20 Miles

*Minimum Bridge Rating is the value of the lowest rated component; i.e. deck, substructure superstructure

Map prepared: 06/2016
Sources: MoDOT Bridge Condition Data May 2016
U.S. Census, 2015 TIGER shapefiles,
Missouri Spatial Data Information System.
Not intended for legal purposes

Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 9

Missouri Toll Ferries
and
Public Port Authorities
Public Port Authorities
Toll Ferries
COUNTY
COUNTY
Missouri River
Mississippi River
Lewis County - Canton Port Authority
Marion County Port Authoriy
St. Joseph Regional Port Authority
Port Authority Of Kansas City Missouri
Howard - Cooper County Regional Port Authority
Winfield Ferry
Golden Eagle Ferry
Pike - Lincoln County Port Authority
Grafton Ferry
St. Louis City Port Authority
St. Louis County Port Authority
Jefferson County Port Authority
Ste. Genevieve - Modoc Ferry
New Bourbon Regional Port Authority
Akers Ferry
Current River
Southeast Missouri Regional Port Authority
Mississippi County Port Authority
Dorena - Hickman Ferry
New Madrid County Port Authority
Pemiscot County Port Authority
St. Joseph Regional Port Authority
Phone: (816) 232-4461
Port Authority of Kansas City Missouri
Phone: (816) 559-3750
Howard - Cooper County Regional Port Authority
Phone: (660) 882-6574
Lewis County - Canton Port Authority
Phone: (573) 767-5393
Marion County Port Authority
Phone: (573) 221-1033
Pike - Lincoln County Port Authority
Phone: (573) 324-4297
St. Louis City Port Authority
Phone: (314) 657-3744
St. Louis County Port Authority
Phone: (314) 615-7663
Jefferson County Port Authority
Phone: (636) 797-6048
New Bourbon Regional Port Authority
Phone: (573) 547-8357
Southeast Missouri Regional Port Authority
Phone: (573) 264-4045
Mississippi County Port Authority
Phone: (573) 683-0290
New Madrid County Port Authority
Phone: (573) 748-0649
Pemiscot County Port Authority
Phone: (573) 333-4125
Akers Ferry
Phone: (573) 858-6645
Winfield Ferry
Phone: (618) 535-5759
Golden Eagle Ferry
Phone: (618) 535-5759
Grafton Ferry
Phone: (800) 258-6645
Ste. Genevieve - Modoc Ferry
Phone: (800) 373-7007
Dorena - Hickman Ferry
Phone: (731) 693-0210
MoDOT
Multimodal Operations
105 W. Capitol Ave.
Jefferson City, MO 65102
Phone: (573) 751-8620
Fax: (573) 526-4709
Prepared by: Missouri Department of Transportation, Transportation Planning
June 18, 2014

Map 10A

Andrew County, Missouri
Off-MoDOT System
Bridges and Culvets
Legend
Structure Class
Bridges (94)
Culverts (10)
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Places
Bolckow
Rea
Rosendale
Fillmore
Savannah
Amazonia
Cosby
Country Club
Union S
0
2.25
4.5
9
Miles
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 10B

Buchanan County, Missouri
Off MoDOT System Bridges
St. Joseph
Easton
Agency
Gower
De Kalb
Rushville
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Legend
Structure Class
Bridges (92)
Culverts (9)
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Local roads
Places
0
2.75
5.5
11
Miles
Mo-Kan
An Economic & Community Development Organization

Map 10C

Clinton County, Missouri
Off MoDOT System Bridges
Stewartsville
Cameron
Osborn
Turney
Gower
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Trimble
Holt
Legend
Structure Class
Bridges (74)
Culverts (25)
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Local roads
Places
0
2.25
4.5
9
Miles
Mo-Kan

Map 10D

DeKalb County, Missouri
Off MoDOT System Bridges
Union Star
Weatherby
Maysville
Amity
Clarksdale
Stewartsville
Osborn
Cameron
Legend
Structure Class
Bridges (169)
Culverts (12)
Road Network
Interstate
US Highway
Business Route
State Highway
Lettered Route
Local roads
Places
0
2.25
4.5
9
Miles
Mo-Kan

FOR MORE INFORMATION ON TIMED STOPS,
BUS STOP LOCATIONS, AND SCHEDULE TIMES,
PLEASE SELECT THE APPLICABLE
INDIVIDUAL ROUTE BROCHURE
IF YOU NEED HELP PLANNING YOUR TRIP,
CALL ST. JOSEPH TRANSIT DISPATCH: 233-6700
ST. JOSEPH
ROUTES & BUS
STOP LOCATIONS
N
SEE
DOWNTOWN
CLOSEUP
Missouri River
KANSAS
NORTH WAL-MART
SOUTH WAL-MART
HYVEE
ST. FRANCIS
MWSU
Hospital
Library
Plaza
PARKWAY
PICKETT
Savannah Rd.
Lincoln
Powell
23RD
23rd St.
Green Hills
Missouri
Benton
Erle
King Hill Plaza
St. Joe Frontier Casino
ELWOOD ON DEMAND
Kohl's/Cinema
Best Buy
Chili's
Shamrock
Jimtown
Green Valley
Cook
Northwood
Krug Park/Pool
Logan
Lindbergh School
Shady
Moss
Huntoon
Dewey
Linn
St Joseph Ave
Highly
Hall
Ridenbaugh
Michel
Patee
Olive
Mitchell
Monterey
Pacific
Hickory
Nor-Am
MFA
National Beef
Lower Lake
Nestle Purina
Omnium
Illinois/BHJ
Triumph/Dailys
Ventura
Diagonal
Valley
Pawnee
Mack
Grant
Lake
US 59
Glenwood
East Lake
Mansfield
Westminister
at Overpass
Anah
Parkway
King Hill Apts
Casey's
Illinois
Countryside
Green Hills
Center
Menards
Shawnee
Specialty Industries
Self Storage
Belt
Coachlight
Vories
Lafayette
Seneca
Penn
Westlake
Brownscheck
Weisenborn
News-Press
Outer Rd.
Beechwood
Hillside
Karnes
Beacon Hill
Carriage Square
Cottonwood Creek
North K-Mart
Gene Field
Ashland
Holley
Summit
Miller
Grand
Beck
Brittany Village
Arbor View
Westgate
Sherman
Woodbine
Hazel's
Hampton Inn
Living Community
Safari
Leonard
University
Far West
Suddenlink
Hillyard
Charles
Angelique
Messanie
Faraon
LaPetite
Probation & Parole
Noyes
Crestview
Habitat
UCP
State Hosp
Walgreens
W Meadow Ln
Felix
Francis
Vine
Locust
Parkway
Anah
Benton
Casey's
Pawnee
Mansfield
Westminister
Overpass
Hyde Park
Downtown Closeup
Missouri River
Downtown Transit Center
to 7th St.
to 6th St.
Climate Controlled Waiting Room
Gazebo
14
13
12
11
15
16
17
18

ST. JOSEPH AVENUE

11 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15 p.m
At Downtown connect to:
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 **routes**

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
At North Wal-Mart connect to:
12 14 **routes**

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15p.m.
Saturdays:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15, 6:15 p.m.

LOVERS LANE
12 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15 p.m.
At Downtown connect to:
11 13 14 15 16 17 18 routes

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m.
At North Wal-Mart connect to:
11 14 routes

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15 p.m.

Saturdays:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15 p.m.

FREDERICK
13 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *HyVee* (*inbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15 p.m

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15 p.m.
Saturdays:
Buses depart *HyVee* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15, 6:15 p.m.

At Downtown connect to:
11 12 14 15 16 17 18 **routes**

CONTINUED

At Hy-Vee connect to:
14 15 **routes**

Printed Sept 2017

FARAON/JULES
14 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
At Downtown connect to: All routes

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
5:15,6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15 p.m.
At North Wal-Mart connect to: 11 & 12 routes

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15 p.m.

Saturdays:
Buses depart *North Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15 p.m.

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown (outbound)* at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15^*, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15^*, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
At Downtown connect to:
11 12 13 14 16 17 18 routes

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *HyVee (inbound)* at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15^*, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15^*, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15 p.m
At Hy-Vee connect to:
14 13 routes

^Specialty Industries serviced on 7:15 and 3:15 p.m. inbound and outbound runs only.

****South Wal-Mart and 2727 S Belt NOT serviced on 7:15 and 3:15 p.m. inbound and outbound runs***

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown (outbound)* at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15p.m.

Saturdays:
Buses depart *HyVee (inbound)* at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15, 6:15 p.m.

At South Wal-Mart connect to:
16 17 18 routes

MISSOURI WESTERN
15 Route

INDUSTRIAL PARK
16 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15 p.m.
At Downtown connect to:
11 12 13 14 15 17 18 routes

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m.
At South Wal-Mart connect to:
15 17 18 routes

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15 p.m.

Saturdays:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15 p.m.

Printed Sept 2017

STOCKYARDS
17 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15 p.m
At Downtown connect to:
11 12 13 14 15 16 18 **routes**

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
At South Wal-Mart connect to:
15 16 18 **routes**

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15p.m.

Saturdays:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15, 6:15 p.m.

Printed Aug 2017

KING HILL
18 Route

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
5:15, 6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15 p.m.
At Downtown connect to:
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 routes

Saturdays:
Buses depart *Downtown* (*outbound*) at:
9:15, 11:15 a.m. and 1:15, 3:15, 5:15 p.m.

Monday - Friday:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
6:15, 7:15, 8:15, 9:15, 10:15, 11:15 a.m.
12:15, 1:15, 2:15, 3:15, 4:15, 5:15, 6:15, 7:15 p.m
At South Wal-Mart connect to:
15 16 17 routes

Saturdays:
Buses depart *South Wal-Mart* (*inbound*) at:
8:15, 10:15, a.m. and 12:15, 2:15, 4:15 p.m.

Bus Service to Elwood
via #18 King Hill Route

Elwood "On Demand" at these times: Monday thru Friday

FROM: Downtown St. Joseph
TO: Elwood & South Wal-Mart

Leave Downtown	Elwood	Arrive Wal-Mart
6:15 AM	6:20 AM	7:05 AM
8:15 AM	8:20 AM	9:05 AM
10:15 AM	10:20 AM	11:05 AM
12:15 PM	12:20 PM	1:05 PM
2:15 PM	2:20 PM	3:05 PM
4:15 PM	4:20 PM	5:05 PM
6:15 PM	6:20 PM	7:05 PM

FROM: South Wal-Mart
TO: Elwood & Downtown St. Joseph

Leave Wal-Mart	Elwood	Arrive Downtown
6:15 AM	7:00 AM	7:05 AM
8:15 AM	9:00 AM	9:05 AM
10:15 AM	11:00 AM	11:05 AM
12:15 PM	1:00 PM	1:05 PM
2:15 PM	3:00 PM	3:05 PM
4:15 PM	5:00 PM	5:05 PM
6:15 PM	7:00 PM	7:05 PM

Schedule effective January 12, 2015

Call to schedule a pick up in Elwood at least 30 minutes in advance (816) 233-6700

#19 EAST

Saturday Only

FROM: Downtown to Hy-Vee					FROM: Hy-Vee to Downtown				
Leave				Arrive	Leave				Arrive
① Downtown	② Frederick at 23rd	③ East Hills Library	④ Hospital - Main	⑤ Hy-Vee	⑤ Hy-Vee	④ Hospital - Main	③ East Hills Library	② Frederick at 23rd	① Downtown
10:15 a.m.	10:25 a.m.	10:40 a.m.	10:55 a.m.	11:05 a.m.	11:15 a.m.	11:25 a.m.	11:40 a.m.	11:50 a.m.	12:05 p.m.
12:15 p.m.	12:25 p.m.	12:40 p.m.	12:55 p.m.	1:05 p.m.	1:15 p.m.	1:25 p.m.	1:40 p.m.	1:50 p.m.	2:05 p.m.
2:15 p.m.	2:25 p.m.	2:40 p.m.	2:55 p.m.	3:05 p.m.	3:15 p.m.	3:25 p.m.	3:40 p.m.	3:50 p.m.	4:05 p.m.
4:15 p.m.	4:25 p.m.	4:40 p.m.	4:55 p.m.	5:05 p.m.	5:15 p.m.	5:25 p.m.	5:40 p.m.	5:50 p.m.	6:05 p.m.

THE RIDE Saturday

2 New Routes on Saturday

#19 East & #20 North

10:15 a.m.—6:05 p.m.

Route deviation available

Effective April 8, 2017

ST. JOSEPH TRANSIT
SNOW ROUTE BUS ROUTES
CITY SNOW PLOW ROUTES
N
KANSAS
NORTH WAL-MART
SOUTH WAL-MART
HY-VEE
The Shoppes at North Village
11
12
14
15
16
17
18
36
169
229
29

Public Transportation

Safe, Reliable & Courteous Transportation For All Ages!

Buchanan County

OATS transportation is available to anyone regardless of age, income, disability, race, gender, religion, or national origin.

Round-trip fares are: within county $6; adjacent county $8; long-distance (beyond 2 counties) $4 per county.

The round-trip fare in-town St. Joseph is $20 due to no other local or federal subsidies. (Fare may apply for seniors over 60 & individuals with disabilities age 18-59- call office to check rate).

Local Medicals, Essential Shopping/Business
Monday – Friday 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

Long Distance Medical
Kansas City 2nd Tuesday each month

East Hills Mall/Walmart/K-Mart
1st & 3rd Tuesdays each month; 9:30 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

Grocery Shopping
2nd & 4th Thursdays in October & December
1st, 3rd & 5th Thursdays in November

To St. Joseph from:
De Kalb & Rushville 1st Wednesdays each month
Agency & Faucett 2nd Wednesdays each month
Easton 1st Thursdays each month

To schedule a ride on any of these routes, call (816) 279-3131.
If you would like to schedule a ride, please call us. We do not schedule trips by email.

Long distance medical transportation is available from Buchanan County to Kansas City on the 2nd Tuesday each month. Trips must be scheduled at least 24 hours in advance by calling OATS office at 800-831-9219.

There is no County Committee in Buchanan County. If you would like to volunteer, please contact OATS Volunteer Coordinator at (573) 443-4516.

© 2017 by OATS Transportation.

CLICK HERE FOR EMPLOYEE LOGIN

Chapter 4: Existing Transportation Management

National Traffic Control Standards

National Traffic Control Standards are those standards specified by the US Department of Transportation in their Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. These Standards specify which traffic signs, road markings, and signals are designed, installed, and used on the Federal Highway System, as well as on State and Local public roads. All traffic control devices must generally conform to these standards. First released in 1935, eight subsequent editions of the manual have been published under the aegis of the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, with numerous minor updates taking into consideration changes in usage and size of the nation's system of roads as well as improvements in technology.

Highway Standards

Standards for Interstate Highways are defined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) in the publication A Policy on Design Standards - Interstate System. For a certain highway to be considered an Interstate, it must meet these construction requirements or obtain a waiver from the Federal Highway Administration. These standards are:

- Controlled access. All access onto and off the roadway is to be controlled with interchanges and grade separations (including railroad crossings). Interchanges should provide full access; ramps are to be designed with the appropriate standards in mind. Minimum interchange spacing should be 1 mi (1.5 km) in urban areas and 3 mi (5 km) in rural areas; collector-distributor roads or other configurations that reduce weaving can be used in urban areas to shorten this distance. Access control (from adjacent properties) should extend at least 100 ft (30 m) in urban areas and 300 ft (90 m) in rural areas in each direction along the crossroad from the ramps.
- Minimum speed of safe travel. Minimum design speed of 70 mph (110 km/h) in rural areas, with 60 mph (100 km/h) acceptable in rolling terrain, and as low as 50 mph (80 km/h) allowed in mountainous and urban areas. Sight distance, curvature and super elevation according to the current edition of AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets for the design speed.
- Maximum grade. Maximum grade is determined by a table, with up to 6% allowed in mountainous areas and hilly urban areas.
- Minimum number of lanes. At least two lanes in each direction, and more if necessary for an acceptable level of service in the design year, according to the current edition of AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. Climbing lanes and emergency escape ramps should be provided where appropriate.
- Minimum lane width. Minimum lane width of 12 ft (3.6 m).
- Shoulder width. Minimum outside paved shoulder width of 10 ft (3.0 m) and inside shoulder width of 4 ft (1.2 m). With three or more lanes in each direction, the inside paved shoulder should be at least 10 ft (3.0 m) wide. If truck traffic is over 250 Directional Design Hour Volume, shoulders at least 12 ft (3.6 m) wide should be considered. In mountainous terrain, 8 ft (2.4 m) outside and 4 ft (1.2 m) inside shoulders are acceptable, except when there are at least four lanes in each direction, in which case the inside shoulders should also be 8 ft (2.4 m) wide.

- Pavement sloping. Pavement cross slope of at least 1.5% and preferably 2% to ensure proper drainage on straight sections. This can be increased to 2.5% in areas of heavy rainfall. Shoulder cross slope should be between 2% and 6% but not less than the main lanes.
- Land slopes within the clear zone should be at most 4:1 and preferably 6:1 or flatter. Roadside barriers should be used for slopes of 3:1 or steeper, in accordance with the current edition of AASHTO's Roadside Design Guide.
- Median width. Minimum median width of 36 ft (11 m) in rural areas, and 10 ft (3.0 m) in urban or mountainous areas. To prevent median-crossing accidents, guardrail should be installed in medians in accordance with the current edition of AASHTO's Roadside Design Guide, based on traffic, median width and crash history. When possible, median openings between parallel bridges less than 30 ft (9.0 m) in width should be decked over; otherwise barriers or guardrails should be installed to exclude vehicles from the gap.
- Recovery areas. No fixed objects should be in the clear recovery area, determined by the design speed in accordance with the current edition of AASHTO's Roadside Design Guide. When this is not possible, breakaway supports or barriers guarding the objects shall be used.
- Curb slope. Vertical curbs are prohibited. Sloping curbs are to be at the edge of the paved shoulder, with a maximum height of 100 mm (4 in). The combination of curbs and guardrail is discouraged; in this case the guardrail should be closer to the road than the curb.
- Vertical clearance. Minimum vertical clearance under overhead structures (including over the paved shoulders) of 16 ft (4.9 m) in rural areas and 14 ft (4.3 m) in urban areas, with allowance for extra layers of pavement. Through urban areas at least one routing should have 16 ft (4.9 m) clearances. Sign supports and pedestrian overpasses must be at least 17 ft (5.1 m) above the road, except on urban routes with lesser clearance, where they should be at least 1 ft (0.3 m) higher than other objects. Vertical clearance on through truss bridges is to be at least 17 ft (5.1 m).
- Horizontal clearance under or along a bridge shall be the full paved width of the rest of the road. Bridges longer than 200 ft (60 m) can be narrower, with a minimum of 4 ft (1.2 m) on both sides of the travel lanes.
- Bridge strength. New bridges are to have at least MS 18 (HS-20) structural capacity. Weaker bridges that can continue to serve the route for 20 more years are allowed to remain. Additional-ly, existing bridges can remain if they have at least 12 ft (3.6m) lanes with 10 ft (3.0 m) outside and 3.5 ft (1.1 m) inside shoulders. Long bridges are to have at least 3.5 ft (1.1 m) on each side of the travel lanes; bridge railing should be upgraded to current standards if necessary.
- Tunnel clearance. Tunnels should in theory be equivalent to long overcrossings, but because of cost the standards can be reduced. Vertical clearance is the same as under bridges, including the provision for alternate routing. Width should be at least 44 ft (13.1 m), which consists of two 12 ft (3.6 m) lanes, 10 ft (3.0 m) outside and 5 ft (1.5 m) inside shoulders, and 2.5 ft (.7 m) safety alkways on each side. If necessary to meet the dimensions of the approach, this can be shifted left or right. A reduced width is acceptable due to high cost. In this case, the minimum width is 30 ft (9.0 m), with at least 2 ft (0.6 m) more than the approach for the sum of the shoulder widths, but at least 24 ft (7.2 m) total, and at least 1.5 ft (0.5 m) on each side for a safety walkway. If there is no safety walkway, a 3 ft (1.0 m) offset with a "safety shape" in the wall is acceptable. The standards have been changed over the years, resulting in many older Interstates not being built to the current standards. Other roads were grandfathered into the system, and yet others are not built to standards because to do so would be too costly or environmentally un-sound.

Street Standards

Street standards address the same issues as Highway Standards, but on the smaller scale of local roadways - city streets and county or township roads who's construction and maintenance are not within the scope of MoDOT's operations. These standards may vary greatly and are met with varying degrees of compliance.

Signalized Intersections

American association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) Strategic Highway Safety Plan includes standards for non-signalized and signalized intersections. The goal is to reduce the annual number of highway deaths. These standards may prompt actions ranging from low-cost measures such as modifying signal timing and signage, to high-cost measures such as intersection reconstruction or grade separation. These standards are built on fundamental principles of user needs, geometric design, and traffic design and operation; safety and operational analysis techniques to address a range of concerns, from individual movements and approaches, pedestrian and bicycle issues, to major corridors. The standards are designed with safety, operational performance, multimodal issues, and physical and economic factors in mind, and are based on the latest research on available methods and best practices in use by jurisdictions across the United States.

Transportation System Management (TSM)

Transportation System Management is a discipline which seeks to identify improvements to enhance the capacity of existing transportation systems. Through better management and operation of existing transportation facilities, these techniques are designed to improve traffic flow, air quality, and movement of vehicles and goods, as well as enhance system accessibility and safety.

Transportation systems management strategies are low-cost but effective in nature, which include, but are not limited to:

- Intersection and signal improvements
- Freeway bottleneck removal programs
- Data collection to monitor system performance
- Special events management strategies

Traffic signal and intersection improvements include such elements as:

- signal timing optimization
- controller/ cabinet and signal head upgrades
- vehicle detectors repair / replacement
- communication with a central system
- turning lanes
- grade separations
- pavement striping
- lane assignment changes
- signage and lighting

Freeway and arterial bottleneck removal consist of identifying congested locations and improving such elements as:

- insufficient acceleration/deceleration lanes and ramps
- weaving sections
- sharp horizontal/vertical curves
- narrow lanes and shoulders
- inadequate signage and pavement striping
- other geometric deficiencies

The identification and elimination of traffic bottlenecks can greatly improve traveling conditions and enhance system capacity, reliability, and safety, especially during peak periods. TSM projects can complement the major capacity improvements and infrastructure by providing improved traffic flow on arterials and local streets. Transportation System Management can be broken down into several main elements, detailed below.

Congestion Management

A congestion management system is designed to avoid "capacity expansion", literally the building of more roadways, if at all possible. Typically analysis takes place first, viewing data (i.e. traffic volume) in relation to the geographic elements ("segments" or "corridors") of a transportation system. Once a preliminary analysis of the entire system highlights the areas of highest congestion, a more detailed analysis of those specific areas can be conducted. Potential causes of congestion are reviewed, and a list of possible solutions is evaluated using a qualitative selection process, leaving only the most likely strategies to pass on to the pre-planning and modeling phase.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) is federally mandated in SAFETEA-LU. The federal transportation bill reserves funding for projects that improve air quality in affected areas. Affected areas are defined as areas that are required by the Clean Air Act to address air quality issues. MoDOT distributes funding to eligible areas for project selection. The EPA determines the geographical boundaries for this program. The Federal Highway Administration and the EPA establish the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program funding levels and eligible work types. The purpose of these funds is to reduce transportation-related emissions and improve air quality. Missouri receives approximately $24.3 million annually during SAFETEA-LU. The Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission approved a funding distribution during SAFETEA-LU of $2.7 million to Kansas City (MARC), and $21.6 million to St. Louis (EWGCG).provides funding for projects and programs in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter which reduce transportation related emissions.

