Destination 2045

Are we *there* yet?

A metropolitan transportation plan for the Ozarks Transportation Organization.





Foreword 6

Part I: Where Are We?

Chapter 1: Existing Conditions 12
Chapter 2: System Performance 45
Chapter 3: Environmental and Cultural Considerations ... 60
Chapter 4: Public Engagement 77
Chapter 5: Goal Development 90



Part II: Where Are We Going?

Chapter 6: Policy and Plan Recommendations 94
Chapter 7: Investment Plan 100



Part III: Are We There Yet?

Chapter 8: Implementation Plan 133

Appendices

1. Urbanized Area and Planning Area Maps....147
2. Prioritization Glossary....150
3. Design Standards....155
4. Visioning Results....167
5. 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program Projects....175
6. Major Thoroughfare Plan Changes....241
7. Referenced Resources....243

Tables and Figures

1. OTO Planning Area....6
2. Population Growth for Cities in the OTO Area from 1990 to 2019....12
3. Two-County Area Population....13
4. Percent Change in Housing Units 2018-2045....13
5. Single Family Units Permitted....14
6. Multi-Family Units Permitted....15
7. Change in Housing Units near Transit....16
8. Housing Units added 2010-2020....16
9. Two-County Area Employment....17
10. 2018 Employment per Square Mile....17
11. Employment Growth 2018-2045....18
12. County of Residence vs. Cunty of Employment....18
13. Journey to Work (in Minutes)....19
14. High Volume Corridors....20
15. Fatal Crash Locations (2015-2019)....20
16. Fatalities in the OTO Region....21
17. Injury Crash Locations (2015-2019)....21
18. Injury Crashes in the OTO Region....22
19. COVID-19 Effects on Total Daily Traffic Volume....23
20. Travel Delay (2020)....23
21. 2019/2020 Volume-to-Capacity....24
22. 2045 Volume-to-Capacity....24
23. Percent Commercial Traffic....26
24. Missouri Freight Network....26
25. Bridge Condition (2020)....27
26. Roadway and Bridge Condition....28
27. Travel Demand Model 2018 Existing + Committed Base Year Result....30
28. Travel Demand Model 2045 Existing + Committed Result....30
29. City Utilities Day Route Map....32
30. CU Transit Ridership – Annual Unlinked Trips....32
31. Missouri State University Bear Line....34

32. CU Transit Peer Service Route Types....36
33. CU Transit Peer Service Hours....37
34. CU Transit Peer Service Statistics....37
35. CU Transit Peer Revenue....37
36. 2012 Route Study Scenarios....38
37. Limited Stop Circulator....39
38. Transit Coordination Plan Prioritized Actions....40
39. Miles of Trail....41
40. Percent Roadway with Sidewalks....43
41. Adopted Safety Targets....45
42. Annual Fatalities and 5-Year Average Fatalities....46
43. Annual Serious Injuries and 5-Year Average Serious Injuries....46
44. 5-Year Fatality Rate....47
45. 5-Year Serious Injury Rate....47
46. Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries....48
47. Adopted Transit Safety Targets....48
48. CU Transit Safety Target Fixed-Route Baseline....49
49. CU Transit Safety Target Paratransit Baseline....49
50. Adopted Transit Asset Management Targets....50
51. Rolling Stock – Existing Inventory 2018....50
52. Facilities – Current Condition (Based on TERM Rating Scale) 2018....50
53. FTA TERM Rating Scale....51
54. Adopted Infrastructure Targets....51
55. Percent of Good Deck Area on NHS....52
56. Percent of Good Deck Area on NHS 10 Year Trend....52
57. Percent of Poor Deck Area on NHS....53
58. Percent of Poor Deck Area on NHS 10 Year Trend....53
59. Percent of Good Interstate Pavement....54
60. Percent of Good Non-Interstate NHS Pavement....54
61. Percent of Poor Interstate Pavement....55
62. Percent of Poor Non-Interstate NHS Pavement....55
63. Adopted Performance Targets....56
64. Interstate Travel Time Reliability....56
65. Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability....57
66. Adopted Freight Reliability Targets....57
67. Truck Travel Time Reliability....58
68. OTO Ecoregions....60
69. 2003-2020 Springfield, MO Area Ozone Design Value Trends....64
70. 2003-2020 Springfield, MO Area $PM_{2.5}$ Design Value Trends....65
71. Minorities in the OTO Area....72
72. Hispanics in Christian and Greene Counties....72
73. Limited English Proficiency Populations in Christian/Greene Counties....73
74. Spanish LEP Populations in Christian and Greene Counties....73
75. Population Below Poverty in the OTO Area....74

76. Zero Car Households in Christian and Greene Counties 74
77. Disabled Population in Christian and Greene Counties 75
78. Population Under 18 in Christian and Greene Counties 76
79. Population Over Age 65 in Christian and Greene Counties 76
80. Visioning Word Clouds 77
81. Survey Response – Strengths 81
82. Survey Response – Challenges 82
83. Survey Response – No-Obstacle Priorities 83
84. Survey Response – Opportunities 84
85. Survey Response – 2045 Word Cloud 85
86. Survey Response – Congestion 86
87. Survey Response – Investment Levels 86
88. Survey Response – Investment Preferences 87
89. Survey Response – Funding Preferences 88
90. OTO *Destination 2045* Web Page 89
91. Mentimeter Example 89
92. MoDOT Statewide Revenue (in millions) 100
93. Non-Transit Revenue Estimates 2022-2045 106
94. Transit Revenue Estimates 2022-2045 108
95. Prioritization Points 109
96. Non-Transit Fiscal Constraint 110
97. Non-Transit Constrained Project List 111
98. Transit Fiscal Constraint 120
99. Transit Constrained Project List 121
100. Unconstrained Non-Transit List – Unfunded Needs 122
101. Unconstrained Transit List – Unfunded Needs 129
102. 2045 Constrained Projects Model Scenario 130
103. Constrained Project Map 131
104. Unconstrained Project Map 132
105. Flexibility in the OTO Design Standards 135
106. Principles for the OTO Design Standards 136
107. Major Thoroughfare Plan Map 137
108. Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Map – North 139
109. Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Map – South 140
110. Regional Trails 141

Amendments


1. Major Thoroughfare Plan – 5/19/2022 249
2. Major Thoroughfare Plan – 7/21/2022 255

Foreword

Destination 2045 is the 5-year update to the Ozarks Transportation Organization's Long Range Transportation Plan. This plan looks to 2045 to determine transportation needs and priorities throughout the region. Solidified with public input, the OTO looks forward to implementing this plan during the five years until the next update.

The Ozarks Transportation Organization

1: OTO Planning Area



The Ozarks Transportation Organization (OTO) is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) that serves as a forum for cooperative transportation decision-making by state and local governments, as well as regional transportation and planning agencies for the Springfield, Missouri urbanized area. An MPO is designated when the urbanized area has a decennial Census population larger than 50,000. MPOs are charged with maintaining and conducting a "continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive" regional transportation planning and project programming process for the MPO's planning area. The planning area is defined as the area projected to become urbanized within the next 20 years. Detailed maps are in Appendix 1.

Metropolitan planning organizations with an urbanized area population over 200,000 people are known as Transportation Management Areas (TMA). OTO was designated as a TMA after the 2000 decennial Census. TMAs have additional considerations beyond smaller MPOs, as defined in 23 USC 134 (k). In a TMA, transportation plans shall be based on a continuing and comprehensive transportation planning process in cooperation with the State and public transportation operators. The transportation planning process must include a Congestion Management System. The Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration also must certify the process no less than every four years. As a TMA, OTO selects projects for programming in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and receives a direct allocation of Surface Transportation Block Grant funding.

OTO membership includes local elected and appointed officials from Christian and Greene Counties, as well as the Cities of Battlefield, Nixa, Ozark, Republic, Springfield, Strafford, and Willard. It also includes technical staffs from the Missouri Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the Federal Aviation Administration. Staff members from local governments and area transportation agencies serve on OTO's Technical Planning Committee which provides technical review, comments, and recommendations on draft plans, programs, studies, and issues.

The OTO planning area includes the urbanized portions of Christian and Greene counties, as well as the areas expected to be urbanized in the next 20 years. The current population of the whole two-county area is just over 381,000. The OTO area is estimated to have a current population of 340,000. By the year 2045, the population of Christian and Greene Counties is expected to be almost 490,000, growing by over 100,000 people in that timeframe.

Destination 2045 Considerations

Congress and the US Department of Transportation set guidance for OTO to follow when developing a long range transportation plan. The current version of this guidance is in the FAST Act (Fixing America's Surface Transportation) Act. Congress is currently developing the next transportation reauthorization bill and while its final composition is unknown, this plan also anticipates potential guidance from that next bill.

Planning Factors

Federal transportation law describes the planning process for the Long Range Transportation Plan. The metropolitan planning process for a metropolitan planning area under this section shall provide for consideration of projects and strategies that will:

1) Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
2) Increase the safety of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
3) Increase the security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
4) Increase the accessibility and mobility of people and for freight;
5) Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns;
6) Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
7) Promote efficient system management and operation;

8) Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system;
9) Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation; and
10) Enhance travel and tourism.

Performance Based Planning

The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21, integrated performance measures into the planning and programming aspects of transportation investment. MAP-21 established seven National Goals as the focus of the Federal-aid highway program. The FAST Act provided for continuation of these goals. Guidance has been released listing the required performance measures to achieve the national goals. The state DOTs, MPOs, and transit agencies are required to coordinate target setting for these measures. MPOs must set their targets within 180 days of the state and transit agency. MPOs may choose to set their own targets or to program in support of the state and transit agency targets. OTO will make this decision on a case-by-case basis.

Safety

To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

Measures:

- Number of Fatalities
- Rate of Fatalities per 100 million VMT
- Number of Serious Injuries
- Rate of Serious Injuries per 100 million VMT
- Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Non-Motorized Serious Injuries

Transit Safety

To achieve a reduction in transit-related fatalities, serious injuries, and safety events, and improve mechanical reliability.

Measures:

- Fatalities: Total Number of Reportable Fatalities by Mode
- Fatalities: Rate per Total Vehicle Revenue Miles by Mode
- Injuries: Total Number of Reportable Injuries by Mode
- Injuries: Rate per Total Vehicle Revenue Miles by Mode
- Safety Events: Total Number Reportable Events by Mode
- Safety Events: Rate per Total Vehicle Revenue Miles by Mode
- System Reliability: Mean Distance between Major Mechanical Failures by Mode

Transit Asset Management:

To maintain transit assets in a state of good repair.

Measures:

- Equipment (non-revenue service vehicles) State of Good Repair
- Facilities State of Good Repair
- Infrastructure State of Good Repair
- Rolling Stock State of Good Repair

Infrastructure Condition

To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.

Measures:

- Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition
- Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition
- Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate in Good Condition
- Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate in Poor Condition
- Percentage of Pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition
- Percentage of Pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition

System Reliability

To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.

Measures:

- Interstate Travel Time Reliability Measure – Percent of Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable
- Non-Interstate NHS Travel Time Reliability Measure – Percent of Person-Miles Traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable

Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.

Measures:

- Freight Reliability Measure – Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index

Congestion Reduction

To achieve a significant reduction in congestion on the National Highway System.

Measures:

- Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Measure – Annual Hours of PHED per Capita (not applicable to OTO)
- Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle Travel (SOV) Measure – Percent of non-SOV Travel (not applicable to OTO)

Environmental Sustainability


To enhance the performance of the transportation system while protecting and enhancing the natural environment.

Measures:

- Emissions Measure – Total Emissions Reduction (not applicable to OTO)

Reduced Project Delivery Delays

To reduce project costs, promote jobs and the economy, and expedite the movement of people and goods by accelerating project completion through eliminating delays in the project development and delivery process, including reducing regulatory burdens and improving agencies' work practices.




Part 1

Where Are We?

Existing Conditions

Demographics and Socioeconomics


The Springfield metropolitan statistical area includes Christian and Greene counties, as well as Dallas, Polk, and Webster counties. From 2010 to 2019, the MSA population increased from 436,712 to 470,300. This is an overall increase of 7.7 percent, or 0.77 percent annualized. Christian County was the fastest growing county in the MSA in terms of percent change over the past 29 years, adding 55,951 people. Greene County grew the most in terms of raw numbers, adding 85,137 people. The City of Springfield has experienced steady growth since 2010 and remains the employment and activity hub for the OTO area.



	1990	2000	2010	2019
Battlefield	1,526	2,385	5,590	6,622
Nixa	4,707	12,124	19,022	22,515
Ozark	4,243	9,665	17,820	20,482
Republic	6,292	8,438	14,751	16,938
Springfield	140,494	151,580	159,498	167,882
Strafford	1,166	1,845	2,358	2,460
Willard	2,177	3,193	5,288	5,632

Source: OTO 2020 Growth Trends


3: Two-County Area Population




Source: US Census/OTO Travel Demand Model

The region is projected to grow through 2045, as well, adding over 100,000 to Christian and Greene Counties, with the majority of this growth expected to be within the OTO region. Housing unit density is expected to change the most in the immediate center city of Springfield, followed by the edges of OTO's municipal jurisdictions. This is demonstrative of the land available for new housing construction.

4: Percent Change in Housing Units 2018-2045






	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Battlefield			40	29	36	47	53	36	23	10	30
Nixa	89	49	72	128	119	101	124	209	247	246	200
Ozark	34	33	49	69	70	92	115	94	85	127	115
Republic - OTO	77	99	54	67	96	107	109	102	102	149	158
Springfield	80	68	-5	29	28	-1	-5	11	12	27	38
Strafford			0	3	2	2	19	24	8	15	20
Willard			13	7	11	6	14	8	25	17	28
Christian - OTO	51	40	7	56	70	106	76	83	79	56	68
Greene - OTO	375	198	270	320	266	266	299	249	320	267	476
Total	706	487	500	708	698	726	804	816	901	914	1,133

Source: OTO 2020 Growth Trends

In 2020, single-family housing permits reached the highest level since 2007 (1,558). The increase is mostly attributable to development in Greene County and the cities of Nixa and Republic. The permit total for new single-family structures in the OTO Area was offset by the demolition 113 houses. Most demolitions occurred in Springfield (67) and Greene County (24).

From 2010 to 2020, most multi-family housing construction permits were issued in the city of Springfield. In 2020, the total number of multi-family units permitted climbed to the 4th highest total in the last ten years. The largest number of the 640 multi-family units added in the OTO area were in the city of Springfield. Greene County issued its highest number of multi-family units since 2009 (237).




	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Battlefield			0	0	0	0	0	0	83	4	0
Nixa	0	50	0	0	0	2	2	6	42	52	12
Ozark	26	20	4	0	0	20	90	18	129	44	12
Republic	18	0	0	0	47	0	4	12	32	0	2
Springfield	20	132	486	216	476	855	141	559	719	95	395
Strafford			0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
Willard			0	0	48	20	0	72	0	0	0
Christian - OTO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greene - OTO	38	12	0	0	0	0	2	-2	20	114	219
Total	102	214	490	216	571	897	247	665	1,025	259	640

Source: OTO 2020 Growth Trends


OTO analyzes these changes in housing units alongside proximity to CU Transit fixed-route bus service. This demonstrates whether or not density in the OTO area is locating near transit. Since 2012, the percentage of households within the CU Service Area (the Springfield city limits) has remained steady at 83 percent, however, that number has slighly reduced for the OTO area from 46 to 45 percent. While these numbers show that housing growth in the region is not densifying near transit, the majority of households in Springfield do have access to transit and the outlying growth is only having a minimal effect.

OTO produces an annual growth trends report that examines recent and historical growth patterns, as well as a variety of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. This information and more can be found on the OTO website.




Source: OTO 2020 Growth Trends

8: Housing Units Added 2010-2020




9: Two-County Area Employment



Source: US Census Bureau

10: 2018 Employment per Square Mile


The proportion of employment in Springfield compared to the OTO region has stayed stable at around 83 percent. Current employment density is concentrated in Springfield, especially surrounding the hospitals and universities.




The greatest growth in employment density is expected in the surrounding areas, near the highways which traverse the region.

Of the people who work in Greene County, 93.4 percent also live in Greene County. Conversely, the majority (61.2%) of Christian County residents commute to another county for work. The MSA percentage of workers living in the same county as they are employed is comparable to that of the United States but over ten percent more than Missouri.

11: Employment Growth 2018-2045





Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey

OTO tracks the average commute-to-work time reported through the American Community Survey by the US Census Bureau. While this information is unavailable for 2020 and the impacts of COVID-19 are yet unknown, the commute time has been slowly growing for the region. The average commute time for all of Christian and Greene Counties is 22.9 minutes and for the cities in OTO, the average commute time is 23.1 minutes. The goal is to keep OTO's average commute time, as calculated by an average of cities in the OTO, below 25 minutes. While Nixa, Ozark, and Christian County are above that time, the average for the region has not grown quickly. With employment growth throughout the region, this should enable more commuters to live near where they work.

13: Journey to Work (in Minutes)

	1990	2000	2015-2019	Difference in Minutes, 2000 to 2015-2019
Christian	27.4	25.1	25.8	0.7
Greene	17.6	19.2	20	0.8
Battlefield	22.6	23.1	22.5	-0.6
Fremont Hills	17	19.8	22.1	2.3
Nixa	19.1	23.8	25.1	1.3
Ozark	19.2	21.6	25.4	3.8
Republic	21.6	25.1	24.3	-0.8
Springfield	15.7	17	18.2	1.2
Strafford	20.4	22.4	22.7	0.3
Willard	23.2	23	24.1	1.1
Average of Greene/Christian	22.5	22.2	22.9	0.7
Average of OTO Cities	19.9	22	23.1	1.1

Source: 2015-2019 American Community Survey

Current System Condition

OTO uses a variety of tools to analyze the current state of the system. Much of this ties into the OTO project prioritization process and informs decision making.

High Volume Corridors


OTO's highest volume corridors are I-44 and US 65, as well as James River Freeway, S. Campbell, and small portions of Kansas Expressway and Glenstone inside the City of Springfield.

Safety


OTO reviews safety data from a variety of perspectives. Besides the system-wide information reported via the national performance measures, it's important to understand which segments are hot spots for various crash types. The OTO five-year fatal crash numbers are trending upwards. These crashes tend to be on higher speed routes, including I-44, US 65, and James River Freeway. Higher fatal crash locations can also be seen on west Kearney and MO 14 west of Nixa.


This map of fatal crash locations shows the average number of fatal crashes on a segment over a five year period. No segment is averaging even one crash per year, with the highest segment average at 0.6.

14: High Volume Corridors



15: Fatal Crash Locations (2015-2019)






Source: MoDOT


Injury crashes appear throughout the OTO region, though still seen more frequently on higher speed and higher volume routes. This includes I-44, US 65, James River Freeway, US 160 both north and south, MO 14, and arterials such as Kearney, Chestnut, Sunshine, Glenstone, and south National and Campbell. This map shows the average number of injury crashes on a segment over five years.

17: Injury Crash Locations (2015-2019)



The number of injury crashes have been fairly steady, however 2017 saw a spike in injury crashes, also with slightly higher years in 2016 and 2018.

Several improvements in recent years have targeted some of these locations, however, distracted driving is a contributing factor in many crashes throughout Missouri.



Show-Me Zero

Source: MoDOT

Show-Me Zero is MoDOT's Strategic Highway Safety Plan. This has replaced the Blueprint for Roadway Safety. OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of MoDOT's safety targets and supporting *Show-Me Zero*, promoting safer roadways in the OTO region. The plan has four emphasis areas which go beyond engineering solutions:

- Occupant Protection
- Distracted Driving
- Speed and Aggressive Driving
- Impaired Driving

Also receiving special attention in the plan are pedestrians and other non-motorized road users. Recommended strategies for metropolitan planning organizations from *Show-Me Zero* are included with the recommendations of *Destination 2045*.

Congestion

OTO uses a number of tools to determine congested corridors. Through FHWA and MoDOT partnerships, OTO has access to HERE and INRIX travel time data, mostly along freeways and major arterials. Local partnerships with MoDOT and the City of Springfield utilize strategically placed wi-fi-based travel time units, which provide information on additional roadways. A number of projects along identified corridors of concern are under construction or programmed in the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program, with anticipated benefits not yet reflected.


Travel Delay

Travel delay is analyzed for the AM and PM peaks. Different thresholds are used on arterials versus freeways to accommodate the differing traffic controls and user expectations of those facilities. Travel delay in the AM is minimal with most impact on US 160 in Nixa to south of Battlefield Road, Route CC, MO 14 through Ozark,

Division in center Springfield/west of Springfield, east Kearney, Glenstone north of Sunshine, Battlefield west of Kansas Expressway, Kansas Expressway north of Kearney/south of Grand, West Bypass, portions of Sunshine, and US 60 west of Republic.

Travel delay in the PM is more severe with the worst locations along Sunshine/413/60 from center Springfield through Republic, Campbell south of Battlefield Road, James River Freeway, Kansas Expressway north of Kearney, MO 14 through Ozark, I-44, US 160 between Willard and Springfield, and MO 125 from Route D to Strafford.


COVID-19 provided a snapshot of how increased travel demand management can free capacity on the roadways. FHWA, MoDOT, and Missouri MPOs are looking into ways to capture these results long-term. Increased telework can reduce demand on the roadways, especially during peak travel times. Consequences, however, can include increased traffic speeds and aggressive driving. Alternately, COVID-19 slowed carpool usage as social/physical distancing became a tool to prevent the spread. While COVID-19 initially seemed a short-term disrupter of typical travel patterns, its effects may be felt long term and aren't yet fully known.



19: COVID-19 Effects on Total Daily Traffic Volume

Source: City of Springfield

20: Travel Delay (2020)




Current Volume-to-Capacity Ratio

The capacity of each roadway has been determined for use in the travel demand model. Traffic volumes are then compared to these capacities to determine if a roadway is nearing or over capacity. This has a direct impact on travel time and roadway safety. Commercial truck traffic also plays a role, with each commercial vehicle receiving an equivalency of three passenger cars.

Current analysis shows that OTO's most congested roadways include I-44, Kansas Expressway, Kearney, Glenstone, and US 60 near Republic, with further congestion shown on Sunshine, US 65, US 60 in east Springfield, as well as east of Springfield. In Nixa and Ozark, MO 14 also shows localized congestion.

21: 2019/2020 Volume-to-Capacity




Future Volume to Capacity Ratio

The travel demand model projects future traffic volumes to 2045 based on assumptions regarding population and employment growth, as well as changes to the roadway network. The 2045 Volume-to-Capacity map shown here assumes a no-build scenario where no more improvements are made to the roadway network beyond those committed in 2018.

Congestion in 2045 is expected to grow throughout the region if no improvements are made to the network, especially on the arterial network and on regional connections outside of the area.

22: 2045 Volume-to-Capacity



Aviation and Goods Movement

Aviation

The main air facility in southwest Missouri is the Springfield-Branson National Airport. This is the primary air connection to the national and international markets. The region also has a private aircraft airport, the Downtown Airport, which coupled with the general aviation facility at the Springfield-Branson airport, serves the charter and private aircraft needs for the community.

The midfield terminal at the Springfield-Branson National Airport opened in 2009 and was built with expansion in mind. The new terminal was built with 10 gates in operation and can grow to 60 gates at full operation. A number of roadway improvements were also made with the opening of the new terminal.

The general aviation facility at the Springfield-Branson National Airport serves all the additional flights at the airport that are not part of the scheduled passenger flights or related to cargo. Supporting cargo, the airport is also considered part of a 23-county Foreign Trade Zone, allowing for the deferment of U.S. Custom's duty payment until goods are sold in the United States. With nearby Partnership Industrial Center West, freight and intermodal transfers are important considerations for this area of the OTO region.

In 2018, the Springfield-Branson National Airport experienced over 1 million passengers for the first time in airport history. This number was exceeded in 2019, however, COVID-19 made a major impact on the airline industry, and it may take two to three years for passenger flights to fully recover. One concern, however, is that the advent of online meetings during COVID-19 will continue to impact business travel in the future. The prior balance of travel was heavily business-biased, so recovery will likely depend upon the return of that travel. Cargo was less impacted by COVID, with weights in 2020 less than 2019, but higher than 2017 and close to 2018. As of June 30, 2021, year-to-date cargo levels were up 9 percent over 2019.

The long term plans for the airport include a secondary runway, though the existing runway would likely be expanded first. Asset management is a concern for the Airport, just as it is for other transportation facilities. In 2019, the Airport conducted a pavement condition study and identified areas in need of improvement.

One area of concern is providing room for additional hangar development and connecting that with the appropriate facilities. There has been recent growth in large hangar development. This includes expansion of a maintenance facility for Envoy, who flies for American Airlines, as well as several others that have yet to be announced. The airport is also working to expand their cargo apron to support this growth.

A foremost goal of the airport is to protect their easements and air space needs. They are continually working with area communities to protect these needs as growth continues.


Goods Movement

Freight has an impact on the capacity and operational movements of the roadway. Those connections that connect the OTO area to the broader region, state, and beyond are those that have the highest percentage of commercial traffic, including I-44, US 65 north of I-44, MO 13 north of I-44, US 60 east of Springfield, MO 125, Kearney, and the US 360/MM area.


This corresponds with the top two tiers of the Missouri Freight Network. The Missouri 2017 Freight Plan identified Tier 1 and Tier 2 freight corridors, signifying importance. The primary criteria include functional classification and freight tonnage.

OTO participated with a multi-state committee to develop the Heartland Freight Technology Plan, concluding in October 2020. This plan includes findings on the assessment, management, and regional harmonization of emerging freight technologies. It is recommended that OTO continue to participate in similar studies and promote participation in freight decision-making with representation from southwest Missouri.

23: Percent Commercial Traffic



24: Missouri 2017 Freight Network



MoDOT is currently drafting the 2021 Missouri Statewide Freight and Rail Plan. This plan is comprehensive and provides guidance at the regional level in coordination with statewide objectives. The 2021 Plan will focus on:


- The Safety of all who use Missouri's transportation
- Mobility and the Reliability of the entire system so that freight can move efficiently
- System Preservation to minimize maintenance and repair costs
- Enhancing Missouri's Economic Competitiveness, bringing greater revenue to the state
- Promoting Choice for how businesses ship their goods

OTO has participated in stakeholder meetings and will continue to monitor the outcomes of this planning process.

Bridge/Roadway Condition

Bridge condition ratings are calculated by taking the lowest sub-rating of the super-structure, sub-structure, and deck. Ratings range from 3 to 9. At a bridge rating of 3, bridges are closed to the public. A bridge rating of 5 is considered Fair, with all primary structural elements as sound, though they may have minor section loss, cracking, spalling, or scour. A bridge rating of 9 is Excellent.


25: Bridge Condition (2020)



Most of the bridges in the OTO area are in fair or better condition, with just a few classified as poor. Unfortunately, the majority of bridges are classified as fair, and the next bridge inspection can change that rating. Many of the bridges in the OTO region are along major roadways such as I-44, US 65, and James River Freeway. It is important that upcoming projects work to preserve or rehabilitate these bridges, limiting further issues in the future.

Roadway condition ratings use factors such as smoothness and physical distress to determine quality. As of 2020, 98 percent of OTO's major roadways were in good condition. Major roads include principal arterials, interstates, freeways, and

expressways. As seen in the adjacent chart, bridge conditions have been maintained and roadway conditions have improved due to a focus on asset management and increased investment mechanisms available through Amendment 3 bonds authorized by Missouri voters in 2004.



Source: MoDOT

Congestion Management Plan

OTO updated the Congestion Management Process Monitoring report in 2019. This report pulls together a variety of data to determine which roadways in the OTO are congested, why they are congested, and what strategies are most effective at mitigating congestion. The 2019 report has confirmed the prior trends of lower congestion in the AM peak and higher congestion in the PM peak.

There are four elements OTO reviews to determine congested roadways and intersections:

- Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
- Crash Frequency
- Average Travel Speeds
- Intersection Level-of-Service

These four elements are combined to identify congested roadways (crashes, volume-to-capacity ratio, travel speed) and congested intersections (intersection level-of-service, volume-to-capacity ratio, travel speed). Similar measures are also considered in the OTO Prioritization Criteria, as seen in Appendix 2.

The 2019 report identified congested roadways and intersections. OTO is working with MoDOT and its members to address these congestion issues as feasible. Additionally, MoDOT and the City of Springfield partner to improve operations along these roadways through the Traffic Management Center of the Ozarks and through MoDOT's Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) focus areas of traffic incident management, work zone management, and advancing technology and roadway operations.

MoDOT TSM&O Primary Focus Areas

- Traffic Incident Management
- Work Zone Management
- Advancing Technology and Roadway Operations

Congested Roadways Identified in 2019

- Campbell
  - Primrose to Republic ..... *Destination 2045* Unconstrained List
- Glenstone ..... Operational/Safety Improvements in FY 2022-2025 TIP
  - At Kearney
  - Chestnut to Monroe
  - Portland/Cinderella to Battlefield
- Kansas Expressway ..... *Destination 2045* Constrained List
  - Talmage to Kearney
  - Bennett to Sunshine
  - Battlefield to James River Freeway
- Kearney ..... *Destination 2045* Constrained List
  - US 65 to Le Compte
- National ..... No Improvements Currently Planned
  - At Battlefield
- Sunshine ..... Scoping for Operational/Safety Improvements in FY 2022-2025 TIP
  - At Campbell
  - National to Glenstone
  - Lone Pine to Oak Grove
  - Deeswood to US 65
- US 160
  - Rt. AA to Rt. CC..... Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP
- US 60
  - MO 174 to Oakwood ..... MM Relocation Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP

Congested Intersections Identified in 2019

- Campbell and Republic ..... Under Construction
- Kansas and Sunshine ..... Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP
- Kansas and Walnut Lawn ..... Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP
- Kansas and WB James River Freeway..... Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP
- Sunshine and National ..... Scoping for Operational/Safety Improvements in FY 2022-2025 TIP
- US 60 and Rt. MM/M..... MM Relocation Programmed in FY 2022-2025 TIP

Traffic Incident Management

As recommended in *Transportation Plan 2040*, OTO coordinates a Traffic Incident Management Committee for the region. The committee adopted the *TIM Strategic Plan, Phase I* in 2016. This plan saw progress toward the adoption of response procedures, the regular debriefing of major incidents, the acquisition of safety equipment for local responders, and surveying of local towing providers. Phase II, adopted in 2020, formalizes the committee's structure and increases the integration of response efforts:


- Endorsement of OTO TIM Operations Guidelines by Local Jurisdictions
- MOU with Examiner's Office Concerning Vehicle Movements
- Site Visits with Agency Leadership
- Formalize Incident Clearance Time Target
- Formalize Roadway Clearance Time Target
- Hold TIM Training Quarterly in the OTO Area
- Bi-Annual Training Survey to Determine Training Needs
- Conduct Annual TIM Exercise
- Formalize Regional Exercise Procedures
- Establish Bylaws
- Identify Future Co-Chairs

Travel Demand Model Base and No-Build Scenario


OTO developed a new travel demand model in preparation for *Transportation Plan 2040*, which was adopted in 2016. This model incorporated several unique features, including consideration for node delay, link delay, dynamic trip assignment and distribution, and the use of cellular data to provide information on internal/external trips. OTO contracted with the Bureau of Economic Analysis at Missouri State University to project population and employment for 2040.

To develop the model for *Destination 2045*, OTO staff revised the population and employment projections for 2045. This information is supplied in the previous Demographic and Socioeconomic discussion. OTO staff also updated the

27: Travel Demand Model
2018 Existing + Committed Base Year Result



28: Travel Demand Model
2045 Existing + Committed Result



transportation network to be used in the model, as well as supplied a listing of projects that had been committed through the Transportation Improvement Program. This information supplied a base year model result for 2018, as well as a 2045 no-build scenario. The results of the constrained project list on the system are included later with that range of alternatives.

Compared to the base year, congestion on OTO's arterials and the majority of freeways is expected to be more widespread. It is important that OTO watch these high volume routes for necessary improvements. The increased congestion corresponds also to those areas where population and employment are expected to grow. Managing the land use and transportation connection will be key to keeping traffic moving throughout the region.

Transit

Information regarding types of funding available for transit programs can be found later in the *Destination 2045* Investment Plan.

Providers


City Utilities

City Utilities is the primary fixed-route transit operator in the OTO region. Fixed route service is provided within the City of Springfield seven days a week. City Utilities also offers paratransit service for those who cannot ride the fixed-route bus due to a disability or health condition. CU Transit operates both day and night routes, as well as on weekends and holidays. Routes and schedules may be found at http://www.cityutilities.net/transit/transit.htm.

CU Service Operates 365 days a year on this schedule:	
Monday to Friday Day Routes	6:00 am to 6:35 pm
Monday to Friday Evening Routes	6:10 pm to 11:10 pm
Saturday Day/Evening Routes	6:00 am to 11:10 pm
Sunday Day/Evening Routes	7:10 am to 11:10 pm
Holiday Routes (no Evening)	8:10 am to 6:10 pm


City Utilities has 25 fixed-route buses and 6 paratransit buses, as well as nearly 100 shelters and 200 benches. Hours of operation for transit in Springfield are Monday through Friday, 6:00 a.m. to 6:35 p.m. and Saturday is 6 a.m. to 11:10 p.m., while night service is 6:10 p.m. to 11:10 p.m., Sundays are 7:10 a.m. to 11:10 p.m., and holidays are 8:10 a.m. to 6:10 p.m. The paratransit hours are the same as the fixed route. City Utilities operates 365 days a year. There are 12 day routes, 7 Saturday and evening routes, and four Sunday and holiday routes. Route maps can be found on the City Utilities website - https://www.cutransit.net/routes/. There is also an app and desktop tracker available called "RouteShout 2.0." This allows users to select their route and see the location of the bus, helping riders better plan their transit trips.

29: City Utilities Day Route Map



Source: City Utilities Transit

In 2016, City Utilities started operating out of a new Transfer Station located at College and Main in downtown Springfield. This replaced a station built in the 1980s. The new station allows for more and bigger buses when needed, as well as additional technology for bus ticketing and operations, including the utilization of real-time traveler information. The new station was also built to accommodate connections



Source: National Transit Database

with other services, such as the MSU Bear Line, when such connections become desired.

Generally in the transit industry, route changes or fare increases in result in a 20 percent reduction in ridership that can take a minimum of 2-3 years to recover. The opening of the new Transit Center in 2016 required a system redesign of all routes. Ridership was not only impacted from the historical perspective but also increased efficiencies. Passengers are able to reach destinations with fewer trips and transfers. Ridership had been trending toward 1.4 million rides in FY 2020 prior to the pandemic, however, it will take several more years for ridership to return following the pandemic.

While fixed-route ridership has decreased, CU Transit's increased use of ADA paratransit service has followed industry-wide trends. It is also thought that the paratransit service has become more well known throughout the community, especially as other services have been discontinued.

Beyond operating the transit system, City Utilities has partnered with the City of Springfield and MoDOT to build sidewalks along bus routes and to construct ADA accessible bus stops. Using their Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310) funding, this partnership has allowed for improved access along several major routes and near critical facilities.

COVID-19 has had a significant impact on City Utilities transit service. During FY 2020, City Utilities Transit took several unprecedented measures to protect both employees and passengers from COVID-19, including an extended modified service during the City of Springfield "stay-at-home" orders, masking enforcement and the installation of both temporary and permanent driver barriers. These protective measures allowed transit to continue to operate during the pandemic without any significant interruption in service. In FY 2020, unlinked passenger trips dipped below 1 million for the first time in over 20 years. While ridership is gradually beginning to recover in FY 2021, it is anticipated that pre-COVID-19 ridership will not be achieved until FY 2023.

Current initiatives at City Utilities transit includes electrification of the fixed-route fleet. CU Transit will receive and deploy two electric buses in 2021, as well as a training simulator. This will allow CU Transit to see if current electric bus technology will support the route needs of Springfield. Another goal is to add lighting at bus stops to improve safety. Finally, CU Transit will introduce hybrid minivans into the fleet to supplement the paratransit service, promoting agility in the program.


City Utilities Transit is planning to survey and analyze the system in the near future upon completion of *Forward SGF* and *Destination 2045*, as these plans will inform the direction of that survey process.

Upcoming projects include improving training and customer service. Digital signage is under consideration on the buses, at the Transit Center, and off the buses

to provide information on bus arrival times and occupancies. Discussion on how the system can grow also relies on how that growth can be funded. It is recommended that a strategic plan be developed to examine these topics.

Missouri State University

Missouri State University contracts with a private provider for regular shuttle service in and round the MSU campus. This service is available to the public at no charge. The MSU routes run days and evenings, with limited service when school is not in session.



31: Missouri State University Bear Line

Though service is now running at full availability, COVID-19 has reduced ridership, partially because fewer students are on campus. While 2019 saw 950,000 passengers, 2020 had just over 220,000 and the service did not run from the end of March to the beginning of August. Meanwhile, the passenger counting system has been recently upgraded and allows for more analysis on current operations.

MSU has multiple multi-modal parking facilities and transfer stations located across campus. The shuttle connects with downtown Springfield to service the University's expansion into the downtown area. Drivers do make announcements regarding stops to meet accessibility requirements.

Future plans for the MSU Bear Line include an update to the look and branding of the Bear Line for marketing purposes, with inclusivity of the University and the community in line. Increases in ridership is expected with improvements downtown, such as the daylighting of Jordan Creek, that will impact MSU parking lots in downtown. Students are also less likely to be licensed drivers when compared to the past and are more environmentally conscious, trending toward multimodal transportation. Other plans include geofencing announcements and LED lights to

help those who are hearing or visually impaired. Finally, MSU is looking to overhaul routes, connect better with CU Transit, and improve accessibility at stops.

OATS Transit

OATS Transit is a non-profit serving 87 counties in Missouri, providing specialized transportation, including the rural general public, senior citizens, and people with disabilities. OATS Transit offers a shared-ride, demand-response, door-to-door service.

OATS offers a mix of service to southwest Missouri and the service provided depends on location, day of the week, and type of service, including medical, veteran, elderly, and general public. Transportation is available throughout Greene County, as well as Barry, Newton, Stone, Taney, and Wright Counties. In these counties, OATS offers routine transportation to Springfield on specified weekdays. Pickup points are established along the routes, however the bus will go off route up to 3 miles. Pick-up and drop-off points are at the curb.

Human Service Transportation Providers

Numerous agencies provide additional human-service transportation throughout the region. Some serve only their specific clients, and others, like OATS, Inc., provide demand-response service for the disabled and elderly in Springfield, and the general public in southwest Missouri.

Intercity Surface Transportation

The OTO region is currently served by two inter-city bus companies, Greyhound Lines, Inc., which serves over 2,400 destinations in North America and Jefferson Lines, which has stops in fourteen states and twenty stops in Missouri, including Springfield. There are 31 cities with Greyhound locations in Missouri, including Springfield, Kansas City, and St. Louis. Hollister, near Branson, is also served by Greyhound. The Greyhound bus station in Springfield is moving to the western edge of Springfield. Greyhound's service to Jefferson City, Kansas City, and St. Louis provides a connection to Amtrak service. Jefferson Lines uses the Greyhound station in Springfield as a stop.

Southwest Missouri is not served by passenger train service, though a desire for such service is brought up repeatedly, as seen in the survey responses for this Plan. Current studies, including one commissioned by MoDOT in 2007, have yet to demonstrate the feasibility of passenger train service.

Regional Intercity Bus Service

As described, OATS Transit fills a need for intercity transportation throughout the region and Missouri. Providing service for both medical and general transportation, OATS reduces the number of trips that would otherwise be taken individually by its riders. OTO has further explored a limited stop circulator in the 2012 Route Study, described below. As density and demand increases, there is a benefit to the region


in the promotion of stronger intercity bus service. Given low commute times in the region, though, it will likely continue to be an option for non-drivers as opposed to a replacement for passenger car commuting and even carpooling.

Springfield Fixed-Route Peer Analysis

In 2019, OTO conducted a peer analysis comparing City Utilities Transit fixed-route service with that offered by peer communities. This analysis used 2017 data from the National Transit Database. It was concluded that City Utilities Transit offers local residents a level of service similar to that found in the peer communities:


- Operates a comparable number of Weekday Routes
- One of few communities to offer dedicated late-night routes/Sunday routes
- One of the few to operate past 10 p.m.
- Only agency to offer service on all major holidays
- All peer communities offered more Saturday service
- Offers less total service than many peers, but is effective in providing the services it does offer
- Charges comparable single ride fares and monthly passes
- Provides the highest percentage of operating funds from local services compared to the eight peer communities

32: CU Transit Peer Service Route Types




Source: OTO 2019 CU Transit Peer Analysis


33: CU Transit Peer Service Hours



Source: OTO 2019 CU Transit Peer Analysis


34: CU Transit Peer Service Statistics






Source: OTO 2019 CU Transit Peer Analysis

35: CU Transit Peer Revenue





Source: OTO 2019 CU Transit Peer Analysis

2012 Route Study


OTO, in partnership with City Utilities Transit, conducted an in-depth transit analysis of both the existing system and a proposed regional system in 2012. The purpose of the study was to determine how well the current fixed-route serves local needs, identify opportunities for improvement, test scenarios, and evaluate a regional service concept. The studies can be found here https://media.ozarkstransportation.org/documents/Fixed-Route-Oporations-Analysis-April-2012.pdf and here https://media.ozarkstransportation.org/documents/Regional-Service-Analysis-April-2012.pdf.

The study recommended five different levels of improvement:

1) Improve reliability
2) Improve frequency
3) Expand east-west options on far south side
4) Additional frequency improvements and limited stop service
5) 15-minute frequency and ½-mile spacing

Each scenario presents specific improvements and the estimated necessary capital costs for implementation.

36: 2012 Route Study Scenarios



Source: OTO 2012 Regional Fixed Route Analysis

The regional service analysis reviewed eleven candidate communities and two service designs: run-through and feeder-to-trunk. Eight routes were eventually selected for cost and route analysis:

1) Branson
2) Fair Grove
3) Nixa-Ozark
4) Rogersville
5) Republic-Battlefield
6) Strafford
7) Walnut Grove-Ash Grove-Willard
8) Limited Stop Circulator

From this plan, the Limited Stop Circulator has been identified as most feasible. Using National, this route connects the Medical mile with MSU, OTC, Government Plaza and the downtown Transfer Station. The new transfer station at Main and College was not finalized at the time of this study, but that should not impact the findings related to this proposed route.

This route and variations on it are receiving additional attention through the City of Springfield's Impacting Poverty Initiative. This route should effectively serve the

public's needs.


The Springfield Comprehensive Plan, Forward SGF, though not finalized, is planned to recommend supporting land use that supports transit, and in particular, improved service along National Avenue.

There has been much discussion for what transit could look like in Springfield and throughout the region, but less discussion regarding the steps required to get there. It is recommended that a strategic plan outline implementation actions.

Transit Coordination Plan

The most recent Transit Coordination Plan (TCP) was adopted in 2017 and the update is just getting underway. The TCP fulfills the federal requirements of a Human Services Transportation Plan enacted in the surface transportation reauthorization bill, most recently the FAST Act. The TCP is intended to identify needs and gaps in human service transportation services for seniors and individuals with disabilities in the OTO region. The TCP is also used to guide the use of Federal Transit Administration Section 5310 Enhance Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program funding. Actions from the 2017 TCP were prioritized for implementation importance:

37: Limited Stop Circulator



Source: OTO 2012 Regional Fixed Route Analysis

38: Transit Coordination Plan Prioritized Actions

Action	Priority
Update and expand distribution of OTO's transit provider brochure	Medium
Deploy and market OTO's '*Let's Go Smart*' and '*Ozarks Commute*' websites	High
Investigate feasibility of mobility management program in OTO planning area	Low
Resolve to support existing Medicaid transportation funding by educating local and state leaders	Medium
Policy changes allowing will-call return trip scheduling	Medium
Policy changes allowing expanded opportunity for same-day scheduling	Medium
Advocate for additional funding for recreational funding for area senior centers and human service agencies	Low
Continue Section 5310 funding for replacement vehicles	High
Continue Section 5310 funding for non-traditional projects that improve ADA accessibility	High
Investigate feasibility of funding passenger facilities in conjunction with vehicle purchases	Medium
Continue Section 5310 funding for new vehicles	High
Create new Section 5310 scoring criteria to prioritize weekend/ after-hours services	Medium
Create new scoring criteria to prioritize intercity connections	Medium
Continue Section 5310 funding for non-traditional projects that expand ADA accessibility	High
Investigate feasibility of funding passenger facilities in conjunction with vehicle purchases	Medium
Encourage use of available space at CU Transit Center by MSU and OATS	Low
Create new Section 5310 scoring criteria to prioritize intercity connections	Medium

Active Transportation

Trail Priorities

OTO has an active Bicycle and Pedestrian planning program, with guidance from the OTO Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC). Recent planning efforts have focused on creating a regionally connected trail system. In 2017, OTO adopted the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Trail Investment Study (RBPTIS) and subsequent Nixa addendum, provides guidance toward implementation of more than 80 miles of trails throughout the OTO region. The Study reviewed alternate alignments, as well as natural environment and cultural concerns, recommending a preferred alignment, planning-level cost estimates, and segmentation for each route. While segments were proposed in $500,000 increments, the overall cost, upwards of $125 million, will take much funding and many years to implement.

Focusing on the goal of connecting the OTO communities via regional trails, a more targeted plan has been developed, *Towards a Regional Trail System*. Developed concurrently with the *Destination 2045* planning process, this is meant to be a standalone regional trail plan that identifies investment levels needed to create a trail system with continuous linkages that connects communities by 2045.

45 by '45

Direct OTO Action

- Identification of sustained and expanded trail funding
- Provide regional trail planning supports
- Target specific corridors and trails for OTO funding
- Create trail system dashboard

Supports offered to OTO Member Jurisdictions

- Support expansion of local funding options
- Support establishment of trail maintenance program/funding

Towards a Regional Trail System identifies successful implementation as 45 miles of trail by 2045. This can be achieved through direct actions by OTO and supports OTO can offer to member jurisdictions. Funding is the most significant factor toward implementation. Three scenarios are provided for additional regional trail funding:

- Allocate any increase in Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding in next reauthorization bill to trails
- Allocate any increase in STBG-Set Aside (formerly Transportation Alternatives Program in the next reauthorization bill to trails
- Modify existing distribution of STBG-Urban funds to direct funding toward trails

These will also need to be matched through private fundraising and community and outside grants.

When including the full extent of regional trails and all the loop trails in area parks, one could count over 100 miles of trail on the ground. OTO tracks miles of existing greenway trails that can be used for transportation; trails that connect places and aren't used only for exercise. Since 2012, nearly 15 miles of trail have been built by members, Ozark Greenways, and with OTO funds.



Source: OTO 2020 State of Transportation

Bicycle and Pedestrian Priorities

Beginning with the first dedicated Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan in 2006, OTO has been working toward the implementation of livable and complete streets. Planning efforts have oscillated between standalone plans and incorporation with the long range transportation plan. Alongside the trail planning efforts, OTO has been working with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) to document priorities for the development and maintenance of sidewalk and on-street bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure at the local level throughout the region.

Past plans have attempted to document all existing facilities with recommendations for locating any new infrastructure. With technology allowing for the constant update of existing inventory within a geographical information system and the potential for improvements innumerable, OTO instead plans to focus on policies that can provide clear guidance to members and MoDOT for the placement and design of future bicycle and pedestrian improvements. As OTO examines ways to overlay street typologies upon the Major Thoroughfare Plan, these policies will be incorporated with context in mind.

It is important that the local bicycle and pedestrian network interface and parallel the roadway network. The drafted priorities under consideration are included here and express OTO's bicycle and pedestrian goals. These will be finalized through BPAC as part of a broader infrastructure plan.

Structure of Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks

- Urban Expressways, Primary Arterials, and Secondary Arterials should include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, incorporating sidewalks on both sides, multi-use sidepaths and/or bicycle accommodations consistent with established best practices
- Freeway corridors should include a parallel network of continuous sidewalks, bike lanes, bike boulevards, and/or other industry standard low-stress accommodations along outer roads or other parallel minor streets to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement along the freeway corridor
- Local bicycle and pedestrian networks should be identified to facilitate movement between neighborhoods, local institutions, schools, and commercial areas, and be built according to established best practices

Integration of Local Bicycle and Pedestrian Networks and the Regional Hard Surface Trail Network

- The region's Hard Surface Trail Network will be integrated into the fabric of each community through numerous neighborhood-level sidewalk and bicycle connections
- Local bicycle and pedestrian networks should be identified and constructed to facilitate movement between trails included in the region's Hard Surface Trail Network

- Local bicycle and pedestrian networks should be identified and constructed to facilitate movement between local institutions, schools, and commercial areas and the region's Hard Surface Trail Network

Funding

- Local jurisdictions should prioritize the construction and long-term maintenance of their local bicycle and pedestrian network in their annual budgets and capital improvement programs
- Local jurisdictions and MoDOT should negotiate in good faith to find opportunities for cost sharing and beneficial long-term maintenance agreements


Complete Streets

A Complete Street is designed with every user in mind, whether a pedestrian, bicyclist, motorist, or user of public transportation, of any age. A complete street ensures the entire right-of-way enables safe access for all users. No two complete streets will look the same. The inclusion and placement of elements such as crosswalks, bike lanes, bus lanes, sidewalks, medians, or curb extensions depends upon the surrounding land use and users' needs. Smart Growth America has an extensive library of materials relating to the implementation of Complete Streets.

The OTO Design Standards recommend pedestrian and bicycle accommodations on a number of roadway classifications. Guidelines for those accommodations are included in the Design Standards found in Appendix 3. OTO has also assembled a variety of resources members can use to implement complete streets best practices through a Complete Streets Toolbox.

Through the implementation of the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan, Design Standards, and Bicycle/Pedestrian Priority Policies, OTO strives for implementation of complete streets concepts. Jurisdictions within the OTO area are encouraged to consider all users when designing projects, regardless of funding source.

In 2011, OTO set its first performance measures and targets, including the goal that by 2035, 35 percent of roadways (excluding freeways and expressways) have sidewalk on at least one side of the street. Since 2012, that percentage has grown from 29 to 32. Sidewalk has even been added to streets not traditionally considered accommodating of pedestrians, such as Kansas Expressway. With the continued effort to connect and complete an



Source: OTO 2020 State of Transportation

active transportation network, the region will benefit from the availability of transportation options.

Ongoing Studies and Reports

OTO produces several reports on an ongoing basis, which provide continual feedback on the planning process. Below is a summary of each document and its update schedule.

Performance Measures Report

This is an annual report produced for the performance measures contained in the long range transportation plan. This report provides an overview of each performance measure, how that measure is trending, and factors which may affect that trend.

Congestion Management Process Report

Every three years, the OTO reviews recurring and non-recurring congestion throughout the region in accordance with federal requirements. This congestion is compared to transportation improvements made throughout the region, allowing for evaluation of strategies that address congestion.

Annual Transportation Report Card

OTO is in the process of developing an annual transportation report card that reviews additional statistics about transportation in the region beyond those included in the performance measures report.

Growth Trends Report

Each year, OTO works with local jurisdictions to track new building permits and demolition permits to determine growth in housing units throughout the region. This effort culminates in a report outlining the growth of the region, as well as provides Census information regarding income and employment throughout the region.

LRTP Implementation Plan

Destination 2045 includes a list of actions that OTO should perform in order to address the goals of this Plan. OTO will annually review progress toward this implementation plan and how those efforts are helping the region attain its vision of an excellent transportation system.

2 System Performance

National Performance Measures System Performance Report

The metropolitan transportation plan is required to include a description of the performance measures and targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system, as well as a system performance report evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system. For all targets, except Transit Safety, OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of the statewide targets. City Utilities Transit developed their own safety plan, and the OTO Board of Directors has adopted the targets stated within that plan.

This system performance report describes each adopted target and is followed by charts showing progress on each target as available when that target was most recently set. Since OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of targets set by MoDOT and City Utilities, OTO relies on these sources for data regarding progress on the targets.

Safety

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on December 17, 2020

To achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.


41: Adopted Safety Targets

Performance Measure	Baseline (2015-2019)	Statewide Target for CY2021
Number of Fatalities	910.0	871.6
Fatality Rate per 100 million VMT	1.213	1.119
Number of Serious Injuries	4681.2	4463.9
Serious Injury Rate per 100 million VMT	6.241	5.829
Number of Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries	462.2	462.2


Source: MoDOT

Discussion


These safety targets are reviewed annually. MoDOT has set a statewide goal, through Show-Me Zero, their strategic highway safety plan, of zero fatalities by 2030 and zero serious injuries by 2040. These are the driving factors behind the targets set in the interim. OTO activities that support the safety targets includes hosting the Traffic Incident Management committee, participating in the Missouri Coalition for Roadway Safety, and programming safety projects and projects that address safety improvements in the transportation improvement program.




Source: MoDOT




Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT

Transit Safety

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on December 17, 2020

To achieve a reduction in transit-related fatalities, serious injuries, and safety events, and improve mechanical reliability.

47: Adopted Transit Safety Targets

Safety Performance Targets

Mode of Transit Service	Fatalities (Total)	Fatalities (per 250k mi)	Injuries (Total)	Injuries (per 250k mi)	Safety Events (Total)	Safety Events (per 250k mi)	System Reliability (VRM/failures)
Bus Fixed-Route (MB)	0	0	2	.5	4	1	20,000
	Fatalities (Total)	Fatalities (Rate)	Injuries (Total)	Injuries (Rate)	Safety Events (Total)	Safety Events (Rate)	System Reliability (VRM/failures)
ADA Paratransit (DR)	0	0	0	0	0	0	45,000

Annual Review and Update of the Safety Performance Targets

January **July** **December**

The Safety Performance Targets were based on a 3-year average from FY2015-2018 and will be evaluated annually in July. The system reliability target was calculated by calculating the miles between major system failures, over the most recent six years, for one randomly selected bus from each model year, then averaging the results for both fixed route and paratransit.

Source: CU Transit FY 2021 Public Transit Agency Safety Plan

Baseline

The baseline used to determine the targets for this category of measures was the average of the prior three years of data available as reported through the National Transit Database.

48: CU Transit Safety Target Fixed-Route Baseline

Bus Fixed-Route (MB)				Target (Rounded)
	2016	**2017**	**2018**	**3 Year Average**
Total Fatalities	0	0	0	0.0
Fatality Rate per 250,000 VRM	0	0	0	0.0
Total Injuries	1	1	4	2.0
Injury Rate per 250,000 VRM	0.233	0.226	0.930	0.5
Total Safety Events	3	1	7	3.7
Safety Event Rate per 250,000 VRM	0.699	0.226	1.628	0.9
Total Major Mechanical System Failures	60	69	36	55.0
Avg Miles between Major Mech Sys Failures	17,895	15,998	29,866	21,253
Annual VRM	1,073,726	1,103,849	1,075,183	1,084,253

Source: CU Transit

49: CU Transit Safety Target Paratransit Baseline

ADA Paratransit (DR)				Target (Rounded)
	2016	**2017**	**2018**	**3 Year Average**
Total Fatalities	0	0	0	0.0
Fatality Rate per 25,000 VRM	0	0	0	0.0
Total Injuries	0	0	0	0.0
Injury Rate per 25,000 VRM	0	0	0	0.0
Total Safety Events	0	0	0	0.0
Safety Event Rate per 25,000 VRM	0	0	0	0.0
Total Major Mechanical System Failures	5	2	1	2.7
Avg Miles between Major Mech Sys Failures	26,406	69,035	152,314	82,585
Annual VRM	132,028	138,069	152,314	140,804

Source: CU Transit

Discussion

The Transit Safety Targets were first adopted in December 2020, so performance has not been reported in any prior plans. OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of the targets set by City Utilities Transit in their Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan. Changes in the targets are not anticipated for 2021. Reviewing previous data, injuries were up in 2018, but mechanical failures were down.

Transit Asset Management

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on December 20, 2018 (Reviewed by MoDOT in 2020 with no changes)

To maintain transit assets in a state of good repair.

50: Adopted Transit Asset Management Targets

MoDOT FY 2019 Targets		
Equipment: Non-revenue support-service and maintenance vehicles (exceeding $50k at purchase)		N/A
Rolling Stock		
Automobiles, Minivans, Vans	8 Years Useful Life	45%
Cutaways	10 Years Useful Life	45%
Buses	14 Years Useful Life	45%
Facilities		
Administrative, Passenger Stations (buildings), and Parking Facilities	30% with a condition rating below 3.0 on FTA's TERM Scale	
Maintenance Facilities	25% with a condition rating below 3.0 on FTA's TERM Scale	
Infrastructure		
Only rail fixed-guideway, track, signals and systems		N/A

Source: MoDOT

Baseline

51: Rolling Stock – Existing Inventory 2018

Asset Type	# of Units	FTA's ULB*	% > ULB	Target
Automobiles	29	8	2	45
Buses	35	14	30	45
Cutaways	641	10	15	45
Minivans	321	8	33	45
Vans	224	8	51	45

* ULB – Useful Life Benchmark

Source: MoDOT

52: Facilities – Current Condition (Based on TERM Rating Scale) 2018

Facility Type	# of Units	Average TERM Condition	% < 3.0 TERM Rating Scale	Target
Administration	19	4	0	30
Maintenance	10	4	0	25
Passenger	1	4	0	30

Source: MoDOT

53: FTA TERM Rating Scale

Rating	Condition	Description
5	Excellent	No visible defects, new or near new condition, may still be under warranty if applicable
4	Good	Good condition, but no longer new, may be slightly defective or deteriorated, but is overall functional
3	Adequate	Moderately deteriorated or defective, but has not exceeded useful life
2	Marginal	Defective or deteriorated in need of replacement, exceeded useful life
1	Poor	Critically damaged or in need of immediate repair, well past useful life

Source: MoDOT

Discussion

City Utilities has elected to participate in the statewide Transit Asset Management Plan. OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of the MoDOT TAM Plan targets. The targets for transit asset management have not changed since first set in 2018 and the baseline data is the same available data.

City Utilities has been working toward a spare reduction ratio plan, taking the number of fixed-route vehicles from 28 to 25. This target will be achieved once two new electric buses are placed into revenue service, and will result in the average age of the fixed-route fleet as 4.68 years. The average age of the paratransit fleet is 5.6 years, however two of the oldest buses are scheduled for replacement in FY 2022.

City Utilities has also made upgrades to their facilities since 2018, including upgrading the Transit Center dispatch area, adding chargers to the Bus Storage Building, and remodeling the Boonville Administration Building.

Infrastructure Condition

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on December 17, 2020

To maintain the highway infrastructure asset system in a state of good repair.

54: Adopted Infrastructure Targets


Performance Measure	2017 Baseline	2019 Statewide Target	2021 Statewide Target
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition	34.0	30.9	26.4
Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition	7.1	7.1	8.2
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition	77.5	N/A	77.5
Percentage of Pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition	61.1	61.1	61.1
Percentage of Pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition	0.1	N/A	0.0
Percentage of Pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition	1.0	1.0	1.0

Source: MoDOT


Discussion

When targets were first set for 2019 and incorporated into *Transportation Plan 2040*, data was not fully available to identify trends and fully set targets. Since then, a full set of data has been used to revise targets for 2021. The statewide target for percent of NHS bridges in good condition was revised, as was percent of bridges classified as poor was revised. Pavement targets remained the same. There are many challenges for MoDOT addressing these targets on a statewide basis, however, the increased focus on asset management should work toward addressing them.


OTO also tracks the condition of pavement on major roadways, as well as bridge condition, within the planning area. Preventative maintenance and other asset management projects are routinely programmed through the transportation improvement program.




Source: MoDOT




Source: MoDOT




Source: MoDOT




Source: MoDOT




Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT

System Reliability

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on December 17, 2020

To improve the efficiency of the surface transportation system.


63: Adopted Performance Targets

Performance Measure	2017 Baseline	2019 Statewide Target	2021 Statewide Target
Interstate Travel Time Reliability Measure: Percent of Person-Miles Traveled on the Interstate that are Reliable (NPMRDS)	91.6	88.9	87.1
Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability Measure: Percent of Person-Miles Traveled on the Non-Interstate NHS that are Reliable (NPMRDS)	92.3	N/A	87.8


Source: MoDOT

Discussion

OTO has agreed to plan and program in support of the MoDOT targets for system reliability. These targets were not revised between first adoption and the review for 2021. The Traffic Incident Management committee, through implementation of their Strategic Plan, works to improve detection, response, and clearing of traffic incidents so that traffic flow may be restored as safely and quickly as possible. This is also monitored through the Traffic Management Center of the Ozarks, a partnership between MoDOT and the City of Springfield. Efforts to improve roadway safety, as discussed, are also important to maintaining reliability.



Source: MoDOT



Source: MoDOT

Freight Movement and Economic Vitality

To improve the national freight network, strengthen the ability of rural communities to access national and international trade markets, and support regional economic development.


66: Adopted Freight Reliability Targets

Performance Measure	2017 Baseline	2019 Statewide Target	2021 Statewide Target
Freight Reliability Measure: Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index (NPMRDS)	1.25	1.28	1.45

Source: MoDOT

Discussion

This target was revisited for 2021 and revised with a target of 1.30 versus 1.45. As with reliability on the interstate and NHS routes, the work of the TIM committee and TMC, as well as safety efforts, are important to maintaining a reliable transportation system, including the movement of truck traffic.



Source: MoDOT

OTO-Defined Performance Measures

OTO adopted regional, non-federally required performance measures in its long range transportation plan, Journey 2035, adopted in December 2011. These same regional performance measures were carried into Transportation Plan 2040. Once adopted, OTO began producing an annual performance measures report and infographic, which are now collectively known as the State of Transportation Report.

The 11 measures first adopted in *Journey 2035* were selected partially because that is what could be measured with the data available. Since then, the amount of information available through MoDOT and other sources has grown considerably. OTO is in the process of developing online dashboards that can continually monitor and update many aspects of the transportation system. This is demonstrated through the sophistication of the OTO prioritization process.

While several of the original performance measures are still relevant in their current form, others have evolved to better demonstrate changes throughout the system. It is recommended that OTO continues to explore the best ways to display this information for public consumption, while still developing a state of transportation report discussing these benchmarks. It is also recommended that this information be reviewed for new targets beyond those federally-required for federal-aid highways and public transportation.

OTO Performance Measures

Vehicle Miles Traveled per Capita

- That VMT per Capita will grow no more than 5 percent from its peak in 2004, at a value of 19, by 2035. Growth should be captured in other modes

Modal Balance

- Decrease “Drove Alone” to 75 percent for the region by 2035

Bicycle/Pedestrian Network Completion

- If, on average, 4 miles of sidewalk are added each year within the OTO area, but no new roadways, by 2035, the total percent of roadways with sidewalks would be 33.5
- That 80 miles of the trail network be completed by 2035

Total Disabling Injury and Fatal Crashes per Million Vehicle Miles Traveled

- That disabling injury and fatal crashes/MVMT will continue a downward trend as shown in the above graphic

On-Time Performance of Transit System

- The CU service standard is 90 percent. The system will be considered to have acceptable on-time performance at this 90 percent level

Percent of Housing Units within ¼-mile of a Bus Route

- That the percent of housing units within the CU Transit service area and the OTO area within ¼-mile of a bus route is on the upward trend between now and 2035

Average Commute Time

- Keep the average commute time less than 25 minutes by 2035

Peak Travel Time

- That less than 20 percent of the OTO area roadways will be severely delayed

Percent of Roadways in Good Condition

- That 85 percent or more of the Major Roads in the OTO region are in Good condition

Bridge Condition

- That the percent of bridges in fair or better condition will stay above 90 percent

Ozone Levels

- That the region will be able to demonstrate transportation conformity for its plans, programs, and projects

3 Environmental and Cultural Considerations

The Ozarks is known for the quality of its natural environment, as well as its plethora of cultural and historic resources. The transportation system should strive to protect and enhance these features.

OTO maintains EnviroSmart, an environment- and hazard-based geodatabase against which projects can be compared, noting those that could require additional attention during the environmental review process. This database includes both natural and environmental justice related elements, developed in consultation with Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri State Parks and the State Historic Preservation Office, Missouri Spatial Data Information Service, and MoDOT, with additional resources from EPA, US Census, and US Department of Transportation. This information is maintained in-house to preserve sensitive areas. This was a recommendation in *Transportation Plan 2040* and is also used to identify projects in the TIP that impact environmental justice areas.

Executive Order on Equity

Equity can be defined as "the consistent and systematic fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals, including individuals who belong to underserved communities that have been denied such treatment."


Underserved communities can be defined as "populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied the full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life."

Natural Resources

Ecoregions

The Ozarks Transportation Organization planning area can be divided into two ecoregions. The majority of the region is covered by the Springfield Plateau, while a portion of the OTO in Christian County is covered by the White River Hills. Ecoregions denote areas of general similarity in ecosystems and in the type, quality, and quantity of environmental resources. They are designed to serve as a spatial framework for the research, assessment, management, and

68: OTO Ecoregions



Source: Environmental Protection Agency

monitoring of ecosystems and ecosystem components. The Springfield Plateau and White River Hills are part of the Ozark Highlands. The Ozark Highlands is characterized by an irregular physiography, forested areas, and limestone bedrock. The Springfield Plateau has moderate topography with karst features and rocky soils. Land cover is a mix of woodland and areas of pastureland in the cleared prairies. Bicyclists throughout the region benefit from the relatively flat nature of the Springfield Plateau. The White River Hills has more extreme topography and is characterized by cliffs, sinkholes, and caves. Much of the land is wooded and is in public lands.

Endangered Species

The Missouri Department of Conservation has identified terrestrial, aquatic, and plant species as endangered within the State of Missouri. Several of these are also listed as either endangered or threatened at the federal level. Christian and Greene County both have several of these species, as well as some species unique to each county.

Christian County

Peregrine Falcon

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Neosho Madtom

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Eastern Spotted Skunk

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Gray Myotis (Gray Bat)

- Endangered (state and US Fish and Wildlife)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Indiana Myotis

- Endangered (state and US Fish and Wildlife)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Missouri Bladderpod

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Western Prairie Fringed Orchid

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Greene County

Bachman's Sparrow

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Least Tern

- Endangered (state and federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Northern Harrier

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Peregrine Falcon

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Ozark Cavefish

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (US Fish and Wildlife)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Eastern Spotted Skunk

- Endangered (state)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Gray Myotis (Gray Bat)

- Endangered (state and US Fish and Wildlife)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Geocarpon (Earth Fruit; Tiny Tim)

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (US Fish and Wildlife)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Missouri Bladderpod

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Western Prairie Fringed Orchid

- Endangered (state)
- Threatened (federal)
- Species of Conservation Concern

Conservation Areas

Conservation areas are lands the Missouri Department of Conservation owns or manages for conservation and public use. No Christian County conservation areas are within the OTO boundaries, though there are several in Greene:

- Valley Water Mill Lake
- Springfield Conservation Nature Center
- Joe Crighton Access
- Tailwaters Access
- Lake Springfield
- Fellows Lake

Air Quality

Air quality throughout the region is regulated through the Clean Air Act, which was last amended in 1990. The Clean Air Act and its Amendments requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. When areas exceed the levels set by these standards, they are considered non-attainment. The 7 regulated pollutants include:

- Carbon Monoxide
- Lead
- Nitrogen Dioxide
- Particulate Matter (PM10)

- Particulate Matter (PM2.5)
- Sulfur Dioxide
- Ozone

If these standards are not met, then an area become known as non-attainment. Should an area come back into attainment, then they are on a 20-year maintenance plan, during which time, the area must continue to stay in attainment, or the process starts all over. Currently, no part of the OTO region is non-attainment for any of these pollutants.

Ozone and PM2.5

Ozone and PM2.5 are two pollutants that are impacted by mobile emissions. Ground-level ozone is the byproduct of several pollutants (NOx and VOCs) reacting with heat, especially over the course of the day. Particulate matter is the term for a mixture of solid particles and liquid droplets found in the air. Fine particulate matter is the main cause behind haze in parts of the United States. Sources include emissions from power plants, industry, and automobiles.

Ozarks Clean Air Alliance

OTO was a founding member of the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance and has held several leadership positions within the organization. The Ozarks Clean Air Alliance currently serves an eleven-county region. OCAA started in 2007 as a subcommittee of the Environmental Collaborative at the Community Partnership of the Ozarks. The group has grown into an active coalition of stakeholders including city, county, and state government officials, local businesses and non-profits, area utility companies, and interested citizens.

Clean Air Action Plan

The Clean Air Action Plan was first adopted in 2009 and originally only addressed ground-level ozone pollutant concerns. Over time, the plan and efforts of the OCAA have grown to include fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). The Clean Air Action Plan now serves as the Path Forward Document for the Ozone and PM Advance Programs through EPA.

The Advance Program is a collaborative effort between EPA, states, tribes, and local governments. The program encourages reductions in ozone and fine particulate matter attainment areas to help these areas meet the NAAQS. The goal is to help keep these areas in attainment.


Transportation Conformity

Violating Ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ limits can impose additional requirements upon a metropolitan planning area within a non-attainment area. These requirements are known as transportation conformity. This means that the projects proposed in an MPO's long range transportation program, as well as those programmed in the transportation improvement program, must help keep the region within attainment. OTO is not currently required to make a conformity determination.

Conformity is established by a regional emissions analysis, which determines if projected emissions for the Plan and TIP exceed emissions limits established by a State Implementation Plan (SIP). A SIP contains region-specific information and goals on appropriate emissions levels that will keep a region in attainment. The regional emissions analysis must be conducted following a process established by EPA. This includes providing data produced by the OTO travel demand model, which meets the requirements for air quality analysis, if required. When finalized, the conformity determination shows that the total emissions projected for the long range transportation plan or TIP are within the on-road mobile source emission limits established by the SIP. Transportation conformity is a public process that must include interagency consultation.

Staying in attainment is ideal for the OTO region. If OTO were to be non-attainment, the LRTP and TIP must be updated more frequently, and some TIP amendments could trigger a conformity analysis. Also, the initial conformity determination timeframe is considerably short.


Meeting the Standards



Ozone Design Value Trends in the Springfield, MO Area from 2003 to 2020. One line represents the evolving EPA NAAQ standards, which can be used for comparison with the actual measured values from Hillcrest High School and Fellows Lake. Ozone concentration is measured in parts per billion (ppb).

Source: Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Even as the standard for Ozone becomes stricter, the OTO region has continued to meet it. The Springfield area has 2 Ozone monitors, one at Fellows Lake and one at Hillcrest High School.



Fine Particulate Matter ($PM_{2.5}$) Design Value Trends in the Springfield, MO Area from 2003 to 2020. One line represents the evolving EPA NAAQ standards, which can be used for comparison with the actual measured values from Hillcrest High School and MSU. Gaps in the data exist due to certification of data when monitors are moved. $PM_{2.5}$ concentration is measured in micrograms per cubic meter ($\mu g/m^3$).
Source: Missouri Department of Natural Resources

Similar results have been seen with fine particulate matter.

Water Quality

According to the Victoria Transport Policy Institute, roads and parking facilities concentrate stormwater, increase flooding and siltation, reduce surface and groundwater recharge, and create physical barriers to fish. Manholes in the roadway can also be a source of infiltration for stormwater into the sewer system.

The Missouri Department of Transportation and local OTO jurisdictions are mindful of requirements to protect water quality during roadway construction. Ozark Greenways has piloted efforts to use trail easements along waterways for riparian corridors, also providing education to farmers on the impacts of cattle in the waterways.

OTO member jurisdictions do need to be aware of impacts from the evolving Waters of the United States rulemaking that is currently underway. This intends to restore the 2015 WOTUS implementation and develops a new rule to establish a durable definition of "waters of the United States."

Resiliency

Resilience in transportation can also be referred to as reliability or risk management and considers the transportation network's ability to adapt to unexpected conditions without catastrophically failing. This includes extreme weather events, as well as daily traffic fluctuations caused by construction and crashes.

Flooding is a major concern along roadways in the OTO area. There have been a number of events that have damaged roadways and necessitated repair as rainfall increases. Flooding has also highlighted those locations lacking alternate routes. Unfortunately, flooding issues can be transient depending upon where the rain falls within the watershed.

The OTO Traffic Incident Management subcommittee considers strategies to help the region respond when unexpected events impact the movement of traffic, such as incident response, using ITS and dynamic message signs, and specialized signal timing plans.

Environmental Mitigation Strategies

Mitigation can take several forms. There are strategies to address natural hazards and strategies to address hazards caused by transportation activities such as construction projects and users of the roadway network. OTO staff served as a member of the Christian County stakeholder committee for their 2020 update.

Natural Hazard Mitigation

Both Christian and Greene Counties have natural hazard mitigation plans. Strategies that relate to the transportation network and safety of roadway users includes:

- Install, replace, and maintain low water crossing markings and gauges
- Enforce floodplain management requirements
- Work with regulatory agencies to obtain appropriate permits to maintain waterways in order to reduce impact of flooding
- Enhance strategies and coordinate with utility providers to manage encroachment of vegetation in easements and rights-of-way
- Plan for and maintain adequate snow and debris clearing capabilities
- Replace and improve low water crossings where identified as effective
- Continue coordination to promote infrastructure development practices that reduce damage from flooding

- Continue to monitor and identify funding from state and federal programs for hazard mitigation activities
- Obtain more accurate mapping information on faults, lineaments and fissures that could be areas of rapid contamination and develop a more extensive map of underground water transfer (groundwater trace) points and recharge areas for important springs in Greene County
- Complete identified City of Springfield & Greene County Capital Improvement Projects
- Use technical knowledge of natural ecosystems to link natural resource management and land use organizations to mitigation activities and technical assistance
- Continue to maintain the current flood mitigation plan used within the core area of the City of Republic and develop a program of flood mitigation for the former Village of Brookline using FEMA guidelines
- Reduce the vulnerability of flooding damage to existing private and public structures
- Promote an effective flow of traffic on intersection of ZZ Highway and Hines Street with adequate visibility and signaled turning
- Promote an effective flow of traffic on intersection M Highway and Republic High School access with adequate visibility and signaled turning
- Obtain LIDAR imaging over the entire unincorporated county and use the LIDAR information to more accurately assess the location, size and stability of existing sinkholes

Transportation-Related Mitigation Activities

All agencies that implement transportation improvements and maintain the system have an environmental responsibility regarding the impact of that system. MoDOT undertakes a variety of environmental mitigation activities and through the management of local public agency projects, monitor's this at the local implementation level, as well. As stated in the MoDOT statewide long range transportation plan:

"MoDOT has taken action to link environmental and transportation planning. MoDOT partners with a variety of state and federal environmental resource agencies including the Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Missouri Department of Conservation, Missouri State Historic Preservation Office, Missouri State Emergency Management Agency, Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to maintain, or assist one of these agencies in maintaining an inventory of environmental and historic resources in the state. This partnership helps transportation decision makers avoid or minimize impacts to resources early in project planning. Further, MoDOT meets as needed with these agencies to seek their input on transportation needs as they are being evaluated and scoped and to partner in the environmental studies and permitting for planned projects.

"MoDOT also uses environmentally friendly construction methods to deliver projects that limit the impact of our transportation system on the natural and human environment. MoDOT has a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to assist with the design, implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment control measures on construction projects as well as maintenance operations. It is MoDOT's responsibility to implement control measures to minimize the release of sediment and pollutants into nearby waterways. Discharges from MoDOT operations are regulated under a general land disturbance permit from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources. MoDOT is committed to protecting the environment through implementation of best management practices to maintain water quality. Similarly, MoDOT takes actions to reduce its carbon footprint by implementing changes that increase the miles-per-gallon rating of MoDOT fleet vehicles and to reduce energy usage at our facilities.

"Moving forward, MoDOT will continue to research and implement new techniques, products and technologies that will help them get even better at keeping the environment clean and protect cultural resources. MoDOT will follow its TS4 (Transportation Separate Stormwater Sewer System) permit requirements and will continue to collaborate with municipalities in meeting their MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems) requirements. MoDOT will build upon and strengthen its partnerships with natural resource agencies to make even better transportation decisions that limit the impact to the environment. Further, MoDOT is committed to expanding the use of recycled materials in its construction projects and supporting non-motorized travel options. Finally, MoDOT will seek out new strategies to reduce our energy consumption and carbon footprint."

Policy decisions, as contained throughout *Destination 2045*, can also mitigate negative environmental impacts:

- Complete streets
- Connected trails
- Enhanced transit
- Electric vehicles
- Transportation options
- Increased network efficiencies
- Traffic management
- Travel demand management
- Clean Air Action Plan Implementation

It is recommended in this plan that OTO continue to develop its EnviroSmart geodatabase, participate in the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance and the Let's Go Smart Transportation Collaborative, and support programs and policies which implement a multi-modal, efficient transportation system.

Cultural and Historical Resources

Items of cultural significance in the region include religious facilities, cemeteries, historical facilities, airports, public and private schools, universities, and local markets. Besides those items on the National Register Listings, Route 66 has a strong presence through the OTO region. Route 66 received its name at the former Historic Colonial Hotel in downtown Springfield. Route 66 travels from Strafford at the east OTO boundary, through Springfield, and out west from there.

Christian County National Register Listings

Ozark Courthouse Square Historic District

- Portions of 2nd Ave, Church, Elm, and 2nd Streets, on the Courthouse Square in Ozark
- The Courthouse is a Classic Revival designed by H. H. Hohenschild
- The buildings on the square were constructed between 1880 and 1945

Smallin Cave Historic District

- 3575 N. Smallin Road, Ozark

Southwest Missouri Prehistoric Rock Shelter and Cave Sites Discontiguous Archeological District

- Address restricted
- Cave sites with prehistoric human occupations, circa 12,000 – 250 B.P.

Wilson's Creek National Battlefield

- Southwest of Springfield on MO ZZ
- The Battlefield includes virtually the entire scene of action of the Battle of Wilson's Creek in 1861.

Greene County National Historic Register Listings

- Abou Ben Adhem Shrine Mosque
- Ambassador Apartments
- Anderson, Elijah Teague, House
- Bailey School
- Bentley House
- Benton Avenue AME Church
- Berry Cemetery
- Beverly Apartments
- Boegel and Hine Flour Mill-Wommack Mill
- Boone, Nathan, House, Nathan Boone Homestead State Historic Site
- Camp Manor Apartments
- Campbell Avenue Historic District
- Christ Episcopal Church
- College Apartments
- Commercial Street Historic District
- Day House
- Fallin Brothers Building
- Finkbiner Building

- Franklin Springfield Motor Co. Building
- Gillioz Theater
- Gilmore Barn
- Gottfried Furniture Co. Building
- Greene County Courthouse
- Heer's Department Store
- Heercleff
- Holland Building
- Hotel Sansone
- Jefferson Street Footbridge
- Keet-McElhany House
- King, J.E., Manufacturing Co.
- Kite, Robert B. and Vitae A., Apartment Building
- Landers Theater
- Lincoln School
- McDaniel Building
- Marquette Hotel
- Marx-Hurlburt Building
- Mid-Town Historic District
- Netter-Ullman Building
- Oberman, D. M., Manufacturing Co. Building,
- Old Calaboose (Old Springfield City Jail)
- Palace Hotel
- Pearl Apartments and Windsor Apartments
- Pearson Creek Archaeological District
- Producers Ice and Manufacturing Company
- Producers Produce Co. Plant
- Pythian Home of Missouri
- Rail Haven Motel
- Rock Fountain Court Historic District
- Route 66 Steak 'n Shake
- St. John's Mercy Hospital Building
- St. Paul Block
- Schneider, Henry, Building
- South Avenue Commercial Historic District
- South-McDaniel-Patton Commercial Historic District
- Springfield Furniture Co.
- Springfield Grocer Co. Warehouse
- Springfield National Cemetery
- Springfield Public Square Historic District
- Springfield Seed Co. Office and Wholesale Building
- Springfield Warehouse and Industrial Historic District
- Stone Chapel, Drury College Campus
- Trail of Tears Roadbed Segment on Josiah Danforth Farm
- U.S. Customhouse and Post Office
- Walnut Street Historic Commercial District
- Walnut Street Historic District
- Washington Avenue Baptist Church (Second Baptist Church)
- West Walnut Street Commercial Historic District
- Wilhoit, E. M., Building
- Wilhoit, Edward M. and Della C., House
- Wilshire Apartments
- Wilson's Creek National Battlefield
- Wise Feed Co. Building
- Woods-Evertz Stove Co. Historic District

Environmental Justice

Environmental justice is a fundamental ideal that ensures federally funded plans and projects do not create a disproportionately adverse effect on minorities, low-income, disabled, elderly and/or under age 18 populations. This ideal is built on the framework of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which states, "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." In 1994, President Clinton issued an Executive Order directed to all Federal agencies to consider and address the effects of all programs, policies, and activities on "minority and low-income populations." This has been further expanded to include the elderly, disabled, and the under 18-years of age populations. President Bush signed an Executive Order in 2000, expanding protection against national origin discrimination, by ensuring programs are accessible by people with limited English proficiency.

Federally funded recipients are to ensure that there are no disproportionate adverse impacts in these communities, or those considered transportation dependent due to age or physical limitations, when allocating or spending federal funds. These recipients are also required to review the benefits and burdens of projects and programs (in this case, transportation improvements) are balanced between the population at large and those traditionally underserved in the planning and programming process.

While it is difficult to make any significant change to the transportation system without negatively affecting someone, the focus of environmental justice is on these impacts and alternative solutions. Any major transportation system change should first consider whether society will be better off with the change, and second, determine the distributional impacts. The first consideration addresses the economic efficiency of a project; that is benefit-cost analysis. The second addresses the equity of who will receive more of the benefits and who will pay more of the costs. This question of equity is the concern of environmental justice. If it is determined that a project negatively impacts a population, the project can be rejected, or the population impacted can be compensated. Should a project still move forward, attempts should be made to minimize the negative impacts.

Analysis


Through the process of planning and programming projects, minority and low-income populations are both highlighted and given additional weighting to ensure that the investment is directed toward areas that include disadvantaged populations. These populations are determined using a GIS-map based analysis to locate both minority and low-income populations. This information is used here in the long-range transportation plan and the transportation improvement plan.

Projects which are located where these populations are represented received weight in the project prioritization process that developed the fiscally constrained list.


In addition to minority and low-income populations, *Destination 2045* further identifies Hispanic, disabled, elderly, youth, and limited English proficiency populations within the OTO region. Federal guidance identifies significant areas as those which contain more of the vulnerable population than the average for the region. The location of these populations has been mapped against the location of the constrained projects included *Destination 2045*.

OTO has implemented a technique to more precisely locate minority and low-income population. These hexbins are used to score potential constrained projects for both of these populations. The hexbins for these two categories are symbolized based on the OTO average. The remaining maps in this section use block groups and are symbolized based on the average for Christian and Greene Counties combined. OTO is planning to further develop this hexbin technique for

71: Minorities in the OTO Area



72: Hispanics in Christian and Greene Counties



additional populations and use in future equity analyses.

Minority and Hispanic


Springfield has the strongest presence of minorities compared to other jurisdictions in the region, although each community besides Willard has levels higher than the OTO average. In reviewing Hispanic populations, each community has a presence greater than the two-county average, except Strafford.

This demonstrates the importance of region-wide outreach for transportation project input.


Limited English Proficiency

OTO adopted an updated Limited English Proficiency Plan in May 2021. "Individuals who have a limited ability to read, write, speak, or understand English are limited English proficient, or 'LEP.'" Overall, over 3,100 individuals in the OTO region speak English less than "very well." Over 15,200 people live in a home where English is not the dominate language spoken. Spanish is the primary language spoken other than English in LEP households. Other languages include Chinese, Vietnamese, and German from among Amish and Mennonite populations.

73: Limited English Proficiency Populations in Christian and Greene Counties



74: Spanish LEP Populations in Christian and Greene Counties




As the OTO constrained project list has projects throughout the region and in each community, it is important that these populations be considered in scoping and public input as they move forward for programming and construction.

Low Income and Disabled


Low-income populations are more concentrated in Springfield. This is also the primary location for support services and fixed-route transit. While OATS service is available in the surrounding area, it does not provide daily usage. It is important to note that there are zero car households where fixed route transit service is unavailable. These areas correspond to locations of disabled populations as well. It is important that OTO ensure there are options available for all transportation system users. It is also important for OTO members to ensure services are accessible in a variety of locations to limit the transportation burden in seeking those services.

In 2018, OTO worked with City Utilities Transit to develop a transit accessibility origin/destination analysis. This analysis developed an interactive tool that can be filtered to show the quality of access different populations have to transit and potential destinations. Though transit

75: Population Below Poverty in the OTO Area



76: Zero Car Households in Christian and Greene Counties




service changes are often seen as a trade-off between coverage and frequency, increased headways can make transit more accessible to a larger geography.

OTO's regional trail plan also provides longer distance travel options that are safe and direct.

It is important that projects in these identified areas, as well as throughout the region, don't introduce pedestrian barriers and enhance safe connections across and along high-volume corridors. As OTO's communities implement their ADA transition plans, these areas should be prioritized for improvement to ensure benefits are maximized sooner.


77: Disabled Population in Christian and Greene Counties




Youth and Elderly

The elderly and youth populations in the region are not generally co-located. The elderly population is more concentrated along the eastern portion of Greene County, while the youth population resides mostly in western Greene County and in Christian County. It is important that projects support school transportation as well as access to services important to both of these age groups. Of note is the stronger location of these populations within unincorporated areas, which also affects available of services, shopping, and additional transportation options.

78: Population Under 18 in
Christian and Greene Counties



79: Population Over 65 in
Christian and Greene Counties



4 Public Engagement


The public engagement process for developing *Destination 2045* was a series of active and passive input activities. These included visioning workshops and an online survey that was available in both English and Spanish. The City of Springfield was also in the midst of launching their public involvement campaign for *Forward SGF*, the next Springfield Comprehensive Plan. As these very large and involved public workshops coincided with OTO's own public involvement efforts, OTO staff participated and used these opportunities as another source of input. Other OTO member communities had also just concluded their comprehensive plans or were in development. OTO also gathered reports from these activities and shared the strategies and actions of these plans during the *Destination 2045* goal development process.


Visioning

A visioning workshop for the Board of Directors was held on January 30, 2020, and the Technical Planning Committee on February 5, 2020. The full results of these workshops can be found in Appendix 4, but they are also summarized here.

Both the Board and TPC workshops followed the same format. Each workshop started by asking members to participate in a word cloud answering the question, "Using one word, what will the transportation system look like in 2045?" The larger the word, the more often it was submitted by members. Words that stand out relate to automated and electric vehicles.

80: Visioning Word Clouds





Here are the results when the results from both workshops are combined:

Rank	Category
1	Autonomous
2	Connected/Intelligent
3	Electric
3	Efficient
5	Walkable/Active
5	Multimodal
7	Transit
7	Safe
9	Congested

There was also a variety of alternative/forward looking transportation suggestions, including personal rapid transit, drones, flying, hyperloop, and micro-mobility options such as scooters and Segways.

The word cloud exercise was followed by a presentation on current and future conditions around the region, and then the attendees were asked a series of questions to help inform *Destination 2045's* vision. Each person was given the opportunity to share their answers to the questions and then the group voted to identify a most common or important theme among the answers.

Where are we? What makes moving around the Ozarks great? What are the region's transportation strengths?

Top Board of Directors Answers:

Flow of traffic on highways	**7**
Partnerships/collaboration	6
Airport growth	1
Roads are well maintained	1
Springfield's grid layout	1

Top Technical Planning Committee Answers:

Connectivity	**5**
Growing trail system	**5**
Alternative routes	4
Engaged communities	2
Low travel times	2
Regional cooperation	2
Space to see and explore	2
Regional ITS	1
Suburban connection	1

Why can't we get there? What are the challenges facing the region today? What is the hardest part about getting around?

Top Board of Directors Answers:

Limited funding	**11**
Civic knowledge/education/driver's ed	4
Infrastructure waning	3
Lack of innovation and inclusiveness	1

Top Technical Planning Committee Answers:

Funding	**21**
Development	1
Gaps in connectivity	1
Land use patterns	1

Where are we going? If there were no obstacles, what would you like us to accomplish by 2045? What will the region be like in 20 years? What will help the region attract new residents, entrepreneurs, businesses, and development?

Top Board of Directors Answers:

Regional Transit System	**8**
Proactive decision making (now)	4
Diverging diamonds and roundabouts	2
Growing population and jobs	1
Innovative and inclusive culture	1
Leverage technology	1

Top Technical Planning Committee Answers:

Capacity improvements equaling growth	**3**
Increased drone deliveries	**3**
Multimodal connection to the rest of the nation	**3**
Additional lanes on freeways and expressways	2
Connected vehicle network/early adoption	2
Increased public-buy-in	2
Lowering drive times	2
Sustainable transportation funding sources	2
Connected modes	1
Connected trail system	1
Enhanced landscaping	1
Fully accessible sidewalk system	1

How can we get there? What opportunities should we use to our advantage? What actions are needed to ensure the region is strong and viable in the future?

Top Board of Directors Answers:

Education/Analysis/Forecasting	**7**
Increased funding	5
Collaboration/cost shares	1
Plan ahead for projects	1
Regional planning/branding	1

Top Technical Planning Committee Answers:

Sustainable long-term funding	**4**
Traffic impact fees and gas tax	**4**
Future looking laws and regulations	3
Aligned policies	2
Public education strategies	2
Use fees for all modes	2
Better land use planning for density	1
Continued regional collaboration	1
Expansion of trail system	1
Reduce regulatory constraints	1
Strong city identity	1
Utilizing funds efficiently	1

Survey

Promotion

The Visioning results informed the development of the survey. The survey was first made available in March 2020. As staff was preparing to share promotional materials with area libraries, locations were closing due to the threat of COVID-19. Shortly thereafter, stay-at-home orders were in effect. As it became clear COVID-19 would be a longer term situation, OTO looked for additional ways to promote the survey and generate interest outside of in-person events.

Following the OTO Public Participation Plan, the survey was promoted on the OTO website, through OTO's social media channels, and distributed via the OTO interested parties e-mail list. Both the Christian and Springfield-Greene County Library systems promoted the survey on their social media and the Springfield-Greene County Library included information in their email newsletter. OTO members were asked to share the survey with their own networks. The City of Nixa went one step further and provided notice to their utility customers. To further encourage survey participation, OTO boosted posts on Facebook and offered the chance to win a gift card to survey participants. Furthermore, OTO curated a mailing

list of 10,000 area residents, selected from a proportional geographic distribution, and provided a promotional postcard to these addresses.

Results

A total of 864 complete responses were received through QuestionPro.


If you had to pick just one transportation improvement to have done by 2045, what would it be?

Trails/sidewalks/bikes received a lot of representation, as does some combination of Kansas Extension/third connection between Christian and Greene Counties, Highways 14 and CC, and then Passenger Rail. This is consistent with the results of MoDOT long range plan six years ago. Other highlights include the freeways around the region.

Where are we? What makes moving around the Ozarks great? What are the region's transportation strengths? (Mark all that apply)

Scenery/Natural Environment came up as the top answer. Next higher answers were good travel times, trails, connectivity, good road conditions. Items not listed as a strength were transit, complete streets, and planning. The recognition of low travel times as a strength does not appear to be geographically dependent. The "Other" responses cite strengths such as the I-44/65/60/360 loop, continual improvements, and transportation for people with disabilities, though other responses say that there are no strengths and improvements are needed.


81: Survey Response - Strengths



Why can't we get there? What are the challenges facing the region today? What is the hardest part about getting around? (Mark all that apply)

First was Congestion, then distracted driving, Not Pedestrian Friendly, and Funding. Missouri does not have an all-ages texting ban. There appears to be a contradiction between a strength of low travel times and a weakness of congestion.

82: Survey Response – Challenges



When comparing strengths and challenges, several trends emerge. Those who think funding is an issue are also those that most appreciate the region's trails and scenery/natural environment, as well as low travel times. Those who most appreciate trails identify challenges such as not pedestrian friendly, congestion, and distracted driving. Those citing the challenge of congestion do partially correlate to the strength of low travel times, but not as strongly as scenery/natural environment, trails, good road conditions, and connectivity.

Many of the "Other" responses include that the region is not bicycle friendly, speeding, poor planning, lack of aesthetics and native plantings, few transportation options to Springfield, lack of ADA (transit and other accommodations) - especially in the surrounding areas.


Where are we going? If there were no obstacles, what would you like us to accomplish by 2045? What will the region be like in 20 years? What will help the region attract new residents, entrepreneurs, businesses, and development? (Mark all that apply)

First were regional, connected trails, then more complete streets, and lower drive times. The preference for mixed-use developments could relate to the desire for lower drive times. That also tied with more capacity and aesthetics.

MoDOT is updating its freight/rail plan, which includes Amtrak and the Missouri River Runner. This service does not apply to this region. The plan's focus is on maintaining the service which is taking all available resources. Hyperloop was also in the news while this survey was available, of which the proposed route is similar to the Amtrak service.

The desire for aesthetics is also channeling the comments from Forward SGF. If desired, these costs will need to be considered in the funding estimates of projects and while that may add to the cost, if that is a priority, then it should be included. Aesthetics as a preference does not seem to be obviously geographically-based. If anything, it ranked higher among those who split work and home between inside the MPO area and outside, irrespective of how that is split.

83: Survey Response – No-Obstacle Priorities




How can we get there? What opportunities should we use to our advantage? What actions are needed to ensure the region is strong and viable in the future? (Mark all that apply)

An expanded trail system received the most responses, but there are a number of answers that are close, including regional planning (not selected as a strength),

community engagement, sustainable long term funding, and increased funding. During the Board Visioning Workshop, there was a lot of discussion around civic education, which is reflected in the responses to this question.

It is noted that in these answers, there is no singular mandate and that perhaps the respondents recognize many things work together in concert.

84: Survey Response - Opportunities



Using one word, what will the transportation system look like in 2045?

The responses to this question have been loaded as typed into a word cloud generator, which produced a list of the most often mentioned words, excluding common words.

The top twenty-five terms, out of 420 counted, include:

1. Congested
2. Better
3. Efficient
4. More
5. Connect
6. Access
7. Electric
8. Busy
9. Same
10. Improved

85: Survey Response – 2045 Word Cloud

11. Autonomous
12. Different
13. Integrated
14. Multi
15. Automated
16. Streamlined
17. Crowded
18. Road
19. Green
20. Car
21. Trail
22. Faster
23. Friendly
24. Modal
25. Sustainable



How would you rate congestion in the region?


The survey included a series of questions about congestion, including the experience to work, from work, and for school/errands. These questions did miss asking what time of day these journeys typically happen. At the same time, the Census only asks about the journey TO work, so this was an effort to expand on that. The response to the OTO survey for congestion on the way to work, was that it is inconvenient, but doesn't last long, which was followed by a mild inconvenience. Over a fifth said it was not a problem.

In comparison, the journey home from work was still predominantly inconvenient, but doesn't last long, with mild inconvenience next, but serious and a parking lot did garner a higher response.

Congestion to/from school was also higher for serious congestion, though not dominant. It is recognized that school traffic can often be its own congestion, as well as part of a protracted PM peak.

For errands, congestion was a mild inconvenience, as well as inconvenient, but doesn't last long, with a combined percentage of more than 70%. Fewer respondents also selected serious issue.


86: Survey Response - Congestion



Transportation Funding

Another series of questions asked about transportation funding. First, in the short term, the majority thought funding should be somewhat or significantly increased. It is recognized that this does not match how the vote has gone statewide, but it does mirror support for local tax initiatives. A greater number of people thought funding should be increased in the long term.


87: Survey Response – Investment Levels



How would you allocate $100 of transportation funding among these categories?

Though the majority answered maintenance, nearly as many answered passenger rail, with significantly fewer dollars distributed to the other categories. Regarding passenger rail, would respondents be willing to pay $X amount for a ticket, or do they think it will just cost that much. Beyond these two, though, the next two are adding capacity and improving transit. Interestingly, only $9 of the $100 were allocated to bicycle and pedestrian improvements, while those have been a priority elsewhere. It could be a function of what the perceived costs are.

The takeaway here and based on the first question is that OTO needs to learn more about the desire for passenger rail.




Please rate your support for the following sources of additional funding for transportation.

For further analysis, the survey looked at support for various funding mechanisms. Generally, most funding types were not supported or required more information for a decision. Though a majority supported it, only 45% would support an increased gas tax. Consistently 20% are asking for more information, so any funding proposal should be accompanied by a good information campaign. A VMT tax is definitely not supported by survey respondents. Overwhelmingly, increased property taxes were not supported. TDDs and impact fees did receive some support.

Interestingly, about 75% supported an increase, but hardly 50% supported any one solution. The challenge is how to raise the funding when there is not consensus on the method.

89: Survey Response – Funding Preferences



If you own a bicycle, how do you use your bicycle?

Another set of questions asked about bicycling. Nearly 30% said they don't own a bicycle, but of those that do, the majority use it for recreation or exercise. Very few use it for transportation. Based on the "Other" answers, it appears very dependent on where people live and work.

In what Zip Code is your main job site located? What is your home Zip Code? What best describes your gender? Which range best matches your age? What best describes your race? Are you of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?


The survey then asks about home and work zip codes, as well as demographics. Respondents were evenly split between male and female, as well as among the age ranges, with a few less in the college ages. The majority of respondents were white, with a few of Hispanic origin.

Planning Committee


The OTO Technical Planning Committee served as the development committee for *Destination 2045*. The committee met almost exclusively over Zoom and meetings were livestreamed and monitored for public input on Facebook. Videos of the completed meetings were uploaded to OTO's YouTube account and shared on the *Destination 2045* webpage.

Interactive survey tools such as Mentimeter and QuestionPro were used to solicit additional input during and between meetings.

90: OTO *Destination 2045* Web Page



91: Mentimeter Example



5 Goal Development

The goals were a result of the public engagement and committee discussion process. In addition, *Transportation Plan 2040* goals and recommendations made in area comprehensive plans were referenced.

Destination 2045 Goals

1. Safe for all users on all modes
2. Asset management and fiscal responsibility
3. Connected, integrated, multi-modal system
4. Resilient and prepared for the future
5. Quality projects implementing best practices

Transportation Plan 2040 Goals

1. Support the economic vitality of the region
2. Encourage productive land use through consistency between planned growth, economic development patterns and transportation improvements
3. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for all users
4. Increase accessibility and mobility for all transportation modes
5. Improve connections within and between all modes of transportation
6. Encourage efficient system management and operations
7. Preserve the existing transportation system and monitor system performance
8. Maximize resources by promoting partnerships, collaboration, and good planning principles
9. Actively seek secure and reliable transportation funding
10. Provide education and advocacy for transportation
11. Protect and enhance the environment when planning for transportation improvements
12. Support the efficient movement of goods

Area Community Comp Plan Recommendations

Below is a selection of relevant and generalized recommendations pulled from area communities who have either adopted or developed that portion of their comprehensive plan.

Bike/Ped/Trail/Multi-Modal

- Provide connectivity between all parks, public open spaces, schools, and commercial districts
- Conserve high quality natural lands for use as passive parks such as an urban forest, mountain bike trails, or education walking trails

- Provide accommodation of multi-modal transport
- Adopt a Complete Street Ordinance
- Provide multi-modal transportation options that are accessible and reliable to users of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds
- Multi-modal connectivity – between activity centers and outwards to neighborhood centers
- Cohesive planning vision and investment – long term quality of parks, greenways, and open spaces
- Establish a comprehensive trails network to enhance physical connections between neighborhood's natural areas and key destinations
- Reduce carbon footprint and heat-island effect
- Support active and healthy lifestyles as well as increased accessibility to essential facilities for all socioeconomic groups, including by walking, biking, and public transit
- Modify zoning code to require new developments include a sidewalk connection to existing adjacent parkland
- Develop more pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure
- Capitalize on trails to encourage biking as a form of recreation
- Connect different forms of transportation into one network
- Create initiatives to improve walkability and bikeability by connecting to trails
- Connect neighborhoods to parks
- Neighborhood amenities- new public spaces, including trails

Aesthetics

- Establish character throughout the central business district through aesthetic enhancements such as lighting, streetscaping, decorative sidewalks, banners, and other beautifications
- Enhance community assets and support placemaking
- Create beautiful gateways and multi-modal corridors along major roadways enhanced with streetscaping elements
- Streetscaping and placemaking – pedestrian amenities, pocket parks, fountains, wayfinding, collaboration with local arts community
- Revise zoning/signage code to create exemptions and incentives for public art, including murals, sculptures, and decorative sidewalks
- As development occurs, identify sustainable opportunities for incorporating plantings and street furniture
- Preserve and enhance the downtown area

Funding

- Develop a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) that includes all transportation methods: roads, sidewalks, and trails
- Implement a dedicated funding source for parks and recreation and trail development

- Implement projects that are fiscally responsible
- Seek out new opportunities for funding and partnerships to improve and invest in the City's parks, recreational facilities, trails, greenways, and open space
- Develop financing tools to facilitate façade and streetscape improvements
- Establish a dedicated transportation sales tax to reduce obligations of general fund
- Advocate to state legislators to increase transportation funding at the state level
- Maximize resources and funding opportunities

Roadways/Operations

- Plan for expansion of the road network
- Ensure future development is compatible with the classification of adjoining streets
- Increase safety for all users of the transportation system
- Improve local traffic flow
- Improve the current road and sidewalk conditions
- Reduce traffic congestion

Development/Land Use

- Promote reinvestment in commercial corridors and gateways to improve their character, spur economic revitalization, and attract new businesses and industry
- Support new residential development in strategic locations to leverage the City's assets including greenways, neighborhood noes, and commercial corridors, and foster creative housing solutions
- Integrate transportation and land use
- Leverage the transportation network as an asset and impetus for economic development and tourism
- Identify and pursue potential easements or acquisitions that would increase connectedness of existing parkland to surrounding streets
- Coordinate signage along state-controlled routes with MoDOT
- Establish a coordinated wayfinding system within the community, including signage for major attractions at major intersections with sidewalks and trails



Part II

Where Are We Going?

6 Policy and Plan Recommendations

The goals outlined in *Destination 2045* require actionable strategies to ensure they are successfully achieved. Just as the goals set the vision based on public input and local planning efforts, the strategies are derived from the discussion and analysis surrounding the existing transportation planning environment and the future transportation outlook.

Beyond these strategies, the *Destination 2045* Investment Plan puts funding behind program and projects that will physically implement the same goals.

2045 Goals

Safe for all users on all modes

Asset management and fiscal responsibility

Connected, integrated, multi-modal system

Resilient and prepared for the future

Quality projects implementing best practices

A safe transportation system for all users on all modes

Implement actions outlined in the Traffic Incident Management Strategic Action Plan

- Regularly convene TIM meetings to identify incident response safety improvements
- Update TIM Strategic Plan as necessary

Support MoDOT Show-Me Zero (Strategic Highway Safety Plan) safety efforts

- Continue to prioritize improvements that improve safety
- Analyze bicycle and pedestrian crash locations to scope improvements
- Establish an interdisciplinary safety committee to lead organizational actions for incorporating safety into all transportation related functions
- Encourage members to adopt a Vision Zero (www.visionzeronetwork.org) approach to addressing transportation safety, including Complete Streets or Livable Streets
- Continue to participate in Missouri Coalition for Roadway Safety meetings and activities
- Educate member agencies on the significance of highway safety and how their agencies can contribute to a safer road system

Continue to improve accessibility for all modes

- Develop standards for multi-modal accessibility
- Identify improvements with the greatest benefits

Consider vulnerable road users and under-represented populations to ensure equity in transportation decision-making

- Continue to refine equity analysis tools available for project identification and prioritization in support of vulnerable road users and under-represented populations
- Continue to monitor transit accessibility to essential public services

Create a safety campaign

- Educate public on rules of the road for all users
- Provide safety information on safe driving behaviors
- Use SGF Yields as a regional model to promote pedestrian safety

Preserve existing transportation assets and promote fiscal responsibility

Set groundwork to successfully seek discretionary funding

- Develop a process for discretionary funding requests
- Utilize a website and other communication for centralized requests
- Anticipate federal funding priorities and develop ready-made analysis materials
- Support funding requests for all modes of transportation that fit within the regional vision
- Identify grant opportunities and use OTO staff to complete grant applications
- Identify and make application to federal discretionary programs

Seek opportunities for partnerships to fund, maintain, and enhance the transportation system

- Promote the use of traffic impact studies that ensure developers are sharing in the costs of growth
- Encourage participation in the statewide cost share program
- Partner with local agencies to make shared investments
- Use OTO staff to support streamlined project administration

Support additional funding for every transportation mode

- Continue to work with Missouri Public Transit Association to educate elected officials regarding the benefits of transit investment
- Continue to partner with MoDOT to identify unfunded needs
- Communicate unfunded needs to elected officials and the public
- Communicate funding shortfalls to elected officials and the public

- Educate public on transportation planning process

Ensure existing system stays in good condition

- Utilize MoDOT asset management plan and CU Transit asset management plan to ensure adequate investment in the transportation system
- Prioritize investments that maintain and prolong the useful life of the existing system
- Identify trail maintenance needs
- Continue to monitor ADA investment in the OTO communities

Monitor and report transportation system performance to inform decision-making

- Review performance measures and targets to best direct investment decisions
- Make investment decisions that support performance targets
- Continue to publish an annual report on the state of transportation in the OTO region

Connected, integrated, multi-modal system

Continue to implement actions outlined in OTO Transit Coordination Plan

- Update the Transit Coordination Plan and identify actions to enhance coordination
- Monitor implementation of the plan
- Implement a local 5310 administration program to ensure timely delivery of transit capital

Support transit programs that expand reverse commute possibilities and improve access to job centers

- Identify large employers and assess the need for transit service
- Identify transit service options for employment needs

Promote transportation demand management through vanpooling and employer-sponsored transportation services

- Identify large employers and provide information on transportation tax incentives
- Connect vanpool providers with employers

Develop a strategic plan to create desired transit service

- Survey the community to ascertain preference for coverage or frequency
- Continue to investigate integrated service between City Utilities Transit, Missouri State University, and OATS
- Work with the City of Springfield and City Utilities Transit to develop a high-frequency transit corridor

- Explore alternatives to fixed route bus transit, such as light rail, streetcar/trolley, micro transit
- Assess mobility as a service to supplement transit and other modes
- Explore options for regional transit service
- Conduct additional research on *Destination 2045* survey response regarding passenger rail and desire for inner-city versus inter-city transportation

Address connectivity gaps with all modes

- Identify connectivity gaps and provide a map for easy reference
- Develop projects that address connectivity gaps
- Identify sidewalk network gaps that support local connections to essential services and transit stops
- Develop multimodal unfunded needs list

Move toward a complete street network

- Ensure complete street design is incorporated into transportation improvement projects
- Promote neighborhood level connections and discourage gated communities that limit transportation connections

Implement *Towards a Regional Trail System*

- Monitor implementation through a dashboard
- Continue to make investments in the regional trail system as outlined in the adopted plan
- Develop projects that advance trail construction readiness
- Monitor funding available for investment in the regional trail system

Continue to provide support for Let's Go Smart

- Use Let's Go Smart website to communicate transportation options
- Participate in Let's Go Smart: Transportation Collaborative

Use Major Thoroughfare Plan to promote multi-modal improvements

- Using street typologies, develop an overlay plan that maximizes complete street investments
- Encourage construction of sidewalks on most roadways
- Implement access management to preserve roadway capacity and improve safety

Continue to implement actions and improvements outlined in the regional Intelligent Transportation System Architecture

- Support the efforts of the Transportation Management Center
- Support implementation of MoDOT's Transportation Systems Management and Operations (TSM&O) Program and Action Plan

- Maintain a list of investments needed to complete the ITS network
- Continue to invest in fiber connections to improve signal timing throughout the region

Continue to monitor congestion and travel time reliability on freeways, expressways, and primary arterials to ensure trips are not diverted to more minor roads

- Identify technology and data needs to better monitor congestion
- Use travel time and other congestion measures to ensure reliability
- Prioritize projects that improve congestion on the freeway system

Support statewide freight planning efforts

- Identify and find solutions to freight bottlenecks
- Serve on freight committees when available
- Continue to use the MoDOT Statewide Freight Plan to prioritize projects

Build a transportation system that supports a resilient region that is prepared for the future

Maintain Environmental Quality

- Continue to participate in the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance to monitor air quality levels and identify ways to maintain Ozone attainment
- Build environmental mitigation early into the project development process, developing a process to ensure early communication with MoDOT, FHWA, and the appropriate agencies

Review ways to develop resiliency to external factors, such as population and employment growth, weather events, and unexpected impacts like COVID-19

- Continue to use EnviroSmart, OTO's environmental database, to inform local project sponsors of environmental considerations in transportation projects
- Identify transportation facilities that are susceptible to flooding
- Support a connected grid network that allows for ease of alternate travel routing
- Promote investment decisions that direct growth near appropriate transportation facilities
- Prioritize projects that encourage job creation, retention, and wage growth
- Continue education of elected officials on the positive effects of local control of federal suballocated funding

Plan for Electric Vehicles, Automated Vehicles, Hyperloop, Drone Delivery, and Connected Vehicles

- Develop an electric vehicle charging infrastructure plan
- Monitor status of Alternative Fuel Corridors

- Work with the Transportation Management Center of the Ozarks to identify and implement technology to accommodate connected and automated vehicles
- Identify improvements supportive of automated vehicles
- Create a connected vehicle infrastructure plan that identifies infrastructure needs
- Monitor transportation technology advancements

Continue to implement the congestion management system

- Identify projects to improve signal timing, traffic bottlenecks, and capacity expansion needs
- Continue to make freeway and expressway investments that connect communities and maintain low commute times
- Support expansion of quality real-time traveler information

Build quality projects that implement best design and engineering practices

Develop attractive projects that add to quality of life in OTO communities

- Provide better project descriptions that include context sensitive solutions in the STIP prioritization process
- Develop standards to improve aesthetics of transportation projects
- Assist member communities with improving gateways to their cities and the region
- Continue to participate in MoDOT scoping and core team meetings

Explore best practices for complete street projects that are fiscally reasonable

- Use street typologies to better scope complete projects
- Sponsor training opportunities for members and partner trade organizations on complete street best practices and emerging trends

Support recommendations in area comprehensive plans

- Research and catalog recommendations in area plans for a more uniform regional approach
- Be a resource to members for implementation at the community-level

7 Investment Plan


Currently, the FAST Act has been extended via continuing resolution through September 2021. The bill to reauthorize surface transportation funding and programs is still a work in progress and could introduce changes to the existing programs and policies presently in effect. That said, each transportation reauthorization introduces and eliminates programs, adjusting funding along the way. MoDOT, City Utilities Transit, and the OTO have continued to receive funding that can implement local, regional, and statewide priorities. While there is uncertainty in the contents of a future funding bill, OTO is confident that funding will continue to be available. MoDOT regularly updates its Citizen's Guide to Transportation and partners with OTO to provide revenue and spending estimates each year.

Revenue Sources

State

Funding for the Missouri Department of Transportation consists of both federal and state revenue, as well as proceeds derived from the sale of bonds. The largest single source of transportation revenue for MoDOT is the federal 18.4-cents per gallon tax on gasoline and 24.4-cents per gallon tax on diesel fuel. Other sources include various taxes on tire, truck, and trailer sales, as well as heavy vehicle use. These highway user fees are deposited in the federal Highway Trust Fund and distributed to the states based on formulae prescribed by federal law through transportation funding acts. This revenue source also includes multi-modal and highway safety grants.

92: MoDOT Statewide Revenue (in millions)



The next largest source of MoDOT's transportation revenue is from the state fuel tax. Fuel taxes represent the state share of revenue received from the State's 17-cent per gallon tax on gasoline and diesel fuels which must be spent on highways and bridges. This revenue source also includes a 9-cent per gallon excise tax on aviation fuel which must be spent on airport projects. In July 2013, the state legislature

eliminated the state motor vehicle use tax and replaced it with the state motor vehicle sales tax, which directs a greater portion to local government agencies. In 2021, the state legislature passed a bill to incrementally increase the fuel tax to 29.5-cents per gallon, also increasing alternative fuel vehicle fees. The bill goes into effect in October of 2021 and potential revenue from this increase is included in the *Destination 2045* revenue projections.

MoDOT receives a portion of the state sales and use taxes paid upon the purchase or lease of motor vehicles. This revenue source also includes the sales tax paid on aviation fuel, which is dedicated to airport projects. In November 2004, Missouri voters passed Constitutional Amendment 3, which 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 state fiscal year 2009, the process of redirecting motor vehicle sales taxes to transportation was fully phased in and the rate of growth in this revenue source has slowed. Periodic reissuing of these bonds has continued to generate additional revenue. MoDOT intends to borrow another $500 million in each 2023 and 2026 with Amendment 3 revenues used for debt repayment.

Vehicle and driver licensing fees include the state share of revenue received from licensing motor vehicles and drivers. This revenue source also includes fees for railroad regulation which are dedicated to multi-modal programs. Similar to the motor fuel tax, the motor vehicle and driver licensing fees are not indexed to keep pace with inflation and there have been no annual registration fee increases since 1984.

The State General Revenue Fund provides approximately 1 to 2 percent of MoDOT's transportation revenue. This funding is appropriated by the Missouri General Assembly for multi-modal programs.

Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation

The Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation provides financial support to both public and private sponsors of eligible transportation projects and can assist financing any stage of the project's development. There are no federal share restrictions on the cost of the projects eligible to receive MTFC assistance. Any highway projects eligible for federal assistance under Title 23 of US Code and any transit capital project eligible for federal assistance under Title 49 if the US Code is eligible for MTFC assistance.

Statewide Transportation Assistance Revolving (STAR) Fund

Authorized by the Missouri General Assembly in 1997, the STAR fund 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.

Federal-Statewide

MoDOT receives federal funding that can be spent within the OTO region. A statewide funding distribution formula, which uses a variety of factors, depending on the purpose of funding, distributes this funding around the state. This funding distribution is detailed in the Planning Framework for Transportation Decision-Making, which was developed through a collaborative process between MoDOT and Missouri's metropolitan planning organizations and regional planning commissions.

Funding to Support the National Highway System

The NHPP provides support for the condition and performance of the National Highway System (NHS), for construction of new facilities on the NHS, and to ensure that investments of Federal-aid funds in highway construction are directed to support progress toward the achievement of performance targets established in a State's asset management plan for the NHS.

Flexible Transportation Funding

A long standing funding program, the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program is one of the most flexible funding sources available among Federal-aid highway funding programs. STBG promotes flexibility in state and local transportation decisions and provides flexible funding to best address state and local transportation needs. Missouri's required set-aside for pedestrian and bicycle activities has traditionally gone toward the implementation of the State ADA Transition Plan.

Safety

The Highway Safety Improvement Program requires a data-driven, strategic approach to improving highway safety on all public roads that focuses on performance, achieving a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads.

The Open Container Transfer Provision requires states to enact and enforce a law that prohibits the possession of any open alcohol beverage container, or the consumption of any alcoholic beverage, in the passenger area of any motor vehicle located on a public highway, or the right-of-way of a public highway, in the states. States, like Missouri, which fail to comply with these minimum requirements have a portion of their highway funds transferred into the State and Community Highway Safety Grant Program. This money may further be transferred into the State's Highway Safety Improvement Program.

HSIP projects will be selected from needs identified through MoDOT's Southwest District Safety Plan. That plan incorporates needs derived through a crash analysis of the region with proposed countermeasures prioritized with a cost/benefit ratio. Additional safety features may be determined and incorporated into projects

identified as needs in system improvement projects selected by OTO and its constituent members, if eligible for HSIP funds.

Federal - Special Programs

A number of unique funding programs appear with each transportation authorization bill. This includes funding that may be directly allocated to MoDOT through a formula, as well as funding that is discretionary and available to a variety of project sponsors. Described here are two of those discretionary programs as they currently exist.

Infrastructure for Rebuilding America (INFRA) Grant Program

The INFRA program provides dedicated, discretionary federal funding for projects that address critical issues facing our nation's highways and bridges. INFRA advances a pre-existing grant program established in the FAST Act of 2015 and utilizes updated criteria to evaluate projects to align them with national and regional economic vitality goals and to leverage additional non-federal funding. Additionally, the program promotes innovative safety solutions that will improve our transportation system. Grants are awarded by the USDOT through a competitive application process.

Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) Discretionary Grant Program

This program provides a unique opportunity for the DOT to invest in road, rail, transit and port projects that promise to achieve national objectives. Previously known as BUILD and TIGER Discretionary Grants, Congress has dedicated nearly $8.9 billion for twelve rounds of National Infrastructure Investments to fund projects that have a significant local or regional impact. The eligibility requirements of RAISE allow project sponsors at the State and local levels to obtain funding for multi-modal, multi-jurisdictional projects that are more difficult to support through traditional DOT programs.

Federal - Regional Suballocated

The Ozarks Transportation Organization is responsible for selecting projects within two federal revenue categories. This means that OTO is responsible for project selection, programming, reasonable progress, and the maintenance of fund balances for STBG-Urban and Transportation Alternative Program (STBG Set-Aside) funding categories.

STBG-Urban

STBG-Urban funding is a subcategory of the Surface Transportation Program consisting of funding that is directly suballocated to metropolitan planning areas with urbanized area populations over 200,000. The federal share for this funding is generally 80 percent, with some specific exceptions for certain Interstate and Safety projects. A variety of activities are eligible under this funding category provided the

funding is spent on roads federally functionally classified as collector or higher, excepting bridges not on federal-aid highways and carpool, biking, pedestrian walkway improvements and other transportation alternatives also not on federal-aid highways.

STBG-Set Aside (formerly TAP)

The STBG-Set Aside program encompasses all previously eligible projects under the former Transportation Alternatives Program. It encompasses Enhancements, Recreational Trails, and Safe Routes to School. Throughout OTO planning documents, this funding is still referred to as TAP funding.

Local

OTO's member jurisdictions receive revenue from a number of sources, including those dedicated to transportation. CART (County Aid Road Trust) funding is available to all OTO member jurisdictions, as it allows cities and counties to share in the state motor fuel tax revenues. This currently generates about $14 million a year for the region. All municipal members, excepting Strafford, have a transportation and/or capital improvements sales tax. Christian and Greene Counties also have property taxes that can be used for transportation, though only Greene County's is dedicated.

Additional local and/or private sources of funding include transportation development districts, transportation corporations, community improvement districts, transportation increment financing, and other examples of private-public partnerships.

Transit - Federal, State, and Local

Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program

The Urbanized Area Formula Grants (Section 5307) program provides grants to urbanized areas for public transportation capital, planning, job access and reverse commute projects, as well as operating expenses in certain circumstances, areas which operate a maximum of 100 buses in fixed-route service during peak hours.

Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities

The Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Grants (Section 5310) program is intended to enhance mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities by providing funds to serve the specials needs of transit-dependent populations beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services.

Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities

The Bus and Bus Facilities Grants (Section 5339) program provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities.

MO HealthNet

City Utilities Transit contracts with the Missouri Department of Social Services each fiscal year for 50 percent of the per trip cost to provide Missouri HealthNet (Medicaid) transportation trips to eligible paratransit passengers.

State Operating Funding

Each year, transit agencies around the state receive a distribution of Missouri General Revenue for operating assistance. This amount of funding has decreased substantially from the original application to the present day. This funding varies from year to year depending upon the State of Missouri budget.

Farebox

Each year, City Utilities receives bus passenger farebox revenue from the sales of bus passes and the cash farebox deposits.

Advertising

Advertisements are sold on buses, inside the fixed route buses, bus shelters with ad panels, and bus benches.

Utility Ratepayers

The City Utilities Customers for Electric, Gas, Water, and SpringNet provide the local match for public transportation in Springfield, Missouri. The net amount absorbed by the Utility customers varies from year to year based on the amount of budgeted expenditures for operations, maintenance, and capital expenditures.

Human Service Providers

FTA Section 5310 funding is competitively awarded on a regular basis to area Human Service Transportation providers. The 5310 awards are administered by MoDOT as set forth in an MOU and the Program Management Plan. The responsibility is on MoDOT to confirm financial capacity in administering these projects. As part of the application process and in executing vehicle purchase agreements with MoDOT, awardees are required to demonstrate financial capacity for both the match and the maintenance of any vehicle purchased. Sources for this funding depends upon the agency, but projects are not awarded to those agencies who cannot provide the requisite match.

Programmed Projects

The OTO has already identified funding and programmed projects for the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program. These are listed in Appendix 5, and all previously appeared in *Transportation Plan 2040*. The total cost of these projects is included in the constrained projects table and the FY 2022-2025 TIP projects are hereby incorporated via this reference.

Funding Projections

The funding projections carry through the end of the Plan timeframe of 2045. The OTO, as a singular organization, plans, programs, and authorizes improvement, expansion, or maintenance revenues, and receives an annual sub-allocation of Surface Transportation Program funds for capital, planning, or engineering improvements.

Several inflationary rates were used to develop estimates. MoDOT funding is inflated at 1 percent per year, consistent with their own projections and slow growth in fuel tax revenue. STBG suballocated funding has been inflated at 2 percent, consistent with past revenue growth in this specific program. Suballocated TAP funding has been periodically inflated by 2 percent every five years, based on the more limited growth seen within prior transportation bills. All transit funding is inflated at 2 percent, while CU Local Share is inflated at 1 percent. While conservative, the revenue projected for this plan is in-line with the overall projections found in *Transportation Plan 2040*. Initial year estimates were derived from MoDOT, City Utilities Transit, and the FAST Act, with the local match showing the minimum amount required for the federal-aid projects which can be afforded here.

Funding projections are time banded in accordance with federal transportation law and guidance. The first four years are in alignment with the FY 2022-2025 TIP, while also accounting for the additional anticipated funding from Missouri's newly passed fuel tax increase, and planned revenue produced by reissuing Amendment 3 bonds. The first ten years are required to be individually fiscally constrained, while the outer years can be time banded. OTO has split the outer years into two bands – 2032 to 2037 and 2038 to 2045. These various splits are color coded into the revenue estimates shown below.

Revenue Estimates through 2045

Revenue Directed to Roadway, Bicycle, Pedestrian, ITS, Operations, and Maintenance Projects

93: Non-Transit Revenue Estimates 2022-2045

	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
MoDOT Directed Revenue	$59,027,891	$76,779,044	$66,592,385	$54,751,931	$58,312,000
Cost Share Projected Revenue	$6,000,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
Suballocated STBG	$6,902,309	$7,040,356	$7,181,163	$7,324,786	$7,471,282
Suballocated TAP	$425,000	$425,000	$425,000	$425,000	$425,000
Local/Other	$25,795,423	$8,708,407	$1,901,541	$1,937,446	$1,974,070
TOTAL	$98,150,623	$94,452,807	$77,600,088	$65,939,163	$69,682,352

	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
MoDOT Directed Revenue	$55,390,100	$55,944,001	$56,503,441	$57,068,475	$57,639,160
Cost Share Projected Revenue	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
Suballocated STBG	$7,620,707	$7,773,121	$7,928,584	$8,087,156	$8,248,899
Suballocated TAP	$433,500	$433,500	$433,500	$433,500	$433,500
Local	$2,013,552	$2,051,655	$2,090,521	$2,130,164	$2,170,600
TOTAL	$66,957,859	$67,702,278	$68,456,046	$69,219,295	$69,992,159

	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036
MoDOT Directed Revenue	$58,215,552	$58,797,707	$59,385,684	$59,979,541	$60,579,337
Cost Share Projected Revenue	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
Suballocated STBG	$8,413,877	$8,582,154	$8,753,797	$8,928,873	$9,107,451
Suballocated TAP	$442,170	$442,170	$442,170	$442,170	$442,170
Local	$2,214,012	$2,256,081	$2,298,992	$2,342,761	$2,387,405
TOTAL	$70,785,610	$71,578,113	$72,380,643	$73,193,345	$74,016,362

	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041
MoDOT Directed Revenue	$61,185,130	$61,796,981	$62,414,951	$63,039,101	$63,669,492
Cost Share Projected Revenue	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000
Suballocated STBG	$9,289,600	$9,475,392	$9,664,900	$9,858,198	$10,055,361
Suballocated TAP	$451,013	$451,013	$451,013	$451,013	$451,013
Local	$2,435,153	$2,481,601	$2,528,978	$2,577,303	$2,626,594
TOTAL	$74,860,896	$75,704,987	$76,559,842	$77,425,614	$78,302,460

	2042	2043	2044	2045	TOTAL
MoDOT Directed Revenue	$64,306,187	$64,949,248	$65,598,741	$66,254,728	$1,468,180,809
Cost Share Projected Revenue	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$1,500,000	$40,500,000
Suballocated STBG	$10,256,469	$10,461,598	$10,670,830	$10,884,247	$209,981,107
Suballocated TAP	$460,033	$460,033	$460,033	$460,033	$10,598,547
Local	$2,679,125	$2,730,408	$2,782,716	$2,836,070	$85,950,577
TOTAL	$79,201,814	$80,101,287	$81,012,320	$81,935,078	$1,815,211,040

94: Transit Revenue Estimates 2022-2045

	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
FTA 5307	$2,755,075	$2,872,825	$2,866,486	$2,923,816	$2,982,292
FTA 5310	$307,843	$314,000	$320,280	$326,686	$333,220
FTA 5339	$292,904	$298,762	$3,304,738	$310,832	$317,049
City Utilities Local Share	$6,800,000	$7,000,000	$7,000,000	$9,500,000	$9,595,000
State of Missouri/Medicaid	$146,500	$146,500	$146,500	$146,500	$149,430
Other local agencies	$42,328	$43,175	$44,039	$44,919	$45,818
TOTAL	$10,344,650	$10,675,262	$13,682,043	$13,252,753	$13,422,808

	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
FTA 5307	$3,041,938	$3,102,777	$3,164,832	$3,228,129	$3,292,692
FTA 5310	$339,884	$346,682	$353,615	$360,688	$367,901
FTA 5339	$323,390	$329,857	$336,455	$343,184	$350,047
City Utilities Local Share	$9,690,950	$9,787,860	$9,885,738	$9,984,595	$10,084,441
State of Missouri/Medicaid	$149,430	$149,430	$149,430	$149,430	$152,419
Other local agencies	$46,734	$47,669	$48,622	$49,595	$50,586
TOTAL	$13,592,326	$13,764,274	$13,938,693	$14,115,621	$14,298,087

	2032	2033	2034	2035	2036
FTA 5307	$3,358,546	$3,425,716	$3,494,231	$3,564,115	$3,635,398
FTA 5310	$375,260	$382,765	$390,420	$398,228	$406,193
FTA 5339	$357,048	$364,189	$371,473	$378,902	$386,481
City Utilities Local Share	$10,185,286	$10,287,139	$10,390,010	$10,493,910	$10,598,849
State of Missouri/Medicaid	$152,419	$152,419	$152,419	$152,419	$155,467
Other local agencies	$51,598	$52,630	$53,683	$54,756	$55,852
TOTAL	$14,480,156	$14,664,858	$14,852,235	$15,042,331	$15,238,239

	2037	2038	2039	2040	2041
FTA 5307	$3,708,106	$3,782,268	$3,857,913	$3,935,071	$4,013,773
FTA 5310	$414,317	$422,603	$431,055	$439,676	$448,470
FTA 5339	$394,210	$402,094	$410,136	$418,339	$426,706
City Utilities Local Share	$10,704,838	$10,811,886	$10,920,005	$11,029,205	$11,139,497
State of Missouri/Medicaid	$155,467	$155,467	$155,467	$155,467	$158,576
Other local agencies	$56,969	$58,108	$59,270	$60,455	$61,665
TOTAL	$15,433,906	$15,632,426	$15,833,847	$16,038,214	$16,248,686

	2042	2043	2044	2045	TOTAL
FTA 5307	$4,094,048	$4,175,929	$4,259,448	$4,344,637	$83,880,061
FTA 5310	$457,439	$466,588	$475,920	$485,438	$9,365,172
FTA 5339	$435,240	$443,945	$452,824	$461,880	$11,910,684
City Utilities Local Share	$11,250,892	$11,363,401	$11,477,035	$11,591,805	$241,572,343
State of Missouri/Medicaid	$158,576	$158,576	$158,576	$158,576	$3,665,459
Other local agencies	$62,898	$64,156	$65,439	$66,748	$1,287,711
TOTAL	$16,459,094	$16,672,595	$16,889,241	$17,109,084	$351,681,431

Range of Alternatives

Funding through 2045 will be limited. For this reason, OTO has reviewed potential projects over that same time frame, so there is a realistic understanding of what can be accomplished. OTO solicits needs and projects from member jurisdictions and through the public input process. These projects are then subjected to a prioritization process. The list of prioritized projects is compared to the available funding amounts through 2045 and a constrained list of priority projects is selected.

Project Prioritization Process

To prioritize projects, the *Destination 2045* subcommittee developed a set of prioritization factors based on the plan goals. A glossary defining the criteria for points is included in Appendix 2.

95: Prioritization Points

Factor	Max Points
High Volume Corridors	8
Safety	40
Bike/Ped Safety	20
At-Grade RR Crossing	4
Multi-Modal	6
Environmental Justice	8
Current Congestion	15
Future Congestion	7
SW Freight Plan	2
Freight Traffic	4
Bridge Condition	6
Extending Life Cycle	4
Local Priority	15
TOTAL Points	**140**

2045 Goals

Safe for all users on all modes

Asset management and fiscal responsibility

Connected, integrated, multi-modal system

Resilient and prepared for the future

Quality projects implementing best practices

Constrained Project Lists

The long range transportation plan is required to contain a financial plan demonstrating how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented. OTO has identified funding for operations, maintenance, and plan implementation of federal-

aid highways and public transportation. As these funds are limited, the list below has been constrained to available funding. The financial plan presented in *Destination 2045* is required to be fiscally constrained by year for the first ten years and the outer years may reflect aggregate cost ranges.

Foremost, OTO has accounted for the FY 2022-2025 Transportation Improvement Program. The FY 2022-2025 TIP contains projects constrained in *Transportation Plan 2040* and has been fiscally constrained itself. The projects contained in the TIP can be found on the OTO website - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/what-we-do/transportation-improvement-program. A small amount of funding is available beyond what has been programmed in the TIP and that has been made available for projects that have yet to be programmed in this timeframe.

Next, OTO has considered those needs that require an annual investment through regular evaluation. The first few years of these programs have already been included in the FY 2022-2025 TIP, then an annual cost/investment plan has been estimated through 2045.

- ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail
- Signal Replacement
- Bridge Asset Management
- Safety Improvement
- Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement
- Minor Routes Pavement
- Intersection Operational Improvement
- ITS Operations and Management
- Operations and Maintenance – State and Local Systems
- Scoping
- Rail

Finally, identified projects have been prioritized as outlined above and assigned a year for construction, with estimated costs inflated to the relevant time frame. The following list has been organized by Route for ease of use. Public transportation projects have been identified in a separate table.

Fiscal Constraint for Roadway, Bicycle, Pedestrian, ITS, Operations, and Maintenance

96: Non-Transit Fiscal Constraint

	2022	2023	2024	2025
Prior Year Funding	$58,933,279	$9,928,368	$14,033,895	$36,308,850
Projected Funding	$98,150,623	$94,452,807	$77,600,088	$65,939,163
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($147,155,534)	($90,347,280)	($55,325,134)	($98,499,870)
Remaining Funding	$9,928,368	$14,033,895	$36,308,850	$3,748,143

	2026	2027	2028	2029
Prior Year Funding	$3,748,143	$1,294,578	$1,546,109	$993,414
Projected Funding	$69,682,352	$66,957,859	$67,702,278	$68,456,046
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($72,135,917)	($66,706,329)	($68,254,973)	($68,823,084)
Remaining Funding	$1,294,578	$1,546,109	$993,414	$626,376

	2030	2031	2032-2037	2038-2045
Prior Year Funding	$626,376	$880,852	$636,463	$23,063,788
Projected Funding	$69,219,295	$69,992,159	$436,814,970	$630,243,401
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($68,964,819)	($70,236,547)	($414,387,645)	($625,531,072)
Remaining Funding	$880,852	$636,463	$23,063,788	$27,776,116

Constrained Project List for Roadway, Bicycle, Pedestrian, ITS, Operations, and Maintenance

97: Non-Transit Constrained Project List

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
39	N/A	*Various*|2022-2025 TIP	Project Costs for TIP Adopted 7/15/2021	2022	$147,155,534
39	N/A	*Various*|2022-2025 TIP	Project Costs for TIP Adopted 7/15/2021	2023	$78,619,210
39	N/A	*Various*|2022-2025 TIP	Project Costs for TIP Adopted 7/15/2021	2024	$52,907,261
39	N/A	*Various*|2022-2025 TIP	Project Costs for TIP Adopted 7/15/2021	2025	$38,395,001
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2023	$430,000
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2024	$800,000
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2025	$1,500,000
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2026	$2,100,000
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2027	$2,163,000
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2028	$2,227,890
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2029	$2,294,727
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2030	$2,363,569
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2031	$2,434,476
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2032-2037	$16,219,601

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
43	N/A	*Various*|ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments	Annual Program	2038-2045	$26,624,524
10	N/A	*MoDOT*|Signal Replacement Program	Annual Program	2026	$4,502,035
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2025	$2,458,636
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2026	$2,532,395
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2027	$2,608,367
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2028	$2,686,618
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2029	$2,767,216
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2030	$2,850,233
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2031	$2,935,740
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$19,730,208
11	N/A	*MoDOT*|Bridge Asset Management Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$32,947,211
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2025	$1,966,909
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2026	$2,025,916
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2027	$2,086,693
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2028	$2,149,294
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2029	$2,213,773
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2030	$2,280,186
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2031	$2,348,592
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$15,647,404
12	N/A	*MoDOT*|Safety Improvement Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$25,685,260
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2025	$8,741,816
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2026	$9,004,070
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2027	$9,274,193

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2028	$9,552,418
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2029	$9,838,991
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2030	$10,134,161
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2031	$10,438,185
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$72,005,677
13	N/A	*MoDOT*|Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Improvement Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$126,566,059
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2025	$811,896
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2026	$836,253
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2027	$861,341
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2028	$887,181
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2029	$913,796
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2030	$941,210
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2031	$969,446
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$6,572,273
19	N/A	*MoDOT*|Minor Routes Pavement Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$11,164,411
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2025	$546,364
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2026	$562,754
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2027	$579,637
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2028	$597,026

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2029	$614,937
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2030	$633,385
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2031	$652,387
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$4,346,501
21	N/A	*MoDOT*|Intersection Operational Improvement Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$7,134,794
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2025	$1,803,000
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2026	$2,082,600
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2027	$1,912,802
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2028	$1,970,186
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2029	$2,029,292
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2030	$2,090,171
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2031	$2,152,876
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2032-2037	$14,343,453
34	N/A	*MoDOT/Springfield*|ITS Operations and Management Program	Annual Program	2038-2045	$23,544,822
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2026	$9,860,043
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2027	$10,155,844

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2028	$10,460,520
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2029	$10,774,335
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2030	$11,097,565
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2031	$11,430,492
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2032-2037	$76,155,222
44	N/A	*Various*|Operations and Maintenance - State and Local Systems	Annual Program	2038-2045	$125,009,026
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2025	$50,000
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2026	$50,000
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2027	$51,500
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2028	$53,045
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2029	$54,636
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2030	$56,275
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2031	$57,964
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2032-2037	$399,851
48	N/A	*MoDOT*|Scoping	Annual Program	2038-2045	$702,827
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2026	$200,000
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2027	$206,000
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2028	$212,180
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2029	$218,545
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2030	$225,102
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2031	$231,855
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2032-2037	$1,544,724
49	N/A	*MoDOT*|Rail	Annual Program	2038-2045	$2,535,669
57	3rd/Oak	*Ozark*|3rd and Oak Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements at 3rd and Oak - Crossing over drainage way	2032-2037	$2,604,581
247	Azalea	*Battlefield*|Azalea Gap	Complete the gap between Lilac Ln and Morning Glory	2023	$875,500

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
1	Chestnut	*MoDOT*|Chestnut Expwy Capacity and Safety Improvements	Capacity and Safety improvements on Chestnut Expressway from Rte. 13 (Kansas Expressway) to Bus. 65 (Glenstone Avenue)	2032-2037	$5,064,462
212	Chestnut	*MoDOT*|Chestnut Expwy from Glenstone to US 65	Operational Improvements	2038-2045	$3,559,229
2	Division	*MoDOT*|Division St Improvements	Capacity improvements from Airport Boulevard to West Bypass	2038-2045	$16,016,529
99	Division	*Springfield*|Division Street - Glenstone to Hwy 65	Capacity and Safety Improvements	2032-2037	$15,844,532
45	EW Arterial	*Greene*|East/West Arterial from Kansas Expressway to Campbell Ave	New roadway corridor with bicycle and pedestrian accommodations	2038-2045	$26,249,311
114	Glenstone	*MoDOT*|Glenstone Safety and Operational Improvements Phase III	Glenstone Safety and Operational Improvements from Valley Water Mill to James River Freeway	2030	$950,078
183	I-244	*MoDOT*|Conversion of JRF and US 65 to I-244	Ramp Improvements and Signage necessary to designate I-244	2029	$1,229,874
4	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Capacity Improvements I	Capacity improvements from Rte. 160 (West Bypass) to Rte. 13 (Kansas Expressway) in Springfield	2032-2037	$17,871,764
5	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Capacity Improvements II	Capacity improvements from Kansas Expwy to Glenstone Ave	2028	$32,958,231
6	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Ramp Improvements	Ramp improvements at I-44/Rte. 125 interchange	2030	$2,533,540
41	I-44/MM/B	*MoDOT*|I-44 and Routes MM/B Interchange	Interchange improvements at Routes MM/B	2023	$7,332,570
22	ITS	*MoDOT*|ITS from Springfield to Rogersville	ITS improvements from Springfield to Rogersville (Route 65 to Route 125)	2024	$1,140,468
126	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase I, II, & III	Kansas Expwy - Norton Rd to Kearney Includes Interchange	2027	$22,316,026
127	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase I, II, & III	Kansas Expwy - Kearney to Grand	2032-2037	$4,340,968
128	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase I	Kansas Expwy - Grand to Republic, excluding Sunshine Intersection	2027	$7,535,281
131	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase II	Kansas Expwy - Grand to Republic, excluding Sunshine Intersection	2032-2037	$9,405,430
248	Kansas Expy/Sunshine	*MoDOT*|Kansas and Sunshine Intersection	Intersection Improvements	2027	$6,955,644

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
134	Kearney	*MoDOT*|Kearney Safety and Operational Improvements - Airport to LeCompte	Kearney - Airport to LeCompte	2032-2037	$2,652,331
138	Kearney	*MoDOT*|Kearney Safety and Operational Improvements - LeCompte to Mulroy	Kearney - LeCompte to Mulroy	2038-2045	$3,737,190
216	LeCompte	*Springfield*|LeCompte Rd Capacity Improvements	Capacity Improvements	2038-2045	$3,559,229
215	LeCompte/YY	*MoDOT*|LeCompte Rd and Rte YY Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	2038-2045	$3,559,229
65	Longview/65	*MoDOT*|Longview & 65 Interchange	Longview and 65 interchange	2038-2045	$24,914,600
246	Main	*Nixa*|Main Street Nixa from Route 14 to North	Widening and Sidewalks	2038-2045	$5,345,693
69	McCracken	*Ozark*|McCracken Rd Expansion	McCracken Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvement	2030	$2,406,863
78	Miller	*Willard*|Miller - E Proctor to New Melville	This is a project to continue improvement on a collector street	2024	$477,405
80	Miller	*Willard*|Miller Rd - New Melville to Hughes	Approximately 3,980 feet of road widening with ADA compliant sidewalks and stormwater improvements	2032-2037	$2,170,484
8	Mulroy Road	*Other*|Mulroy and I-44	Interchange Improvements	2023	$3,090,000
14	Route 125	*MoDOT*|Rte. 125 Intersection and Outer Road Improvements	Intersection improvements at I-44 North Outer Road; Relocate North Outer Road	2032-2037	$11,299,539
240	Route 125/Farm Road 84	*MoDOT*|Route 125 and Farm Road 84 Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	2038-2045	$1,334,711
172	Route 125/OO	*MoDOT*|S. 125/OO Signalization	Signalization	2028	$1,194,052
15	Route 13	*MoDOT*|Rte. 13 Intersection improvements at FR 94	Add turn lanes/reconfigure intersection/safety enhancements	2028	$1,791,078
16	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Rte. 14 Improvements from 14th Avenue to Rte. W	Capacity, safety and operational improvements from 14th Ave. to Rte. W	2029	$10,811,821
17	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Rte. 14 Improvements from Rte. NN to 3rd Street	Widen bridge, add westbound right turn lane from Route NN to 3rd Street in Ozark. Potential Cost Share	2029	$4,304,559
18	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Rte. 14 Improvements Nixa to Ozark	Roadway improvements from Tiffany Boulevard/Majestic Oak Ave. to Fremont Road	2038-2045	$42,427,784
61	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Rte. 14 Improvements - Fremont to 32nd	Route 14 improvements from Fremont to 32nd	2038-2045	$5,698,325

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
56	Route 14/Church	*MoDOT*|Church and 14 Crossing improvements	Hwy 14 & Church control & Streetscape upgrade	2025	$2,403,999
59	Route 14/W	*MoDOT*|Intersection Improvements at W - Route 14	Intersection Improvements at W	2026	$2,813,772
139	Route 160	*MoDOT*|Rte. 160 Capacity Improvements	US 160 - Plainview to Hwy CC	2038-2045	$39,151,514
140	Route 160	*MoDOT*|Rte. 160 Capacity Improvements	US 160 - Hwy CC to Rte 14	2038-2045	$19,575,757
142	Route 160	*MoDOT*|Rte. 160 Capacity Improvements	US 160 & Aldersgate Intersection improvements	2038-2045	$1,779,614
244	Route 174	*MoDOT*|Rte. 174 Intersection improvements at Main St	Intersection improvements	2032-2037	$3,328,075
243	Route 174	*MoDOT*|Rte 174	Capacity Improvements Main to 60	2032-2037	$7,234,946
23	Route 60	*MoDOT*|US 60 Capital Improvements	Capital improvements from Route M/MM to Route 360	2025	$10,091,334
24	Route 60	*MoDOT*|Rte. 60 Freeway Improvements from Routes NN/J to Farm Road 223	Freeway improvements from e/o Rtes. NN/J to Farm Road 223	2032-2037	$22,693,133
26	Route 60	*MoDOT*|Rte. 60 Freeway Improvements	Freeway improvements from e/o Rte. 65 to w/o Rtes. NN/J w/o interchange at 189	2032-2037	$28,939,785
196	Route 60	*MoDOT*|US 60 Safety and Capacity Improvements- M to Main St Phase I	Intersection Improvements	2029	$4,181,571
200	Route 60	*MoDOT*|US 60 improvements - RT 174 to MM	Six Lane	2026	$31,064,043
250	Route 60	*MoDOT*|Address flooding on Route 60 between NN and 223	Roadway geometric improvements to reduce flooding on Route 60	2032-2037	$5,787,957
167	Route 60/65	*MoDOT*|Ramp Improvements at Route 60/65	Ramp Capacity Improvements	2032-2037	$14,469,893
235	Route 60/National	*MoDOT*|JRF & National Interchange Capacity Improvements	Interchange Improvements	2038-2045	$14,236,914
27	Route 65	*MoDOT*|Rte. 65 Interchange Improvements at Kearney Street	Interchange improvements, replace bridge at Route 744 (Kearney St.) in Springfield	2030	$19,001,551
28	Route 65	*MoDOT*|Rte. 65 Capacity Improvements, Rte. 14 to Rte. F	Capacity and Operational Improvements from Rte. 14 to Rte. F	2025	$11,145,815
29	Route 65	*MoDOT*|Rte. 65 Capacity Improvements, Rte. CC to Rte. 14	Capacity Improvements Rte. CC to Rte. 14	2029	$16,575,010

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
33	Route 65/CC	*MoDOT*|Route 65 and Rte. CC Interchange operational improvements	Eastbound Dual Left turn lanes to Route 65, extend northbound ramp	2025	$2,513,272
213	Route AA/Owen	*MoDOT*|Rte AA intersection improvements at Owen Rd	Intersection Improvements	2038-2045	$2,669,421
161	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection Realignment	Rte AB & Hwy 266	2038-2045	$3,559,229
162	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection improvements	Hwy 266 & Rte B	2032-2037	$4,051,570
30	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Capacity Improvements Fremont Road to Rte. 65	Capacity improvements from Fremont Road to Route 65 in Ozark	2025	$6,009,999
31	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Extension in Nixa	Extend Route CC from Route 160 to Main Street in Nixa	2032-2037	$8,681,936
32	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Intersection improvements at Main St.	Intersection Improvements at Rte. CC & Main Street in Nixa	2031	$2,413,830
63	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. J Improvements Ozark	Rte J - US 65 to Hwy NN - Widening	2038-2045	$5,338,843
154	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Improvements in Nixa and Ozark - Cheyenne to Main	Rte. CC Cheyenne to Main	2030	$11,400,931
155	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Improvements in Nixa and Ozark - Fremont to Cheyenne	Rte CC - Fremont to Cheyenne	2032-2037	$10,128,925
204	Route FF	*MoDOT*|Route FF Intersection Improvements	Improvements at various locations along FF through Battlefield	2032-2037	$4,340,968
36	Route MM	*MoDOT*|Rte. MM Improvements I-44 to James River Freeway	Capacity Improvements from I-44 to James River Freeway in Republic	2025	$10,061,830
37	Route MM	*MoDOT*|Route MM Capacity Improvements	Widen improvements from 3 to 5 lanes	2038-2045	$3,000,430
251	Route MM	*MoDOT*|Widen Bridge over James River Freeway	Bridge Widening	2038-2045	$12,457,300
64	Route NN	*MoDOT*|NN Improvements - Jackson to Weaver	Operational and Safety Improvements on HWY NN from Weaver to Jackson	2031	$4,175,274
67	Route NN	*MoDOT*|Hwy NN Improvements - J to Sunset	Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements	2038-2045	$2,598,237
245	Route O/Miller	*MoDOT*|Route O and Miller Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements	Intersection and Pedestrian Improvements	2038-2045	$177,961
169	Route OO/Washington	*MoDOT*|Route OO and Washington Street Intersection Improvements	Intersection improvements at Washington Street, including widening of grade crossing and signalization	2026	$4,502,035
209	Route P	*MoDOT*|Rte P Intersection Improvements at Miller	Intersection Improvements	2032-2037	$1,085,242

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Time Band	Inflated Cost
38	Route ZZ	*MoDOT*|Rte. ZZ Extension	Extend Route ZZ to Route 60, construct railroad overpass in Republic.	2031	$27,712,078
202	Route ZZ	*MoDOT*|Rte ZZ Intersection Improvements at Hines	Intersection Improvements	2032-2037	$2,170,484
233	Route ZZ/Repmo	*MoDOT*|Rte ZZ & Repmo Dr Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	2038-2045	$2,669,421
58	South	*MoDOT*|South Street Expansion	Capacity/Safety/Operational Improvements 6th to 14th	2028	$1,515,252
40	Sunshine	*MoDOT*|East Sunshine Safety and Operational Improvements	Safety and operational improvements on Sunshine Street from Bus. 65 (Glenstone Avenue) to Bedford Avenue.	2032-2037	$3,255,726
147	West Bypass	*MoDOT*|West Bypass Intersection Improvements Phase I	Various Intersection Improvements from Division to James River Freeway	2031	$2,283,353
				TOTAL COST	**($1,846,368,203)**
				Prior Year Funding*	$58,933,279
				Projected Funding	$1,815,211,040
				Remaining Funding	$27,776,116
				*Prior year funding identified in FY 2022-2025 TIP	

Fiscal Constraint for Transit

98: Transit Fiscal Constraint

	2022	2023	2024	2025
Prior Year Funding	$4,017,791	$2,320,541	$2,039,085	$5,192,974
Projected Funding	$10,344,650	$10,675,262	$13,682,043	$13,252,753
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($12,041,900)	($10,956,718)	($10,528,154)	($11,446,454)
Remaining Funding	$2,320,541	$2,039,085	$5,192,974	$6,999,273

	2026	2027	2028	2029
Prior Year Funding	$6,999,273	$6,714,986	$6,583,705	$6,607,532
Projected Funding	$13,422,808	$13,592,326	$13,764,274	$13,938,693
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($13,707,096)	($13,723,606)	($13,740,447)	($13,757,624)
Remaining Funding	$6,714,986	$6,583,705	$6,607,532	$6,788,601

	2030	2031	2032-2037	2038-2045
Prior Year Funding	$6,788,601	$7,129,076	$7,634,147	$8,528,395
Projected Funding	$14,115,621	$14,298,087	$89,711,725	$130,883,188
Inflated Constrained Project Costs	($13,775,145)	($13,793,017)	($88,817,477)	($135,987,192)
Remaining Funding	$7,129,076	$7,634,147	$8,528,395	$3,424,392

99: Transit Constrained Project List

***Expected Sponsor*|Expenses**	**2022**	**2023**	**2024**	**2025**
CU Transit|Operating Expenses	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Preventative Maintenance	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Planning	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Security	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|ADA Enhancements	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Fixed Route Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$0	$2,000,000
CU Transit|Paratransit Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$560,000	$0
CU Transit|Shelter/Signs/ Amenities	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|ITS	$0	$0	$0	$0
Various|Other Agency Vehicles	$0	$0	$0	$0
Various|FY 2022-2025 TIP	$12,041,900	$10,956,718	$9,968,154	$9,446,454
Total	($12,041,900)	($10,956,718)	($10,528,154)	($11,446,454)
Prior Year Funding	$4,017,791	$2,320,541	$2,039,085	$5,192,974
Projected Funding	$10,344,650	$10,675,262	$13,682,043	$13,252,753
Remaining Funding	$2,320,541	$2,039,085	$5,192,974	$6,999,273

***Expected Sponsor*|Expenses**	**2026**	**2027**	**2028**	**2029**
CU Transit|Operating Expenses	$11,257,740	$11,257,740	$11,257,740	$11,257,740
CU Transit|Preventative Maintenance	$1,623,840	$1,623,840	$1,623,840	$1,623,840
CU Transit|Planning	$227,312	$231,858	$236,495	$241,225
CU Transit|Security	$37,279	$38,024	$38,785	$39,560
CU Transit|ADA Enhancements	$160,362	$163,569	$166,841	$170,177
CU Transit|Fixed Route Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Paratransit Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Shelter/Signs/ Amenities	$50,192	$51,196	$52,220	$53,264
CU Transit|ITS	$102,956	$105,015	$107,115	$109,258
Various|Other Agency Vehicles	$247,416	$252,364	$257,411	$262,559
Various|FY 2022-2025 TIP	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	($13,707,096)	($13,723,606)	($13,740,447)	($13,757,624)
Prior Year Funding	$6,999,273	$6,714,986	$6,583,705	$6,607,532
Projected Funding	$13,422,808	$13,592,326	$13,764,274	$13,938,693
Remaining Funding	$6,714,986	$6,583,705	$6,607,532	$6,788,601

Expected Sponsor|Expenses	2030	2031	2032-2037	2038-2045
CU Transit|Operating Expenses	$11,257,740	$11,257,740	$72,435,489	$110,991,562
CU Transit|Preventative Maintenance	$1,623,840	$1,623,840	$10,448,247	$16,009,655
CU Transit|Planning	$246,050	$250,971	$1,614,816	$2,474,353
CU Transit|Security	$40,352	$41,159	$264,826	$405,789
CU Transit|ADA Enhancements	$173,581	$177,053	$1,139,207	$1,745,585
CU Transit|Fixed Route Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Paratransit Bus Replacement	$0	$0	$0	$0
CU Transit|Shelter/Signs/ Amenities	$54,329	$55,416	$356,562	$546,354
CU Transit|ITS	$111,443	$113,672	$731,396	$1,120,705
Various|Other Agency Vehicles	$267,811	$273,167	$1,826,933	$2,693,189
Various|FY 2022-2025 TIP	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total	($13,775,145)	($13,793,017)	($88,817,477)	($135,987,192)
Prior Year Funding	$6,788,601	$7,129,076	$7,634,147	$8,528,395
Projected Funding	$14,115,621	$14,298,087	$89,711,725	$130,883,188
Remaining Funding	$7,129,076	$7,634,147	$8,528,395	$3,424,392

Unconstrained Projects

The following tables include those projects not prioritized for funding.

Non-Transit Unconstrained Needs

100: Unconstrained Non-Transit List – Unfunded Needs

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
74	10th	*Ozark*|10th Street Bridge	10th Street Bridge - Part of the NN Improvements to South - Connect NN to Oak and then South St. Must cross Finley River	$8,500,000
3	4th to Plainview	*Battlefield*|New Road from City of Battlefield to Plainview	Connecting 4th in Battlefield to Plainview Road	$2,000,000
222	Camino Alto/Lyon	*Springfield*|Camino Alto & Lyon Ave	Signalization	$2,500,000
92	Campbell	*Springfield*|Campbell Avenue - Republic to Westview (Primrose)	Capacity and Safety Improvements	$1,500,000
46	EW Arterial	*Greene*|East/West Arterial - Campbell to National Ave	New roadway including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.	$15,000,000
47	EW Arterial	*Greene*|East/West Arterial - National Ave to Kissick	New roadway including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.	$19,000,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
185	EW Arterial	*Greene*|East/West Arterial from Kissick to Southview	New roadway including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.	$15,000,000
187	EW Arterial	*Greene*|E/W Arterial - Kansas Expy to FF	New roadway including bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.	$17,000,000
52	Farm Road 115/140	*Greene*|Farm Road 115 (Haseltine Rd) at Farm Road 140	Intersection improvements at FR 115 & FR 140 to include a new roundabout with storm water and pedestrian improvements.	$1,500,000
7	Farm Road 190	*Greene*|Extend Farm Road 190 past Battlefield	Extension from FF to FR 115	$2,000,000
221	Farm Road 89/Hickory	*Greene*|Farm Road 89 & Hickory Ln	Signalization	$10,000
220	Farm Road 89/ Williamsburg	*Greene*|Farm Road 89 & Williamsburg Walk	Signalization	$10,000
70	Farmers Branch	*MoDOT*|Farmers Branch Expansion	Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements Farmers Branch to County Line	$3,350,000
71	Fremont	*Ozark*|Fremont Rd Expansion	Fremont Rd - HWY CC to Longview Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements	$2,765,000
73	Fremont	*Ozark*|Fremont Rd Expansion - Ph 2	Fremont Rd - Longview to 14. Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements	$3,550,000
231	Glenstone/ Sunshine	*MoDOT*|Glenstone & Sunshine intersection improvements	Operational improvements at Sunshine and Glenstone	$5,000,000
234	Hines/Lynn	*Republic*|Hines & Lynn intersection improvements	Intersection Improvements	$2,000,000
83	Hughes	*Willard*|Hughes Rd - Megan to Hunt Rd	Approximately 1,340' of new road construction, built to collector standards. ROW acquisition required.	$550,000
121	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Safety and Operational Improvements	I-44 - US 65 to Rte 125	$4,080,000
116	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Safety and Operational Improvements	I-44 - Chestnut to US 160	$4,080,000
117	I-44	*MoDOT*|I-44 Safety and Operational Improvements	I-44 - 360 to Chestnut	$4,080,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
168	I-44/125	*MoDOT*|I-44 and Route 125 Interchange Improvements	Interchange improvements at Route 125 including pedestrian accommodations	$20,000,000
130	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase III	Kansas Expwy - Grand to Republic, excluding Sunshine Intersection	$6,500,000
125	Kansas Expy	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expressway Capital Improvements Phase I, II, & III	Kansas Expwy - OTO Northern Boundary to Norton	$25,000,000
236	Kansas Expy/Walnut	*MoDOT*|Kansas Expwy & Walnut St bike crossing	Bike/ped crossing improvements	$150,000
219	Main/Farm Road 168	*Greene*|Main & FR 168 intersection improvements	Intersection Improvements	$550,000
81	McCracken	*Ozark*|McCracken Rd Upgrades Ph 2	Operational and Safety Improvements Hawkins Road to HWY J	$2,250,000
68	Melton	*Ozark*|Melton Intersection & Turn Lane	Intersection at Melton & right turn lane on to Melton	$996,000
55	National Avenue	*Greene*|National Avenue (FR 163) Roadway Extension	Extend National Avenue (FR 163) from Farm Road 192 to the southern Greene County/Christian County line as a Primary Arterial corridor.	$7,000,000
66	North	*Ozark*|W North Rd Improvements	Longview expansion from Cheyenne to Fremont	$1,560,000
88	North	*Nixa*|North St expansion	Upgrading North St to current OTO Secondary Arterial Standards	$8,000,000
62	OTC Entrance	*MoDOT*|OTC Entrance Upgrades	OTC Campus Entrance control upgrade	$2,500,000
54	Plainview Road	*Greene*|Plainview Road (FR 182) Widening from Golden to Battlefield City Limits	Widening Plainview Road (FR 182) to a 3-lane section including upgraded pedestrian facilities and new curb & gutter.	$10,000,000
184	Republic	*Springfield*|Republic Road Bridge over JRF	New Bridge to connect to Gasconade	$25,000,000
242	Route 125	*MoDOT*|125	Safety Improvements from FR 84 to OTO North Boundary	$5,000,000
241	Route 125/Farm Road 132	*MoDOT*|125/ FR 132	Intersection Improvements	$475,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
173	Route 125/OO	*MoDOT*|N. 125/OO Intersection Improvements	Intersection Improvements	$2,000,000
239	Route 125/YY	*MoDOT*|125/YY	Intersection Improvements	$2,000,000
218	Route 13	*MoDOT*|Highway 13 Connector to 160	Alternate route from US 360 to US 160	$65,000,000
190	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Hwy 14 Nicholas to OTO western boundary	Capacity and Safety Improvements	$7,500,000
189	Route 14	*MoDOT*|Hwy 14 improvements Rte W to Rte JJ	Capacity and Safety improvements	$3,250,000
141	Route 160	*MoDOT*|Rte. 160 Capacity Improvements	US 160 - Rte 14 to OTO Boundary improve transition from 6-lanes to 4-lanes to 2-lanes	$6,000,000
193	Route 160	*MoDOT*|US 160 widening from Jackson to Rte 123	Capacity Improvements	$7,500,000
192	Route 160/Farm Road 123	*MoDOT*|US 160 & FR 123 intersection improvements	Intersection Improvements	$2,000,000
201	Route 174/Boston	*MoDOT*|Intersection Improvements Rte 174/Boston	Intersection Improvements	$1,500,000
238	Route 413	*MoDOT*|MO 413 - JRF to West Bypass	six-lane	$21,000,000
249	Route 60	*MoDOT*|US 60 Safety and Capacity Improvements- M to Main St Phase II	Intersection Improvements	$3,500,000
9	Route 60	*MoDOT*|Rte. 60 Freeway Improvements	Interchange at 189	$20,000,000
124	Route 60	*MoDOT*|James River Freeway Capacity Improvements	JRF - West Bypass to Kansas Expwy	$16,000,000
123	Route 60	*MoDOT*|James River Freeway Capacity Improvements	JRF - MO 413 to West Bypass	$15,000,000
122	Route 60	*MoDOT*|James River Freeway Capacity Improvements	JRF - I-44 to MO 413	$15,000,000
25	Route 60	*MoDOT*|Rte. 60 Capacity Improvements west of Republic	Roadway improvements from County Road 194 to West Avenue in Republic.	$3,979,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
42	Route 60/Main/P	*MoDOT*|US 60 & Main St. Republic/State Highway P	Intersection improvements at US 60 & Main St./State Highway P, Republic. Linear and capacity improvements along Main St./State Highway P. to E Miller Rd.	$3,000,000
164	Route 65	*MoDOT*|US 65 Intersection improvements north of I-44	Us 65 & Rte AA/C	$12,500,000
165	Route 65	*MoDOT*|US 65 Intersection improvements north of I-44	US 65 & Rte KK/A	$2,500,000
186	Route 65/Gasconade	*Springfield*|Highway 65 & Gasconade Interchange	New interchange S. of Gasconade on US 60	$60,000,000
225	Route AB	*MoDOT*|Rte AB Safety improvements from Willard to Rte EE	Safety Improvements	$1,000,000
159	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection improvements	Rte AB & Rte EE	$1,000,000
160	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection improvements	Rte AB and RR X-ing	$500,000
157	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection improvements	Rte AB & New Melville (FR84)	$500,000
158	Route AB/266/B	*MoDOT*|Rtes. AB, 266 and B Intersection improvements	Rte AB & FR 94	$500,000
214	Route B	*MoDOT*|Rte B from Rte 266 to I-44 lane widening	Capacity Improvements	$1,500,000
156	Route CC	*MoDOT*|Rte. CC Improvements in Nixa and Ozark	Rte NN - Hwy J to Pheasant Rd - operational and safety improvements	$29,000,000
207	Route FF	*MoDOT*|Rte FF intersection improvements at Weaver (FR 178)	Intersection improvements	$2,500,000
205	Route FF	*MoDOT*|Rte FF Safety and Capacity improvements through Battlefield	Capacity and Safety Improvements	$13,500,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
35	Route FF	*MoDOT*|Rte. FF intersection improvements at Republic Road	Intersection improvements at various locations	$2,600,000
208	Route M	*MoDOT*|Rte M capacity improvements Rte ZZ to Rte FF	Capacity Improvements	$20,000,000
232	Route M/Farm Road 101	*MoDOT*|Rte M & FR 101 intersection improvements	Intersection Improvements	$1,250,000
206	Route MM	*MoDOT*|Rte MM intersection improvements at Sawyer	Intersection Improvements	$1,250,000
75	Route NN	*MoDOT*|Hwy NN Improvements Oak to South St	NN improvements Oak to South St - Connect NN to Oak and then South St. Must cross Finley River	$642,070
174	Route OO	*MoDOT*|OO Capacity Improvements	Capacity Improvements Route OO from south Route 125 to north Route 125	$5,800,000
210	Route P	*MoDOT*|Rte P capacity improvements from Main to Miller	Capacity Improvements	$4,250,000
217	Route P	*MoDOT*|Rte P center turn lane US 60 to Lombardy	Add a center turn lane to Route P	$3,750,000
79	Route W	*MoDOT*|Hwy W Expansion	HWY W from 14 to Old Prospect Road, Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements	$2,700,000
203	Route ZZ	*MoDOT*|Rte ZZ intersection improvements at FR 174	Intersection Improvements	$1,500,000
82	Selmore	*Ozark*|Selmore Widening	Capacity, Operational and Safety Improvements	$3,810,000
76	Sunset	*Ozark*|Sunset Intersection Improvements	Intersection at Sunset improvements	$1,390,000
170	Washington/Madison	*Strafford*|Realignment of Washington and Madison	Washington, Madison from Route OO to Bumgarner	$750,000

Project No.	Route	*Expected Sponsor*|Project Name	Description	Current Cost
53	Weaver Road	*Greene*|Weaver Road (FR 178) Widening - West of Campbell Ave.	Widening Weaver Road (FR 178) to a 3-lane secondary arterial section. Project to include pedestrian facilities and curb/gutter.	$50,000,000
20	West Bypass	*MoDOT*|West Bypass Intersection Improvements Phase II	Division to James River Freeway	$1,750,000
			Total	**$649,127,070**

Transit Unconstrained Needs

These needs are based on useful life replacements of existing transit vehicles, as well as remaining Shelter/Signs/Amenities unafforded on the constrained list. Trolley service as a supplement to the existing fixed-route service has been discussed for key locations in and around downtown Springfield. The costs for purchasing three trolleys, as well as operating them, has been included. Also listed are the recommended service changes from the 2012 Transit Route Study. For Levels I through V, the costs are in addition to the previous level and the base transit system, such that Level V total cost would include the current system, plus the costs include din Levels I, II, III, IV, and V. Levels I through V also consider replacement costs for the initial capital costs.

101: Unconstrained Transit List – Unfunded Needs

***Expected Sponsor*|Expenses**	**2022-2026**	**2027-2031**	**2032-2037**	**2038-2045**	**Total**
CU Transit|6 Paratransit Buses		$726,000			**$726,000**
CU Transit|10 Fixed Route Electric Buses		$10,000,000			**$10,000,000**
CU Transit|10 Fixed Route Electric Buses			$10,000,000		**$10,000,000**
CU Transit|6 Paratransit Buses			$726,000		**$726,000**
CU Transit|4 Fixed Route Electric Buses				$4,000,000	**$4,000,000**
CU Transit|Trolley Service (3 Trolleys)		$1,500,000			**$1,500,000**
CU Transit|Trolley Service (Operating)		$500,000	$5,000,000	$5,000,000	**$10,500,000**
CU Transit|Electric Infrastructure	$1,800,000	$3,000,000	$2,400,000	$1,200,000	**$8,400,000**
CU Transit|Placemaking Shelters	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000	**$200,000**
CU Transit|Route Study Level I Additional Costs	$6,426,105	$6,383,085	$10,359,429	$16,907,203	**$40,075,822**
CU Transit|Route Study Level II Additional Costs	$13,135,181	$11,517,597	$21,643,197	$30,507,247	**$76,803,222**
CU Transit|Route Study Level III Additional Costs	$17,339,590	$17,411,821	$28,248,027	$47,419,979	**$110,419,417**
CU Transit|Route Study Level IV Additional Costs	$19,385,976	$16,909,144	$31,946,087	$44,788,111	**$113,029,317**
CU Transit|Route Study Level V Additional Costs	$49,579,852	$47,097,901	$82,218,339	$127,784,880	**$306,680,972**
CU Transit|Limited Stop Circulator	$626,281	$674,683	$878,796	$1,474,536	**$3,654,297**
Total	**$108,342,985**	**$115,770,231**	**$193,469,876**	**$279,131,956**	**$696,715,048**


Model Results


As the *Destination 2045* planning process commenced, the OTO travel demand model was utilized to determine current and future needs should no investment be made to the transportation network by 2045. The following results highlight the results of the OTO investment plan.

Travel Demand Model
2045 Existing & Committed Result

102: 2045 Travel Demand Model

Travel Demand Model
2045 Constrained Scenario






0 1.25 2.5 5
Miles

Volume-to-Capacity Ratio
- > 0.85
- 0.85 - 0.77
- 0.77 - 0

Destination 2045



Unmapped Projects

10	Signal Replacement Program
11	Bridge Asset Management Program
12	Safety Improvement Program
13	Interstate and Major Routes Pavement Program
19	Minor Routes Pavement Program
21	Intersection Operational Improvement Program
34	ITS Operations and Management Program
39	2022 - 2025 Adopted TIP Projects
43	ADA/Bike/Ped/Trail Investments
44	Operations & Maintenance - State & Local
48	Scoping
49	Rail
183	James River Freeway Conversion to I-244

Destination 2045


103: Constrained Projects

Project Construction Year

- 2023 - 2026
- 2027 - 2030
- 2031 - 2032
- 2033 - 2040
- 2041 - 2045

0 1.25 2.5 5
Miles

N



Destination 2045

104: Unconstrained Projects

Project Locations

0 1.25 2.5 5
Miles



Part III

Are we there yet?

8 Implementation Plan

Major Thoroughfare Plan

The OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan (MTP) provides guidelines for designing a roadway network for the efficient movement of people and goods throughout the metropolitan area. The MTP was first adopted by the OTO Board of Directors in October 2004, with several amendments since then. The MTP has also been extensively reviewed with each long range transportation plan update.

The MTP classifies roadways based on their intended function and shows both existing and future roadways. These future major transportation corridors should serve as a general guide for securing street rights-of-way, though the locations are general in nature and final alignments will depend upon a detailed location study. The classifications shown on the MTP map direct the application of the OTO design standards, found in Appendix 3. Additional considerations should be made regarding the application of the MTP roadway classifications besides potential function, including alignment and corridor preservation, as well as land use and development.

Network Updates

With the adoption of *Transportation Plan 2040*, over 300 changes were made to the major thoroughfare plan. Since then, it has been amended six more times. *Transportation Plan 2040* introduced the concept of rural collectors and also amended the OTO design standards. With *Destination 2045*, OTO is recommending minor changes to address the realignment of MM across US 60 and that associated roadway network. OTO has also added the extension of 4th Street in Battlefield to correspond to projects submitted for consideration on the constrained project list. Two collectors south of west Sunshine have also been removed. These changes can be found in Appendix 6.

Street Typologies

Most modifications and variances to the Major Thoroughfare Plan are the result of incongruencies between proposed functional classifications, and associated design standards, and the physical limitations of the surrounding land use. It has become clear that one-size does not fit all.

Functional street classifications take into account both the design characteristics of the roadway network and the character those roadways are meant to provide. The OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan implements functional class as a hierarchy of roadways that range from high travel mobility (arterials) to high access (local or residential). Street typologies supplement the traditional functional classification


system to better emphasize a more balanced street function, considering land use and all users – pedestrians, cyclists, transit users, and motorists. Where sufficient public right-of-way exists, all design elements may be accommodated. Within constrained public-right-of-way, trade-offs must be balanced and should encourage healthy and active transportation options.

Incorporating into MTP


OTO worked with the *Destination 2045* planning committee to determine how street typologies could be integrated into the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan.

First, the committee was asked to consider how generalized flexibility should be incorporated. There was a definite preference for implementing a street typology system, compared to adjusting specific corridors or limiting the design standards.

105: Flexibility in the OTO Design Standards



Next, the committee was asked which principles should guide the OTO design approach. Connectivity and circulation were identified as most important, followed by street function, and then a tie between integration of land use and streets and needs of all users. Street character ranked lowest, but was still slightly weighted toward important.



OTO also separately asked how each community implements the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan and Design Standards. Just over 60 percent responded that they serve as guidance for how to functionally classify streets, but the community uses their own design standards. A quarter stated that the MTP serves as the Major Street Plan and is directly implemented through code. Just over 10 percent stated that they are useful to enforce some things but not everything. No one said they do not use them at all.

Next Steps


Implementation of street typologies is a recommendation in the City of Springfield *Forward SGF* Comprehensive Plan, which will be finalized in later 2021. Coupled with place types, these concepts will introduce another tool for assessing the transportation and land use connection.

Destination 2045 will carry forward the functional classification and proposed road system of the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan with some amendments as described. It is recommended that OTO work with the region to apply the street typology recommendations to the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan, providing flexibility and limiting the need for future variances and amendments. It is recognized that multiple OTO members use the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan as their Major Street Plan. It will be important to maintain this use of the MTP as well.

Destination 2045

107: Major Thoroughfare Plan

Amendment 2 - 7/21/2022



Esri, NASA, NGA, USGS

Existing Streets Class

- Freeway
- Expressway
- Primary Arterial
- Secondary Arterial
- Collector
- Boulevard
- Rural Collector
- Local

Future Streets Class

- Expressway
- Primary Arterial
- Secondary Arterial
- Collector
- Local

0 1.25 2.5 5

Miles

N

OTO


Bicycle/Pedestrian/Trail Facilities

The Bicycle and Pedestrian map shows those facilities which currently exist, and facilities proposed in prior planning efforts. The map is comprehensive, but it is not meant to be the sole source of the region's priorities. Instead, it is meant to be a current representation of the projects and policies in the Plan. Also, while the map shows existing trails, a separate map has been provided showing the trails considered through the Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Trail Investment Study.

This map was first produced with the Comprehensive OTO Area Bicycle-Pedestrian Plan. That version of the map illustrated the trails from Vision 20/20, the on-street connections between communities and trails, connections to the interior city systems, and can be characterized as primarily a bicycle-oriented map. *Journey 2035* incorporated the bicycle-pedestrian plan and its map included both bicycle and pedestrian improvements, emphasizing the connection between modes. Introduced in Journey 2035 was the Priority Sidewalk Corridor. This concept highlights corridors in need of continuous sidewalk along both sides of the street. The Link was also new to the prior plan. The Link is an enhanced corridor that connects trails across town. *Transportation Plan 2040* further refined alignments and proposed routes.

It is OTO's goal that through implementation of complete streets, OTO's design standards, and the trail implementation plan, *Towards a Regional Trail System*, construction of future facilities will rely less on a map and more on the needs of the system and users. Bicycle and pedestrian needs should be considered along all corridors and with every project. The OTO should continue to focus on connecting communities with trail and completing trail gaps, so they can support transportation-related usage.

108: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities (North)




109: Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities (South)

- Future Park
- Connection to City Interior System
- Bike/Ped Trail
- Trans America Trail
- The Link
- The Link - Proposed
- Bike Lane
- Bike Route
- Share the Road
- Bike Route - Future
- Sidewalk - Priority Corridor
- Railroad
- River
- Lakes
- Park Property
- MO Department of Conservation
- Wilson's Creek NB
- School Property
- City Limits
- OTO Boundary

N

0 1.25 2.5 5 Miles



Destination 2045

110: Proposed & Existing Trails

Trail Status

- Proposed Trail Alignments
- Existing Trails & Greenways
- Funded Trail Projects
- On-Street Connections

N

0 1.25 2.5 5
Miles

5-Year Implementation Guide

By **Calendar Year** from 2022 through next plan adoption in 2026

Ongoing

Education

- Communicate unfunded needs to elected officials and the public
- Communicate funding shortfalls to elected officials and the public
- Educate public on transportation planning process
- Continue education of elected officials on the positive effects of local control of federal suballocated funding
- Continue to prioritize improvements that improve safety
- Continue to work with Missouri Public Transit Association to educate elected officials regarding the benefits of transit investment
- Use Let's Go Smart website to communicate transportation options
- Sponsor training opportunities for members and partner trade organizations on complete street best practices and emerging trends
- Use SGF Yields as a regional model to promote pedestrian safety

Prioritization

- Utilize MoDOT asset management plan and City Utilities Transit asset management plan to ensure adequate investment in the transportation system
- Prioritize investments that maintain and prolong the useful life of the existing system
- Prioritize projects that improve congestion on the freeway system
- Promote investment decisions that direct growth near appropriate transportation facilities
- Prioritize projects that encourage job creation, retention, and wage growth
- Continue to use the MoDOT Statewide Freight Plan to prioritize projects
- Make investment decisions that support performance targets

Revenue-Seeking

- Support funding requests for all modes of transportation that fit within the regional vision
- Identify grant opportunities and use OTO staff to complete grant applications
- Identify and make application to federal discretionary programs

Partnerships

- Continue to partner with MoDOT to identify unfunded needs
- Encourage participation in the statewide cost share program
- Partner with local agencies to make shared investments
- Continue to participate in Missouri Coalition for Roadway Safety meetings and activities
- Support implementation of MoDOT's TSM&O Program and Action Plan

- Support the efforts of the Transportation Management Center
- Continue to participate in MoDOT scoping and core team meetings

Monitoring and Implementation

- Continue to publish an annual report on the state of transportation in the OTO region
- Monitor implementation of the TCP
- Monitor trail implementation through a dashboard
- Continue to monitor ADA investment in the OTO communities
- Monitor funding available for investment in the regional trail system
- Maintain a list of investments needed to complete the ITS network
- Identify technology and data needs to better monitor congestion
- Develop trail projects that advance trail construction readiness
- Continue to make investments in the regional trail system as outlined in the adopted plan
- Use travel time and other congestion measures to ensure reliability
- Monitor transportation technology advancements
- Monitor status of Alternative Fuel Corridors
- Continue to monitor transit accessibility to essential public services
- Build environmental mitigation early into the project development process, developing a process to ensure early communication with MoDOT, FHWA, and the appropriate agencies

Committees and Community Involvement

- Serve on freight committees when available
- Regularly convene TIM meetings to identify incident response safety improvements
- Participate in Let's Go Smart: Transportation Collaborative
- Continue to participate in the Ozarks Clean Air Alliance to monitor air quality levels and identify ways to maintain Ozone attainment
- Be a resource to members for implementation at the community-level

Project-Level

- Promote the use of traffic impact studies that ensure developers are sharing in the costs of growth
- Support a connected grid network that allows for ease of alternate travel routing
- Continue to use and maintain EnviroSmart, OTO's environmental database, to inform local project sponsors of environmental considerations in transportation projects
- Ensure complete street design is incorporated into transportation improvement projects
- Promote neighborhood level connections and discourage gated communities that limit transportation connections
- Encourage construction of sidewalks on most roadways

- Continue to invest in fiber connections to improve signal timing throughout the region
- Continue to make freeway and expressway investments that connect communities and maintain low commute times
- Support expansion of quality real-time traveler information

Year One (2022)

- Continue to refine equity analysis tools available for project identification and prioritization in support of vulnerable road users and under-represented populations
- Analyze bicycle and pedestrian crash locations to scope improvements
- Establish an interdisciplinary safety committee to lead organizational actions for incorporating safety into all transportation related functions
- Educate member agencies on the significance of highway safety and how their agencies can contribute to a safer road system
- Educate public on rules of the road for all users
- Provide safety information on safe driving behaviors
- Develop a process for discretionary funding requests
- Utilize a website and other communication for centralized requests
- Anticipate federal funding priorities and develop ready-made analysis materials
- Review performance measures and targets to best direct investment decisions
- Update the Transit Coordination Plan and identify actions to enhance coordination
- Develop Trail Implementation Dashboards
- Identify connectivity gaps and provide a map for easy reference
- Develop a list of investments needed to complete the ITS network
- Provide better project descriptions that include context sensitive solutions in the STIP prioritization process
- Develop multimodal unfunded needs list

Year Two (2023)

- Develop a public and elected official education campaign with identified focus areas
- Encourage members to adopt a Vision Zero (www.visionzeronetwork.org) approach to addressing transportation safety, including Complete Streets or Livable Streets
- Use OTO staff to support streamlined project administration
- Determine the next ready-to-construct trail project
- Develop standards for multi-modal accessibility
- Develop standards to improve aesthetics of transportation projects

- Identify, document, and map accessibility improvements with the greatest benefits
- Identify sidewalk network gaps that support local connections to essential services and transit stops
- Identify trail maintenance needs and develop a trail maintenance plan
- Implement a local 5310 administration program to ensure timely delivery of transit capital
- Identify and document large employers and assess the need for transit service
- Identify transit service options for employment needs and recommend service needs to City Utilities Transit
- Identify large employers and provide information on transportation tax incentives
- Connect vanpool providers with employers
- Assess feasibility of "mobility as a service" to supplement transit and other modes
- Conduct additional research on *Destination 2045* survey response regarding passenger rail and desire for inner-city versus inter-city transportation
- Using street typologies, develop an overlay plan that maximizes complete street investments
- Implement access management to preserve roadway capacity and improve safety
- Develop an electric vehicle charging infrastructure plan
- Work with the Transportation Management Center of the Ozarks to identify and implement technology to accommodate connected and automated vehicles
- Identify and develop a plan for improvements supportive of automated vehicles
- Create a connected vehicle infrastructure plan that identifies infrastructure needs
- Review local ordinances and provide recommended changes to regarding neighborhood level connectivity
- Research and catalog recommendations in area plans for a more uniform regional approach

Year Three (2024)

- Survey the community to ascertain preference for transit coverage or frequency
- Continue to investigate integrated service between City Utilities Transit, Missouri State University, and OATS
- Work with the City of Springfield and City Utilities Transit to develop a high-frequency transit corridor
- