Regional Transportation Plan
2018

ADOPTED 2-27-19

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	City of Savannah Mayor
Soctt Burnham	Buchanan County	County Commissioner
Bob Burnett	Buchanan County	Citizen Member
Johnnie Hoggatt	Buchanan County	Citizen Member
Drew Bontrager	Clinton County	City of Cameron Public Works Director
Wade Wilken, Jr.	Clinton County	Presiding Commissioner
Michael O'Donnell	Clinton County	City of Cameron Planning and Zoning
Gary McFee	DeKalb County	County Commissioner
Bill Gray	DeKalb County	County Road and Bridge Supervisor
Meilissa Meek	DeKalb County	County Clerk

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
Andrew County
DeKalb County
Buchanan County
Clinton County
Bolckow
Fillmore
Rosendale
Union Star
Savannah
Amazonia
Cosby
Country Club
St. Joseph
Maysville
Weatherby
Amity
Clarksdale
Stewartsville
Cameron
Osborn
Easton
Agency
Gower
Turney
Rushville
De Kalb
Plattsburg
Lathrop
Lewis and Clark Village
Dearborn
Trimble
Holt
Legend
Interstate
U.S. Highway
Missouri Numbered Route
Missouri Lettered Route
County
Community
Miles
0 2.5 5 10 15 20
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.
Mo-Kan

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

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
Weatherby
Amity
Maysville
Clarksdale
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
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 called Ag Expo Way.

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 a 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, including 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 CC
Location: Route CC from U.S. Highway 59 to I-29
AADT: 250
IRI: 170
Need: Route CC from US Highway 59 to I-29 is in need of repair. The road surface suffers from crumbling and rutting. There are no rumble strips.
Project List: Maintenance

Image A-2

County: Andrew
Route(s) Involved: Route Y
Location: Route Y from U.S. Highway 71 to Route H
AADT: 246 AADT on Route Y, east of Route H and 146 AADT on Route Y, south of Nodaway County line
IRI: 175
Need: Route Y from Route H to the north county line is in need of repair due to pot holes, rutting and crumbling edges. The road lacks shoulders and rumble strips.
Project: Maintenance

Image A-3

County: Andrew
Route(s) Involved: Route M
Location: Route M from MO Highwy 48 to US Highway 169
AADT: 420
IRI: 185
Need: Route M is in need of resurfacing. Some areas have pot holes and crumbling edges. The road lacks shoulders and rumble strips.
Project: STIP

Image A-4

County: Andrew
Route(s) Involved: US Route 59
Location: US Route 59 south of Savannah to Country Club Village
AADT: 10,294
Crash Rate: 12.7
Need: Safety enhancements along US Route 59 are needed for turning traffic. Visibility and lack of turning landes for decelerating traffic are of concern. Paved shoulders are present but there are no rumble strips.
Project List: Safety Enhancements

Image B-1

County: Buchanan
Route(s) Involved: Double deck bridge on I-229
AADT: 8,045 on I-229 north of US Route 59
Need: The double deck bridge is expensive to maintain and due for a $50 million repair. Demolishing the bridge and bringing traffic down to ground level would be less expensive and easier to maintain in the long run.
Project List: STIP

Image B-2

County: Buchanan
Route(s) Involved: MO Route 116
Location: MO Route 116 from Rushville to Route Y
AADT: 754 east of Route V intersection; 618 west of Route V intersection
Need: Safety enhancements, specifically guard rails, are needed along MO Route 116 where there are steep embankments.
Crash Rate: 1.96
Project List: Safety Enhancements

Image B-3

County: Buchanan
Route(s) Involved: Bike/pedestrian trail along US Highway 59
Location: Following along US Highway 59 south from St. Joseph and then west towards Atchison, Kan.
AADT: 5,321 on US Highway 59 south of St. Joseph; 6,652 west of the "T" stop on US Highway 59.
Need: The proposed addition to the Quad Trail is a bike/pedestrian trail system that traverses four states and the proposed secition in Buchanan County would traverse the west side of the county, near the established vehicle route of US Highway 59.
Project List: Multi-modal

Image B-4

County: Buchanan
Route(s) Involved: Route H
Location: Route H and Route A
AADT: 141
Need: Realign Route H with Route A to create a direct intersection. The current configuration requires Route H east/west traffic to briefly travel north/south along Route A.
Crash Rate: 0.97
Project List: Maintenance

Image C-1

County: Clinton
Route(s) Involved: Bridge on Route NN
AADT: 162 on Route NN, west of MO Highway 33
Need: The bridge on Route NN needs to be widened for two lanes of traffic. The bridge has exposed rebar.
Project List: STIP

Image C-2

County: Clinton
Route(s) Involved: Route J
Location: Route J from south county line to Route C
AADT: 336
IRI: 210
Need: Route J is in need of resurfacing due to the cracks in the surface and crumbling edges. There are no shoulder or rumble strips.
Project List: Maintenance

Image C-3

County: Clinton
Route(s) Involved: Route H
Location: Route H from MO Highway 33 to US Highway 69
AADT: 138
IRI: 225
Need: Route H is in need of resurfacing due to the deep rutting and cracks. The edge of the road is crumbling. There are no shoulders or rumble strips.
Project List: Maintenance

Image C-4

County: Clinton
Route(s) Involved: I-35, Route BB and Bob Griffin Road
AADT: 1,710 at Route BB, east of I-35
Need: The current overpass and ramps are not properly sized or aligned to safely and effectively accomodate future traffic volumes. The expansion project is needed to property handle exisiting traffic from local uses, including hospital traffic, and future growth at the intersection, including the new 380 acre industrial park. The existing bridge is too narrow based on current design guidelines and has no capability of accomodating ADA compliant mixed-use (pedestrian and bicycle) needs.
Crash rate: 2.08
Project List: STIP

Image D-1

County:DeKalb
Route(s) Involved: Intersection of I-35, US Highway 36 and Bob Griffin Road
AADT: 18,032 east of I-35 on US Route 36 (6,594 truck traffic), 8,306 on ramp off northbound I-35 to US Route 36
Need: An expansion is needed to address the traffic volume and flow at this congested intersection. The area is experiencing growth with the construction of a large truck stop and hotel. This will contribute to increased traffic volumes, including trucks needing to make wide turns.
Crash Rate: 3.21
Project List: STIP

Image D-2

County: DeKalb
Route(s) Involved: Route H
Location: Route H from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Highway 6
AADT: 190 between Route E and MO Highway 6
IRI: 260
Need: Route H is in need of resurfacing due to the cracking surface and crumbling edges. There are no shoulders or rumble strips.
Project List: Maintenance

Image D-3

County: DeKalb
Route(s) Involved: Route O
Location: Route O only from Clarksdale to Route N
AADT: 179
IRI: 205
Need: This specific section of Route O is in need of repairs due to cracking and rutting. The road has no shoulders or rumble strips.
Project List: Maintenance

Image D-4

County: DeKalb
Route(s) Involved: Route D
Location: Route D from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Route 6
AADT: 382
IRI: 235
Need: Route D is in need of repairs due to the cracking surface and deep rutting. The road does not have shoulders or rumble strips.
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

- Safety Enhancements
- Maintenance
- STIP

0 3 6 12 Miles

Map 12

Buchanan County Transportation Priorities

Map 13

Clinton County Transportation Priorities

Map 14

DeKalb County Transportation Priorities

Expansion Project

Maintenance

0 2.5 5 10 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

2019-2023 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# Let With: Future Cost: Estimate Total:

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2018 6/2019	7/2019 6/2020	7/2020 6/2021	7/2021 6/2022	7/2022 6/2023
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

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).

Project description and location.

Metropolitan Planning Organization (Y/N).

Projects let in combination.

Date project is to be awarded to begin construction (Season and calendar year for 2018 & 2019. SFY only beyond 2019).

Estimated cost range beyond 2023.

Anticipated Federal Funding Category^

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

Total project cost estimate.

Dollars programmed in previous STIPs.

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

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

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

Dollars for construction, utilities and contingency.

Dollars funded from other sources.

(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.

2019-2023 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 229 / Job No.: 1I3233	Pavement resurfacing from the I-29 interchange, north of St. Joseph, to 22nd Street (Rte. 371). Excludes bridge along Missouri River in St. Joseph.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Engineering:		5	68	113	451	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	6,272	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

Length: 10.97 MPO: Y
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — AC-State: 6,213 State: 691 Local: 0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 6,909

County: Andrew / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 0I3005C	Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from Rte. K to Platte County line. Includes I-229 in Andrew and Buchanan Counties.						
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

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 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 273

County: Andrew / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3109	Bridge replacement over Hopkins Creek, 0.2 mile south of Rte. T near Amazonia. Project involves twin bridges A1293.						
Engineering:		184	314	469	0	0	0
R/W:		0	10	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	5,012	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

Length: 0.07 MPO: N
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — Fed: 4,644 State: 1,161 Local: 0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Fall 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP
TIP #: BP-2018-02 — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 5,989

County: Andrew / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3241	Bridge rehabilitation on bridge over Rte. T, near Amazonia. Project involves twin bridges A1292.						
Engineering:		0	15	25	79	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

Length: 0.02 MPO: N
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 944 State: 236 Local: 0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,180

County: Andrew / Route: MO 48 / Job No.: 1S3133	Bridge replacement over Agee Creek, 2 miles east of Rte. D near Whitesville. Project involves bridge K0085.						
Engineering:		15	37	50	0	0	0
R/W:		0	5	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	520	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

Length: 0.10 MPO: N
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 490 State: 122 Local: 0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Summer 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 627

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

2019-2023 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: US 59 / Job No.: 1S3190	Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. 71 to Market Street in Savannah, and on the southbound lanes from Market Street to Savannah city limits, and in the northbound lanes from Market Street to I-29.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
Length: 10.45 MPO: Y			Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 993 State: 248 Local: 0	Engineering:	15	89	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Winter 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
TIP #: RR-2018-06 Let With: 1S3189	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,256	Construction:	0	1,152	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: US 59 / Job No.: 1S3251	Bridge rehabilitation over I-29, 1.2 miles south of the Nodaway River, near Savannah. Project involves bridge A1288.						
Length: 0.05 MPO: N		Engineering:	0	3	8	35	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 418 State: 105 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Construction:	0	0	0	477	0	0
TIP #: Let With:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 523	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: BU 71 / Job No.: 1S3189	Pavement resurfacing of the southbound lanes from south city limits of Savannah to I-29 north of St. Joseph. Project includes shoulder repairs to northbound and southbound lanes.						
Length: 5.12 MPO: Y		Engineering:	18	100	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 1,130 State: 282 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay	Awd Date: Winter 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Construction:	0	1,312	0	0	0	0
TIP #: RR-2018-07 Let With: 1S3190	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,430	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: RT DD / Job No.: 1S3171	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. T, in Savannah, to Rte. 59 in Country Club Village.						
Length: 7.61 MPO: Y		Engineering:	3	17	54	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 607 State: 152 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing	Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Construction:	0	0	688	0	0	0
TIP #: RR-2018-08 Let With:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 762	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Andrew / Route: RT O / Job No.: 1S0559	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over the Platte River, 1.5 miles west of Rte. Z near Cosby. Project involves bridge N0868.						
Length: 0.15 MPO: N		Engineering:	429	99	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,157 State: 289 Local: 0	R/W:	16	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	1,347	0	0	0	0
TIP #: Let With:	Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,891	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.**

2019-2023 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	Fund	Awd Date	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Let With:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:
Andrew	RT T	1S3248	10.09	Y	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing		Pavement resurfacing from Rte. DD, in Savannah, to end of route.	AC-State: 699 State: 174 Local: 0	Fall 19	STBG		0	873
Atchison	MO 111	1S3055	0.05	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacement and add guardrail over Mill Creek, 1 mile south of Rte. Z near Corning. Project involves bridge X0172.	Fed: 1,135 State: 284 Local: 0	Summer 18	NHPP		0	1,672
Atchison	US 136	1P3193	11.44	N	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing		Pavement improvements from I-29, in Rock Port, to Rte. O near Tarkio.	AC-State: 1,532 State: 382 Local: 0	Summer 19	NHPP		0	1,919
Atchison	IS 29	0I3005B	63.97	N	Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Preventive Maint		Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from the Iowa State line to Rte. K in Andrew County.	AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0	Spring 19	NHPP		0	273
Atchison	IS 29	1I3110	0.25	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge rehabilitation over the Nishnabotna River, 1 mile south of the Iowa State line. Involves twin bridges A2369.	Fed: 3,947 State: 986 Local: 0	2021	NHPP		0	4,939

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Engineering:	0	25	62	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	786	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	243	100	0	0	0	0
R/W:	10	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	1,319	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	5	31	132	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	1,751	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
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
Engineering:	6	83	105	308	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	4,437	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.**

2019-2023 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: Atchison Route: I-29 Job No.: 1I3238 Length: 0.00 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Safety (Statewide) Sec Cat: Safety TIP #:	Add signs for wrong way movements at various ramp locations. Andrew, Atchison, Buchanan, and Holt Counties. Awd Date: Spring 19 Let With: Fed: 334 State: 37 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 376	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	5	29	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	342	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Atchison Route: RT J Job No.: 1S3054 Length: 0.09 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over the Tarkio River, 0.6 mile east Rte. 59 near Fairfax. Project involves bridge L0447. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 1,321 State: 330 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,770						
	Engineering:	119	146	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	5	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

County: Atchison Route: RT U Job No.: 1S3204 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Drainage Ditch, 1.3 miles south of Rte. 136 near Phelps City. Project involves bridge R0475. Awd Date: Fall 19 Let With: Fed: 270 State: 68 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 340						
	Engineering:	2	10	24	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	304	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Buchanan Route: MO 116 Job No.: 1S3129 Length: 0.12 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over I-29, 1 mile east of Rte. 371 near Faucett. Project involves bridge A0074. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 1,277 State: 320 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,723						
	Engineering:	126	162	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	1,425	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Buchanan Route: US 169 Job No.: 1S3195B Length: 24.26 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. FF, in St. Joseph, to the Clay County line. Awd Date: 2020 Let With: AC-State: 467 State: 117 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 584						
	Engineering:	0	35	48	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	501	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.**

2019-2023 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 169 Job No.: 1S3249 Length: 3.47 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing on the Belt Highway from Rochester Road to Mitchell Avenue in St. Joseph. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 1,557 State: 389 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,946	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
		Engineering:	0	20	35	124	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	1,767	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Buchanan Route: US 169 Job No.: 1S3257 Length: 3.19 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing from Mitchell Avenue To Rte. FF in St. Joseph. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: AC-State: 1,704 State: 426 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,130							
		Engineering:	0	5	15	28	130	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,952	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

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 resurfacing from 1.5 miles south of Rte. O to Platte County line near Dearborn. Awd Date: Fall 19 Let With: AC-State: 3,968 State: 441 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,420							
		Engineering:	11	85	291	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	4,033	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Buchanan Route: US 36 Job No.: 1P0862 Length: 5.68 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing from Missouri River bridge to 0.75 mile east of Rte. AC in St. Joseph. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 4,006 State: 1,001 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,029							
		Engineering:	22	42	71	325	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	4,569	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 rehabilitation over I-229 and 6th Street in St. Joseph. Project involves bridge L0319. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: Fed: 1,414 State: 352 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,826							
		Engineering:	60	134	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	1,632	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.**

2019-2023 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: MO 371 Job No.: 1S3076 Length: 13.04 MPO: Y Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #: Let With: 1S3153	Pavement resurfacing, add rumblestripes, and upgrade guardrail from Rte. 752, in St. Joseph, to Platte County line. $500,000 Open Container funds. Fed: 2,332 State: 583 Local: 0 Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,993		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
			Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
		Engineering:	78	212	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	2,703	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	500	0	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 Let With:	Pavement resurfacing and upgrade guardrail from Rte. 752 in St. Joseph to north of Rte. 45 intersection near Rushville. AC-State: 2,569 State: 643 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 3,263							
		Engineering:	51	294	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	2,918	0	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 Let With:	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. AC, in St. Joseph, to Rte. 31 near Clarksdale. Fed: 1,764 State: 441 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,221							
		Engineering:	16	63	164	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	1,978	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 Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing TIP #: Let With:	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 169 to Rte. 116 near Gower. AC-State: 573 State: 144 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 719							
		Engineering:	2	15	48	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	654	0	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 Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing TIP #: RR-2018-10 Let With:	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 371, near Faucett, to Rte. 169 in Gower. AC-State: 899 State: 225 Local: 0 Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,129							
		Engineering:	5	18	76	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

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

2019-2023 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 #:	Let With:	Description	Fed:	State:	Local:	AC-State:	Awd Date:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:
Buchanan	RP IS229N TO MO759N	1I3186	0.71	Y	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst			Bridge rehabilitation 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.	1,261	315	0		Fall 18	NHPP	0	1,601
Buchanan	RT YY	1S3222	1.88	Y	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay			Pavement resurfacing from east of Belt Highway to Riverside Road in St. Joseph.		60	0	242	2021	STBG	0	304
Caldwell	MO 116	1S3195C	18.41	N	Taking Care Of System	Preventive Maint			Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. D to Rte. A in Braymer. Except within the city limits of Polo.		81	0	324	2020	STBG	0	405
Caldwell	US 36	1P3165	13.16	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay			Pavement resurfacing, pavement repair and upgrade guardrail in the westbound lanes from Rte. 13 to the Livingston County line, near Hamilton.	3,083	771	0		Fall 19	NHPP	0	3,929
Carroll	US 24	1P3175	0.02	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		1P3176, 1P3177, 1P3178	Bridge rehabilitation over the Missouri River overflow, 1.9 miles north of Missouri River near Carrollton. Project involves bridge A2619.	297	75	0		Summer 18	NHPP	0	380

STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING

County:	Route:	Job No.:	Item	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Buchanan	RP IS229N TO MO759N	1I3186	Engineering:	25	120	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	1,456	0	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Buchanan	RT YY	1S3222	Engineering:	2	5	10	22	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	0	265	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caldwell	MO 116	1S3195C	Engineering:	0	10	29	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	0	366	0	0	0
			FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Caldwell	US 36	1P3165	Engineering:	75	20	250	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
Carroll	US 24	1P3175	Engineering:	8	28	0	0	0	0
			R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
			Construction:	0	344	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.**

2019-2023 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: Carroll / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 1P3176	Bridge rehabilitation over Wakenda Creek, 0.5 mile north of Rte. 10 near Carrollton. Project involves bridge A2906.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 0.12 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,273 State: 317 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: 1P3177, 1P3178, 1P3175 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,618						
Engineering:		28	109	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	1,481	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Carroll / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 2P2211	Pavement resurfacing, add shoulders, and upgrade guardrail from 1.9 miles east of Rte. 41, near Dewitt, to Rte. 5 in Keytesville. $175,000 Open Container funds.						
Length: 17.44 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 4,043 State: 1,010 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,211						
Engineering:		158	22	324	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	4,707	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	175	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Carroll / Route: US 65 / Job No.: 1P3147	Bridge rehabilitation and add guardrail on various bridges in Carroll, Daviess, Livingston and Linn Counties. Project involves bridges H0614, F0097, G0862, and A2053.						
Length: 0.29 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 739 State: 185 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 944						
Engineering:		20	69	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	855	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Carroll / Route: RT E / Job No.: 1S3207	Bridge replacement over Turkey Creek, 0.8 mile east of Rte. D near Norborne. Project involves bridge L0181.						
Length: 0.04 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 692 State: 172 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2022 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 866						
Engineering:		2	1	16	59	56	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	0	732	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Carroll / Route: RT E / Job No.: 1S3208	Bridge replacement over Lost Creek, 0.9 mile east of Rte. OO near Carrollton. Project involves bridge L0184.						
Length: 0.01 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 372 State: 92 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2022 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 466						
Engineering:		2	1	12	28	29	0
R/W:		0	0	0	6	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	0	388	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.**

2019-2023 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	Fund	Fed	State	Local	Awd Date	Let With	Anticipated Fed Cat	Future Cost	Estimate Total
Carroll	RT V	1S3209	0.01	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacements on Rte. V over Miami Station Branch, near DeWitt, and on Rte. C over Turkey Creek and Branch of Turkey Creek, 1.9 miles west of Rte. F. Project involves bridges Y0492, W0026 and W0027.		990	248	0	2022		NHPP	0	1,240
Carroll	RT W	1P2219C	0.49	N	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans		ADA Transition Plan improvements in Bogard.		82	19	0	2022		STBG	0	115
Carroll	RT Z	2S2185	0.02	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacement over Tater Hill Creek, 1.1 miles west of Rte. 65 near Coloma. Project involves bridge T0267.		706	175	0	2021		NHPP	0	904
Chariton	MO 129	1S3170	20.79	N	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing		Pavement resurfacing and ADA Transition Plan improvements from Macon County line to Rte. PP in Salisbury. $50,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds.		1,662	415	0	Fall 18		STBG	0	2,082
Chariton	MO 139	1S3157	0.09	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacement over Grand River Overflow, 1.6 miles west of Rte. EE near Sumner. Project involves bridge R0420.		2,096	524	0	2021		NHPP	0	2,624

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Engineering:	2	1	21	36	82	0
R/W:	0	0	0	5	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,093	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	14	1	1	1	6	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	0	92	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	23	17	43	59	0	0
R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	757	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	5	161	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	1,916	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	50	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	4	82	163	170	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	2,205	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.**

2019-2023 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	Bridge replacement over Middle Fork Chariton River, 1.8 miles west of Rte. 129 near Salisbury. Project involves bridge G0826.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 0.12 MPO: N	Engineering:	49	149	154	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
Fed: 1,703 State: 426 Local: 0	Construction:	0	0	1,821	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awd Date: Summer 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,178	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 1P3177	Bridge rehabilitation over Long Creek, 0.7 mile west of Rte. KK near Keytesville. Project involves bridge A3778.						
Length: 0.12 MPO: N	Engineering:	9	15	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fed: 155 State: 39 Local: 0	Construction:	0	179	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: Let With: 1P3176, 1P3178, 1P3175 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 203	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 1P3178	Bridge rehabilitation and bridge painting on the bridge over Chariton River, 0.3 mile west of Rte. KK near Keytesville. Project involves bridge A3779.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	9	20	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fed: 210 State: 53 Local: 0	Construction:	0	243	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: Let With: 1P3176, 1P3177, 1P3175 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 272	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 2P2182	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over Mussel Fork River and the overflow bridge, 0.1 mile west of Keytesville. Project involves bridges H0520 and H0631.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	221	395	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
Fed: 2,808 State: 702 Local: 0	Construction:	0	3,110	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awd Date: Fall 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 3,731	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Chariton / Route: US 24 / Job No.: 2P2183	Bridge replacement to the overflow structure of the Middle Fork Chariton River, 1.5 miles east of Rte. 129 near Salisbury. Project involves bridge G0891.						
Length: 0.06 MPO: N	Engineering:	109	133	157	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fed: 1,822 State: 456 Local: 0	Construction:	0	0	1,988	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awd Date: Summer 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,387	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

2019-2023 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	Awd Date: Fall 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Fed: 3,475	State: 870	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 4,448	TIP #:	Let With:

Pavement resurfacing and add rumblestripes 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	Awd Date: Fall 19	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Fed: 2,510	State: 627	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 3,144	TIP #:	Let With:

Pavement resurfacing and add rumblestripes from Rte. 169 to Rte. 33 at Lathrop.

County: Clinton	Route: US 169	Job No.: 1P3103	Length: 0.19	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 18	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Fed: 1,327	State: 332	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 2,149	TIP #:	Let With:

Bridge replacement and add guardrail 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	Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	AC-State: 3,166	State: 352	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 3,524	TIP #:	Let With:

Pavement resurfacing from DeKalb County line to Shoal Creek, near Cameron.

County: Clinton	Route: IS 35	Job No.: 1I3018	Length: 8.26	MPO: N	Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 19	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	AC-State: 5,426	State: 603	Local: 0	Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 6,044	TIP #:	Let With:

Pavement resurfacing from north of Rte. 116 to Clay County line near Holt.

	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Engineering:	103	308	0	0	0	0
R/W:	0	3	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	4,034	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	7	45	281	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	2,811	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	485	116	0	0	0	0
R/W:	5	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	1,543	0	0	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	6	25	43	226	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	0	3,224	0	0
FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering:	15	101	412	0	0	0
R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:	0	0	5,516	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 1I3240	Pavement resurfacing from Shoal Creek to one mile north of Rte. 116, near Lathrop.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 7.63 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	40	50	216	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	3,183	0	0
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — Fed: 3,140 State: 349 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 3,489	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Clinton / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1S3059	Bridge rehabilitation and upgrade guardrail over I-35, 4.4 miles south of Cameron. Project involves bridge A1152.						
Length: 0.13 MPO: N	Engineering:	51	64	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	728	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 633 State: 159 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Winter 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: 1S3130, 1S2166, 1S3141, 1S3131 — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 843	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 0I3005E	Job Order Contracting for pavement repair from Rte. 6 near Winston to the Clay County line.						
Length: 32.17 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	23	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	250	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge — AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: Spring 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 273	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: IS 35 / Job No.: 1I3192	Bridge rehabilitation over the Grand River and the Grand River overflow, south of Rte. C near Pattonsburg. Project involves twin bridges A1756 and A1758.						
Length: 0.62 MPO: N	Engineering:	20	45	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	517	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 450 State: 112 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: Summer 18 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 582	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Daviess / Route: US 69 / Job No.: 1P3199	Pavement preservation treatment on Rte. 69 and Rte. 6 from I-35 to the Trenton city limits.						
Length: 34.90 MPO: N	Engineering:	10	43	177	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	2,429	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 2,119 State: 530 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: 2020 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 2,659	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

2019-2023 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: US 69 / Job No.: 1P3250	Shoulder repair on Rte. 6 and Rte. 69 from I-35 to Trenton city limits.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 34.90 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	10	25	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	305	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 272 State: 68 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Summer 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 340	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Daviess / Route: RT B / Job No.: 1S3141	Bridge rehabilitation over I-35, 3.8 miles west of Rte. 13 near Coffey. Project involves bridge A1917.						
Length: 0.11 MPO: N	Engineering:	40	66	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	820	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 709 State: 177 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Winter 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: 1S3130, 1S2166, 1S3131, 1S3059 — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 926	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Daviess / Route: RT C / Job No.: 1S3131	Bridge rehabilitation and add guardrail over I-35, 0.8 mile east of Rte. 69 near Pattonsburg. Project involves bridge A1809.						
Length: 0.11 MPO: N	Engineering:	38	78	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	990	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 854 State: 214 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Winter 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: 1S3130, 1S2166, 1S3141, 1S3059 — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 1,106	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Daviess / Route: RT DD / Job No.: 1S3130	Bridge rehabilitation over I-35, 1 mile east of Rte. 69 near Pattonsburg. Project involves bridge A1807.						
Length: 0.11 MPO: N	Engineering:	30	65	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	870	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 748 State: 187 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Winter 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP							
TIP #: — Let With: 1S2166, 1S3141, 1S3131, 1S3059 — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 965	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
County: Daviess / Route: RT J / Job No.: 1S3282	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 6 to Rte. 36 near Kidder. $650,000 District Operations for low volume route resurfacing.						
Length: 10.44 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	60	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	650	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 568 State: 142 Local: 0	FFOS:	0	650	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Low Type Resurfacing — Awd Date: Winter 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG							
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 710	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

2019-2023 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 KK Job No.: 1S2166 Length: 0.08 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation and upgrade guardrail over I-35, 1 mile west of Rte. 69 near Altamont. Project involves bridge A1801. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: 1S3130, 1S3141, 1S3131, 1S3059 Fed: 595 State: 149 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 784	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	40	55	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	689	0	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 #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over Third Fork Platte River, 0.3 mile west of Rte. F near Union Star. Project involves bridge J0605. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 1,063 State: 264 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,437						
	Engineering:	110	116	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	1,206	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: RT A Job No.: 1S3136 Length: 0.13 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Lost Creek, 0.5 mile south of Rte. W near Maysville. Project involves bridge A1378. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 617 State: 153 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 773						
	Engineering:	3	7	16	55	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	692	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: RT A Job No.: 1S3137 Length: 0.10 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over North Fork Lost Creek, 1.6 miles south of Rte. Z near Maysville. Project involves bridge T0641. Awd Date: Summer 19 Let With: Fed: 511 State: 126 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 647						
	Engineering:	10	32	63	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	537	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Dekalb Route: RT D Job No.: 1S0588 Length: 0.40 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over Ervens Branch, 0.4 mile north of Rte. W near Maysville. Project involves bridge S0419. Awd Date: Summer 19 Let With: Fed: 558 State: 139 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 754						
	Engineering:	57	22	43	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	15	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	617	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.**

2019-2023 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 #	Let With	Awd Date	Anticipated Fed Cat	Future Cost	Estimate Total	Description		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Gentry	US 136	1P3235	24.74	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay			2022	NHPP	0	4,901	Pavement resurfacing from Stanberry to 0.7 mile east of Rte. 169, and from 0.6 mile east of Rte. C, in Albany, to Rte. 13 near Bethany. Two disconnected sections.	Engineering:	5	1	44	80	310	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	0	0	4,461	0
					AC-State: 3,917	State: 979	Local: 0							FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gentry	US 169	1P3106	0.14	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst			2021	NHPP	0	1,306	Bridge rehabilitation over Middle Fork Grand River, 0.6 mile east of Rte. YY near Gentry. Project involves bridge A0729.	Engineering:	6	5	33	93	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	0	1,169	0	0
					Fed: 1,040	State: 260	Local: 0							FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grundy	MO 6	1P3144	1.69	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay			Fall 19	NHPP	0	1,201	Pavement resurfacing and ADA Transition Plan improvements in Trenton from west city limits to Rte. 65. $350,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds.	Engineering:	82	28	77	0	0	0
														R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	1,009	0	0	0
					Fed: 895	State: 224	Local: 0							FFOS:	0	4	346	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grundy	US 65	1P3252	0.02	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst			2021	NHPP	0	449	Bridge rehabilitation over Rte. 6 in Trenton. Project involves bridge A2570.	Engineering:	0	2	11	28	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	0	0	408	0	0
					Fed: 360	State: 89	Local: 0							FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grundy	RT Z	1S3281	6.28	N	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing			Winter 19	STBG	0	384	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 6 to Rte. 65 near Trenton. $350,000 District Operations.	Engineering:	0	34	0	0	0	0
														R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
														Construction:	0	350	0	0	0	0
					AC-State: 307	State: 77	Local: 0							FFOS:	0	350	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 0I3005D 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. Awd Date: Spring 19 Let With: AC-State: 245 State: 28 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 273	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
		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: Harrison Route: IS 35 Job No.: 1I0914 Length: 14.17 MPO: N Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 136 at Bethany to Rte. C near Pattonsburg. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 7,358 State: 818 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 8,208							
		Engineering:	32	54	90	522	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	7,510	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison Route: IS 35 Job No.: 1I3017 Length: 14.08 MPO: N Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing and upgrade guardrail from Rte. N, at Eagleville, to Rte. 136 at Bethany. Excludes concrete pavement in the southbound lanes north of Bethany. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: AC-State: 4,634 State: 515 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 5,303							
		Engineering:	154	359	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	4,790	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison Route: IS 35 Job No.: 1I3242 Length: 0.05 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Pole Cat Creek, south of Bethany. Project involves twin bridges A1896. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: Fed: 1,225 State: 138 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHFP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,363							
		Engineering:	0	1	9	25	93	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,235	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison Route: RT EE Job No.: 1S3253 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Panther Creek, 0.1 mile south of Rte. F, near New Hampton. Project involves bridge R0075. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 477 State: 119 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 596							
		Engineering:	0	3	15	37	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	541	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 1S3181	Bridge painting on various bridges in Harrison, Daviess, Holt, Sullivan and Clinton Counties. Project involves bridges A1919, A1801, A1807, A1809, A1917, N0366, P0528, A1152 and A2535.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
Length: 0.90 MPO: N			Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,415 State: 354 Local: 0	Engineering:	7	46	120	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,776	Construction:	0	0	1,603	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison / Route: RT P / Job No.: 1S3158	Bridge replacement over White Oak Creek, 0.4 mile west of Rte. TT near McFall. Project involves bridge P0576.						
Length: 0.02 MPO: N		Engineering:	4	30	51	130	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 1,095 State: 273 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	5	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	1,152	0	0
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,372	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Harrison / Route: RT V / Job No.: 1S3122	Bridge replacement over Coal Creek, 1.2 miles north of Rte. WW near Cainsville. Project involves bridge N0373.						
Length: 0.06 MPO: N		Engineering:	15	5	10	46	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 551 State: 137 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	627	0	0
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 703	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: MO 111 / Job No.: 1S3153	Pavement resurfacing and add rumblestripes from Rte. T, in Forest City, to Rte. 59 in Oregon.						
Length: 2.48 MPO: N		Engineering:	20	41	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 392 State: 98 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Construction:	0	449	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Let With: 1S3076 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 510	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: US 159 / Job No.: 1P3128	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over Penny Slough Creek, 1.2 miles west of Rte. 111 near Fortescue. Project involves bridge A2584.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N		Engineering:	99	104	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 905 State: 227 Local: 0	R/W:	0	20	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Spring 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	1,008	0	0	0	0
TIP #:	Let With: 1S3127 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,231	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 1P3254	Bridge rehabilitation over Big Lake overflow, 1 mile west of Rte. 111, near Big Lake. Project involves bridge A2716.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 0.02 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 283 State: 71 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 354						
Engineering:		0	3	10	23	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	0	318	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: US 159 / Job No.: 1S3127	Bridge rehabilitation and add guardrail on bridge over I-29 near Mound City. Project involves bridge A2535.						
Length: 0.13 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 508 State: 128 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Spring 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: 1P3128 Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 663						
Engineering:		27	48	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	588	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3019	Pavement resurfacing from Rte. 118, in Mound City, to Rte. 59 north of the Nodaway River bridge.						
Length: 16.69 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 8,653 State: 962 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay	Awd Date: Summer 18 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 9,625						
Engineering:		10	786	0	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	8,829	0	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3020B	Bridge painting over the Nodaway River, 0.8 mile south of Rte. 59 near Oregon. Project involves bridges A1287 and G0490.						
Length: 0.03 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	AC-State: 1,177 State: 131 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,313						
Engineering:		5	10	86	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	1,212	0	0	0
FFOS:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Payments:		0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: IS 29 / Job No.: 1I3099	Bridge rehabilitation over Kimsey Creek and Rte. E near Mound City. Project involves twin bridges A1770 and A1771.						
Length: 0.32 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge	Fed: 3,851 State: 428 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Summer 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,327						
Engineering:		48	65	300	0	0	0
R/W:		0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction:		0	0	3,914	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 1P3023B	Bridge painting over Davis Creek, 0.2 mile south of Rte. 118 near Mound City. Project involves twin bridges A1767.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 0.04 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 372 State: 41 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint	Awd Date: 2020 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: 1P3056B, 1S0623B, 1S3090B, 1S3057B Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 423						
	Engineering:	10	1	28	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	384	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	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 mile east of Maitland. Corps to design and administer project. Estimate represents MoDOT's share. Near bridge A1252.						
Length: 0.07 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	AC-State: 427 State: 106 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: N/A Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 578						
	Engineering:	45	3	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	520	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: RT B / Job No.: 1S3061	Bridge rehabilitation over I-29 near Oregon. Project involves bridge A1834.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 843 State: 211 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: 2021 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,064						
	Engineering:	10	5	27	74	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	948	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: RT H / Job No.: 1S3162	Bridge rehabilitation over Nichols Creek, 0.3 mile east of Rte. B, near Oregon. Project involves bridge P0997.						
Length: 0.02 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 353 State: 88 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 444						
	Engineering:	3	10	34	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	397	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Holt / Route: RT T / Job No.: 1S3070	Bridge rehabilitation over Spring Creek, 0.5 mile south of Rte. O near Oregon. Project involves bridge R0223.						
Length: 0.10 MPO: N							
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System	Fed: 296 State: 73 Local: 0						
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst	Awd Date: Fall 19 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP						
TIP #:	Let With: Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 378						
	Engineering:	9	10	28	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	331	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.**

2019-2023 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: RT T / Job No.: 1S3071	Bridge rehabilitation over Easter Creek, 0.8 mile north of Rte. U near Oregon. Project involves bridge R0224.	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Length: 0.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	9	10	30	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 308 State: 77 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Fall 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	345	0	0	0
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 394	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Linn / Route: MO 11 / Job No.: 1S3245	Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. 129 to Bus. 36 in Brookfield.						
Length: 21.96 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	1	10	38	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 465 State: 116 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Preventive Maint — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG	Construction:	0	0	0	532	0	0
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 581	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Linn / Route: US 36 / Job No.: 1P3236	Pavement resurfacing and pavement repair in the eastbound and westbound lanes from Parsons Creek, 1.1 miles west of Rte. 139, near Wheeling, to the Macon County line.						
Length: 25.10 MPO: N	Engineering:	5	37	117	556	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — AC-State: 6,935 State: 1,732 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay — Awd Date: 2021 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	0	7,957	0	0
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 8,672	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Livingston / Route: MO 190 / Job No.: 1S3156	Bridge rehabilitation over the Thompson River, 0.9 mile east of Rte. Y, near Chillicothe. Project involves bridge A1376.						
Length: 0.21 MPO: N	Engineering:	27	84	218	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 2,714 State: 678 Local: 0	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst — Awd Date: Fall 19 — Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP	Construction:	0	0	3,090	0	0	0
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 3,419	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Livingston / Route: US 36 / Job No.: 1P3255	Bridge rehabilitation over Blackwell Creek, 1.2 miles east of Rte. 65, near Chillicothe. Project involves twin bridges A1180.						
Length: 0.03 MPO: N	Engineering:	0	2	15	54	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System — Fed: 694 State: 173 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	796	0	0
TIP #: — Let With: — Future Cost: 0 — Estimate Total: 867	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.**

2019-2023 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: Livingston Route: US 65 Job No.: 1P3114 Length: 0.29 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over the Grand River, 1.3 miles south of Rte. 36 near Chillicothe. Project involves bridge A1249. Awd Date: Fall 19 Let With: Fed: 3,606 State: 901 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,561	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
		Engineering:	54	96	291	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	4,120	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Livingston Route: US 65 Job No.: 2P2217 Length: 4.48 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing and ADA Transition Plan improvements from north of County Road 228 to Rte. 36 in Chillicothe. $200,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: Fed: 1,428 State: 357 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,864							
		Engineering:	79	143	0	0	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	1,642	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	200	0	0	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Mercer Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3225 Length: 7.40 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing and add shoulders from Rte. 65, in Princeton, to Rte. C. $650,000 Open Container Funds Awd Date: 2021 Let With: AC-State: 1,590 State: 398 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,990							
		Engineering:	2	14	24	128	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	1,822	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	650	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Mercer Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3226 Length: 11.98 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing and add shoulders from Harrison County line to Rte. 65 in Princeton. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 2,931 State: 732 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 3,665							
		Engineering:	2	5	70	246	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	3,342	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	146	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Mercer Route: RT BB Job No.: 1S3161 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Branch of Weldon Fork Creek, 3.5 miles west of Rte. 65, near Mercer. Project involves bridge N0855. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 272 State: 68 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 344							
		Engineering:	4	2	8	24	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	306	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.**

2019-2023 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: Mercer Route: RT E Job No.: 1S3191 Length: 31.42 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. 65, near Princeton, to Rte. 6 near Milan. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: Fed: 603 State: 151 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 769	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	15	54	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	700	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Mercer Route: RT M Job No.: 1S3218 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over Little Muddy Creek, 2.6 miles east of Rte. 65 near Mercer. Project involves bridge T0087. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: Fed: 644 State: 159 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 805						
	Engineering:	2	1	22	40	58	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	6	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	0	676	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3107 Length: 0.08 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over Mozingo Creek, 1 mile east of Rte. F near Maryville. Project involves bridge H0512. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: Fed: 629 State: 156 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 791						
	Engineering:	6	1	15	28	52	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	5	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	0	684	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3160 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over Long Branch, 1.2 miles west of Rte. E, near Ravenwood. Project involves bridge H0513. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: Fed: 1,489 State: 372 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,864						
	Engineering:	3	1	34	60	125	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	5	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,636	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3234 Length: 15.94 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Thin Lift Overlay TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing from 102 River to Rte. J near Clyde. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: AC-State: 2,422 State: 606 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 3,033						
	Engineering:	5	22	38	194	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	2,774	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.**

2019-2023 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:	Anticipated Fed Cat:	Let With:	Future Cost:	Fed:	State:	Local:	Estimate Total:		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Nodaway	MO 148	1P3010	14.40	N	Taking Care Of System	Thin Lift Overlay		Pavement resurfacing and add rumblestripes from Iowa State line to Rte. 71 near Maryville.	Fall 18	STBG		0	2,325	582	0	2,988	Engineering:	81	232	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	2,675	0	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		Bridge replacement over Florida Creek, 0.7 mile west of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0920.	2020	NHPP		0	615	154	0	844	Engineering:	75	47	57	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	660	0	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		Bridge replacement over White Cloud Creek, 2.3 miles east of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0922.	2020	NHPP		0	731	182	0	955	Engineering:	42	52	67	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	789	0	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		Bridge replacement over Big Slough Creek, 0.8 mile west of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0919.	2020	NHPP		0	540	134	0	705	Engineering:	31	44	50	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	9	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	571	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nodaway	MO 46	1S3139	0.10	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacement over stream, 3.2 miles east of Rte. AB near Maryville. Project involves bridge S0921.	2020	NHPP		0	654	164	0	844	Engineering:	26	37	58	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	718	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.**

2019-2023 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.: 1S3172 Length: 24.18 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Pavement resurfacing and add rumblestripes from Rte. 136, at Ravenwood, to Rte. 169 in Grant City. $844,000 Open Container funds. Awd Date: Fall 19 Let With: Fed: 3,647 State: 911 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 4,657	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	99	31	292	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	4,235	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	844	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Nodaway Route: MO 46 Job No.: 1S3258 Length: 0.04 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over the Nodaway River, 1 mile west of Rte. 113, near Skidmore. Project involves bridge S0918. Awd Date: 2022 Let With: Fed: 2,066 State: 516 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,582						
	Engineering:	0	10	75	130	182	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	0	2,185	0
	FFOS:	0	0	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 resurfacing and ADA Transition Plan improvement from Rte. 136 to Rte. 6 in Green City. $135,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds. Awd Date: Fall 19 Let With: Fed: 1,337 State: 334 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,675						
	Engineering:	4	31	111	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	43	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	1,486	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	35	100	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Putnam Route: US 136 Job No.: 1P3152 Length: 0.02 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation and add guardrail over Brush Creek, 0.6 mile west of Rte. F near Livonia. Project involves bridge H0440. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 261 State: 65 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 341						
	Engineering:	15	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

County: Putnam Route: MO 5 Job No.: 1P3246 Length: 8.44 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Pavement preservation treatment from Iowa State line to Rte. 136 in Unionville. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: AC-State: 161 State: 39 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 200						
	Engineering:	0	1	7	14	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	178	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.**

2019-2023 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: RT Y Job No.: 1S3163 Length: 0.01 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over North Blackbird Creek, 2.6 miles south of Rte. 129 near Unionville. Project involves bridge P0834. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: Fed: 239 State: 58 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 301	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	4	2	7	21	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	267	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: MO 129 Job No.: 1S3247 Length: 11.36 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Preventive Maint TIP #:	Pavement preservation treatment from Rte. C, south of Green City, to Rte. 11. Awd Date: 2021 Let With: AC-State: 176 State: 44 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 220						
	Engineering:	0	1	7	14	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	0	198	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: MO 139 Job No.: 1L1800 Length: 0.57 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	ADA Transition Plan improvements within the city limits of Newtown. $475,000 Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: Fed: 524 State: 131 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 803						
	Engineering:	142	52	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	6	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	603	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	5	470	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: MO 139 Job No.: 2S2176 Length: 0.20 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over Newtown Branch, 0.6 mile south of Rte. EE near Newtown. Project involves bridge S0583. Awd Date: Fall 18 Let With: Fed: 634 State: 159 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 895						
	Engineering:	97	79	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	5	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	714	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: MO 6 Job No.: 1P3077 Length: 0.10 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over West Yellow Creek, 0.5 mile east of Rte. P near Milan. Project involves bridge L0796. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 859 State: 214 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,159						
	Engineering:	86	214	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	854	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.**

2019-2023 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: MO 6 Job No.: 1P3239 Length: 0.51 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	Rebuild pavement and upgrade sidewalks to comply with the ADA Transition Plan within the city limits of Green Castle. $575,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds. Awd Date: Summer 19 Let With: Fed: 1,394 State: 348 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,767	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
		Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
	Engineering:	25	180	167	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	1,385	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	575	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: MO 6 Job No.: 2P0470 Length: 0.10 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement and add guardrail over West Locust Creek, 1.3 miles west of Rte. Z near Humphreys. Project involves bridge J0379. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: Fed: 1,772 State: 443 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,341						
	Engineering:	126	326	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	9	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	1,880	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: RT BB Job No.: 1S3151 Length: 0.14 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation over Rooks Branch, 4.4 miles north of Rte. OO near Milan. Project involves bridge P0528. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: 1S3148, 1S3149 Fed: 154 State: 38 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 207						
	Engineering:	15	17	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	175	0	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: RT D Job No.: 1S3243 Length: 0.69 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans TIP #:	Rebuild pavement and upgrade sidewalks to comply with the ADA Transition Plan on Rte. FF and Rte. D within the city limits of Green Castle. $344,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds. Awd Date: Summer 19 Let With: Fed: 1,064 State: 266 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,380						
	Engineering:	50	130	121	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	10	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	0	1,069	0	0	0
	FFOS:	0	0	344	0	0	0
	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Sullivan Route: RT EE Job No.: 1S3148 Length: 0.04 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation and add guardrail over Medicine Creek, 0.5 mile east of Rte. 139 near Newtown. Project involves bridge N0448. Awd Date: Winter 19 Let With: 1S3149, 1S3151 Fed: 350 State: 88 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 454						
	Engineering:	16	35	0	0	0	0
	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Construction:	0	403	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.**

2019-2023 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:	Let With:	Future Cost:	Estimate Total:		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING: Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
Sullivan	RT M	1S3167	18.32	N	Taking Care Of System	Low Type Resurfacing		Pavement resurfacing and ADA Transition Plan improvements from Rte. O to Rte. 11 in Brookfield. $30,000 Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds.	1,394	350	0	Spring 19	STBG		0	1,773	Engineering:	29	132	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	3	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	1,609	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	30	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	RT PP	1S3140	0.12	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge replacement over East Medicine Creek Drainage Ditch, 0.2 mile east of Rte. 139 near Osgood. Project involves bridge P0956.	1,099	275	0	Summer 19	NHPP		0	1,389	Engineering:	15	57	114	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	5	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	1,198	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sullivan	RT ZZ	1S3149	0.03	N	Taking Care Of System	Rehab And Reconst		Bridge rehabilitation over West Fork Locust Creek, near Harris. Project involves bridge N0366.	214	54	0	Winter 19	NHPP	1S3148, 1S3151	0	288	Engineering:	20	20	0	0	0	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	248	0	0	0	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Various	Various	0P3022B	0.00	N	Safety	Safety		Safety projects at various locations in the Northwest District. $1,028,000 Statewide Open Container funds.	1,076	119	0	2022	Safety		0	1,195	Engineering:	0	0	0	0	72	0
																	R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
																	Construction:	0	0	0	0	1,123	0
																	FFOS:	0	0	0	0	1,028	0
																	Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Various	Various	0S3022B	0.00	N	Taking Care Of System	N- Ada Trans		ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $875,000 from Statewide Transportation Alternatives funds.	814	203	0	2022	STBG		0	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.**

2019-2023 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.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
County: Various		Curve safety improvements at various locations in the Northwest District.									Engineering:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Route: Various											R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job No.: 0X3121B											Construction:	0	0	0	229	0	0
Length: 0.00	MPO: N										FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Safety (Statewide)				Fed: 206	State: 23	Local: 0					Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Safety		Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety														
TIP #:	Let With:		Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 229													
County: Various		Job Order Contracting for guard cable and guardrail repair at various major route locations in the Northwest District.									Engineering:	0	0	0	29	0	0
Route: Various											R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job No.: 1P3126											Construction:	0	0	0	371	0	0
Length: 0.00	MPO: Y										FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System				AC-State: 320	State: 80	Local: 0					Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance		Awd Date: 2021	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG														
TIP #:	Let With:		Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 400													
County: Various		Job Order Contracting for guardrail and guard cable repair on various major route locations in the Northwest District.									Engineering:	5	30	0	0	0	0
Route: Various											R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job No.: 1P3198											Construction:	0	350	0	0	0	0
Length: 0.00	MPO: Y										FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System				AC-State: 304	State: 76	Local: 0					Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance		Awd Date: Spring 19	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP														
TIP #: HE-2018-02	Let With:		Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 385													
County: Various		Job Order Contracting for guardrail and guard cable repair on various major route locations in the Northwest District.									Engineering:	0	5	5	0	0	0
Route: Various											R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job No.: 1P3244											Construction:	0	0	361	0	0	0
Length: 0.00	MPO: Y										FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System				AC-State: 297	State: 74	Local: 0					Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: Routine Maintenance		Awd Date: 2020	Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP														
TIP #:	Let With:		Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 371													
County: Various		ADA Transition Plan improvements at various locations in the Northwest District. $419,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds.									Engineering:	0	27	47	0	0	0
Route: Various											R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Job No.: 1P3287											Construction:	0	0	432	0	0	0
Length: 0.00	MPO: N										FFOS:	0	0	419	0	0	0
Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System				Fed: 405	State: 101	Local: 0					Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sec Cat: N- Ada Trans		Awd Date: 2020	Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG														
TIP #:	Let With:		Future Cost: 0	Estimate Total: 506													

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

2019-2023 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.: 1P3288 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. $923,000 Statewide Transportation Alternative funds.	Awd Date: 2021 Let With:	Fed: 935 State: 234 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: STBG Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 1,169	STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING	Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
				Engineering:	0	35	75	80	0	0
				R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
				Construction:	0	0	0	979	0	0
				FFOS:	0	0	0	923	0	0
				Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1S3256 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge rehabilitation on various bridges in the Northwest District.	Awd Date: 2022 Let With:	Fed: 1,938 State: 484 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,422							
				Engineering:	0	5	15	70	147	0
				R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
				Construction:	0	0	0	0	2,185	0
				FFOS:	0	0	0	0	0	0
				Payments:	0	0	0	0	0	0

County: Worth Route: RT YY Job No.: 1S3134 Length: 0.14 MPO: N Fund Cat: Taking Care Of System Sec Cat: Rehab And Reconst TIP #:	Bridge replacement over the Middle Fork Grand River, 0.5 mile north of Rte. W near Gentry. Project involves bridge H0617.	Awd Date: 2021 Let With:	Fed: 1,751 State: 437 Local: 0 Anticipated Fed Cat: NHPP Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 2,256							
				Engineering:	68	49	86	148	0	0
				R/W:	0	0	6	0	0	0
				Construction:	0	0	0	1,899	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.**

2019-2023 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.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
FFOS:	5	2,289	2,803	1,719	1,903	0
Total R/W:	42	212	16	27	0	0
Total Construction:	0	66,968	71,247	63,232	19,398	0
Paybacks:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	42	67,180	71,263	63,259	19,398	0
Total Engineering:	5,085	9,034	7,306	5,154	1,403	0
Grand Total:	5,127	76,214	78,569	68,413	20,801	0

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
State	13,575	14,059	11,492	3,906	0
AC-State	20,058	18,160	21,725	5,483	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	33,633	32,219	33,217	9,389	0
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	42,581	46,350	35,196	11,412	0
Grand Total	76,214	78,569	68,413	20,801	0

Project Count: 143

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

MoDOT's Northwest District

PAYMENT PROJECTS

2019-2023 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 #: Let With:	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. $357,000 Economic Development funds. Fed: 0 State: 360 Local: 0 Awd Date: N/A Anticipated Fed Cat: State Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 360		STATE FISCAL YEAR PROJECT BUDGETING					
			Prior Prog.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
		Engineering:	0	1	1	1	0	0
		R/W:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
		FFOS:	0	0	0	357	0	0
		Payments:	0	0	0	357	0	0
County: Various Route: Various Job No.: 1P3200 Length: 0.00 MPO: N Fund Cat: Safety Sec Cat: Safety TIP #: Let With:	On-call work zone enforcement at various locations in the Northwest District. Fed: 11 State: 1 Local: 0 Awd Date: N/A Anticipated Fed Cat: Safety Future Cost: 0 Estimate Total: 12							
		Engineering:	0	2	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	10	0	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 Let With:	Payback beginning in SFY 2008 for Safe and Sound bridges in the Northwest District. Fed: 0 State: 44,865 Local: 0 Awd Date: N/A Anticipated Fed Cat: State Future Cost: 75,001 - 100,000 Estimate Total: 107,665							
		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:	62,631	8,973	8,973	8,973	8,973	8,973

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

2019-2023 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.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
FFOS:	169	0	0	357	0	0
Total R/W:	169	0	0	0	0	0
Total Construction:	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paybacks:	62,631	8,983	8,973	9,330	8,973	8,973
Sub-Total:	62,800	8,983	8,973	9,330	8,973	8,973
Total Engineering:	0	3	1	1	0	0
Grand Total:	62,800	8,986	8,974	9,331	8,973	8,973

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
State	8,975	8,974	9,331	8,973	8,973
AC-State	0	0	0	0	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	8,975	8,974	9,331	8,973	8,973
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	11	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	8,986	8,974	9,331	8,973	8,973

Project Count: 3

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

2019-2023 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.	7/2018-6/2019	7/2019-6/2020	7/2020-6/2021	7/2021-6/2022	7/2022-6/2023
FFOS:	174	2,289	2,803	2,076	1,903	0
Total R/W:	211	212	16	27	0	0
Total Construction:	0	66,968	71,247	63,232	19,398	0
Paybacks:	62,631	8,983	8,973	9,330	8,973	8,973
Sub-Total:	62,842	76,163	80,236	72,589	28,371	8,973
Total Engineering:	5,085	9,037	7,307	5,155	1,403	0
Grand Total:	67,927	85,200	87,543	77,744	29,774	8,973

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
State	22,550	23,033	20,823	12,879	8,973
AC-State	20,058	18,160	21,725	5,483	0
Local	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-total State	42,608	41,193	42,548	18,362	8,973
Federal					
Sub-total Federal	42,592	46,350	35,196	11,412	0
Grand Total	85,200	87,543	77,744	29,774	8,973

Project Count: 146

*** 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	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
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	7.432	19.114	19.573	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	7.602	19.114	19.573	0.000	0.000
Statewide Interstate And Major Bridge - Programmed	7.432	19.687	20.189	0.000	0.000
Safety - Available	1.139	1.139	1.720	1.699	1.694
Safety - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.028	0.000
Safety - Fund Transfers	-1.159	-1.187	-1.687	-1.355	0.000
Safety - Carryover	0.028	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.002	0.081	0.066	0.000	0.000
Safety - Total Available	0.010	0.033	0.099	1.372	1.694
Safety - Programmed	0.010	0.000	0.000	1.123	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Available	22.656	23.044	23.133	22.864	22.797
Taking Care Of System - FFOS	2.289	2.803	1.719	0.875	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Fund Transfers	22.917	37.667	14.471	0.000	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Carryover	-4.314	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	18.462	4.118	5.475	1.991	0.000
Taking Care Of System - Total Available	62.010	67.632	44.798	25.730	22.797
Taking Care Of System - Programmed	68.379	60.547	51.817	27.248	8.973
Flexible & Other - Available					
Flexible & Other - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.357	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Fund Transfers	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Carryover	1.242	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Award and Completed Project Adjustments	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Total Available	1.242	0.000	0.357	0.000	0.000
Flexible & Other - Programmed	0.000	0.000	0.357	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Available					
Statewide Safety - FFOS	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Fund Transfers	0.342	0.000	0.216	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	0.342	0.000	0.216	0.000	0.000
Statewide Safety - Programmed	0.342	0.000	0.229	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 2020 - 2023
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	73.236	86.779	65.043	27.102	24.491
Total Flexible Funds Available	0.000	0.700	13.977	20.885	21.088
Adjustments	18.464	4.199	5.541	1.991	0.000
Carryovers	-0.844				
Total Available by SFY	73.236	87.479	79.020	47.987	45.579
Total Programmed by SFY	76.163	80.234	72.592	28.371	8.973

Note: Three percent inflation compounded annually applied to program years 2020 - 2023
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.

STIP Prioritization

Points	Map # & County	Identified Need	Funding Type	Type of Need	Other
41	D1 - DeKalb	Intersection of I-35, US 36, Bob Griffin Road	STIP	Expansion Project	Crash Rate: 3.21
32	C3 - Clinton	Route H from Highway 33 to Highway 69	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 225
28	A2 - Andrew	Route Y from U.S. Highway 71 to Route H	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 175
25	D4 -DeKalb	Route D from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Route 6	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 235
22	C4 - Clinton	I-35, Route BB and Bob Griffin Road	STIP	Expansion Project	Crash Rate: 2.08
19	A4 - Andrew	US Route 59 south of Savannah to Country Club Village	STIP	Safety Improvements	Crash Rate: 12.7
11	D2 - DeKalb	Route H from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Route 6	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 260
10	A1 - Andrew	Route CC from U.S. Highway 59 to I-29	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 170
8	A3 - Andrew	Route M from MO Highway 48 to US Highway 169	STIP	Resurfacing	IRI: 185
8	B4 - Buchanan	Align Route H where it crosses Route A	Maintenance	Safety Improvements	Crash Rate: 0.97
7	C2 - Clinton	Route J from south county line to Route C	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 210
2	B3 - Buchanan	Bike/pedestrian trail alongside US Highway 59	Multi-modal	Bike/Ped	
0	B1 - Buchanan	Double deck bridge on I-229 (bring down)	STIP	Bring Road to Ground	
0	B2 - Buchanan	Guard rails on areas of MO Route 116 from Rushville to Route Y	STIP	Safety Improvements	Crash Rate: 1.96
0	C1 - Clinton	Bridge on Route NN (east of Route K near the bend)	STIP	Widen Bridge	
0	D3 - DeKalb	Route O from only Clarksdale to Route N	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 205
0	D3 - DeKalb	Route O from only Clarksdale to Route N	Maintenance	Resurfacing	IRI: 205

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 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 cer-

tifies 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) and Safe Routes to School (SRTS) activities.

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 7.1 identifies how construction program funds are allocated annually to districts using the following formula:

Funding Distribution Overview

Figure 8.1 MoDOT Funding Distribution for Construction Funds

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

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)

Figure 8.2 MoDOT Funding Distribution by District

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

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. There are additional lists for multi-modal and safety improvements. The Mo-Kan TAC dentified the following projects as addressing smooth roadways for the region:

STIP

Map Number	Description
A3	Route M from MO Highway 48 to US Highway 169

Maintenance List:

Map Number	Description
A1	Route CC from U.S. Highway 59 to I-29
A2	Route Y from U.S. Highway 71 to Route H
C2	Route J from south county line to Route C
C3	Route H from Highway 33 to Highway 69
D2	Route H from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Route 6
D3	Route O from only Clarksdale to Route N
D4	Route D from Route Z (Gentry County) to MO Route 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 aging double-decker bridge on I-229 was identified as a transportation prioity. The Mo-Kan TAC identified the following projects to address bridges for the region:

Map Number	Description
B1	Double deck bridge on I-229 (bring down)
C1	Bridge on Route NN (east of Route K near the bend)

Congestion and Development Considerations

In addition to 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 the City of Cameron area will impact the capacity of the transportation in those areas. The Mo-Kan TAC identified the following needs as having an impact on traffic congestion and flow:

Map Number	Description
C4	I-35, Route BB and Bob Griffin Road
D1	Intersection of I-35, US 36, Bob Griffin Road

Safety Enhancements

Safety improvements are essential to include in transportation priorities. Mixed use developments requires an examination of certain intersections/interchanges and other roadway features, such as turn lanes, traffic signals, and acceleration/deceleration lanes. The lack of guard rails near ravines and road realignment are also examined. The Mo-Kan TAC identifed the following needs as having an impact on roadway safety:

Map Number	Description
A4	Crossovers on US Route 59 south of Savannah to Country Club Village
B2	Lack of guard rails on areas of MO Route 116 from Rushville to Route Y
B4	Realign Route H where it crosses Route A

Bike/Pedestrian Enhancements

Non-motorized forms of transportation, such as biking and walking, are becoming more common. Investments in hiking and pedestrian trails have been linked to benefits that include improved connectivity, healthier communities and economic development. The Mo-Kan TAC identifed the following need as having an impact on bike/pedestrian usage:

Map Number	Description
B3	Develop bike/pedestrian trail alongside US Highway 59