Priority in distributing funds is geared towards projects and programs involving diesel retrofits and other cost-effective emission reduction activities, and cost effective congestion mitigation activities that provide air quality benefits including projects and programs that:

- establish or operate advanced truck stop electrification systems
- improve transportation systems management and operations that mitigate congestion and improve air quality
- involve the purchase of diesel retrofits that are for motor vehicles or non-road vehicles and non-road engines used in construction projects located in ozone or particulate matter non- attainment or maintenance areas and funded under 23 USC

- conduct outreach activities that provide assistance to diesel equipment and vehicle owners and operators regarding the purchase and installation of diesel retrofits.

Additionally Missouri, with a number of other Midwestern states is permitted to use program funding for the purchase of alternative fuels or biodiesel.

Access Management

Road systems serve two necessary, but often conflicting, functions: traffic movement and access to land. Access management is the regulation of interchanges, intersections, driveways and median openings to a roadway. Its objectives are to enable access to land uses while maintaining roadway safety and mobility through controlling access location, design, spacing and operation.

Access management is most evident on freeways where access is grade separated and all movements are via dedicated ramps. It is very important on arterial roads where at-grade inter-sections and private driveways greatly increase the number of conflicts involving vehicles, cyclists, and pedestrians. It is also important on minor roadways for safety considerations such as driver sight distance. Planners, engineers, architects, developers, elected officials, citizens and attorneys all play a significant role in access management. Businesses frequently view any attempt to limit access to their land uses as economically detrimental. This can make implementation controversial. However, there is a growing body of evidence showing that access management can have the positive effect of increasing market area through reducing travel times on major roadways, and that minor increases in circuitry do not cause customers to stop patronizing businesses.

Traditionally, the goal of access management has been to provide adequate access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity and speed. However, it has become increasingly apparent that the planning and design of both roadways and neighboring land uses must be coordinated not only to simultaneously preserve the functional integrity of the highway system while allowing efficient access to and from abutting properties, but also to serve the desired land use objectives of local communities.

As cities expand, increased development along arterial highways generates more and more demand for driveways and intersecting local roads to serve abutting and nearby businesses, industries and neighborhoods. Without access, planning and management, arterials become increasingly congested and safety is compromised. Planning the number of and controlling the location of access points helps to ensure both the safe and efficient flow of traffic and improved service to adjacent lands. The functional integrity of the arterial is maintained and major capacity improvements are often not needed or can be delayed until a later date. At the same time, bicycle and pedestrian travel is made safer due to fewer sites for potential conflicts with vehicles turning into and out of intersecting driveways.

In the older, developed portions of urban areas, access management is only possible on an ad hoc basis, with consolidation or removal of existing access being sought in conjunction with roadway reconstruction or urban redevelopment projects. It is primarily on the urban fringes that it is possible to coordinate transportation system improvements with land development to avoid creating situations where too much poorly spaced access renders a facility incapable of effectively serving its traffic-carrying function. When access management and land use planning are coordinated, it is possible to ensure that when properties are developed, site designs are compatible with efficient movement of traffic onto and off of public roadways and, at the same time, are conducive to pedestrian movements, bicycle traffic and transit usage.

Proper access management, particularly with regard to spacing and type of access, can also be used as a tool, in conjunction with proper zoning, to help shape development patterns in a manner consistent with local community plans and desires.

Right of Way and Corridor Preservation

There is a growing awareness that land use decisions affect transportation needs and transportation improvements, in turn, affect land use decisions. Freeway interchanges and arterial road junctions have become focal points for new shopping centers, industrial parks and office complexes. Urban and suburban arterial roadways are lined with strips of roadside development.

It has been argued that highway improvements have exacerbated problems of sprawling, uncontrolled development by providing easier access to urban fringe areas and beyond. This development has, at the same time, affected the functional integrity of roadways by causing problems of congestion and capacity loss.

Rapid, often unplanned, peripheral development has frequently been the source of major problems for both local and state transportation systems: buildings have often been constructed close to the roadways, making future capacity expansion difficult and costly; and too many access points onto roadways have resulted in vehicle conflicts, reduced safety and a general deterioration in traffic flow. Once areas have been fully, or even partially, developed, there is often little that can be done to alleviate these problems. However, toward the peripheries of urban areas, where development occurs, how close it will be to existing roadways and the type of access it will have to existing and future facilities.

Those who take part in the Transportation Planning process should always keep in mind the relationship of transportation and land use. This includes a consideration of the likely effects of transportation decisions on land use and development and the consistency of transportation plans and programs with the provisions of local land use and development plans. Corridor preservation is one means of coordinating transportation planning with land use planning and development. Its goal is to prohibit, or at least minimize, development in areas which are likely to be required to meet transportation needs in the future. These areas include: lands adjacent to existing roadways which are projected to require capacity expansion; areas which might be needed to construct entirely new routes for urban bypasses or to serve new neighborhoods or commercial developments; and land needed for bicycle, transit and pedestrian facilities (e.g. bikeways, walkways, transit turnouts, bus ways and light rail corridors).

When corridors are preserved in advance, negative land use and social impacts, as well as the costs of transportation improvements, are minimized. However, when land is not preserved for future needs, disruption of residences and businesses is a frequent result and the cost of obtaining the land to accommodate improvements is likely to be considerably higher. At times, the needed improvement can not even be made because the disruption and cost would be too great.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Transportation-demand management, or Transportation Demand Management, succinctly is described as being "the art of influencing traveler behavior for the purpose of reducing or redistributing travel demand." The primary purpose of Transportation Demand Management is to reduce the number of vehicles using highway facilities while providing a wide variety of mobility options for those who wish to travel. A major emphasis of Transportation Demand Management strategies and actions exists to reduce single-occupant-vehicle travel and the number of trips made by single- occupant vehicles. Reducing this type of travel limits congestion and enables the existing transportation infrastructure to move traffic more efficiently. Commuters frequently are the focus of Transportation Demand Management actions because of their regular, predictable driving patterns, the possibilities of employer partnerships and the opportunities for ridesharing programs.

Transportation Demand Management has assumed a significant role in federal and local transportation policies through regional ridesharing agencies, transportation management associations, employers, local ordinances and development agreements. Transportation Demand Management encompasses both alternatives to driving alone and the techniques or supporting strategies that encourage the use of these modes, tying it closely to transportation energy conservation. Application of Transportation Demand Management alternatives and supporting strategies can occur at many different levels of government and the private sector.

Common areas for Transportation Demand Management planning are those sites where there are many employers grouped together, such as a central business district, business park or shopping center, as well as large entertainment complexes or areas of highly concentrated housing. These areas highlight Transportation Demand Managements integral relationship with other elements of transportation planning, like access and congestion management. Transportation Demand Management is also applied on regional basis (i.e. a corridor, such as I-70) where government agencies often direct the initiative.

For this type of application the primary focus of the Transportation Demand Management program is to affect as many travelers as possible within the travel region. However, experience shows that the effectiveness of regional Transportation Demand Management programs depends greatly on the type and amount of participation by local entities in the region. Development of effective Transportation Demand Management programs therefore should be approached from the perspective of how community leaders, government, citizens, and private commercial and industrial interests can work together to meet the goals of providing greater mobility.

Transportation Demand Management strategies include:

- Public mode support -- Publicly provided alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel, includ-ing services and facilities that encourage and support other travel modes.
- Employer-based support -- Private-sector programs and services that encourage employees to change their commuting practices; typical TDM alternatives to single-occupant vehicles may include carpools and vanpools; public and private transit, including bus pools and shuttles; and Non-motorized travel such as bicycling and walking.
- Telecommunications -- Emerging demand-management solutions that are based on advanced telecommunications technologies.
- Land-use policies, Planning and zoning is the most effective long-term TDM strategies which have the abilities to shape population density, urban design, land-use mix, travel needs and travel patterns.
- Public policy and regulation -- Restrictions and regulations that govern private vehicle use and provide political support and guidance to new institutional relationships.

Energy Conservation

In United States, about half the air pollution comes from cars and trucks. Educating the public on ways to driving less and use smart driving practices reduces emissions. Some methods of "driving less" are:

- Carpool (Missouri Rideshare and Carpool Programs) RIDESHARE is a free publicly funded commuter service designed to inform people about less expensive and environmentally friendly commuting alternatives. These include carpooling, vanpooling, transit program, and employer services such as flextime and telecommuting. MARC Rideshare program serves Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte, and Ray counties in Missouri and Johnson, Leavenworth and Wyandotte counties in Kansas. The Mid-Missouri Rideshare Program serves the counties of Audrain, Boone, Callaway, Camden, Cole, Cooper, Crawford, Gasconade, Howard, Maries, Miller, Moniteau, Morgan, Osage, Pettis, Phelps, Pulaski, and Randolph. RideFinders is a free public service authorized and funded by the Federal Highway Administration for the purpose of lowering the amount of ozone pollution and traffic congestion in the St. Louis Metro area. RideFinders works in partnership with employers and commuters in the region to provide new transportation options that meet the above goals. Free services include carpool matching/vanpool formation and public transit information. RideFinders serves St. Louis City, St. Louis County, Franklin, Jefferson and St. Charles Counties in Missouri and Madison, Monroe, and St. Clair counties in Illinois. The City of Springfield offers a carpool matching service for the counties of Barry, Barton, Cedar, Christian, Dade, Dallas, Douglas, Greene, Jasper, LaClede, Lawrence, Ozark, Polk, Stone, Taney, Webster, and Wright.
- Walk or ride a bicycle.
- Shop by phone or mail.
- Ride public transit.
- Telecommute.

Some examples of "smart driving" practices are:

- Accelerate gradually.
- Use cruise control on the highway.
- Obey the speed limit.
- Combine errands into one trip.
- Keep vehicles tuned and support the smog check program.
- Don't top off the fuel tank.
- Replace air filters regularly.
- Keep tires properly inflated.

Also, when purchasing a new vehicle, consumers should be encouraged to select the most efficient, lowest polluting model they can find, ideally either a non-polluting car or zero emission vehicle, which typically use "alternative" fuels. There are many fuels today being used as "alternatives" to gasoline. In most instances, the alternative fuel is less polluting than gasoline, resulting in fewer harmful emissions into the air and a lower negative impact on human health. Many organizations in cities in the United States have voluntarily adopted programs to use alternative fuels in their fleets. These same cities are making efforts to provide the fueling infrastructure necessary to operate alternatively fueled vehicles, which are becoming more and more widely available.

Biofuels are chemicals made from cellulosic biomass such as herbaceous and woody plants, agricultural and forestry residues, and a large portion of municipal solid and industrial waste. The two most common types of biofuels that are being developed and used in the United States are corn ethanol and soy-based biodiesel, which burn more cleanly than gasoline and diesel. Their use strengthens rural economies, decreases America's dependence on imported oil, reduces air and water pollution, and reduces greenhouse gas emissions. Biofuels are domestically grown renewable fuels - reducing our reliance on foreign oil.

The Fuel Conservation for State Vehicles, Section 414.400-414.417 RSMo, and the Energy Policy Act establishes opportunities for Missouri state agencies such as MoDOT to better manage transportation fuel consumption, reduce waste, and promote the use of cleaner, domestic alternative fuels.

Local City/County Systems

Local city and county road systems are, for the most part, maintained on an ongoing basis in the counties and larger communities and on an annual basis for the smaller communities. A mixture of road pavement surfaces occurs throughout the region, ranging from dirt to gravel to chip seal to asphalt. Most counties throughout the region have dirt and gravel roads with a few sparsely located chip and seal roads. These are mostly maintained on a monthly basis and similarly are the maintenance of county-owned bridges. The cities, large and small, within the Mo-Kan region support a more balanced combination of gravel, chip and seal, asphalt, and in a few cases brick streets. Depending on the size of the community, these roads are maintained on a monthly or annual basis, and utilize either a city work crew or a contract to perform the maintenance.

The majority of communities in the Mo-Kan Region have minor traffic congestion problems that center around large production facilities and schools. These issues are currently monitored by the individual communities' local governments and are dealt with on a case by case basis. Another issue, however, that affects some of the larger communities is a need for more signalization on major state routes that intersect with local streets.

All four counties and a majority of the communities throughout the region have policies in place that address access management, right of way and new road construction standards.

Chapter 5: Identification of Needs

The first step in any kind of long range planning is the identification of needs. Planning for future transportation needs requires both an examination of the current state of transportation (as detailed earlier in this plan) and a certain degree of prediction of the events that may occur several years removed from present day. While some chacteristics of transportation planning are generally easy to predict (the deterioration of pavement, maintenance and repair of bridges), other regional features can be much more difficult to anticipate (new developments, changing traffic patterns, road closures).

This chapter identifies the transportation needs for the Mo-Kan region for the next 10 years, as determined by the county commissions of Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton, and DeKalb counties and the Mo-Kan TAC. The needs were identified by the county commissions and ranked by the TAC. The rankings will need to be revisited at least every other year. Rankings were based on immediacy of the issue, cost effectiveness, feasibility, and impact. Each location is given a map number, which allows identification of the location on the maps provided at the end of this chapter.

At the suggestion of the Central MoDOT Office and in an effort to prolong the life of our rural roads, the prioritization process was modified in 2011. Rather than considering all Mo-Kan region projects for the Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP), the TAC drafts two lists: a STIP inclusion list and a maintenance list. The maintenance list includes minor improvement projects on roads with fewer than 400 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). The maintenance projects are then submitted to the area engineers for consideration in the use of local maintenance funds for a more immediate response. The STIP list includes bridge projects, major safety improvements, and projects on roads with greater than 400 AADT. Both lists are included and prioritized in the RTP.

Image A-1

County: Andrew

Route(s) Involved: Route Y

Location: North county line to Highway 71

AADT: 246

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image A-2

County: Andrew

Route(s) Involved: Route CC and K

Location: Highway 59 to south county line

AADT: 250 on Route CC

Need: Resurfacing

Project: Maintenance

Image A-3

County: Andrew

Route(s) Involved: Route DD

Location: Savannah to St. Joseph

AADT: 566

Need: Resurfacing

Project: STIP

Image A-4

County: Andrew

Route(s) Involved: Route D

Location: US 48 to US 169

AADT: 210

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image B-1

County: Buchanan

Route(s) Involved: Route V

Location: South of Parker Road to Hwy 116

AADT: 164

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image B-2

County: Buchanan

Route(s) Involved: Route H

Location: Route A to Gower

AADT: 686 from Route FF to Route E / 382 from Route E to Highway 169

Need: Resurfacing

Project: STIP

Image B-3

County: Buchanan

Route(s) Involved: Route 6

Location: Route P to Hwy 31

AADT: 1,318

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: STIP

Image B-4

County: Buchanan

Route(s) Involved: Route E

Location: Highway 169 to Highway 116

AADT: 466

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: STIP

Image C-1

County: Clinton

Route(s) Involved: Bridge on Route NN

Location: Route NN, east of Route K, near the bend in the road

AADT: 162

Need: Bridge deck replacement

Priority List

STIP

Image C-2

County: Clinton

Route(s) Involved: Route J

Location: Route C to south county line

AADT: 336

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image C-3

County: Clinton

Route(s) Involved: Route H

Location: Highway 33 to I-35

AADT: 138

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image C-4

County: Clinton

Route(s) Involved: Bridge at 272nd Street

Location: Bridge that crosses over I-35

AADT: 980

Need: Bridge deck replacement

Project List: STIP

Image D-1

County:DeKalb

Route(s) Involved: Route E

Location: Highway 169 to east county line

AADT: 274

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

County: DeKalb

Image D-2

Route(s) Involved: Route H

Location: Highway 6 to north county line

AADT: 198

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image D-3

County: DeKalb

Route(s) Involved: Route W

Location: Route A to Route D

AADT: 170

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

Image D-4

County: DeKalb

Route(s) Involved: Route D

Location: Highway 6 to north county line

AADT: 382

Need: Resurfacing

Project List: Maintenance

The following maps and document are included at the end of this chapter:

- Map 11: Andrew County Transportation Priorities
- Map 12: Buchanan County Transportation Priorities
- Map 13: Clinton County Transportation Priorities
- Map 14: DeKalb County Transportation Priorities

Map 11

Andrew County Transportation Priorities
A1
A2
A3
A4
State Hwy U
State Hwy H
State Hwy Y
State Hwy B
Bolckow
State Rte B
State Hwy J
State Rte Bb
State Hwy P
Rea
48
Fillmore
State Hwy A
Rosendale
71
State Hwy C
State Hwy D
State Rte M
State Hwy CC
I-29
State Hwy E
Savannah
State Hwy E
State Rte F
State Hwy T
State Hwy Dd
169
Amazonia
59
State Hwy K
I-229
Cosby
State Hwy Z
State Hwy Uu
State Hwy O
State Hwy W
Country Club
STIP
Maintenance
0
3
6
12
Miles

Map 12

Buchanan County Transportation Priorities
Maintenance
STIP
I-229
59
I-29
St. Joseph
6
State Rte Z
State Hwy P
B3
State Hwy C
Easton
31
State Hwy U
State Hwy Ff
169
Agency
B1
State Hwy A
State Hwy H
State Rte Kk
State Rte H
B2
State Hwy Mm
State Hwy E
State Rte H
State Hwy V
State Hwy Jj
State Hwy CC
Rushville
State Hwy Hh
371
State Hwy Y
State Rte Dd
State Hwy Vv
B4
116
45
State Hwy D
State Hwy B
Lewis and Clark Village
0
5
10
20
Miles

Map 13

Clinton County Transportation Priorities

Map 14

DeKalb County Transportation Priorities
D1
D2
D3
D4
D1
D2
State Hwy Z
Union Star
169
State Hwy E
State Hwy H
State Hwy A
State Hwy D
State Hwy E
State Hwy F
31
State Hwy H
State Hwy W
State Hwy H
Weatherby
State Hwy V
6
Maysville
Amity
State Hwy N
State Hwy O
State Hwy C
Clarksdale
State Hwy O
State Hwy Ee
State Hwy J
State Hwy Ra
33
I-35
36
Stewartsville
Osborn
Cameron
STIP
Maintenance
0
3
6
12
Miles

Chapter 6: Future Project Plan for 10 Years

This chapter lists the needs for the Mo-Kan region which have progressed into "projects"; that is to say, they have been identified as priorities for the region, programmed and funded for completion during the next 10 years by MoDOT District One. The following pages list the projects included on the current Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) for the Mo-Kan Region.

The following documents are included at the end of this chapter:

- Insert: Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan Map

MoDOT's Northwest District

PROJECT DESCRIPTION KEY

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs, and R/W incidentals.

County: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Route: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
Job No.:
Length: MPO: Fed: State: Local:
Fund Cat:
Sec Cat: Award Date Anticipated Fed Cat:
TIP# Future Cost: Estimate Total:

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2017 6/2018	7/2018 6/2019	7/2019 6/2020	7/2020 6/2021	7/2021 6/2022
Engineering:	99	9	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	99	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	999	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	99	0	0
Payments:	0	99	0	0	0	0

Anticipated Federal Funding Category^

Estimated cost range beyond 2022.

Date project is to be awarded to begin construction (Season and calendar year for 2017 & 2018. SFY only beyond 2018).

Metropolitan Planning Organization (Y/N).

Total project cost estimate.

Federal, Advanced CN-State, State and Local share of project costs.

Dollars programmed in previous STIPs.

Dollars funded from other sources.

Dollars for construction, utilities and contingency.

Dollars for right-of-way (land acquisition).

Dollars to be paid back for accelerating the project or payments to others.

Dollars for engineering that include preliminary engineering, construction engineering and right-of-way incidentals.

Project description and location.

County location of project.

Route location of project.

Project number used to track project costs.

Total length in 1/100 miles.

Primary Funding Category.*

Secondary Funding Category.**

Transportation Improvement Program number (MPO projects only).

(All Costs in Thousands)

***Primary Funding Category:**

- Take Care of System
- Statewide Interstate & Major Bridge
- Safety
- Statewide Safety
- Flexible & Other
- Amendment 3

****Secondary Funding Category:**

- Enhancements
- Low Type Resurfacing
- N - Ada Trans (ADA Transition Plan)
- Preventive Maint (Preventive Maintenance)
- Regional
- Rehab And Reconst (Rehabilitation and Reconstruction)
- Routine Maintenance
- Safety
- Systems Operations
- Thin Lift Overlay
- Urban Safety

^Anticipated Federal Funding Category:

CMAQ - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality.
* Usually 80% Federal & 20% State funds.
Earmark - usually 80% Federal & 20% State funds.
NHFP - National Highway Freight Program.
* Usually 80% Federal & 20% State funds.
NHPP - National Highway Performance Program.
* Usually 80% Federal & 20% State funds.
* Sometimes 90% Federal & 10% State funds.
Safety - usually 90% Federal & 10% State funds.
State - No federal funds, state only funded.
STBG - Surface Transportation Block Grant program.
* Usually 80% Federal & 20% State funds.

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Andrew / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 0I3004C	Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from Rte. K to Platte County line. Includes I-229 in Andrew and Buchanan Counties.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 44.04 MPO: Y							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Spring 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #: HE-2018-03	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 273						
Engineering:		0	23	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	250	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3109	Replace bridges over Hopkins Creek, 0.2 mile south of Rte. T near Amazonia. Project involves twin bridges A1293 in the northbound and southbound lanes.						
Length: 0.07 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Fed: 5,169 State: 575 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #: BP-2018-02	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,750						
Engineering:		6	178	297	431	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	4,838	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: MO 48 / Job No.: 1S3133	Replace bridge over Agee Creek, 2 miles east of Rte. D near Whitesville. Project involves bridge K0085.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 515 State: 128 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 643						
Engineering:		0	15	37	50	0	0
R/W:		0	0	5	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	536	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: US 59 / Job No.: 1S3190	Pavement improvements from I-29 to Loop 29 (North Belt Hwy.) at Country Club Village.						
Length: 1.77 MPO: Y							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 181 State: 45 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #: RR-2018-06	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 226						
Engineering:		0	4	16	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	206	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: US 71 / Job No.: 1P3102	Pavement improvements in disconnected sections from north of Rte. A in Nodaway County to south of Rte. 48.						
Length: 11.78 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 4,495 State: 1,123 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay	Awd Date: Summer 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,713						
Engineering:		95	418	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	5,200	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Description	Fed:	State:	Local:	AC-State:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Andrew	BU 71	1S3189	8.75	Y	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint	RR-2018-07	Pavement shoulder improvements from Rte. 71, west of Savannah, to I-29 north of St. Joseph.	767	192	0		Fall 18	STBG	0	959	Engineering:	0	18	65	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	876	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Andrew	RT D	1S3201	15.60	Y	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing	RR-2018-05	Pavement improvements from Rte. 48 to Rte. 169 near Savannah. $1,080,000 District Operation funds.		237	0	947	Fall 17	STBG	0	1,184	Engineering:	0	104	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	1,080	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	1,080	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Andrew	RT DD	1S3171	7.61	Y	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing	RR-2018-08	Pavement improvements from Rte. T, in Savannah, to Rte. 59 in Country Club Village.	792	198	0		2020	STBG	0	992	Engineering:	2	1	17	67	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	0	905	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Andrew	RT O	1S0559	0.15	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over the Platte River, 1.5 miles west of Rte. Z near Cosby. Project involves bridge N0868.	2,180	545	0		Summer 18	NHPP	0	2,803	Engineering:	78	351	153	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	16	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	2,205	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Atchison	MO 111	1S3055	0.05	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over Mill Creek, 1 mile south of Rte. Z near Corning. Project involves bridge X0172.	1,250	313	0		Summer 18	NHPP	0	1,604	Engineering:	41	202	93	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,258	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Description	Fed:	State:	Local:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Atchison	RT J	1S3054	0.09	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over the Tarkio River, 0.6 mile east Rte. 59 near Fairfax. Project involves bridge L0447.	1,427	356	0	Fall 18	NHPP	0	1,815	Engineering:	32	89	144	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	1,545	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	MO 116	1S3129	0.12	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over I-29, 1 mile east of Rte. 371 near Faucett. Project involves bridge A0074.	1,170	293	0	2019	NHPP	0	1,499	Engineering:	36	95	107	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	1,251	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	US 169	1S3143	0.15	Y	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans		ADA Transition Plan improvements at three intersections in St. Joseph. On Belt Hwy. at Wal-Mart South entrance and at Commons Drive. On Rte. AC at Pickett Road. $273,000 Statewide Transportation Alternatives Funds. To be let in combination with 1S3143B.	AC-State: 304	76	0	Winter 18	STBG	0	380	Engineering:	0	39	0	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	341	0	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	273	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	US 169	1S3143B	0.10	Y	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans	BP-2018-03	ADA Transition Plan improvements on Belt Hwy. at the intersections with Faraon St. and Rte. 36 in St. Joseph. $527,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. To be let in combination with 1S3143.	593	149	0	Winter 18	STBG	0	760	Engineering:	18	63	0	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	30	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	649	0	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	527	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	IS 229	1I0904	2.47	Y	Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Rehab And Reconst	RR-2018-01	Pavement improvements from 22nd Street to I-29 south intersection in St. Joseph.	1,920	213	0	Fall 17	NHPP	0	2,140	Engineering:	7	180	0	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	1,953	0	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Fed:	State:	Local:	AC-State:	Estimate Total:	Description		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Atchison	RT J	1S3054	0.09	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Fall 18	NHPP	0	1,427	356	0		1,815	Replace bridge over the Tarkio River, 0.6 mile east Rte. 59 near Fairfax. Project involves bridge L0447.	Engineering:	32	89	144	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,545	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	MO 116	1S3129	0.12	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		2019	NHPP	0	1,170	293	0		1,499	Replace bridge over I-29, 1 mile east of Rte. 371 near Faucett. Project involves bridge A0074.	Engineering:	36	95	107	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,251	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	US 169	1S3143	0.15	Y	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans		Winter 18	STBG	0		76	0	304	380	ADA Transition Plan improvements at three intersections in St. Joseph. On Belt Hwy. at Wal-Mart South entrance and at Commons Drive. On Rte. AC at Pickett Road. $273,000 Statewide Transportation Alternatives Funds. To be let in combination with 1S3143B.	Engineering:	0	39	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	341	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	273	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	US 169	1S3143B	0.10	Y	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans	BP-2018-03	Winter 18	STBG	0	593	149	0		760	ADA Transition Plan improvements on Belt Hwy. at the intersections with Faraon St. and Rte. 36 in St. Joseph. $527,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. To be let in combination with 1S3143.	Engineering:	18	63	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	30	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	649	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	527	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	IS 229	1I0904	2.47	Y	Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Rehab And Reconst	RR-2018-01	Fall 17	NHPP	0	1,920	213	0		2,140	Pavement improvements from 22nd Street to I-29 south intersection in St. Joseph.	Engineering:	7	180	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	1,953	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Buchanan Route: IS 29 Job No.: 1I3183 Length: 8.86 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #: RR-2018-02	Pavement improvements from 1.5 miles south of Rte. O to Platte County line near Dearborn. AC-State: 3,851 State: 428 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,279	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
		Engineering:	0	11	66	286	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	3,916	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P3120 Length: 0.23 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #: BP-2017-01	Bridge substructure rehabilitation over I-229 and 6th Street in St. Joseph. Project involves bridge L0319. Fed: 1,493 State: 372 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,875	Engineering:	10	50	134	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	1,681	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: MO 371 Job No.: 1S3076 Length: 13.04 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. 752, in St. Joseph, to Platte County line. $500,000 from Open Container funds. Fed: 2,355 State: 589 Local: 0 Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,960	Engineering:	16	62	204	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	2,678	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	500	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: US 59 Job No.: 1P3188 Length: 14.62 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #: RR-2018-04	Pavement improvements from Rte. 752 in St. Joseph to north of Rte. 45 intersection near Rushville. AC-State: 2,257 State: 564 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,821	Engineering:	0	51	195	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	2,575	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: MO 6 Job No.: 1P3072 Length: 11.06 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #: RR-2018-09	Pavement improvements from Rte. AC, in St. Joseph, to Rte. 31 near Clarksdale. Fed: 1,956 State: 488 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,450	Engineering:	6	10	63	174	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	2,197	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
County: Buchanan Route: MO 752 Job No.: 1P3184 Length: 0.98 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 348 State: 87 Local: 0 Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay — Awd Date: Fall 17 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 439	Pavement improvements from Rte. 371 to I-229 in St. Joseph.						
	Engineering:	4	35	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	400	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: RT E Job No.: 1S3196 Length: 8.57 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 649 State: 163 Local: 0 Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 812	Pavement improvements from Rte. 169 to Rte. 116 near Gower.						
	Engineering:	0	2	15	52	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	743	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: RT H Job No.: 1S3197 Length: 13.92 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 928 State: 232 Local: 0 Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG TIP #: RR-2018-10 — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,160	Pavement improvements from Rte. 371, near Faucett, to Rte. 169 in Gower.						
	Engineering:	0	5	18	76	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	1,061	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Buchanan Route: RP IS229N TO MO759N Job No.: 1I3186 Length: 0.35 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 722 State: 180 Local: 0 Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Winter 18 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 912	Replace bridge expansion joints and update guardrail on various bridge ramps on I-229, Rte. 36, Rte. 752, and Rte. 759 in St. Joseph. Project involves bridges A0887, A2232, A2233, A2234, A2235, A3849, A3850 and A3147.						
	Engineering:	10	72	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	830	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Caldwell Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P3165 Length: 13.01 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 3,141 State: 786 Local: 0 Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay — Awd Date: Fall 18 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 3,929	Pavement improvements in the westbound lanes from Rte. 13 to the Livingston County line, near Hamilton.						
	Engineering:	2	73	270	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	3,584	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Description	Awd Date:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:	Fed:	State:	Local:	AC-State:	Anticipated Fed Cat:		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Carroll	MO 10	1P3108	17.03	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay		Pavement improvements from Ray County line to Rte. 65 near Carrollton.	Winter 18	0	2,271		448	0	1,791	NHPP	Engineering:	32	153	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	2,086	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	US 24	1P3175	0.02	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge deck improvements on bridge over the Missouri River overflow, 1.9 miles north of Missouri River near Carrollton. Project involves bridge A2619.	Summer 18	0	369	294	73	0		NHPP	Engineering:	2	6	26	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	335	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	US 24	1P3176	0.12	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge deck improvements on the bridge over Wakenda Creek, 0.5 mile north of Rte. 10 near Carrollton. Project involves bridge A2906.	Summer 18	0	1,781	1,417	354	0		NHPP	Engineering:	10	18	116	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,637	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	US 24	2P2211	17.44	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay		Pavement and shoulder improvements from 1.9 miles east of Rte. 41, near Dewitt, to Rte. 5 in Keytesville. $175,000 from Open Container funds.	2019	0	4,539	3,571	891	0		NHPP	Engineering:	77	81	459	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	3,922	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	175	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Carroll	US 65	1P3147	0.35	N	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint		Replace expansion joints on various bridges in Carroll, Daviess, Livingston and Linn Counties. Project involves bridges H0614, F0097, G0862, A3844 and A2053.	Summer 18	0	1,222	973	244	0		NHPP	Engineering:	5	15	84	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,118	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Description	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:	AC-State:	State:	Local:	Fed:
Carroll	RT J	1L1801F	9.94	N	Pavement improvements from Rte. 65 to end of state maintenance, 2.7 miles east of Rte. 139, near Hale.	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing	Fall 17	STBG	0	935	736	184	0	
Carroll	RT W	1P2219C	0.49	N	Improvements to sidewalks and pedestrian ramps in Bogard.	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst	2020	STBG	0	110		19	0	78
Carroll	RT Z	2S2185	0.02	N	Replace bridge over Tater Hill Creek, 1.1 miles west of Rte. 65 near Coloma. Project involves bridge T0267.	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst	2021	NHPP	0	927		180	0	725
Chariton	MO 129	1S3170	20.79	N	Pavement improvements from Macon County line to Rte. PP in Salisbury.	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing	2020	STBG	0	2,355		471	0	1,882
Chariton	MO 139	1S3157	0.09	N	Replace bridge over Grand River Overflow, 1.6 miles west of Rte. EE near Sumner. Project involves bridge R0420.	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst	2021	NHPP	0	2,403		480	0	1,920

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING

	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Engineering:	15	64	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	856	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	13	1	1	6	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	89	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	22	1	17	43	59	0
R/W:	0	0	0	5	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	780	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	2	3	42	154	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	2,154	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	3	1	82	163	153	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	2,001	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Chariton Route: US 24 Job No.: 1P3132 Length: 0.12 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over Middle Fork Chariton River, 1.8 miles west of Rte. 129 near Salisbury. Project involves bridge G0826. Awd Date: 2020 Fed: 1,735 State: 435 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,175	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
	Engineering:	5	44	149	141	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	1,831	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton Route: US 24 Job No.: 1P3177 Length: 0.12 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Replace expansion joints on the bridge over Long Creek, 0.7 mile west of Rte. KK near Keytesville. Project involves bridge A3778. Awd Date: Summer 18 Fed: 205 State: 51 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 258						
	Engineering:	2	7	18	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	231	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton Route: US 24 Job No.: 1P3178 Length: 0.10 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Replace expansion joints on the bridge over Chariton River, 0.3 mile west of Rte. KK near Keytesville. Project involves bridge A3779. Awd Date: Summer 18 Fed: 264 State: 66 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 332						
	Engineering:	2	7	23	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	300	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton Route: US 24 Job No.: 2P2182 Length: 0.08 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over Mussel Fork River, 0.1 mile west of Keytesville. Project involves bridge H0520. Awd Date: Summer 18 Fed: 2,285 State: 570 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,936						
	Engineering:	81	142	226	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	2,482	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton Route: US 24 Job No.: 2P2183 Length: 0.06 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge to the overflow structure of the Middle Fork Chariton River, 1.5 miles east of Rte. 129 near Salisbury. Project involves bridge G0891. Awd Date: 2020 Fed: 1,910 State: 478 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,447						
	Engineering:	59	50	133	157	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	2,048	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Chariton	Route: MO 5	Job No.: 1P3024	Length: 20.15	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	TIP #:	Awd Date: Fall 18	Future Cost: 0	Fed: 2,848	State: 713	Local: 0	AC-State:	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Estimate Total: 3,598	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Marceline to Rte. 24 in Keytesville.

County: Clinton	Route: MO 116	Job No.: 1P1043	Length: 13.25	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay	TIP #:	Awd Date: 2020	Future Cost: 0	Fed: 2,320	State: 579	Local: 0	AC-State:	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Estimate Total: 2,899	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. 169 to Rte. 33 at Lathrop.

County: Clinton	Route: MO 116	Job No.: 1S3125	Length: 0.02	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	TIP #:	Awd Date: Winter 18	Future Cost: 0	Fed:	State: 63	Local: 0	AC-State: 253	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Estimate Total: 331	Replace bridge over McGuire Creek, 1.7 miles west of Rte. 169 near Gower. Project involves bridge Z0383.

County: Clinton	Route: US 169	Job No.: 1P3103	Length: 0.19	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	TIP #:	Awd Date: Summer 18	Future Cost: 0	Fed: 2,535	State: 634	Local: 0	AC-State:	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Estimate Total: 3,244	Replace bridge over Castile Creek, 1 mile southeast of Gower. Project involves bridge L0679.

County: Clinton	Route: IS 35	Job No.: 1I3016	Length: 5.08	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	TIP #:	Awd Date: 2020	Future Cost: 0	Fed:	State: 243	Local: 0	AC-State: 2,187	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Estimate Total: 2,430	Pavement improvements from DeKalb County line to Shoal Creek, near Cameron.

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING

County	Route	Job No.	Length	MPO	Fund Cat	Sec Cat	TIP #	Awd Date	Future Cost	Fed	State	Local	AC-State	Anticipated Fed Cat	Estimate Total	Description		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Chariton	MO 5	1P3024	20.15	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Fall 18	0	2,848	713	0		STBG	3,598	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Marceline to Rte. 24 in Keytesville.	Engineering:	37	69	244	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	3	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	3,245	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	MO 116	1P1043	13.25	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay		2020	0	2,320	579	0		STBG	2,899	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. 169 to Rte. 33 at Lathrop.	Engineering:	0	7	45	195	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	0	2,652	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	MO 116	1S3125	0.02	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Winter 18	0		63	0	253	STBG	331	Replace bridge over McGuire Creek, 1.7 miles west of Rte. 169 near Gower. Project involves bridge Z0383.	Engineering:	15	30	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	2	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	284	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	US 169	1P3103	0.19	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Summer 18	0	2,535	634	0		NHPP	3,244	Replace bridge over Castile Creek, 1 mile southeast of Gower. Project involves bridge L0679.	Engineering:	75	410	178	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	2,576	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clinton	IS 35	1I3016	5.08	N	Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Rehab And Reconst		2020	0		243	0	2,187	NHPP	2,430	Pavement improvements from DeKalb County line to Shoal Creek, near Cameron.	Engineering:	0	6	38	112	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	0	2,274	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Clinton / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I3018	Pavement improvements from north of Rte. 116 to Clay County line near Holt.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 8.26 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	AC-State: 3,631 State: 403 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,039						
Engineering:		5	10	62	271	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	3,691	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Clinton / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1S3059	Replace bridge deck over I-35, 4.4 miles south of Cameron. Project involves bridge A1152.						
Length: 0.13 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 800 State: 200 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2019 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,019						
Engineering:		19	32	74	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	894	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Clinton / Route: RT C / Job No.: 1S3088	Pavement and shoulder improvements from south city limits of Plattsburg to Rte. CC in Clay County. $760,000 Open Container funds. Project to be let in combination with 4P3051B.						
Length: 8.08 MPO: Y							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,220 State: 305 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Fall 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,567						
Engineering:		36	103	0	0	0	0
R/W:		6	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	1,422	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	760	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: MO 13 / Job No.: 1S0579	Replace bridge over Honey Creek, 0.5 mile north of Rte. HH near Gallatin. Project involves bridge J0860.						
Length: 0.15 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,139 State: 284 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Spring 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,571						
Engineering:		148	101	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	10	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	1,312	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 0I3004E	Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from Rte. 6 near Winston to the Clay County line.						
Length: 32.17 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Spring 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 273						
Engineering:		0	23	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	250	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Daviess / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I3192	Replace expansion joints on northbound and southbound lane bridges over the Grand River and the Grand River overflow, south of Rte. C near Pattonsburg. Project involves bridges A1756 and A1758.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 0.62 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,016 State: 113 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,129						
Engineering:		0	20	79	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	1,030	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1L1801D	Pavement and shoulder improvements from I-35 to Rte. 6 near Altamont.						
Length: 3.18 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 252 State: 64 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing	Awd Date: Fall 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 320						
Engineering:		4	28	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	288	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1P3199	Pavement improvements on Rte. 69 and Rte. 6 from I-35 to the city limits of Trenton.						
Length: 34.90 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 2,132 State: 534 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,666						
Engineering:		0	10	43	173	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	2,440	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: RT B / Job No.: 1S3141	Replace bridge deck over I-35, 3.8 miles west of Rte. 13 near Coffey. Project involves bridge A1917.						
Length: 0.11 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 654 State: 164 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2019 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 833						
Engineering:		15	25	59	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	734	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: RT C / Job No.: 1S3131	Replace bridge deck over I-35, 0.8 mile east of Rte. 69 near Pattonsburg. Project involves bridge A1809.						
Length: 0.11 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 755 State: 188 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2019 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 957						
Engineering:		14	24	67	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	852	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Daviess Route: RT DD Job No.: 1S3130 Length: 0.11 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge deck over I-35, 1 mile east of Rte. 69 near Pattonsburg. Project involves bridge A1807. Awd Date: 2019 Fed: 649 State: 162 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 819	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
		Engineering:	8	22	54	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	735	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess Route: RT KK Job No.: 1S2166 Length: 0.08 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge deck over I-35, 1 mile west of Rte. 69 near Altamont. Project involves bridge A1801. Awd Date: 2019 Fed: 547 State: 138 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 707							
		Engineering:	22	18	49	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	618	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: US 169 Job No.: 1P3146 Length: 0.07 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over Third Fork Platte River, 0.3 mile west of Rte. F near Union Star. Project involves bridge J0605. Awd Date: 2019 Fed: 1,070 State: 266 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,371							
		Engineering:	35	77	108	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	1,146	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P0918 Length: 5.90 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement improvements in the eastbound lane from east of Grindstone Creek to Caldwell County line, and in the westbound lane from east of Rte. C to east of Caldwell County line near Cameron. Awd Date: Summer 17 AC-State: 2,659 State: 665 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 3,411							
		Engineering:	87	245	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	3,079	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P3086 Length: 0.41 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	Reconstruct the horizontal curve in the westbound lane 0.2 mile east of Rte. 33 near Osborn. Awd Date: Summer 17 Fed: 1,878 State: 209 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,218							
		Engineering:	126	139	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	5	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	1,948	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Dekalb / Route: US 36 / Job No.: 1P3105	Pavement improvements on eastbound lanes from east of Rte. 31 to Rte. 33 (north) near Osborn.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 10.50 MPO: N	Engineering:	50	137	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 1,494 State: 374 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay — Awd Date: Summer 17 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	1,731	0	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,918	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb / Route: 36 / Job No.: 1P3187	Guardrail improvements in the eastbound and westbound lanes within the county limits.						
Length: 0.00 MPO: N	Engineering:	15	52	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 362 State: 90 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance — Awd Date: Fall 17 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	400	0	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 467	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb / Route: RT A / Job No.: 1S3136	Replace bridge deck over Lost Creek, 0.5 mile south of Rte. W near Maysville. Project involves bridge A1378.						
Length: 0.13 MPO: N	Engineering:	2	1	7	16	55	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 634 State: 157 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	0	712	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 793	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb / Route: RT A / Job No.: 1S3137	Replace bridge over North Fork Lost Creek, 1.6 miles south of Rte. Z near Maysville. Project involves bridge T0641.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	2	8	32	54	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 503 State: 126 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	530	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 631	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb / Route: RT D / Job No.: 1S0588	Replace bridge over Ervens Branch, 0.4 mile north of Rte. W near Maysville. Project involves bridge S0419.						
Length: 0.40 MPO: N	Engineering:	17	40	26	41	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 604 State: 150 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	10	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	637	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 771	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Dekalb Route: RT W Job No.: 1S3202 Length: 5.05 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing TIP #:	Pavement improvements from Rte. A to Rte. D near Maysville. $470,000 District Operations funds. AC-State: 418 State: 104 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 522	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
		Engineering:	0	52	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	470	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	470	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Gentry Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3006 Length: 3.86 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement improvements from 1.1 miles east of Rte. 169 to 0.5 mile west of Rte. C in Albany. AC-State: 937 State: 235 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,210							
		Engineering:	38	84	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	1,088	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Gentry Route: US 169 Job No.: 1P3106 Length: 0.14 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge deck over Middle Fork Grand River, 0.6 mile east of Rte. YY near Gentry. Project involves bridge A0729. Fed: 1,069 State: 267 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,341							
		Engineering:	5	1	5	33	93	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,204	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Grundy Route: MO 6 Job No.: 1P3144 Length: 1.69 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement and ADA Transition Plan improvements in Trenton from west city limits to Rte. 65. Includes work to replace pedestrian curb ramps and state owned sidewalks. $300,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternative funds. Fed: 830 State: 207 Local: 0 Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,042							
		Engineering:	5	82	90	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	860	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	4	296	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison Route: IS 35 Job No.: 0I3004D Length: 49.20 MPO: N Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from the Iowa State line to Rte. 6 in Daviess County near Winston. AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0 Awd Date: Spring 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 273							
		Engineering:	0	23	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	250	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Harrison / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I0914	Pavement improvements from Rte. 136 at Bethany to Rte. C near Pattonsburg.																		
Length: 14.17	MPO: N																		
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge						Fed: 6,369	State: 708	Local: 0											
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2020	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP																	
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 7,087																	

County: Harrison / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I3017	Pavement improvements from Rte. N, at Eagleville, to Rte. 136 at Bethany. Excludes concrete pavement in the southbound lanes north of Bethany.																		
Length: 14.08	MPO: N																		
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge						AC-State: 6,350	State: 706	Local: 0											
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP																	
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 7,076																	

County: Harrison / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I3169	Pavement and bridge improvements from Iowa State line to Rte. N at Eagleville, including the northbound lane bridge at the Iowa State line. Project involves bridge A2739.																		
Length: 7.88	MPO: N																		
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge						AC-State: 4,746	State: 527	Local: 0											
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 17	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP																	
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 5,278																	

County: Harrison / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1L1801B	Pavement improvements from Rte. 136 to Rte. C, near Pattonsburg.																		
Length: 12.68	MPO: N																		
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System						AC-State: 943	State: 236	Local: 0											
Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing	Awd Date: Fall 17	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG																	
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 1,188																	

County: Harrison / Route: RT EE / Job No.: 1S3123	Replace bridge deck over Big Muddy Creek, 0.1 mile south of Rte. M. Project involves bridge N0408.																		
Length: 0.07	MPO: N																		
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System						Fed: 261	State: 65	Local: 0											
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 17	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP																	
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 336																	

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Engineering:	10	22	110	474	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	6,471	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	20	134	742	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	6,180	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	5	473	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	4,800	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	9	106	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	1,073	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	10	26	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	300	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Harrison / Route: RT H / Job No.: 1S3124	Length: 0.13	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 17	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 623	State: 156	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 794	TIP #:

Replace bridge deck over I-35, 1.3 miles west of Rte. 13 near Coffey. Project involves bridge A1919.

County: Harrison / Route: RT H / Job No.: 1S3181	Length: 0.90	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 1,950	State: 488	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 2,438	TIP #:

Bridge painting on various bridges in Harrison, Daviess, Holt, Sullivan and Clinton Counties. Project involves bridges A1919, N0408, A1801, A1807, A1809, A1917, N0366, P0528, A1152 and A2535.

County: Harrison / Route: RT P / Job No.: 1S3158	Length: 0.02	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 803	State: 201	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 1,007	TIP #:

Replace bridge over White Oak Creek, 0.4 mile west of Rte. TT near McFall. Project involves bridge P0576.

County: Harrison / Route: RT V / Job No.: 1S3122	Length: 0.06	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 570	State: 142	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 722	TIP #:

Replace bridge over Coal Creek, 1.2 miles north of Rte. WW near Cainsville. Project involves bridge N0373.

County: Holt / Route: MO 111 / Job No.: 1S3153	Length: 2.48	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Fed: 337	State: 84	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 426	TIP #:

Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. T, in Forest City, to Rte. 59 in Oregon.

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
County: Harrison, Route: RT H, Job No.: 1S3124						
Engineering:	15	59	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	720	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Harrison, Route: RT H, Job No.: 1S3181						
Engineering:	0	7	46	157	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	2,228	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Harrison, Route: RT P, Job No.: 1S3158						
Engineering:	3	1	30	50	73	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	850	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Harrison, Route: RT V, Job No.: 1S3122						
Engineering:	10	5	5	10	46	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	646	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Holt, Route: MO 111, Job No.: 1S3153						
Engineering:	5	15	35	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	371	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Holt / Route: US 159 / Job No.: 1P3128	Replace bridge over Penny Slough Creek, 1.2 miles west of Rte. 111 near Fortescue. Project involves bridge A2584.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 0.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	39	65	99	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 977 State: 245 Local: 0	R/W:	0	20	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2019 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	1,038	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,261	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: US 159 / Job No.: 1S3127	Replace bridge deck on bridge over I-29 near Mound City. Project involves bridge A2535.						
Length: 0.13 MPO: N	Engineering:	10	17	48	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 537 State: 134 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2019 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	606	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 681	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3020	Replace bridge deck and expansion joints in southbound lane over the Nodaway River, 0.8 mile south of Rte. 59 near Oregon. Project involves bridges A1287.						
Length: 0.16 MPO: N	Engineering:	130	193	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — Fed: 2,437 State: 271 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Summer 17 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	2,515	0	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 2,838	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3020B	Paint bridges over the Nodaway River, 0.8 mile south of Rte. 59 near Oregon. Project involves bridges A1287 and G0490.						
Length: 0.17 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	5	10	96	0	0
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — AC-State: 1,364 State: 153 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	1,406	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,517	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3093	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. W to Rte. 118 at Mound City.						
Length: 15.24 MPO: N	Engineering:	293	576	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — AC-State: 7,110 State: 789 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Summer 17 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	7,323	0	0	0	0
TIP #: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 8,192	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3099	Replace bridge decks in the northbound and southbound lanes over Kimsey Creek and Rte. E near Mound City. Project involves twin bridges A1770 and A1771.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Length: 0.32 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Fed: 3,979 State: 443 Local: 0	Engineering:	22	26	65	300	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,444	Construction:	0	0	0	4,031	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1P3023B	Bridge painting over Davis Creek, 0.2 mile south of Rte. 118 near Mound City. Project involves twin bridges A1767.						
Length: 0.04 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 383 State: 43 Local: 0	Engineering:	9	1	1	28	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 435	Construction:	0	0	0	396	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: US 59 / Job No.: 1S0605	Replace bridge over Davis Creek, 0.1 mile west of Mound City. Project involves bridge H0670.						
Length: 0.05 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 434 State: 109 Local: 0	Engineering:	48	48	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	5	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 596	Construction:	0	495	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: RT A / Job No.: 1S3180	Section 14 Streambank protection project with the Corps of Engineers, on the Nodaway River 0.2 miles east of Maitland. Corps to design and administer project. Cost represents MoDOT's share. Near bridge A1252.						
Length: 0.07 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 295 State: 73 Local: 0	Engineering:	40	7	1	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: N/A Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 408	Construction:	0	0	350	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: RT B / Job No.: 1S3061	Replace bridge deck over I-29 near Oregon. Project involves bridge A1834.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 868 State: 216 Local: 0	Engineering:	9	1	5	27	74
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,093	Construction:	0	0	0	0	977
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Route: Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Awd Date:	Future Cost:	AC-State:	State:	Local:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Estimate Total:	Description		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Linn / US 36 / 1P3219	0.07	N	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint		Fall 17	0	132	33	0	NHPP	165	Preventive maintenance on bridge in the eastbound lane over Higgins Drainage Ditch, 1.6 miles west of Rte. 130 near Laclede. Project involves bridge A3254. $150,000 District Operations funds.	Engineering:	0	15	0	0	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	150	0	0	0	0
														FFOS:	0	150	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linn / US 36 / 2P2210	9.90	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Summer 17	0	1,290	323	0	NHPP	1,649	Shoulder improvements in the westbound lane from west of West Yellow Creek to west of Mussel Fork Creek, near Bucklin.	Engineering:	36	113	0	0	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	1,500	0	0	0	0
														FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Linn / RT MM / 1S3079	0.13	N	Flexible & Other	Rehab And Reconst		N/A	0		Fed: 241	60	0	STBG	336	Section 14 streambank protection project with the Corps of Engineers near Locust Creek, 0.5 mile west of Rte. 5 near Browning. Corps to design and administer project. Cost represents MoDOT's share. Payment to Corp for design work. Near bridge A2098.	Engineering:	15	1	0	0	0	0
														R/W:	20	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	300	0	0	0	0
														FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livingston / MO 190 / 1S3156	0.21	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		2020	0		Fed: 2,807	702	0	NHPP	3,512	Replace bridge deck over the Thompson River, 0.9 mile east of Rte. Y, near Chillicothe. Project involves bridge A1376.	Engineering:	3	24	84	218	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	0	3,183	0	0
														FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Livingston / US 65 / 1P3114	0.29	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		2020	0		Fed: 3,743	936	0	NHPP	4,685	Replace bridge deck over the Grand River, 1.3 miles south of Rte. 36 near Chillicothe. Project involves bridge A1249.	Engineering:	6	48	96	291	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	0	4,244	0	0
														FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Description	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:	AC-State:	State:	Local:	Fed:	Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Livingston	US 65	2P2217	3.14	N	Pavement improvements from Rte. 190 to Rte. 36 in Chillicothe. Project includes improvements to pedestrian crossings at various intersections.	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay	Fall 18		0	1,218	967	242	0		Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	9	70	109	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	1,030	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
Livingston	RT H	1L1801E	8.01	N	Pavement improvements from Rte. 65 to Rte. 139 near Hale.	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing	Fall 17		0	754	592	147	0		Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	15	52	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	687	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
Mercer	US 136	1P3100	0.10	N	Replace bridge over Big Muddy Creek, 2.9 miles east of Rte. 65 near Princeton. Project involves bridge H0953.	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst	Fall 17		0	1,560		287	0	1,150	Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	118	133	0	0	0	0
																					5	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	1,304	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
Mercer	US 65	1P3185	97.77	N	Pavement treatment from Iowa State line to Rte. 190, in Chillicothe, and from Rte. 36 the Missouri River. Project includes Mercer, Grundy, Livingston and Carroll Counties.	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint	Winter 18		0	3,830	3,042	761	0		Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	27	303	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	3,500	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
Mercer	RT BB	1S3161	0.02	N	Replace bridge deck over Branch of Weldon Fork Creek, 3.5 miles west of Rte. 65, near Mercer. Project involves bridge N0855.	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst	2021		0	353		70	0	280	Engineering:	R/W:	Construction:	FFOS:	Payments:	3	1	2	8	24	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	315	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0
																					0	0	0	0	0	0

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Description	Awd Date:	Future Cost:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Fed:	State:	Local:	Estimate Total:		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Mercer	RT E	1S3191	31.42	N	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint		Pavement improvements from Rte. 65, near Princeton, to Rte. 6 near Milan.	Fall 18	0	STBG	632	158	0	790	Engineering:	0	15	54	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	721	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	MO 148	1P3010	14.40	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay		Pavement and shoulder improvements from Iowa State line to Rte. 71 near Maryville.	Fall 18	0	STBG	2,202	550	0	2,752	Engineering:	0	81	199	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	2,472	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	MO 46	1S0447	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over Florida Creek, 0.7 mile west of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0920.	2020	0	NHPP	744	185	0	977	Engineering:	48	27	47	64	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	0	786	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	MO 46	1S0616	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over White Cloud Creek, 2.3 miles east of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0922.	2020	0	NHPP	774	193	0	979	Engineering:	12	30	52	67	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	0	813	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	MO 46	1S3138	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over Big Slough Creek, 0.8 mile west of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0919.	2020	0	NHPP	648	161	0	814	Engineering:	5	26	44	56	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	9	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	0	674	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Nodaway Route: MO 46 Job No.: 1S3139 Length: 0.10 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over stream, 3.2 miles east of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0921.	Fed: 688 State: 172 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 865	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
			Engineering:	5	21	37	58	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	739	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: MO 46 Job No.: 1S3172 Length: 24.18 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement and shoulder improvements from Rte. 136, at Ravenwood, to Rte. 169 in Grant City.	AC-State: 4,215 State: 1,053 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,270							
			Engineering:	2	97	361	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	4,810	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: US 71 Job No.: 1P3182 Length: 0.04 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Systems Operations TIP #:	Installation of traffic signals and geometric improvements at intersection of Rte. 71 and Bus. 71 in Maryville. $158,000 District Operations funds.	AC-State: 136 State: 34 Local: 0 Awd Date: Summer 17 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 179							
			Engineering:	9	12	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	158	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	158	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam Route: MO 129 Job No.: 1P3168 Length: 19.94 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing TIP #:	Pavement improvements from Rte. 136 to Rte. 6 in Green City.	Fed: 1,340 State: 334 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,676							
			Engineering:	2	2	30	111	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	1,531	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3067 Length: 0.13 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over West Locust Creek, 1 mile west of Rte. E near Unionville. Project involves bridge J0406.	Fed: 1,557 State: 388 Local: 0 Awd Date: Winter 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,070							
			Engineering:	125	203	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	1,737	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Putnam / Route: US 136 / Job No.: 1P3152	Length: 0.02	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2019	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 276	State: 69	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 350	Replace bridge deck over Brush Creek, 0.6 mile west of Rte. F near Livonia. Project involves bridge H0440.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
												Engineering:	5	10	26	0	0	0
												R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Construction:	0	0	309	0	0	0
												FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam / Route: US 136 / Job No.: 2P2186	Length: 0.13	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Winter 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 721	State: 180	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 967	Replace bridge over Elm Branch, 1.1 miles east of Rte. 139 near Lucerne. Project involves bridge J0400.						
												Engineering:	66	85	0	0	0	0
												R/W:	0	1	0	0	0	0
												Construction:	0	815	0	0	0	0
												FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam / Route: MO 139 / Job No.: 1L1800	Length: 32.81	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing	Awd Date: Winter 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Fed: 2,657	State: 664	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 3,426	Pavement and ADA Transition Plan improvements from the Iowa State line to Rte. 6 in Sullivan County. Project includes pedestrian improvements in Newtown. $300,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds.						
												Engineering:	105	257	0	0	0	0
												R/W:	0	6	0	0	0	0
												Construction:	0	3,058	0	0	0	0
												FFOS:	0	300	0	0	0	0
												Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam / Route: RT Y / Job No.: 1S3163	Length: 0.02	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 246	State: 60	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 309	Replace bridge deck over North Blackbird Creek, 2.6 miles south of Rte. 129 near Unionville. Project involves bridge P0834.						
												Engineering:	3	1	2	7	21	0
												R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Construction:	0	0	0	0	275	0
												FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan / Route: MO 129 / Job No.: 1L1801C	Length: 7.71	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing	Awd Date: Fall 17	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	AC-State: 507	State: 126	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 643	Pavement improvements from Rte. 6 to Rte. H, near Green City.						
												Engineering:	10	47	0	0	0	0
												R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Construction:	0	586	0	0	0	0
												FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
												Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Length:	MPO:	Fund Cat:	Sec Cat:	TIP #:	Description	Awd Date:	Future Cost:	Fed:	State:	Local:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Estimate Total:		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Sullivan	MO 139	2S2176	0.20	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over Newtown Branch, 0.6 mile south of Rte. EE near Newtown. Project involves bridge S0583.	Fall 18	0	841	210	0	NHPP	1,096	Engineering:	45	52	90	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	904	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	MO 6	1P3077	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over West Yellow Creek, 0.5 mile east of Rte. P near Milan. Project involves bridge L0796.	Summer 18	0	657	164	0	NHPP	842	Engineering:	21	41	54	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	721	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	MO 6	2P0470	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge over West Locust Creek, 1.3 miles west of Rte. Z near Humphreys. Project involves bridge J0379.	2019	0	1,367	341	0	NHPP	1,759	Engineering:	51	97	160	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	9	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	1,442	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	RT BB	1S3151	0.14	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge deck over Rooks Branch, 4.4 miles north of Rte. OO near Milan. Project involves bridge P0528.	2019	0	166	41	0	NHPP	212	Engineering:	5	10	17	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	180	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	RT EE	1S3148	0.04	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Replace bridge deck over Medicine Creek, 0.5 mile east of Rte. 139 near Newtown. Project involves bridge N0448.	2019	0	339	84	0	NHPP	428	Engineering:	5	11	32	0	0	0
																R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Construction:	0	0	380	0	0	0
																FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Sullivan Route: RT M Job No.: 1S3167 Length: 18.32 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing TIP #:	Pavement and ADA Transition Plan improvements from Rte. O to Rte. 11 in Brookfield. Project includes updating pedestrian curb ramps in Brookfield. $30,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Fed: 1,188 State: 297 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2019 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,487	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
	Engineering:	2	30	102	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	3	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	1,350	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	30	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: RT PP Job No.: 1S3140 Length: 0.12 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge over East Medicine Creek Drainage Ditch, 0.2 mile east of Rte. 139 near Osgood. Project involves bridge P0956. Fed: 1,138 State: 285 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,425						
	Engineering:	2	13	57	114	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	1,234	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: RT ZZ Job No.: 1S3149 Length: 0.03 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Replace bridge deck over West Fork Locust Creek, near Harris. Project involves bridge N0366. Fed: 203 State: 51 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2019 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 259						
	Engineering:	5	15	18	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	221	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0P3020B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	Safety projects at various locations in the Northwest District. $844,000 from Statewide Open Container funds. Fed: 858 State: 96 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 954						
	Engineering:	0	0	0	59	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	895	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	844	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0P3021B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	Safety projects at various locations in the Northwest District. $738,000 from Statewide Open Container funds. Fed: 772 State: 86 Local: 0 Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 858						
	Engineering:	0	0	0	0	52	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	0	806	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	738	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0P3022B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	Safety projects at various locations in the Northwest District. $738,000 from Statewide Open Container funds. Awd Date: 2022 Future Cost: 0 Fed: 795 State: 88 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Estimate Total: 883		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
			Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
		Engineering:	0	0	0	0	0	52
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	831
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	738
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0S3018B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $260,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: 2019 Future Cost: 0 Fed: 228 State: 58 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Estimate Total: 286							
		Engineering:	0	0	18	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	268	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	260	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0S3019B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $909,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: 2019 Future Cost: 0 Fed: 749 State: 187 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Estimate Total: 936							
		Engineering:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	936	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	909	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0S3020B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $779,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: 2020 Future Cost: 0 Fed: 705 State: 176 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Estimate Total: 881							
		Engineering:	0	0	0	55	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	826	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	779	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0S3021B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $875,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: 2021 Future Cost: 0 Fed: 814 State: 203 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Estimate Total: 1,017							
		Engineering:	0	0	0	0	61	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	956	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	875	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 0S3022B Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $875,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: 2022 Fed: 837 State: 209 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,046	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
		Engineering:	0	0	0	0	0	61
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	985
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	875
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3126 Length: 0.00 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance TIP #:	Job Order Contracting for guard cable and guardrail repair at various major route locations in the Northwest District. Awd Date: Spring 18 AC-State: 303 State: 76 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 379							
		Engineering:	0	29	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	350	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3194 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Bridge improvements on various routes in the Northwest District. Awd Date: 2020 Fed: 1,390 State: 348 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,738							
		Engineering:	0	4	30	113	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	1,591	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3198 Length: 0.00 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance TIP #: HE-2018-02	Job Order Contracting for guardrail and guard cable repair on various major route locations in the Northwest District. Awd Date: 2019 AC-State: 317 State: 79 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 396							
		Engineering:	0	5	30	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	361	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1S3195 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Pavement improvements on various routes in the Northwest District. Awd Date: 2020 AC-State: 3,274 State: 819 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,093							
		Engineering:	0	14	84	282	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	3,713	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: **Worth**
Route: **RT YY**
Job No.: **1S3134**

Replace bridge over the Middle Fork Grand River, 0.5 mile north of Rte. W near Gentry. Project involves bridge H0617.

Length: **0.14** MPO: **N**

Fund Cat: **Taking Care Of System** Fed: **1,635** State: **410** Local: **0**

Sec Cat: **Rehab And Reconst** Awd Date: **2020** Anticipated Fed Cat: **NHPP**

TIP #: Future Cost: **0** Estimate Total: **2,055**

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
Engineering:	10	58	122	149	0	0
R/W:	0	0	8	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	1,708	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
FFOS:	0	4,401	2,170	1,623	1,613	1,613
Total R/W:	46	170	62	5	0	0
Total Construction:	0	68,144	65,224	70,815	9,522	1,816
Paybacks:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	46	68,314	65,286	70,820	9,522	1,816
Total Engineering:	3,218	9,308	7,715	5,621	711	113
Grand Total:	3,264	77,622	73,001	76,441	10,233	1,929

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
State	12,687	13,729	12,294	1,960	297
AC-State	42,144	14,398	19,608	0	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	54,831	28,127	31,902	1,960	297
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	22,791	44,874	44,539	8,273	1,632
Grand Total	77,622	73,001	76,441	10,233	1,929

Project Count: 141

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

MoDOT's Northwest District

PAYMENT PROJECTS

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

County: Buchanan Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P3035Z Length: 0.50 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Flexible & Other Sec Cat: Regional TIP #:	Payback from the Economic Development program to Buchanan County Agri-Business Center Board in SFY 2021 for the design, engineering and right of way for project 1P3035. Awd Date: N/A Future Cost: 0	Fed: 0 State: 358 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: State Estimate Total: 358	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
			Engineering:	0	0	0	0	1	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	357	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	357	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3174 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	On-call work zone enforcement at various locations in the Northwest District. Awd Date: N/A Future Cost: 0	Fed: 46 State: 5 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Estimate Total: 51							
			Engineering:	0	1	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	50	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3200 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	On-call work zone enforcement at various locations in the Northwest District. Awd Date: N/A Future Cost: 0	Fed: 47 State: 5 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Estimate Total: 52							
			Engineering:	0	0	2	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	50	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 5B0800O Length: 0.00 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #: BR-33	Payback beginning in SFY 2008 for Safe and Sound bridges in the Northwest District. Awd Date: N/A Future Cost: 75,001 - 100,000	Fed: 0 State: 43,615 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: State Estimate Total: 97,692							
			Engineering:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	169	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	169	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	53,908	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723	8,723

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
FFOS:	169	0	0	0	357	0
Total R/W:	169	0	0	0	0	0
Total Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paybacks:	53,908	8,773	8,773	8,723	9,080	8,723
Sub-Total:	54,077	8,773	8,773	8,723	9,080	8,723
Total Engineering:	0	1	2	0	1	0
Grand Total:	54,077	8,774	8,775	8,723	9,081	8,723

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
State	8,728	8,728	8,723	9,081	8,723
AC-State	0	0	0	0	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	8,728	8,728	8,723	9,081	8,723
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	46	47	0	0	0
Grand Total	8,774	8,775	8,723	9,081	8,723

Project Count: 4

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

2018-2022 Highway and Bridge Construction Schedule

Transportation Planning
P.O. Box 270
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Construction contingency applied to construction cost in the year the project is awarded.
Three percent project growth factor compounded annually is applied to right-of-way and construction costs in program years 2, 3, 4, and 5.
No inflation is applied to the Funding From Other Sources (FFOS) or Payments.
Engineering includes PE costs, CE costs and R/W incidentals.

Northwest **Total**

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2017-6/2018	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022
FFOS:	169	4,401	2,170	1,623	1,970	1,613
Total R/W:	215	170	62	5	0	0
Total Construction:	0	68,144	65,224	70,815	9,522	1,816
Paybacks:	53,908	8,773	8,773	8,723	9,080	8,723
Sub-Total:	54,123	77,087	74,059	79,543	18,602	10,539
Total Engineering:	3,218	9,309	7,717	5,621	712	113
Grand Total:	57,341	86,396	81,776	85,164	19,314	10,652

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
State	21,415	22,457	21,017	11,041	9,020
AC-State	42,144	14,398	19,608	0	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	63,559	36,855	40,625	11,041	9,020
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	22,837	44,921	44,539	8,273	1,632
Grand Total	86,396	81,776	85,164	19,314	10,652

Project Count: 145

*** Subject to the approval of the Transportation Improvement Program by the governing Metropolitan Planning Organization.**

District Program Summary
Northwest
(Dollars in Millions)
Amounts include construction and right of way, excludes engineering.

State Fiscal Year	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Available					
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Fund Transfers	23.842	7.632	22.193	0.000	0.000
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Carryover	0.170	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Total Available	24.012	7.632	22.193	0.000	0.000
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Programmed	23.842	7.861	26.626	0.000	0.000
Safety - Available	1.153	1.178	1.151	1.145	1.138
Safety - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.844	0.738	0.738
Safety - Fund Transfers	-0.600	-1.075	-1.100	0.000	0.000
Safety - Carryover	1.331	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.142	0.000	0.081	0.066	0.000
Safety - Total Available	2.026	0.103	0.976	1.949	1.876
Safety - Programmed	1.998	0.050	0.895	0.806	0.831
Taking Care Of System - Available	22.885	23.436	23.274	23.157	23.009
Taking Care Of System - FFOS	4.401	2.170	0.779	0.875	0.875
Taking Care Of System - Fund Transfers	18.360	24.666	8.527	0.000	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Carryover	-3.774	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	3.059	14.190	4.118	0.675	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Total Available	44.931	64.462	36.698	24.707	23.884
Taking Care Of System - Programmed	50.947	66.150	52.019	17.440	9.708
Flexible & Other - Available					
Flexible & Other - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.357	0.000
Flexible & Other - Fund Transfers	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Carryover	1.542	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.090	-0.324	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Total Available	1.542	0.090	-0.324	0.357	0.000
Flexible & Other - Programmed	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.357	0.000
Statewide Safety - Available					
Statewide Safety - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Fund Transfers	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Carryover	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Total Available	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Programmed	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - Available					
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - Fund Transfers	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - Carryover	2.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - Total Available	2.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Major Projects & Emerging Needs - Programmed	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Amendment 3 - Available					
Statewide Amendment 3 - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Amendment 3 - Fund Transfers	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Amendment 3 - Carryover	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Amendment 3 - Total Available	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Amendment 3 - Programmed	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Note: Three percent inflation compounded annually applied to program years 2019 - 2022
Two percent construction contigency applied to construction.

District Program Summary
Northwest
(Dollars in Millions)
Amounts include construction and right of way, excludes engineering.

Total Categorized Funding Available by SFY	74.541	72.287	59.543	27.013	25.760
Total Flexible Funds Available	0.000	0.741	25.544	25.196	24.078
Adjustments	3.201	14.280	3.875	0.741	0.000
Carryovers	1.299				
Total Available by SFY	74.541	73.028	85.087	52.209	49.838
Total Programmed by SFY	77.087	74.061	79.540	18.603	10.539

Note: Three percent inflation compounded annually applied to program years 2019 - 2022
Two percent construction contigency applied to construction.

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
2018-2022
Northwest District
Highway and Bridge Construction Projects
Type of Work
B = New/Improved Bridge
H = New/Expanded Highway
M = Major Bridge
O = Other/Safety
P = Pavement Treatment
State Fiscal Year*
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
Urban Areas
Missouri Major Roads
St. Joseph Area Transportation Study Organization
Label Key
Job No.-Type of Work
* July 1 - June 30
Note: Some projects overlap. The state fiscal year displayed in these instances will follow the order shown in the legend. Label tag color corresponds to respective state fiscal year.
See St. Joseph Area Inset
St. Joseph Area
Missouri Department of Transportation
1-888-ASK-MODOT
WWW.MODOT.ORG
June 29, 2017
MoDOT
Miles
0 1 2 4 6 8 10 12
0 1 2 4 Miles
MARYVILLE
TRENTON
CHILLICOTHE
CAMERON
Nodaway
Worth
Harrison
Mercer
Putnam
Sullivan
Grundy
Livingston
Chariton
Carroll
Daviess
Caldwell
Clinton
Gentry
Dekalb
Andrew
Buchanan
Atchison
Holt

Chapter 7: RTP for 10 Years

Chapter 7 documents the prioritization of the needs presented in Chapter 5, as determined by the Mo-Kan TAC and the Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton, and DeKalb county commissions. The maps in Chapter 5 identify the location and scope of the listed priorities. It is anticipated that these rankings will change as time progresses, and should be revisited at least annually by the TAC. Priorities are based on cost effectiveness, feasibility, population impacted, and regional significance. In the past, identified priorities were categorized into high, medium and low priority. The number of identified priorities submitted decreased to four top priorities per county so all priorities are considered to be high.

2017 STIP Prioritization

County	Route(s)	Map Number
DeKalb	Interchange on I-35 and US 36	D1
Andrew	Route DD	A3
Buchanan	Route H	B2
Clinton	Route NN Bridge	C1
Buchanan	MO 6	B3
Clinton	272nd Street Bridge	C4
Buchanan	Route E	B4

2017 Maintenance Prioritization

County	Route(s)	Map Number
Andrew	Route D	A4
DeKalb	Route D	D4
Buchanan	Route V	B1
Clinton	Route H	C3
Clinton	Route J	C2
Andrew	Route Y	A1
Andrew	Route CC	A2
DeKalb	Route H	D2
DeKalb	Route W	D3

Chapter 8: Financing

Federal Funding Sources

Federal revenue sources include the 18.4 cents per gallon tax on gasoline and 24.4 cents per gallon tax on diesel fuel. Other sources include various taxes on tires, truck and trailer sales, and heavy vehicle use.

Federal Funding - FAST Act

According to the US Department of Transportation, the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act is a $305 Billion five-year bill to improve the Nation's surface transportation infrastructure, including roads, bridges, transit systems, and rail transportation network. The bill, which was signed by President Obama on Dec. 4, 2015, is the first long-term transportation bill to be passed in 10 years. Since the 2012 expiration of the previous bill, MAP-21, 36 extensions had been filed to maintain transportation funding. The following information, according to the U.S. House of Representative's Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, provides a summary of the bill:

Roads and Bridges

- Facilitates commerce and the movement of goods by refocusing existing funding for a National Highway Freight
- Program and a Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program
- Expands funding available for bridges off the National Highway System
- Converts the Surface Transportation Program (STP) to a block grant program, increases flexibility for states and local governments, and rolls the Transportation Alternatives Program into the STP Block Grant
- Streamlines the environmental review and permitting process to accelerate project approvals
- Eliminates or consolidates at least six separate offices within the Department of Transportation and establishes a National Surface Transportation and Innovative Finance Bureau to help states, local governments, and the private sector with project delivery
- Increases transparency by requiring the Department of Transportation to provide project-level information to Congress and the public
- Promotes private investment in our surface transportation system
- Promotes the deployment of transportation technologies and congestion management tools
- Encourages installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure equipment to improve congestion and safety
- Updates research and transportation standards development to reflect the growth of technology
- Public Transportation
- Increases dedicated bus funding by 89 percent over the life of the bill
- Provides both stable formula funding and a competitive grant program to address bus and bus facility needs
- Reforms public transportation procurement to make federal investment more cost effective and competitive

- Consolidates and refocuses transit research activities to increase efficiency and accountability
- Establishes a pilot program for communities to expand transit through the use of public-private partnerships
- Eliminates the set aside for allocated transit improvements
- Provides flexibility for recipients to use federal funds to meet their state of good repair needs
- Provides for the coordination of public transportation services with other federally assisted transportation services to aid in the mobility of seniors and individuals with disabilities
- Requires a review of safety standards and protocols to evaluate the need to establish federal minimum safety standards in public transportation and requires the results to be made public

Highway and Motor Vehicle Safety

- Focuses funding for roadway safety critical needs
- Increases percentage of National Priority Safety Program states can spend on traditional safety programs
- Ensures more states are eligible for safety incentive grant funds and encourages states to adopt additional safety improvements
- Encourages states to increase safety awareness of commercial motor vehicles
- Increases funding for highway-railway grade crossings
- Requires a feasibility study for an impairment standard for drivers under the influence of marijuana
- Improves the auto safety recall process to better inform and protect consumers
- Increases accountability in the automobile industry for safety-related issues

Truck and Bus Safety

- Overhauls the rulemaking process for truck and bus safety to improve transparency
- Consolidates truck and bus safety grant programs and provides state flexibility on safety priorities
- Incentivizes the adoption of innovative truck and bus safety technologies
- Requires changes to the Compliance, Safety, Accountability program to improve transparency in the FMCSA's oversight activity
- Improves truck and bus safety by accelerating the introduction of new transportation technologies

Hazardous Materials

- Grants states more power to decide how to spend training and planning funds for first responders
- Requires Class I railroads to provide crude oil movement information to emergency responders
- Reforms an underutilized grant program for state and Indian tribe emergency response efforts

- Better leverages training funding for hazmat employees and those enforcing hazmat regulations
- Requires real-world testing and a data-driven approach to braking technology
- Enhances safety for both new tank cars and legacy tank cars
- Speeds up administrative processes for hazmat special permits and approvals
- Cuts red tape to allow a more nimble federal response during national emergencies

Railroads

- Provides robust reforms for Amtrak, including reorganizing the way Amtrak operates into business lines
- Gives states greater control over their routes, by creating a State-Supported Route Committee
- Speeds up the environmental review process for rail projects
- Creates opportunities for the private sector through station and right-of-way development
- Consolidates rail grant programs for passenger, freight, and other rail activities
- Establishes a Federal-State Partnership for State of Good Repair grant program
- Strengthens Northeast Corridor planning to make Amtrak more accountable and states equal partners
- Allows competitors to operate up to three Amtrak long-distance lines, if at less cost to the taxpayer
- Strengthens passenger and commuter rail safety, and track and bridge safety
- Preserves historic sites for rail while ensuring that safety improvements can move forward
- Unlocks and reforms the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing (RRIF) loan program
- Includes reforms to get RRIF loans approved more quickly with enhanced transparency
- Provides commuter railroads with competitive grants and loans to spur timely Positive Train Control implementation
- Provides competitive opportunities for the enhancement and restoration of rail service

Additional Provisions

- Includes strongly bipartisan measures to simplify rules and regulations, aid consumers, enhance our capital markets, assist low-income housing residents, and help build a healthier economy
- Includes bipartisan provisions to provide energy infrastructure and security upgrades
- Streamlines the review process for infrastructure, energy, and other construction projects

Financing Provisions

- Includes fiscally responsible provisions to ensure the bill is fully paid for

- Ensures the Highway Trust Fund is authorized to meet its obligations through FY 2020
- Directs offsets from the FAST Act into the Highway Trust Fund to ensure fund solvency
- Reauthorizes the dedicated revenue sources to the Highway Trust Fund, which periodically expire

What the Fast Act Means for Missouri

In early January 2016, MoDOT produced an executive summary that provides an overview of the impact of the FAST Act on Missouri's transportation system. The following information is taken from that executive summary:

From Fiscal Year 2016 to Fiscal Year 2020, the availability of federal funds Missouri will be able to match will be approximately $1 billion, which is an increase of 9.8 percent over the previous federal bill – MAP 21. Federal dollars represent the largest source of funds in MoDOT's budget. With current state revenue projections, it is anticipated that MoDOT will be able to fully match its available federal funds. The best news for Missouri is the FAST Act allows for a five-year period of funding certainty which will allow for effective project planning.

Safety

The Office of Highway Safety will be required to conduct a survey every two years of all automated traffic enforcement systems to include red light running cameras and speed enforcement camera systems. The legislation requires a separate grant application for states to implement the 24-7 sobriety programs.

A study will be conducted on marijuana impaired driving including the issues of methods used to detect and measure marijuana levels and identify the role and extent of marijuana impairment in motor vehicle accidents.

States will be allowed to submit a multi-year plan detailing motor carrier safety efforts. These reports will include annual updates. States will undertake efforts to emphasize and improve enforcement of state and local traffic safety laws and regulations.

Freight

The bill establishes a new competitive grant program for very large, predominantly highway projects that benefit the national freight network. One condition of this program is a project estimated cost of $100 million or 30 percent of a state's annual federal appropriation. The minimum grant is $25 million. However, there are some reserves (10 percent) for smaller projects of less than $5 million and 25 percent for rural areas (population less than 200,000).

A local match will be required for funds used to support the capital needs of public ferries. FAST revises the formula for apportionment. The biggest change is the minimum fiscal year allocation of $100,000.

Performance metrics will be developed on the nation's top 25 ports in each category of tonnage, containers and dry bulk. The St. Louis port is the only one that qualifies as a mandate on the list.

New funding is designated to improve the freight highway network. The language includes requirements to be designated as a "freight project." MoDOT will need to add these elements to its planning processes. Missouri has more than two percent of the national freight mileage so its apportionment must be spent on the primary freight network, critical urban and critical rural freight corridors instead of the broader freight system.

State Freight Plans are now mandated and must be in place within two years for Missouri to be able to access the freight funds. State Freight Advisory Committees remain as an encouraged activity, but not mandated.

Transit

The FAST Act provides transit increases of 9 to11 percent over five years and also increases the annual statewide allocation for buses and bus facilities.

Based on the estimated apportionments, the new surface transportation bill provides modest increases of approximately 3.5 percent in the first year and approximately 2 percent per year increase through Fiscal Year 2020.

The statewide allocation for the Bus & Bus Facilities program has increased from $1.25 million to $1.75 million per year. This is an increase for much needed capital projects. This program also includes a new competitive grant program.

Rural Area Funding program appears to remain the same with no significant changes. The funding in Missouri appears to increase modestly in each year based in preliminary estimates from $17.7 million in 2016 to $19.4 million in 2020 (8.7 percent).

Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program will see modest increased funding from $4.86 million in 2016 to $5.37 million in 2020 (9 percent). There is a provision added for a new "pilot program for innovative coordinated access and mobility." Grant money could be available for eligible entities.

Environment

The environmental provisions of the bill are intended to streamline the project delivery process and ensure interagency cooperation. New language under Efficient Environmental Review for Project Decision making changes definition of "project" to include multimodal projects and "lead federal agency" to "operating administration" so that projects benefit from review efficiencies; takes into account any source of federal funding. This should be helpful to multimodal projects. Similar streamlining of rail projects can be achieved once regulatory procedures are put in place.

Integration of Planning and Environmental Review: Clarifies and defines the planning products that can be adopted during National Environmental Policy Act development. Includes: Financing, modal choice, purpose and need, preliminary screening of alternatives, description of the environmental setting, methodology for analysis and programmatic level mitigation.

DOT and Heads of Federal Agencies will develop coordinated and concurrent environmental review and permitting process for Environmental Impact Statements.

Planning

The FAST Act expands the scope of the planning process to include addressing resiliency and reliability of the transportation system, mitigating storm water impacts of surface transportation and enhancing travel and tourism of the transportation system.

The act requires state DOTs to incorporate the performance measures for rural transit agencies into its planning documents. In addition, the FAST Act requires states to establish a state freight plan in order to receive National Highway Freight Program funds. The state freight plan may be part of the state's long-range transportation plan, but is more granular in requirements than a long-range transportation plan.

Performance Management

If a state DOT does not achieve or make significant progress toward achieving targets after one reporting cycle (instead of two reporting cycles), then the state DOT must include a description of the actions they plan to take to achieve their targets in the future in a report.

The penalty for falling below the minimum condition levels for pavements on the interstate system is imposed after the first reporting cycle (instead of after two reporting cycles); eliminates the need to collect safety data and information on unpaved or gravel roads.

USDOT will now assess if the state DOT has made significant progress toward the achievement of freight performance targets. If the state DOT has not made significant progress, then there are additional reporting requirements but not penalties associated with obligating freight funds.

Establishes a performance management data support program to enable the USDOT to better support state DOTs, Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the Federal Highway Administration in the collection and management of data for performance-based planning and programming.

Motor Carrier Services

Changes language to make sure that a tow vehicle is equal to or exceeds the gross vehicle weight of the disabled vehicle it is towing.

The act will allow emergency vehicles that travel the interstate to weigh 86,000 pounds.

The act increases the length limit of some automobile transport trucks; this will require legislative action.

Research

Every Day Counts Program has been continued.

The FAST Act establishes a new National Surface Transportation and Innovative Finance Bureau. Highway Research, Technology and Education Authorization Program funding mostly stays the same or has small increases.

The Innovative Pavement Research and Deployment Program have been expanded. It now requires the Secretary to develop a program to stimulate deployment of advanced transportation technologies to improve system safety, efficiency and performance.

The goals for the Intelligent Transportation System have been expanded, but are mostly freight-related.

ITS program funds for operational tests can't be used for building physical surface infrastructure unless the construction is incidental and critically necessary to implement the ITS project.

The new Assistant Secretary for Research and Technology's responsibilities would include coordinating departmental Research & Technology activities, advancing innovative technologies, developing comprehensive statistics and data and coordinating multimodal and multidisciplinary research. The Secretary can enter into cooperative contracts with federal, state and local and other agencies to conduct departmental research on a 50/50 cost share basis.

The Transportation Research Board will be required to do a study ($5 million; report due in 3 years) on how to restore the interstate highway system to premier status.

University Transportation Center funding has been increased; funding levels within ranges will be flexible instead of fixed. No change in matching requirements.

Rail

This is the first surface transportation bill to include a rail title; passenger rail and other rail investments total $10.4 billion over the five-year life of the legislation. Federal funding for intercity passenger rail does not begin until Federal Fiscal Year 2017.

FAST Act's most significant language to Missouri pertains to operating assistance. For the first time, Congress has provided states a chance to compete for $20 million per year to offset costs for state-sponsored service. This primarily targets states' new cost from the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2009 (PRIIA).

In Missouri's case, costs were relatively the same after PRIIA. Therefore, it is uncertain how much Missouri will be able to obtain from this new funding source. States can compete for this funding to improve infrastructure and vehicles used in the delivery of intercity passenger rail. This is similar to what Congress did through ARRA and the creation of the High Speed and Improved Passenger Rail Program – which delivered much needed projects like the Osage River Railroad Bridge.

Grade crossing safety remained a distinct safety program targeting improvements at highway rail grade crossings.

Congress also put funding towards a committee currently working on costs. This committee stems is made up of the Federal Railroad Administration, states, and Amtrak. The committee continues to work to help ensure states are paying only their fair share of costs. For example, this committee is addressing call center costs.

Missouri has identified to Amtrak for years that its call center costs are too high and they need a better system to track where these costs are allocated. It seems they are primarily allocated to states, instead of Amtrak, where appropriate. This should continue to help lower costs to Missouri and other states.

Highway and Bridge Revenue Sources

State motor fuel tax

The largest source of revenue from Missouri user fees is the state fuel tax. Assessed at a rate of 17-cents per gallon, it produced over 45 percent of state transportation revenues in 2016. However, the motor fuel tax is not indexed to keep pace with inflation, and there has been no rate increase since 1996. History shows that even when fuel prices rise dramatically, Missourians are generally unwilling or unable to turn to other modes of transportation, continuing to drive their personal vehicles and to purchase fuel to do so. Trends show motor fuel tax revenues increase about one percent annually. However, if fuel prices rise and stay at higher rates, more Missourians may turn to more fuel-efficient vehicles, make fewer trips or seek other transportation options they had previously avoided. While good for the environment, these actions erode motor fuel tax revenues.

Motor vehicle sales and use taxes

Motor vehicle sales and use taxes provided approximately 26 percent of state transportation revenues in 2016. This is the one source of state revenue that has recently provided substantial additional resources for transportation. In November 2004, Missouri voters passed Amendment 3. This set in motion a four-year phase in, redirecting motor vehicle sales taxes previously deposited in the state's General Revenue Fund to a newly created State Road Bond Fund. In accordance with this constitutional change, MoDOT began selling bonds to fund road improvements. From 2000-2010, MoDOT sold bonds that provided additional resources for highway improvements. Bonds are debt and similar to a home mortgage – this debt must be repaid over time. The total debt payment in fiscal year 2016 totaled $280 million.

MoDOT has three kinds of bonds: senior bonds that were authorized by the Missouri General Assembly in 2000; Amendment 3 bonds that were authorized by Missouri voters in 2004; and federal GARVEE (Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle) bonds that financed specific projects. Borrowing accelerated construction and allowed MoDOT to avoid inflation in labor and materials costs. It gave Missourians improvements that would not have been built for many years with pay-as-you-go funding. Without borrowing, many of those projects still would not be completed. Senior bonds will be paid off by 2023, Amendment 3 bonds will be paid off by 2029 and GARVEE bonds will be paid off by 2033. The average interest rate on all outstanding debt combined is 2.98 percent.

Motor vehicle and driver's licensing fees

Motor vehicle and driver's licensing fees also provided approximately 21 percent of Missouri's state transportation revenue in 2016. Similar to motor fuel tax, these fees are not indexed to keep pace with inflation, and there have been no annual registration fee increases since 1984. This revenue source increases at a rate of about 2.5 percent annually.

Transportation revenues are shared

It is important to remember that cities and counties receive a substantial portion of these state transportation revenues. For example, cities and counties receive approximately 4.5 cents of the state's 17-cent per gallon fuel tax. They also receive approximately 14 percent of the remaining state transportation revenues discussed earlier. These funds go directly to cities and counties to fund local transportation.

Interest earned on invested funds and other miscellaneous collections

The remaining 8 percent of state transportation revenues comes from interest earned on invested funds and other miscellaneous collections in 2016. During the Amendment 3 bonding program, cash balances in state transportation funds have been unusually high. Bond proceeds are received in large increments and are paid out over time as project costs are incurred. When the Amendment 3 projects are completed, the balance of state transportation funds will be substantially less, and interest income will also decline.

Funding for Alternative Modes of Transportation

Transportation funding for alternative modes has historically been less than 5 percent of all MoDOT transportation revenue (approximately $96 million annually). Funding for alternate modes of transportation comes from a variety of sources including motor vehicle sales taxes, aviation fuel and sales taxes, railroad regulation fees, state general revenue funds and federal grants. MoDOT Multimodal Operations is responsible for supporting alternative transportation programs within the state. The division functions to continue the advancement and strategic planning for Aviation, Rail, Transit, Waterways, and Freight Development initiatives designed to expand Missouri's infrastructure and facilitate travel and commerce. Through the integration of the various modes, the traveling public enjoys greater accessibility to the resources of the state while industry capitalizes on improved transportation efficiencies.

Multimodal Operations Functional Overview

- Assists in the development of port authorities through the distribution of capital and administrative funding while championing the efficiencies of waterborne transportation to industry and the general public.
- Administers federal and state capital improvement funding for Missouri's eligible public aviation facilities.
- Conducts airports safety inspections.

- Provides financial and technical assistance to public transit and specialized mobility providers across the state.
- Partners with industry and local communities to promote economic development and improved freight traffic efficiency by examining existing infrastructure obstructions and proactively assessing potential obstacles.
- Regulates freight and passenger rail operations, oversees rail crossing safety and construction projects, conducts railroad safety inspections, and provides outreach educational opportunities.
- Supports the continued operation of Amtrak in the state and provides direction for the development of expanded passenger rail service.

The amalgamation of the non-highway transportation modes into a single regulatory division traces its lineage back to the formation of the Missouri Highways and Transportation Department in 1980. With the subsequent merger and reorganization, Multimodal Operations assumed charge of consolidated authority over Aviation, Rail, Transit, and Waterway operations within the state as the definitive administrative body. The division has since evolved into a very specialized organization, centered on engaging partnership participation that focuses on safe, accessible, efficient, and environmentally responsible alternative transportation solutions. In fiscal year 2012, Multimodal Operations functioned with an operating budget of $2.5 million and a staff of 31, maintained over 4,000 internal and external partnership contacts, and cumulatively delivered over $79 million in multimodal projects with partners across the state (nearly $47 million federal funds, over $14 million in state funds, and over $18 million in local match funds).

Multimodal Operations Profile – Activities by Mode

- Aviation
  - Administer grants and provide guidance for public use airports (State Block Grant Program & State Aviation Trust Fund Program)
  - Conduct airport safety inspections
  - Publish Aeronautical Chart, Airport Directory, and Show Me Flyer
  - Maintain State Airport System Plan (SASP)
  - Approve Airport Master Plans (AMP) and Airport Layout Plans (ALP)
  - Maintain Automated Weather Observing System (AWOS) equipment
  - Promote education to the aviation community and other enthusiasts
- Rail
  - Conduct railroad infrastructure safety inspections (including track, grade crossing signals, and operating practices)
  - Support Amtrak passenger rail service through Missouri and promote ridership both through operations and project delivery
  - Maintain Statewide Rail Plan to identify the framework for freight and passenger rail development in Missouri for the next twenty years (including High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail HSPIR))

- Regulate safety for freight rail and passenger rail in Missouri
- Enforce safety regulations for light rail operations (Metrolink)
- Administer the Missouri Highway/Rail Crossing Safety Program
- Plan and administer funding for rail/highway construction projects
- Present outreach seminars on railroad grade crossing safety in conjunction with Missouri Operation Lifesaver
- Catalog freight and passenger rail maps of Missouri

- Transit
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5310 Agencies Serving Seniors and Persons with Disabilities
  - Transportation Assistance Vehicle Program
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Transit Assistance Formula Grant Program, Section 5311(b) Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP), and 5311(f) Intercity Bus Program
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (JARC)
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5317 New Freedom Program
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5309 Discretionary Transit Capital Program
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5305 Statewide Transit Planning Grant Program
  - Administer federal grant funding under Section 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities Grant Program
  - Administer state funded Missouri Elderly and Handicapped Transportation Assistance Program (MEHTAP)(RSMo 208.250-208.265)
  - Administer state funded Missouri State Transit Assistance Program (RSMo 226.195)
  - Administer federal grant funding consistent with the new MAP-21 transportation funding provisions
  - Provide technical support and program assistance to partners and external customers
- Waterways
  - Assist in the formation and operation of port authorities in Missouri
  - Provide technical assistance and promote use of Missouri's navigable rivers
  - Represent port interests in industry and governmental bodies
  - Assist in distributing capital and administrative funding for port improvements
  - Provide financial assistance to two ferryboat operations
  - Maintain waterways map of port authorities

- Freight Development
    - Encourage freight initiatives that promote economic development and efficient movement of goods
    - Conduct studies to determine opportunities for enhanced system capacity
    - Evaluate performance of state infrastructure to improve efficiencies
    - Host public forums and outreach opportunities for public comment and contribution

Unlike highways, MoDOT does not own multimodal facilities. Instead, MoDOT's role is to administer funding and provide an oversight role for multimodal improvements. Many of the multimodal entities receive local tax revenue and direct federal funding, which are not included in these amounts. MoDOT administered $35 million of aviation funds in fiscal year 2016. Missouri has dedicated taxes on aviation fuel to fund improvements to public use airports in Missouri. MoDOT also administers federal funding to improve airfield pavement conditions and lighting systems, eliminate obstructions and for expansion projects.

In fiscal year 2016, MoDOT administered $34 million of transit funds. The majority of these funds are from federal programs that support operating costs and bus purchases for transit agencies across the state. There is a small amount of state and General Revenue funding to support operating costs for transit agencies. MoDOT administered $19 million of rail funds in fiscal year 2016. These funds are used to support two programs – the Amtrak passenger rail service between St. Louis and Kansas City, and safety improvements at railroad crossings. The Amtrak funding is from General Revenue, and safety improvements at railroad crossings are from state and federal sources.

Waterways funding totaled $6 million in fiscal year 2016. These funds provided operating and capital assistance to Missouri's river ports and ferry boat operators. MoDOT also administers a $1 million freight enhancement program that provides assistance to public, private or not-for-profit entities for non-highway capital projects that improve the efficient flow of freight in Missouri.

Internal operating costs to administer the various multimodal programs totaled $3 million, including salaries, wages and fringe benefits. In fiscal year 2016, MoDOT administered $98 million for multimodal needs. Since only $96 million was available, MoDOT used $2 million of cash balances dedicated by law to multimodal activities to provide these projects and services.

Missouri's transportation needs are substantial, and the costs of the needs are enormous. Yet, the sources that have traditionally provided transportation funding in Missouri and in the nation are not adequate. They do not keep pace with the rising cost of construction and maintenance, and they provide little for alternative modes of transportation. Another complicating factor is that Missouri's transportation revenues are small in comparison to many other states. Missouri's revenue per mile of state highway is one of the lowest in the region and in the country. Missouri ranks 47th nationally in revenue per mile which leads to significant unfunded transportation needs across the state. Missouri receives both state and federal transportation funds. Much of the funding comes with strings attached, limiting the activities for which it can be used. For example, the state motor fuel tax can only be spent on highways and bridges. It is not available for alternative modes of transportation. Federal funds may be earmarked for specific projects or limited to specific types of construction such as interstate maintenance. Some federal and state funds are allocated to specific modes of transportation such as transit or passenger rail.

Funding Tools for the Local or Regional Level

Funding for local county and municipal roadway maintenance and construction comes primarily from the state-distributed motor fuel tax, individual city and county capital improvement sales taxes and transportation sales taxes. Additional potential revenue options are available for local or regional transportation projects.

Economic Development Administration - Public Works and Economic Development Program

Through the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, the United States Department of Commerce, through its EDA branch, offers project grants to enhance regional competitiveness and promote long-term economic development in regions experiencing substantial economic distress. EDA provides Public Works investments to help distressed communities and regions revitalize, expand, and upgrade their physical infrastructure to attract new industry, encourage business expansion, diversify local economies and generate or retain long-term private sector jobs and investment. Current priorities include proposals that help support existing industry clusters, develop emerging new clusters or attract new economic drivers.

Project grants may be used for investments in facilities such as water and sewer systems, industrial access roads, industrial and business parks, port facilities, railroad sidings, distance learning facilities, skill-training facilities, business incubator facilities, redevelopment of brownfields, eco-industrial facilities and telecommunications infrastructure improvements needed for business retention and expansion. Eligible activities include the acquisition or development of public land and improvements for use for a public works, public service or development facility, and acquisition, design and engineering, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of publicly-owned and operated development facilities, including related machinery and equipment. A project must be located in a region that, on the date EDA receives an application for investment assistance, satisfies one or more of the economic distress criteria set forth in 13 C.F.R. 301.3(a). In addition the project must fulfill a pressing need of the region and must:

1. Improve the opportunities for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities in the region;
2. Assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities in the region; or
3. Primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families.

In addition, all proposed investments must be consistent with the currently approved Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) for the region in which the project will be located, and the applicant must have the required local share of funds committed, available and unencumbered. Also, the project must be capable of being started and completed in a timely manner.

USDA Rural Development

Community Programs, a division of the Housing and Community Facilities Programs, is part of the United States Department of Agriculture's Rural Development mission area. Community Programs administers programs designed to develop essential community facilities for public use in rural areas. These facilities include schools, libraries, childcare, hospitals, medical clinics, assisted living facilities, fire and rescue stations, police stations, community centers, public buildings and transportation. Through its Community Programs, the Department of Agriculture is striving to ensure that such facilities are readily available to all rural communities. Community Programs utilizes three flexible financial tools to achieve this goal: the Community Facilities Guaranteed Loan Program, the Community Facilities Direct Loan Program, and the Community Facilities Grant Program.

Community Programs can make and guarantee loans to develop essential community facilities in rural areas and towns of up to 20,000 in population. Loans and guarantees are available to public entities such as municipalities,

counties, and special-purpose districts, as well as to non-profit corporations and tribal governments. Applicants must have the legal authority to borrow and repay loans, to pledge security for loans, and to construct, operate and maintain the facilities. They must also be financially sound and able to organize and manage the facility effectively. Repayment of the loan must be based on tax assessments, revenues, fees, or other sources of money sufficient for operation and maintenance, reserves and debt retirement. Feasibility studies are normally required when loans are for start-up facilities or existing facilities when the project will significantly change the borrower's financial operations. The feasibility study should be prepared by an independent consultant with recognized expertise in the type of facility being financed.

Community Programs can guarantee loans made and serviced by lenders such as banks, savings and loans, mortgage companies which are part of bank holding companies, banks of the Farm Credit System or insurance companies regulated by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. Community Programs may guarantee up to 90percent of any loss of interest or principal on the loan. Community Programs can also make direct loans to applicants who are unable to obtain commercial credit. Loan funds may be used to construct, enlarge, or improve community facilities for health care, public safety and public services. This can include costs to acquire land needed for a facility, pay necessary professional fees and purchase equipment required for its operation. Refinancing existing debts may be considered an eligible direct or guaranteed loan purpose if the debt being refinanced is a secondary part of the loan, is associated with the project facility and if the applicant's creditors are unwilling to extend or modify terms in order for the new loan to be feasible.

Additionally, Community Programs also provides grants to assist in the development of essential community facilities in rural areas and towns of up to 20,000 in population. Grants are authorized on a graduated scale. Applicants located in small communities with low populations and low incomes will receive a higher percentage of grants. Grants are available to public entities such as municipalities, counties, and special-purpose districts, as well as non-profit corporations and tribal governments. In addition, applicants must have the legal authority necessary for construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed facility and also be unable to obtain needed funds from commercial sources at reasonable rates and terms.

Grant funds may be used to assist in the development of essential community facilities. Grant funds can be used to construct, enlarge, or improve community facilities for health care, public safety and community and public services. This can include the purchase of equipment required for a facility's operation. A grant may be made in combination with other Community Facilities financial assistance such as a direct or guaranteed loan, applicant contributions or loans and grants from other sources. The Community Facilities Grant Program is typically used to fund projects under special initiatives, such as Native American community development efforts, child care centers linked with the Federal government's Welfare-to-Work initiative, Federally-designated Enterprise and Champion Communities and the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative area.

Statewide Transportation Assistance Revolving (STAR) Fund

The STAR Fund, authorized by the Missouri General Assembly in 1997, provides loans to local entities for non-highway projects such as rail, waterway and air travel infrastructure. The STAR fund can also provide loans to fund rolling stock for transit and the purchase of vehicles for elderly or handicapped persons. The STAR fund can assist in the planning, acquisition, development and construction of facilities for transportation by air, water, rail or mass transit; however, STAR fund monies cannot fund operating expenses. The local district engineer must endorse projects in cooperation with MoDOT's Multimodal Team. The Cost Share Committee evaluates STAR applications and provides a recommendation to the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission (MHTC), which is the deciding body.

Delta Regional Authority - Delta Development Highway System

The Delta Regional Authority (DRA) was established by Congress in 2000 to enhance economic development and improve the quality of life for residents of this region. The DRA encompasses 252 counties and parishes in Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri and Tennessee.

There are 29 counties in Missouri that are a part of the DRA region. The counties are in the southeast part of the state and make up the Eighth Congressional District. They are: Bollinger, Butler, Cape Girardeau, Carter, Crawford, Dent, Douglas, Dunklin, Howell, Iron, Madison, Mississippi, New Madrid, Ozark, Pemiscot, Perry, Phelps, Oregon, Reynolds, Ripley, Scott, Shannon, St. Francois, Ste. Genevieve, Stoddard, Texas, Washington, Wayne and Wright. There are a total of 566 DDHS miles identified in Missouri, which constitutes 14.7 percent of the total DDHS miles, of which 346 miles are 2-lane facilities. The Missouri DDHS improvements consist of widening and upgrading portions of US 60, US 63, US 67, US 412 and MO 8.

As a key part of its effort to improve the lives of Delta residents, the DRA operates a grant program in the eight states it serves. The DRA works closely with local development districts, which provide technical assistance to grant applicants. Once grant applications are submitted each year, the federal co-chairman determines which applications are eligible for funding and which are ineligible. There is an appeals process for those applicants whose submissions are deemed ineligible. From the list of eligible applicants, the governors of the eight states then make recommendations to the full board. The board decides which projects are funded based on the funds available. Congress has mandated that transportation and basic public infrastructure projects must receive at least 50 percent of appropriated funds. The authority may provide matching funds for other state and federal programs.

During a planning retreat in February 2005, the Delta Regional Authority board voted to make transportation one of the authority's three major policy development areas. The DRA Highway Transportation Plan/Delta Development Highway System Plan (DDHS) was developed following input from transportation executives and local organizations in the eight states covered by the DRA. Public meetings were held throughout the region in the fall of 2006. The plan was presented to the President and Congress. The DDHS consists of 3,843 miles of roads throughout the region. The estimated cost to complete the planned improvement projects for these roads is $18.5 billion. Of the roads in the plan, 27 percent provide four or more travel lanes already and the remainder is two-lane roads.

Missouri Department of Economic Development - Community Development Block Grants

Through the Missouri Department of Economic Development, the Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG), a federal program through HUD, offers grants to small Missouri communities to improve local facilities, address critical health and safety concerns and develop a greater capacity for growth. The program offers funds for projects that can range from housing and street repairs to industrial loans and job training. State CDBG funds are only available to non-entitlement areas (incorporated municipalities under 50,000 and counties under 200,000 in population).

Larger cities receive funds directly through the Entitlement Communities Grants program. The entitlement program provides annual grants on a formula basis to entitled cities and counties to develop viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low-income and moderate-income persons. HUD awards grants to entitlement community grantees to carry out a wide range of community development activities directed toward revitalizing neighborhoods, economic development and providing improved community facilities and services. Entitlement communities develop their own programs and funding priorities. However, grantees must give maximum feasible priority to activities which benefit low- and moderate-income persons. A grantee may also carry out activities which aid in the prevention or elimination of slums or blight. Additionally, grantees may fund activities when the grantee certifies that the

activities meet other community development needs having a particular urgency because existing conditions pose a serious and immediate threat to the health or welfare of the community where other financial resources are not available to meet such needs. CDBG funds may not be used for activities which do not meet these broad national objectives.

Sales Tax

The 4.225 percent state sales/use tax rate in Missouri is lower than the rates in 38 other states, as of Jan. 1, 2017, according to Taxfoundation.org. Missouri communities have the option of adopting a local sales tax, generally ranging from one-half to one percent. Counties may also adopt a sales tax generally ranging from one-fourth to one percent that can be used for transportation.

Use Tax

Use tax is similar to sales tax, but is imposed when tangible personal property comes into the state and is stored, used or consumed in Missouri. Communities have the option of adopting a local use tax equal to the local sales tax for that community to use for transportation expense.

Local Option Economic Development Sales Tax

The Local Option Economic Development Sales Tax, approved by the Missouri General Assembly in 2005, allows citizens to authorize a supplemental sales tax dedicated exclusively for certain economic development initiatives in their home municipality. The state statute section governing this program is found at 67.1305 RSMo. The voter-approved tax of not more than one half per cent is charged on all retail sales made in the municipality that are subject to sales taxes under Ch.144 RSMo. Missouri statutes define "municipality" as an incorporated city, town, village or county. Revenues generated by the tax may not be used for retail developments unless such retail projects are limited exclusively to the redevelopment of downtown areas and historic districts. A portion of the revenues may be used for project administration, staff and facilities, and at least twenty per cent of the funds raised must be used for projects directly related to long-term economic preparation, such as land acquisition, installation of infrastructure for industrial or business parks, water and wastewater treatment capacity, street extensions and for matching state or federal grants related to such long-term projects. Any remaining funds may also be used for marketing, training for advanced technology jobs, grants and loans to companies for employee training, equipment and infrastructure and other specified uses.

Neighborhood Improvement District

A Neighborhood Improvement District (NID) may be created in an area desiring certain public-use improvements that are paid for by special tax assessments to property owners in the area in which the improvements are made. The kinds of projects that can be financed through an NID must be for facilities used by the public, and must confer a benefit on property within the NID. An NID is created by election or petition of voters and/or property owners within the boundaries of the proposed district. Election or petition is authorized by a resolution of the governing body of the municipality in which the proposed NID is located. Language contained in the petition narrative or ballot question must include certain information including, but not limited to a full disclosure of the scope of the project, its cost, repayment and assessment parameters to affected property owners within the NID.

Community Improvement District

A Community Improvement District (CID) may be either a political subdivision or a not-for-profit corporation. CIDs are organized for the purpose of financing a wide range of public-use facilities and establishing and managing policies and public services relative to the needs of the district. By request petition, signed by property owners

owning at least 50 percent of the assessed value of the real property, and more than 50 percent per capita of all owners of real property within the proposed CID, presented for authorizing ordnance to the governing body of the local municipality in which the proposed CID would be located.

Unlike a Neighborhood Improvement District, a CID is a separate legal entity, and is distinct and apart from the municipality that creates the district. A CID is, however, created by ordinance of the governing body of the municipality in which the CID is located, and may have other direct organizational or operational ties to the local government, depending upon the charter of the CID.

Tax Increment Financing

Local Tax Increment Financing (Local TIF) permits the use of a portion of local property and sales taxes to assist funding the redevelopment of certain designated areas within your community. Areas eligible for Local TIF must contain property classified as a "Blighted", "Conservation" or an "Economic Development" area, or any combination thereof, as defined by Missouri Statutes. The idea behind Local TIF is the assumption that property and/or local sales taxes (depending upon the type of redevelopment project) will increase in the designated area after redevelopment, and a portion of the increase of these taxes collected in the future (up to 23 years) may be allocated by the municipality to help pay the certain project costs, partially listed above.

Transportation Development Districts

Transportation Development Districts (TDDs) are organized under the Missouri Transportation Development District Act, Sections 238.200 to 238.275 of the Missouri State Statutes. The district may be created to fund, promote, plan, design, construct, improve, maintain and operate one or more projects or to assist in such activity.

Transportation Development Corporations

Transportation Development Corporations (TDCs) are organized under the Missouri Transportation Corporation Act, Sections 238.300 to 238.367 of the Missouri State Statutes. TDCs act in promoting and developing public transportation facilities and systems and in promoting economic development. Demands for transportation improvements have greatly outpaced the funds available to meet them. In response to this demand, the Missouri Department of Transportation has established various mechanisms for successful public/public and public/private partnerships. These expand financing options for transportation projects that serve a public purpose, including: highway and rail projects, transit equipment, air and water transportation facilities and elderly/handicapped vehicles. The benefits to a project assisted by these partnerships may include: inflation cost savings, early economic and public benefits, financing tailored to the project's needs and a reduced cost of project financing.

Partnership Debt-Financing Programs

Debt-financing programs make loans to a project that has to be repaid. The Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation's (MTFC) authority to form and operate is initially derived from the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). The MTFC incorporated in August 1996, adopted bylaws and subsequently entered into a Cooperative Agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), agencies of the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission (Commission). Under the authority granted initially by TEA-21, as amended by 23 U.S.C. 610, the Missouri Non Profit Corporation Act, Chapter 355, RSMo, and pursuant to the Cooperative Agreement, the Commission organized the MTFC to assist in financing transportation improvements.

The MTFC provides direct loans for transportation projects within the state of Missouri. Loans are funded from available MTFC resources. The MTFC assistance may be any type authorized by 23 U.S.C. 610. The following are examples of potential financing options included in 23 U.S.C. 610: Primary or subordinated loans, Credit enhancements, Debt reserve financing, Subsidized interest rates, Purchase and lease agreements for transit projects, and Bond security. These direct loans must help assist the Commission to achieve continued economic, social and commercial growth of Missouri, act in the public interest, or promote the health, safety and general welfare of Missouri citizens.

Bridge Replacement Off-System (BRO)

The Off-System Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (BRO) program provides funding to counties for replacement and rehab of bridges. A minimum amount of approach roadway construction may be allowed under the program. Federal Funds are available to finance up to 80% of the eligible project cost, but may be increased with the use of credit earned from replacing an eligible bridge that is not on the federal-aid system. It will be necessary for the local agency to provide the necessary matching funds. The fair market value of donated right-of-way may be credited to the local agency's matching share with the amount not to exceed the local agency's share. Both Missouri Department of Economic Development CDBG funds and EDA Local Public Works funds can be used to match BRO funds, if used on the project.

BRO Funds are administered according to the following policy:

- The current Highway Act requires that at least 15% and no more than 35% of the state's total bridge appropriation be allocated to the counties and the City of St. Louis for use on off-system bridges (BRO). The Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission approves the amount of bridge funds allocated to this program. Off-system bridges are bridges that are on roads that are functionally classified as a local road or street and rural minor collectors.

Federal Aviation Administration - Airport Improvement Program

The Airport Improvement Program (AIP) provides grants to public agencies - and, in some cases, to private owners and entities - for the planning and development of public-use airports that are included in the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS). For large and medium primary hub airports, the grant covers 75 percent of eligible costs (or 80 percent for noise program implementation). For small primary, reliever, and general aviation airports, the grant covers 95 percent of eligible costs. AIP grants for planning, development or noise compatibility projects are at or associated with individual public-use airports (including heliports and seaplane bases). A public-use airport is an airport open to the public that also meets the following criteria:

1. Publicly owned, or
2. Privately owned but designated by the FAA as a reliever, or
3. Privately owned but having scheduled service and at least 2,500 annual enplanements.

Further, to be eligible for a grant, an airport must be included in the NPIAS. The NPIAS, which is prepared and published every two years, identifies public-use airports that are important to public transportation and contribute to the needs of civil aviation, national defense, and the postal service. The description of eligible grant activities is described in the authorizing legislation and relates to capital items serving to develop and improve the airport in areas of safety, capacity and noise compatibility. In addition to these basic principles, a grantee must be legally, financially and otherwise able to carry out the assurances and obligations contained in the project application and grant agreement.

Eligible projects include those improvements related to enhancing airport safety, capacity, security and

environmental concerns. In general, sponsors can use AIP funds on most airfield capital improvements or repairs except those for terminals, hangars, and non-aviation development. Any professional services that are necessary for eligible projects - such as planning, surveying and design - are eligible as is runway, taxiway and apron pavement maintenance. Aviation demand at the airport must justify the projects, which must also meet Federal environmental and procurement requirements. Projects related to airport operations and revenue-generating improvements are typically not eligible for funding. Operational costs - such as salaries, maintenance services, equipment and supplies - are also not eligible for AIP grants.

FAA Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF)

The Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF), created by the Airport and Airway Revenue Act of 1970, provides funding for the federal commitment to the nation's aviation system through several aviation-related excise taxes. Funding currently comes from collections related to passenger tickets, passenger flight segments, international arrivals/ departures, cargo waybills, aviation fuels and frequent flyer mile awards from non-airline sources like credit cards.

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Funding

Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was authorized under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) to provide for a variety of alternative transportation projects, including many that were previously eligible activities under separately funded programs. The TAP replaces the funding from pre-MAP-21 programs including Transportation Enhancements, Recreational Trails, Safe Routes to School, and Scenic Byways, wrapping them into a single funding source. The TAP remains in place with the 2015 passage of the FAST ACT. The mission of the Transportation Alternatives Program is to improve our nation's communities through leadership, innovation, and program delivery. The funds are available to develop a variety of project types located in both rural and urban communities to create safe, accessible, attractive, and environmentally sensitive communities where people want to live, work, and recreate. The Transportation Alternatives Program consists of: Transportation Enhancement (TE) activities, Recreational Trails Program (RTP), Safe Routes to School (SRTS) activities, and Boulevards from Divided Highways.

Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP)

The Traffic Engineering Assistance Program (TEAP) allows local public agencies (LPA) to receive engineering assistance for studying traffic engineering problems. Typical traffic engineering related projects include: corridor safety and/or operational analysis, intersection(s) safety and/or operational analysis, speed limit review, sign inventory, pedestrian/bike route analysis, parking issues, and other traffic studies, etc. Local public agencies are reimbursed for eligible project costs at a rate of 80 percent with the local agency providing a 20-percent match. Funds administered by MoDOT, will provide 80 percent of the TEAP project costs, up to $8,000 per project. If the total cost is greater than $10,000, the local agency can pay more than 20 percent to complete the TEAP project, if desired.

Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP)

The Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP) provides funds for projects on Federal Lands Access Transportation Facilities that are located on or adjacent to, or that provide access to Federal lands as provided for in the FAST Act. The FLAP, as an adjunct to the Federal-Aid Highway Program, covers highway programs in cooperation with federal-land managing agencies. It provides transportation-engineering services for planning, design, construction and rehabilitation of the highways and bridges providing access to federally owned lands. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) also provides training, technology, deployment, engineering services and products to

other customers. The FHWA administers the Federal Lands Access Program, including survey, design and construction of forest highway system roads, parkways and park roads, Indian reservation roads, defense access roads and other federal-lands roads. The FHWA, through cooperative agreements with federal-land managing agencies such as the National Park Service, Forest Service, Military Traffic Management Command, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, administers a coordinated federal-lands program consisting of forest highways, public-lands highways, park roads and parkways, refuge roads and Indian reservation roads. This program provides support for approximately 30,000 miles of public roads serving Federal and Indian lands to support the economic vitality of adjacent communities and regions.

Cost Share Program Guidelines

The purpose of the Cost Share Program is to build partnerships with local entities to pool efforts and resources to deliver state highway and bridge projects. The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) allocates Cost Share funds based on the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission's (MHTC) approved funding distribution formula. At least 10 percent is set-aside for projects that demonstrate economic development through job creation. Projects are selected by the Cost Share Committee, which consists of the Chief Engineer, Chief Financial Officer and the Assistant Chief Engineer. They are then recommended for approval by the MHTC via a STIP amendment.

MoDOT participates up to 50 percent of the total project costs on the state highway system. While contributions are expected on economic development projects, the Cost Share Committee may increase MoDOT's participation up to 100 percent for economic development projects that create new jobs. Job creation will be verified by the Department of Economic Development. The project agreement will identify requirements for returning funds if jobs are not created as planned. Retail development projects do not qualify as economic development.

MoDOT's participation includes the amount of Cost Share funds allocated to the project, District STIP or Operating Budget funds and activities performed by MoDOT such as preliminary engineering, right of way incidentals and construction engineering.

Generally, the Cost Share funding per project is limited to $10 million in total and $2.5 million per year. However, projects exceeding this limit can be considered based on factors such as project need, the opportunity for economic development and the willingness of the local partners to be flexible and bring resources to the table. Project applications should not expand the state highway system or increase maintenance costs for MoDOT. Project applications that significantly expand the state highway system or increase maintenance costs for MoDOT must seek pre-approval by the Chief Engineer prior to submittal.

Funding Distribution

On Jan. 10, 2003, the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission adopted an objective method to distribute transportation funds using factors reflecting system size and usage and where people live and work. The distribution of funds has been the subject of debate for over a decade. The method for determining where and on what to spend limited transportation dollars has changed several times. Changes have been a result of both long-term project plans and political pressure centered on dividing funds between the urban and rural areas of the state. This method goes beyond the narrow discussions of geography and allows for allocation of funding based on objective, transportation-related factors that are representative indicators of physical system needs.

Since 2003, the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission has used a formula to distribute construction program funds for road and bridge improvements to each of its districts (seven since 2011). This is the largest area of MoDOT's budget that provides funding for safety improvements, taking care of the system and flexible funds that districts can use to take care of the system or invest in major projects that relieve congestion and spur

economic growth. In many districts, taking care of the system funds are not sufficient to maintain current system conditions. Districts use flexible funds to make up the difference, but often times still fall short. Figure 8.1 identifies how construction program funds are allocated annually to districts using the following formula:

Figure 8.1 MoDOT Funding Distribution for Construction Funds

Total Available Construction Program Funds		
Safety **$35 million**	**Taking Care of the System*** **$435 million**	**Flexible** **remaining funds**
• **$3 million distributed for statewide program** • **$32 million distributed based on 3-year crash rates**	• **$310 million distributed based on amount of highway travel, bridge size and highway miles** • **$125 million distributed for statewide interstate and major bridge needs**	• **Distributed based on population, employment and highway travel**

* Funding distributed to Taking Care of the System is not enough to maintain existing system conditions. Districts use flexible funds to make up the difference, but many districts still fall short.

Source: MoDOT's Citizen's Guide to Transportation Funding in Missouri, 2016

Figure 8.2 MoDOT Funding Distribution by District

Source: MoDOT's Citizen's Guide to Transportation Funding in Missouri, 2016

Funding Distribution Overview

Once construction program funds are distributed to districts, MoDOT collaborates with regional planning groups to identify local priorities based on projected available funding. The regional transportation improvement plans are brought together to form the department's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, which outlines five years of transportation improvements. As one year of the plan is accomplished, another year is added.

When adding the construction program, operations, administration and highway safety programs together, the following amounts were spent in districts based on the three-year average from fiscal years 2014 through 2016:

Table 8.3 MoDOT Funding Distribution – Total by District ($ Millions)

District	Construction Program	Operations	Admin	HWY Safety Programs	Total
Northwest	$46	$57	$2	-	$105
Northeast	$41	$50	$2	-	$93
Kansas City	$217	$52	$3	-	$272
Central	$90	$65	$2	-	$157
St. Louis	$229	$62	$3	-	$293
Southwest	$132	$80	$2	-	$214
Southeast	$84	$76	$2	-	$162
Statewide	$36	$67	$35	$16	$154
Total	$875	$509	$51	$16	$1,450

Source: MoDOT's Citizen's Guide to Transportation Funding in Missouri, 2016

Chapter 9: Plan Implementation

The Mo-Kan Regional Transportation Plan is not meant to be a step-by-step guide to transportation planning in the Andrew, Buchanan, Clinton, and DeKalb county service area. Nor is it intended to dictate what projects are funded in the area, or what needs are greater than others. Rather, the RTP is designed to provide a direct, unfettered method in which local elected officials, the general public, and other interested stakeholders can identify and prioritize important transportation needs in the aforementioned counties. Using that prioritization, the Mo-Kan TAC can then recommend projects to MoDOT's Northwest District. The District then uses that input to help determine which projects in the region are funded for construction. As transportation needs change with shifting population patterns, economic growth, and deteriorating infrastructure, it is recommended that the Mo-Kan RTP is reviewed and updated every five years, or more often as conditions warrant.

Smooth Roadways

The ability to travel anywhere in the state on a smooth roadway not only enhances the attractiveness of Missouri, but can also have a positive economic impact on a region. Further, a smooth roadway reduces avoidance accidents and automobile repair bills. Per the request of MoDOT Northwest District staff, road surface needs are categorized into two lists: a maintenance list for rural roads with less than 400 AADT, and a list for roads with higher traffic volumes that will be considered for the STIP. The Mo-Kan TAC has identified the following projects as addressing smooth roadways for the region:

STIP

Map Number	Description
A-3	Rough conditions, road edge crumbling on Route DD from Savannah to St. Joseph
B-2	Rough conditions, crumbling, pitting and surface deterioration on Route H from Route A to Gower
B-3	Cracking roadway and crumbling road edge on Route 6 from Route P to Highway 31
B-4	Rough conditions, cracking and crumbling road edge on Route E from Highway 169 to Highway 116

Maintenance List:

Map Number	Description
A-1	Rough conditions and crumbling road edge on Missouri Route Y from north county line to Hwy 71
A-2	Rough conditions, cracking on Missouri Route CC and Route K from Hwy 59 to south county line
A-4	Rough conditions, cracking, and crumbling road edge along Missouri Route D from Hwy 48 to Hwy 169
B-1	Surface and road edge cracks, road edge crumbling on Route V from south of Parker Road to Highway 116
C-2	Rough conditions on Route J from Route C to south county line
C-3	Route H from Hwy 33 to Hwy 69
D-2	Route H from Route 6 to north county line
D-3	Route W from Route A to Route D
D-4	Route D from north county line to Highway 6

Bridge Improvements

Bridges play a critical role in the transportation of people and goods. When a bridge is closed the time and expense for traffic to detour can be significant. Therefore, keeping bridges operational is essential in transportation planning. Bridge construction/repair projects are to be considered for STIP inclusion. The Mo-Kan TAC has identified the following projects to address bridges for the region:

Map Number	Description
C-1	Narrow single-lane bridge should be replaced with two-lane bridge
C-4	Poor deck condition on bridge at 272 Street over I-35

Congestion and Development Considerations

In addition to safety and roadway enhancements, the Mo-Kan RTP seeks to identify future significant development in its service area which will have an impact on traffic patterns and volumes. New development, particularly in southern Andrew County and southern Clinton County, will impact the capacity of the transportation in those areas. Further, mixed use developments around St. Joseph require an examination of certain intersections/interchanges and other roadway features, such as turn lanes, traffic signals, and acceleration/deceleration lanes. The Mo-Kan TAC has identified the following needs as having an impact on traffic congestion and flow:

Map Number	Description
C-1	Narrow single-lane bridge should be replaced with two-lane bridge
D-1	Interchange should be constructed at Bob Griffon Road and Highway 36

Appendix A:

Roadway Safety Assessment

Northwest Missouri Regional Road Safety Assessment Program

Junction of US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road Buchanan County, Missouri

Conducted May 9, 2017

Mo-Kan Regional Council
224 N. 7th Street
St. Joseph, MO 64501
www.mo-kan.org

Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments
114 W. 3rd Street
Maryville, MO 64468
www.nwmorcog.org

Green Hills Regional Planning Commission
1104 Main Street
Trenton, MO 64683
www.ghrpc.org

Table of Contents

1.0 Background 2
- 1.1 RSA Team 5
- 1.2 RSA Process 6
- 1.3 RSA Report 6
- 1.4 Study Area Characteristics, Operations and Safety Performance 7

2.0 Assessment Findings and Suggested Solutions 9
- 2.1 Junction Safety 9
- 2.2 Road Painting and Striping 12
- 2.3 Signage Issues 14
- 2.4 Sight Distance 17

3.0 Conclusion 18
- 3.1 Summary of Issues 19

Attachments

Attachment A: Crash Data (2010 – Present)
Attachment B: AADT and Crash Type
Attachment C: Crashes by Severity, Weather, Surface Condition and Lighting Condition
Attachment D: Crashes by Year, Season and Day
Attachment E: Crashes by Month and Time of Day
Attachment F: Location of Crashes

1.0 Background

A Roadway Safety Assessment (RSA) is a safety performance examination at a specific roadway by a multi-disciplinary team. The team reviews crash data to familiarize themselves with the types of crashes and the roadway conditions at the time the crashes occurred. Then the team visits the site to observe traffic patterns and notes safety concerns. These observations are compiled into a report and submitted to the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT).

Mo-Kan Regional Council, Green Hills Regional Planning Commission and the Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments have been funded to perform RSAs in MoDOT's Northwest District as part of the Core Activities task in the yearly work plan. Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) members were asked to submit potential RSA locations for consideration. MoDOT provided crash statistics and Mo-Kan provided photographs of the proposed locations to the TAC members to assist them in determining which location to select. The TAC voted at their March 1, 2017, meeting to conduct the annual RSA at the junction of US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road. US 169 is also identified as Rochester Road at this location.

The study area for the RSA is located in Buchanan County, approximately 1,500 feet northeast of the city limits of St. Joseph. The area where US 169 departs St. Joseph's city limits has experienced significant growth over the last decade with a new shopping area, hotels, YMCA and other facilities. North of the RSA location on US 169 has also experienced an increase in residential dwellings and several businesses are located near the junction. Thus, traffic has increased at the junction as the surrounding area experienced residential and commercial growth.

US 169 is a two-lane state maintained road that serves as an arterial road for the City of St. Joseph. County Line Road is the dividing line between Andrew County to the north and Buchanan County to the south. However, County Line Road is maintained by Buchanan County. NE Woodbine Road is also maintained by Buchanan County.

Although the number of vehicle crashes is relatively low (2.9 average per year), there have reportedly been numerous near misses. Crashes at the junction are primarily occurring when 1) a vehicle rear ends another vehicle that has stopped or slowed down to make a turn or 2) motorists take the northbound land curve on US 169 too fast and loose control of their vehicle. Since the majority of crashes at the RSA location occur on US 169, this road is the primary focus in the RSA. The layout of the junction, where several roads and driveways connect to US 169 in close proximity to each other, will be examined. Figures 1-4 provide an overview of the location, showing its location in relation to the county and city limits of St. Joseph, as well as the land use of the surrounding area.

Figure 1 – Buchanan County

Figure 2 - St. Joseph City Limits

Figure 3 – Area surrounding RSA site

Figure 4 – Close up of RSA site

US 169 spans 966 miles, from Minnesota to Oklahoma. It enters Missouri in the Kansas City area and exits at Grant City. In St. Joseph it is known as the Belt Highway and in the north part of the city it angles northwest out of town, crossing over I-29. Approximately 1,600 feet beyond the city limits is the junction of US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road, the site of the RSA.

The county does not have road history available for NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road.

MoDOT provided the following road history for US 169:

US 169 was originally graded along the existing alignment with an earth (dirt) surface and was originally labeled Route 4.

- 1930 – 20’ concrete surface was placed in Andrew County to the Buchanan county line
- 1931 – Buchanan County line south, roadway was widened and a 20’ concrete surface was placed
- 1933 – Highway Commission classified roadway as US 169
- 1963 – Widened pavement to 24’ and asphalt resurfacing
- 1976 – Asphalt resurfacing
- 2000 – Asphalt resurfacing
- 2009 – Asphalt resurfacing and constructed 2’ paved shoulders
- 2015 – Preventative maintenance treatment (Chip-seal)

1.1 RSA Team

The RSA team was composed of MoDOT, city and county staff, highway patrol, concerned citizens and Regional Planning Commission (RPC) staff members. The RSA Team included the following individuals:

Name	Organization
Rebecca Thacker	Mo-Kan Regional Council
Tanner Stark	Mo-Kan Regional Council
Jackie Spainhower	NWMORCOG
Lance Rains	Green Hills RPC
Bryce Acton	MoDOT
Joseph Turner	MoDOT
Michael Rinehart	MoDOT
Elizabeth Bowen	MoDOT
Bob Caldwell	TAC Member
Bob Burnett	TAC Member
Don Dillman	TAC Member
Sgt. Dudek	Region H Highway Patrol
Sgt. Root	Region H Highway Patrol

1.2 RSA Process

The RSA was conducted in a manner consistent with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Road Safety Audit Guidelines. The RSA team convened on Tuesday, May 9, 2017, at MoDOT's Northwest District Office. Prior to the field visit, the assessment team had a brief informational meeting to prepare team members unfamiliar with the RSA process. The RSA team analyzed the following information to prepare for the field visit:

- Map of the area
- Traffic volume data
- Crash history over the past seven years

After the team discussed all of the known details of the study area, they conducted a field visit. They observed driving habits, traffic flow and potential sight obstructions within the study area. Team members took photographs, made notes and evaluated signage. The owner of Sprint Lumber, located at the junction of US 169, NE Woodbine and County Line Road, was interviewed during the field visit. Staff from another business, Cabinets, Counters and More, was informed of the RSA and interviewed prior to the assessment. The observations from the people at both businesses were similar; motorists drive too fast, the junction is difficult for tractor trailers and turning off at a junction can be problematic.

After conducting a field visit, the RSA team reconvened for a post-audit meeting. Items of interest at the intersection include:

- Location and size of speed limit signs
- Narrow width of shoulders
- Speed of traffic
- Increased traffic due to recent commercial and residential development in adjacent area
- Spacing of chevrons on northbound lane curve on US 169
- Concern of three roads intersecting at the junction
- Location of mailboxes on the east side of the junction
- Absence of turn lanes on US 169

During the post-audit discussion, the RSA team shared their observations, identified particular issues, determined prospective solutions, rated the level of difficulty to implement each solution and estimated the level of cost to execute each plan. Following the post-audit meeting, Mo-Kan Regional Council staff compiled all information collected during the RSA process and created this formal report.

1.3 RSA Report

This report provides information on the issues identified by the assessment team. The informa-

tion was deemed relevant to the stated goal of the RSA which identified opportunities for improvement of the road safety within the study area.

Additionally, this report provides an assessment of the roadway as well as suggestions for improvement of the project area. The suggestions should not be viewed as design or operational recommendations; they are intended to be illustrative of potential solutions to the safety issues identified at the study area. The suggestions are being presented for consideration only.

1.4 Study Area Characteristics, Operations and Safety Performance

US 169 is a two-lane arterial road located in Buchanan County with 12-foot-wide lanes. The shoulder width ranges from two to four feet. The junction US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road is a multi-use area consisting of farmland, businesses and residential homes. This has resulted in traffic at the location being a mix of tractor trailers, agricultural vehicles and personal vehicles.

Figure 5 – View of US 169 Northbound at RSA Location

Figure 6 – View of US 169 Southbound at RSA Location

The safety features of edge lines and rumble strips are present. The annual average daily traffic (AADT) on US 169 is 3,500 vehicles and 350 in truck traffic volume. The AADT on Woodbine Road is 470. Northbound vehicles are leaving the city limits of St. Joseph and have just passed the last traffic signal. Many northbound vehicles are in an acceleration mode, often exceeding the speed limit when they enter the 45 mph speed zone that leads into the curve at the RSA location. Both north and sound bound US 169 have warning signs including chevrons, curve with speed advisory and trucks entering roadway.

Figure 7 – Speed limits near the RSA site

Figure 8 – Signage at the RSA site

The RSA team reviewed 2010-2016 crash data for the study area which indicates 20 reported crashes have occurred in the junction. During this seven-year time span there has been one fatality, one disabling injury (DI or serious injury), five minor injuries and 13 property damage only (PDO) crashes. These occurrences were used to figure the severity index for the junction, which is 2.3. This is considered a mid to lower range severity index but the site was selected because of expressed confusion over who has the right-of-way at the junction, the increasing amount of traffic and the speed along US 169.

Eight of the 20 reported crashes have been rear end collisions, the most common type of crash, followed by out of control (four) and other (three). The majority of the crashes, 80%, have occurred during daylight and 70% have occurred on dry road surface conditions. Twelve of the crashes occurred in clear weather conditions. The weather conditions were snowy in three of the crashes, rainy in two of the crashes, cloudy in two of the crashes and freezing in one crash. Even though winter was the highest season for crashes (seven), the majority of crashes occurred during daylight hours with clear weather conditions, on dry pavement. Appendix A provides additional statistics about the crashes at the RSA site.

2.0 Assessment Findings and Suggested Solutions

The RSA team has included their findings in this report, which contains a list of the potential strategies to remedy the problems. The team also rated the difficulty to implement the strategies and estimated their prospective cost level. This information is included in Chapter 3.1, along with a complete list of the RSA findings and suggested solutions.

2.1 Junction Safety

Safety Concerns: Along US 169 several of the issues related to safety were observed, as shown in Figures 9 - 12:

- Waffling on US 169
- Absence of a turn lane on US 169
- Acceleration zone
- Multiple activities occurring in close proximity

Observations: RSA team members noted concerns at the US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road Route junction. US 169 has two-foot-wide paved shoulders at the junction area.

The absence of a turn lane on US169 where the other two roads intersect is problematic. Besides the other two roads at the junction, there are businesses and residents located at and near the junction. Traffic is entering and exiting at several points in close proximity. US 169 northbound vehicles are in an acceleration mode at the junction, as they pass through the last traffic light

while exiting city limits. US 169 southbound vehicles typically have not started to decelerate when they approach the junction.

If a vehicle needs to turn off US 169 on to one of the four turnoffs located at the junction, following traffic must decelerate or stop in their lane. A common near-miss situation is when following vehicles fail to notice a decelerating or stopped vehicle at the junction, resulting in a sudden swerve to avoid a collision. A turn lane would remove decelerating vehicles from the path of other vehicles, creating a safer junction.

Another observation that RSA team members made was that the junction is probably wide enough to construct a roundabout. The construction of a roundabout would decrease the points of conflict, minimizing the number of directions that vehicles can potentially collide with one another. Discussion occurred on whether large farm equipment could transverse a round-about, as well as if the northbound incline would be problematic for tractor trailers.

In an effort to increase junction safety, the owners of the business Sprint Lumber poured a sizeable concrete apron that provides their customers and vendors better traction when pulling onto US 169. They have also posted a dangerous curve caution sign.

The Sprint Lumber owner has seen several accidents where he observed insurance information exchanged but no law enforcement was called to the scene. It is possible that the number of crashes at this location are under reported.

Figure 9 - Waffling on US 169

Figure 10 - Absence of turn lane on US 169

Figure 11 - Acceleration Zone I-229 and US 169 (Rochester Road) traffic light

Figure 12 - RSA Location – Junction of US 169, NE Woodbine Road and County Line Road

Suggested Solutions: The following options were suggested:

- Smooth out the waffling on the road by building the road up
- Add a blinking light on the north hill for northbound US 169 traffic
- Add a turn lane that both southbound and northbound US 169 traffic could access
- Construct a roundabout at the junction, which would have six entrances.
- Realign NE Woodbine Road to join US 169 south of the current junction.

2.2 Road Painting and Striping/Rumbles

Safety Concern: The curve just north of the junction has been the location of several crashes. There are edge lines and edge rumbles on US 169. NE Woodbine and County Line Road do not have these features, as illustrated in Figures 13 and 14.

- No centerline rumble strip on US 169
- Faded paint on US 169

Observations: The edge lines and edge rumble strips help alert motorists when they depart their lane. US 169 has edge rumbles but including a centerline rumble would offer an additional level of safety since motorist would have rumbles on both sides of their lane. It was observed that the paint was faded. A new coat of reflective paint would visually assist motorists in identifying the borders of their lane.

Figure 13 - No centerline rumble strip on US 169

Figure 14 - Faded paint on US 169

Suggested Solutions: The following options should be considered:

- Center line rumble strip would alert drivers when they cross into the oncoming lane
- The repainting of roads would assist night time drivers

2.3 Signage Issues

Safety Concern: On US 169, northbound traffic has just passed the last stop light (I-229 and US 169) as they exit St. Joseph city limits and are in an acceleration mode when they approach the curve at the RSA site. The speed limit is 50 mph on US 169 (Rochester Road) as it exits the city limits. As northbound traffic enters the RSA location, there is a school bus stop sign, followed shortly after by a 45 mph curve sign. Four chevrons are located on the east side of US 169, two are located shortly after the 45 mph curve sign and the other two are located north of the junction.

US 169 southbound has very similar signage and speed limits. Traffic approaches the junction at 50 mph then a sign warning motorists of trucks entering the roadway 900 feet ahead, followed by a 45 mph turn sign. Chevrons are also present.

Signage examples include:

- Signage informing motorists of the curve and 45 mph speed limit on US 169
- Chevrons on the curve on US 169
- School bus stop ahead signage on US 169
- Warning sign of dangerous curve posted by a private business

Figure 15 - US 169 Northbound Signage

Figure 16 – Additional US 169 Northbound Signage

Figure 17- Warning Sign Posted at Private Business for Customers

Figure 18 – US 169 Southbound Signage

Figure 19 – Additional US 169 Southbound Signage

Suggested Solutions: The following options should be considered:

- Verify that the speed limit sign south of the junction on US 169, northbound lane is the proper size (36”x 48”)
- Check chevron spacing to determine if they are properly spaced and have florescent yellow coating
- Install larger speed limit sign on US 169, north side of the junction for south bound traffic
- Evaluate signal timing at the traffic light south of the junction, located at US 169 and I-29, to better space depending on traffic flow. Possibly coordinate signals in the Shoppes at North Village area. By determining what time of the day traffic is heaviest on northbound US 169, traffic signals can be coordinated to allow for a large traffic gap.
- Install flashers on top of hill by curve on US 169, north of the junction.

2.4 Sight Distance

Safety Concern: Sight distance was sufficient at the junction. However, some improvements could be made. Specific examples include:

- The curve north of the junction on US 169 could decrease visibility

Observations: The team assessed the area around the junction of US 169 and deduced that there could be poor sight distance, in certain circumstances when looking north. Factors that could contribute to poor sight distance could include high grass in the ditch that could obstruct a motorist’s view and inclement weather that could decrease visibility.

Figure 20 - The curve north of the junction on US 169

Suggested Solutions: The following options should be considered:

- Removal of pond to the northwest of the junction to improve site distance.

3.0 Conclusion

This assessment has been prepared to aid the responsible road authorities in the identification and actualization of prospects to improve safety within the study area. The assessment is based on information available at the time of the field review. The suggestions it contains are for consideration only, and are in no way intended to serve as design or operational recommendations. A summary of the site-specific issues outlined above is presented in the following table in Section 3.1, including potential improvement strategies, the level of difficulty to implement, and the estimated cost range. Input for this table was collected from the Road Safety Assessment team members.

This report does not rule out the identification of additional issues pertaining to safety by the responsible road authorities, or the emergence of new issues over time. It is recommended that the responsible agencies review this report, document their responses to the issues identified in a formal response report, and track their progress toward the implementation of safety improvements prompted by the assessment.

3.1 Summary of Issues

Site-Specific Issue	Potential Improvement Strategy	Difficulty/Cost to Implement
Geometric	Smooth out the waffling on the road by building the road up	Low
Geometric	Add a blinking light on the north hill for northbound US 169 traffic	Medium
Geometric	Add a turn lane that both southbound and northbound US 169 traffic could access or a one direction turn lane	High
Geometric	Construct a roundabout at the junction, which would have six entrances.	High
Geometric	Realign NE Woodbine Road to join US 169 south of the current junction.	High
Paint/Rumble strips	Add centerline rumble strip on US 169	Medium
Paint/Rumble strips	Repaint lines on US 169	Low
Signage	Verify that the speed limit sign south of the junction on US 169, northbound lane is the proper size (36”x 48”)	Low
Signage	Check chevron spacing to see they are properly spaced and have florescent yellow coating	Low
Signage	Install larger speed limit sign on US 169, north side of the junction for south bound traffic	Low
Signage	Evaluate signal timing at the traffic light south of the junction, located at US 169 and I-29, to space out traffic more depending on traffic flow. Possibly coordinate signals in the Tuscany Village area. By determining what time of the day traffic is heaviest on northbound US 169, traffic signals can be coordinated to allow for a large traffic gap.	Low
Signage	Install flashers on top of hill by curve on US 169, north of the junction.	Medium
Visibility	Removal of pond northwest of junction to improve site distance	High

Attachment A: Crash Data
2010 - 2016

Crash Data US 169 @ County Line/N. Woodbine (2010-2016 Buchanan/Andrew County)

Bryce.acton@modot.mo.gov

YEAR	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	TOTAL
Property Damage Only (PDO)	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	13
Minor Injury (MI)	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Disabling Injury (DI or serious injury)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Fatal (Fatality)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	3	3	5	2	2	3	2	20
ANIMAL DRAWN VEH/RIDDEN ANIMAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ANIMAL NOT DEER/DOG/FARM ANIMAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ANIMAL OTHER THAN DEER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AVOIDING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BACKING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CHANGING LANES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CROSS MEDIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DOG	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DUAL LEFTS COLLIDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
DUAL RIGHTS COLLIDE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FARM ANIMAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FIXED OBJECT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HEAD ON	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
JACKKNIFE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LEFT TURN	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
LEFT TURN RIGHT ANGLE COLLISON	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
OTHER	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
OUT OF CONTROL	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	4
PARKING OR PARKED CAR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PASSING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PEDESTRIAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PEDACYCLE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
REAR END	1	1	2	1	0	2	1	8
RIGHT ANGLE	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
RIGHT TURN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RIGHT TURN RIGHT ANGLE COLLISION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SIDESWIPE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
U-TURN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3	3	5	2	2	3	2	20

Crashes (serious & fatal)

Serious- Driver 1 was traveling SB on US 169. Driver 1 lost control entering the curve and traveled off the right side of the roadway. Driver 1 reentered the roadway, crossed the centerline, and then struck driver 2 head on traveling NB. *Probable cause: driving too fast for conditions.*

Fatal- Driver 1 (motorcyclists) was traveling SB on US 169. Driver 1 failed to negotiate the curve and ran off the left side of the roadway and struck an embankment. *Probably cause: too fast for conditions.*

Roadway Features

- AADT: **3500 (US 169) / 470 (Woodbine RD)**
  Truck traffic- ***350*** *(tractor trailer)*
- Shoulder width(s) range 2 to 4 feet
- Lane width- 12 feet
- Warning signs are present (*chevrons, curve w/speed advisory and trucks entering roadway*)
- Edge line present / Rumble strips present

Severity Index	Crashes/Year	Crash Rate
2.3	2.9	2.0

SI= [PDO (1) + MI (3) + DI (6) + Fatal (12)] / (# crashes)

$$\text{RATE} = \frac{(\text{No. of crashes} * 1{,}000{,}000)}{(\text{No. of years} * 365 * \text{Entering AADT})}$$

Attachment B: AADT and Crash Types

Attachment C: Crashes by Severity, Weather, Road Condition and Lighting

Attachment D: Crashes by Year, Season and Day

Attachment E: Crashes by Month and Time of Day

Attachment F: Location of Crashes

Appendix B:

Regional Sidewalk Assessment

Mo-Kan Regional Council Sidewalk Assessment

Background

During Fiscal Year 2010, Mo-Kan Regional Council, Northwest Missouri Regional Council of Governments, and Green Hills Regional Planning Commission agreed to begin a sidewalk assessment program for northwest Missouri. The regional planning commissions worked with the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) Northwest District (formerly known as District 1) to complete the assessment in two phases, Phase 1 and Phase 2. The purpose of the project was to collect general information about pedestrian infrastructure as well as to assess the existing sidewalk systems in northwest Missouri. Such information may be utilized for planning purposes, establishing local priorities, potential grant applications, participation in the Safe Routes to School program and the Transportation Enhancement program.

The first phase, completed during FY2010 and early FY2011, was a simple survey to identify existing sidewalks and assess the importance of sidewalks to each of the communities in Mo-Kan's four-county region.

During FY2011, the second phase began with the regional planning commissions agreeing to expand this survey to a more intensive assessment of sidewalk systems. Beginning in the spring of 2011, Mo-Kan employees utilized aerial photography and Google Earth to identify existing sidewalks in member communities served by Mo-Kan's Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC). With this information in-hand, member communities' sidewalks were then visually assessed and categorized based on its current condition.

Initially, the second phase of the project was to be limited to communities with populations over 1,000; however, member communities with populations over 500 (Agency, Stewartsville and Trimble) were also included due to the assessment team working ahead of schedule. Union Star (population 437) was also included in the assessment because the City was applying for funds to pay for sidewalk improvements. To help strengthen Union Star's application, the community was included in the second phase. The application was not submitted but Union Star's sidewalks continue to be evaluated since there is a possibility of the community applying for funds in the future.

Communities included in Phase 2

Sidewalks assessed in communities with populations over 1,000:

Cameron	Maysville
Gower	Plattsburg
Lathrop	

Sidewalks assessed in communities with populations between 500 and 1,000:

Agency	Trimble
Stewartsville	

Sidewalks assessed in communities considering applying for sidewalk grants with populations under 500:

Union Star

In 2014 the five communities with populations over 1,000 (Cameron, Gower, Lathrop, Maysville and Plattsburg) were assessed again, along with Stewartsville.

Sidewalk Assessments were not completed in 2015 due to staff changes so in the summer of 2016 all nine communities received sidewalk assessments. Union Star continues to be included in the assessment although the population was under 500. In 2017 the communities with populations between 500 and 1,000 were assessed.

Assessment Methods:

After using aerial photography and Google Earth to identify existing sidewalks, Mo-Kan staff traveled to each community to collect condition information. Each sidewalk was visually assessed and categorized using the following criteria:

Good: Unlikely to hinder mobility of the average pedestrian. The sidewalk is free from significant cracking, buckling, gravel surfaces, or other debris which would impede pedestrian traffic.
Map key: Green

Fair: Uneven and distressed surface that hinders mobility of the average pedestrian. The sidewalk contains surface cracks, vegetation overgrowth, or debris.
Map key: Yellow

Poor: Impassable to mobility impaired pedestrian; hinders mobility of average pedestrian. The sidewalk has deep cracking or buckling, significant vegetative overgrowth, poor drainage, bulging surface (due to tree roots) and / or debris such that pedestrian travel would be impeded.
Map key: Red

City of Cameron

Sidewalks in the City of Cameron (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 9,836) were surveyed in July 2016 by Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 112,983 linear feet (21.40 miles) of sidewalk in Cameron.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Cameron's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	38,412	34.00%
Fair	36,100	31.95%
Good	38,471	34.05%
Totals:	**112,983**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting sidewalks in good condition in Cameron include certain sections of downtown, the Eagles Landing neighborhood in south Cameron, areas near Cameron R-1 High School, and a new residential neighborhood on Timberline Drive and Rosewood Court in northwest Cameron. With the exception of some areas downtown, Cameron's older neighborhoods are primarily served by sidewalks exhibiting either poor or fair conditions (65.95%). Most northern sections of Cameron, including busy commercial/retail areas near U.S. Highway 36 and Interstate-35, are not served by sidewalks. The lack of sidewalks in these areas restricts walkability, resulting in an environment that requires individuals to drive. State routes within Cameron (excluding I-35 and U.S. 36, which are divided four-lane highways) include U.S. 69, and State Highway A. These roads are not adequately served by sidewalks in most areas of the community.

Good Rating:

7th Street and Main

Fair Rating:

Groat Street and 4th Street

Poor Rating:

East 6th Street and Locust

Mo-Kan
Cameron, MO
N Willowbrook Dr
Harris Ln
E 14th St
US Hwy 36
Co Rd 56W 8th St
E 8th St
Co Rd 65
W 2nd St
Burlington Rd
W Prospect St
W Cornhill St
W Prairie St
NE 352nd St
State Hwy A
Euclid Ave
E Ford St
Park Dr
Evergreen St
Dugan Dr
Park Ave
South St
Aquila Dr
NE Packard Ln
0 ¼ ½ 1
Miles
Legend
Poor - 38,412 Feet
Fair - 36,100 Feet
Good - 38,471 Feet
Streets
City Limits
N

City of Gower

Sidewalks in the City of Gower (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 1,501) were surveyed in July 2016 by Mo-Kan Regional Council staff. The assessment identified approximately 22,244 linear feet (4.21 miles) of sidewalk in Gower.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Gower's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	10,655	47.90%
Fair	4,400	19.78%
Good	7,189	32.32%
Totals:	**22,244**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting good sidewalks in Gower include certain sections of downtown, a newer subdivision in northeast Gower, areas near East Buchanan C-1 High School, and a residential neighborhood on Santa Fe Drive and Castile Street in east Gower. With the exception of a few areas, Gower's neighborhoods are primarily served by sidewalks exhibiting poor or fair conditions (67.68%). Much of the community is not served by sidewalks, including commercial areas along U.S. Highway 169. State Routes within Gower include U.S. 169, State Highway H and State Highway VV, all of which greatly lack adequate sidewalk infrastructure. The addition of sidewalks connecting residential neighborhoods to the school and businesses along Highway 169 would greatly improve Gower's walkability.

Good Rating:

Shivel Street and 3rd Street (southeast corner)

Fair Rating:

Hallar Street and 4th Street (southwest corner)

Poor Rating:

2nd Street, between Bryan Street and Dewey Street (southeast corner)

Mo-Kan
Gower, MO
Cummings Dr
Andrew Ct
Somerset Dr
Natalee Ln
Bryan St
Dewey Ave
4th St
3rd St
1st St
Winner Ave
Hallar Ave
2nd St
Gregory Dr
Field St
Santa Fe Ln
Bland Ln
Railroad Ave
Matthews Ln
Santa Fe Dr
Castile St
Ave
S 1st St
Kennedy Dr
Shivel Ave
S 2nd St
Allen St
Washington St
Lincoln Dr
Smith St
S 3rd St
Clinton Dr
0 500 1,000 2,000
Feet
Legend
Poor - 10,655 Feet
Fair - 4,400 Feet
Good - 7,189 Feet
City Limits
Streets
N
Field St
Kennedy Dr
Smith St
Co Rd 324

City of Lathrop

Sidewalks in the City of Lathrop (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 2,049) were surveyed in July 2016 by Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 27,780 linear feet (5.26 miles) of sidewalk in Lathrop.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Lathop's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	14,467	52.08%
Fair	6,278	22.60%
Good	7,035	25.32%
Totals:	**27,780**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting good sidewalks in Lathrop include sections of downtown, the City Park, and a new residential area north of North Street (MO 116). Other areas served by sidewalks include Lathrop's elementary school, and much of Oak Street; however, most sidewalks in town (74.68%) are in either poor or fair condition. Lathrop has relatively few sidewalks compared to other communities within the region of comparable size. Currently, no sidewalks serve the high school, which forces students to walk or bike in the streets, or drive to school. Additionally, MO116 separates the high school from most of the community, further restricting Lathrop's walkability. State routes in town include MO 116, MO 33, and State Highway A, all of which lack adequate sidewalks in most areas. Lathrop was awarded a Transportation Alternatives Program Grant from MoDOT in 2016 to improve approximately 2,000 feet of sidewalk on Center Street, from Oak Street to South Street, which would serve the elementary and middle schools. Construction has not started at this time.

Good Rating:

Locust and Oak Street

Fair Rating:

Center Street, near Oak Street

Poor Rating:

Locust & Plattsburg Street

Lathrop, MO
Mo-Kan
Co Rd 243
Hubbard Pl
Hondo St
Latigo St
North St
Ash St
Sellers Pl
Jewell
Franklin St
Centennial Pl
Maple St
Railroad Cir
Swim Club Dr
Walnut St
Pine St
West St
Center St
Lisa Ave
Cedar St
Colonial Dr
Plattsburg St
Russell St
Tichenor St
Oak St
Ash St
Ridge St
Valley St
Bohart St
Orem St
Clinton St
Park St
Locust St
Whitcomb St
Short St
East St
0
750
1,500
3,000
Feet
Legend
Poor - 14,467 Feet
Fair - 6,278 Feet
Good - 7,035 Feet
City Limit
Streets
N
Co Rd 147
State Hwy A
State Hwy 33
State Hwy 116
Elm St
West St
Maple St
Clinton St
Co Rd 245
South St
Co Rd 171
State Hwy 33

City of Maysville

Sidewalks in the City of Maysville (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 1,094) were surveyed in July 2016 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 30,928 linear feet (5.85 miles) of sidewalk in Maysville.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Maysville's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	12,058	38.99%
Fair	10,731	34.70%
Good	8,139	26.31%
Totals:	**30,928**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting the best sidewalks in Maysville include in front of the schools on W. Main Street, sections of downtown and a few sporadic locations in residential neighborhoods. Areas surrounding the Crestview Estate Retirement Community have sidewalks that have been downgraded to fair. Most of Maysville's existing sidewalks are located in the city's older neighborhoods and along major routes. In contrast, the newest neighborhoods in western and southern areas of Maysville largely lack sidewalk infrastructure. State routes in town include MO 6 and Highway 33, which are fairly well served by sidewalks within city limits; however, the current state of those sidewalks is primarily in poor or fair condition.

Good Rating:

Main & Washington Street

Fair Rating:

W. Elm Street, between Water and Washington

Poor Rating:

Washington and King Street

Mo-Kan
Maysville, MO
W Main
Meadowlane Dr
Orchard St
School Dr
Victory St
Hickory St
Architon St
N Polk St
E Jackson St
E Main St
King St
W Wilson St
Auerman Dr
E Wilson Ave
Sycamore Dr
Maple Ter
Pine Valley Rd
S Hillcrest Dr
Arthur Dr
Camden St
Rose
Ada St
Macadee St
Hill and Taylor St
Dallas St
Elm St
Cherry St
Maple St
S Washington St
E Sheridan St
Taylor St
Water St
E Sherman St
W Grant St
Shelton St
S Sloan St
SE Walnut St
Iona St
Florence St
Highland St
S Polk St
Railroad St
Meadow Ln
State Hwy 6
N Sloan St
S Water St
State Hwy A
S Polk St
SE Walnut St
0 500 1,000 2,000
Feet
Legend
Poor - 12,058 Feet
Fair - 10,731 Feet
Good - 8,139 Feet
Streets
City Limits
N

City of Plattsburg

Sidewalks in the City of Plattsburg (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 2,291) were surveyed in July 2016 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 52,066 linear feet (9.86 miles) of sidewalk in Plattsburg.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Plattsburg's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	20,092	38.59%
Fair	22,602	46.17%
Good	12,128	15.24%
Totals:	**61,044**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting the best sidewalks in Plattsburg include sections of downtown, areas surrounding Plattsburg's public schools, and a few sporadic locations in residential neighborhoods. In relation to other communities within the region of comparable size, Plattsburg has many sidewalks; however, most sidewalks (84.76%) in town are in either poor or fair condition. These sidewalks primarily exist in the city's older neighborhoods, while the newest neighborhoods are void of sidewalks. State routes in town include MO 116 and Highway C, which are fairly well served by sidewalks within city limits.

Good Rating:

W. Osage and N. 7th Street

Fair Rating:

7th Street and Maple Street

Poor Rating:

Turney and Railroad Street

Mo-Kan
Plattsburg, MO
Mid America Dr
W Plotsky Ave
Vance St
N Ingles St
Porter St
Gladys St
N Birch St
Railroad St
Depot St
North St
South St
Turney St
Bureau St
Dewey St
N 2nd St
E Walnut St
N 7th St
N 6th St
N 5th St
N 4th St
N 3rd St
W Osage St
E Osage St
N State Hwy Y
W Maple St
E Maple St
W Locust St
E Locust St
N Redbird Ln
W Broadway
Y Hwy
W Clay Ave
E Clay Ave
Ridge Rd
S 8th St
S Oak St
S 6th St
S 5th St
S 4th St
S 3rd St
Riley St
S Main St
S Elm St
W Frost St
Walnut St
E Grogan St
Morgana Haven Dr
Hillside Ln
Echo Cir
Missouri Ave
Park St
Jones
Circle Dr
Valley Dr
Truman St
SW Town and Country Ln
Patricia St
Gary St
Co Rd 331
Burnside Ave
NW 264th St
W Broadway St
W State Rte 116
SW Shaver Rd
S Birch Ave
N Main St
State Hwy C
0
750
1,500
3,000
Feet
Legend
Poor - 20,092 Feet
Fair - 24,041 Feet
Good - 7,933 Feet
Streets
City Limits
N

Village of Agency

Sidewalks in the Village of Agency (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 672) were surveyed in April 2017 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 1,518 linear feet (.29 miles) of sidewalk in Agency.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Agency's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	719	47.15%
Fair	806	52.85%
Good	0	0%
Totals:	**1,525**	**100.00%**

In relation to communities within the region of comparable size, Agency is served by very few sidewalks. The sidewalks that do exist are largely in poor condition and are located on Main Street and SE State Route H in residential neighborhoods. In recent years, Agency has come to serve as a bedroom community to St. Joseph and Kansas City due to its proximity to Interstate 29. Therefore, the village has experienced substantial residential growth; however, public investments in sidewalk infrastructure have not accompanied this new development. This as has been the case in other growing communities within the Mo-Kan region as well. State routes within Agency include State Highway H and State Highway FF, both of which are not currently served by sidewalks.

Fair Rating:

Main Street,
between Third and Fourth Streets

Poor Rating:

Main and Third Street

Mo-Kan
Agency, MO
Miller St
Boone St
Main St
SE State Hwy F1
1st St
Possom Holler
Pleasanthill
2nd St
3rd St
Co Rd 145
State Rte O
State Hwy F1
0
250
500
1,000
Feet
Legend
Fair - 806 Feet
Streets
Poor - 719 Feet
N

City of Stewartsville

Sidewalks in the City of Stewartsville (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 735) were surveyed in April 2017 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 10,637 linear feet (2.01 miles) of sidewalk in Stewartsville.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Stewartsville's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	5,932	55.77%
Fair	3,554	33.41%
Good	1,151	10.82%
Totals:	**10,637**	**100.00%**

The best sidewalks in Stewartsville are located in areas of downtown on Main Street. In relation to other communities within the region of comparable size, Stewartsville has many sidewalks; however, the overall condition is mostly fair or poor (89.18%). These sidewalks primarily exist in the city's older residential neighborhoods. Sidewalks are not present in the newer, northern areas of town. MoDOT routes in town include State Highway K and State Highway Y, which include sidewalks with variable conditions in older areas of Stewartsville. Sidewalks are not present on Y, nor on U.S. 36, which is a divided four-lane highway on the north edge of the City.

Good Rating:

6th Street and Main Street

Fair Rating:

8th Street and Main Street

Poor Rating:

West Street and 6th Street

Mo-Kan
Stewartsville, MO
US Hwy 36
Main St
Co Rd 25
State Hwy Y
Legend
Poor - 5,932 Feet
Fair - 3,554 Feet
Good - 1,151 Feet
Streets
City Limits
N
0 250 500 1,000
Feet
Clay St
Clinton St
E 10th
W 10th St
Buchanan St
9th St
Sam St
Washington St
8th St
7th St
Dekalb St
West St
6th St
W 5th St
4th St
W 3rd St
W 2nd St
Railroad Ave
E 2nd St
Main St

City of Trimble

Sidewalks in the City of Trimble (*Census.gov* 2015 estimated population: 640) were surveyed in April 2017 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 1,578 linear feet (0.30 mile) of sidewalk in Trimble.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Trimble's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	1,243	78.77%
Fair	335	21.23%
Good	0	0%
Totals:	**1,578**	**100.00%**

In relation to communities within the region of comparable size, Trimble is served by very few sidewalks. The majority of sidewalks that do exist are in poor condition (78.77%) and are located primarily along Port Arthur Road (State Highway F) in residential neighborhoods, with some adjacent to City Hall. In recent years, Trimble has come to serve as a bedroom community to Kansas City, due to its location in southern Clinton County, along U.S. Highway 169. Therefore, the community has experienced residential growth; however, public investments in sidewalk infrastructure have not accompanied this new development. This has been the case in other growing communities within the Mo-Kan region as well. State routes within Trimble include State Highway F and U.S. Highway 169. Relatively few sidewalks are located along F, with most being in poor condition. No sidewalks exist along U.S. 169, despite commercial/retail development along the highway.

Fair Rating:

Port Arthur Road and Cherry Street (west side)

Poor Rating:

Port Arthur Road and Cherry Street (east side)

Trimble, MO
Mo-Kan
US Hwy 169
1st St
2nd St
Third St
Walnut St
E Walnut St
Port Arthur Rd
Cherry St
Willow St
Main St
3rd St
E Oak St
S Main St
N
0 125 250 500 Feet
Legend
Fair - 335 Feet
Poor - 1,243 Feet
Streets
City Limits
SW 214th St
Howard Rd
Miller Rd
Co Rd 369
SW Wohlford Rd
N 3rd St
E Oak St
US Hwy 169
SW State Hwy F

City of Union Star

Sidewalks in the City of Union Star (2010 population: 437) were surveyed in April 2017 by employees of Mo-Kan Regional Council. The assessment identified approximately 20,458 linear feet (3.87 miles) of sidewalk in Union Star.

Sidewalk Conditions:

The table below presents the current state of Union Star's sidewalks, based on observations made during the assessment.

Condition	Linear Feet	Percent of Total
Poor	17,192	84.03%
Fair	2,720	13.30%
Good	546	2.67%
Totals:	**20,458**	**100.00%**

Areas exhibiting the best sidewalks in Union Star are located in a few sporadic locations in residential neighborhoods. In relation to other communities within the region of comparable size, Union Star has many sidewalks, which serve most areas of the community; however, the majority of sidewalks in town are in poor condition (84.03%). State routes in town include U.S. 169 and State Highway Z. Some sidewalks are located along Highway 169 inside the city limits, most of which are in poor condition. No sidewalks exist along Highway Z in town, which is where the public school is located.

Good Rating:
5th Street and Cedar Street

Fair Rating:
Cedar and 4th Street

Poor Rating:
6th Street and Walnut Street

Union Star, MO
Mo-Kan
College St
9th St
8th St
6th St
5th St
Walnut St
7th St
4th St
3rd St
2nd St
Cedar St
Maple St
1st St
Locust St
9th St
Linn St
0 250 500 1,000
Feet
Legend
Poor - 17,192 Feet
Fair - 2,720 Feet
Good - 546 Feet
Streets
City Limits
N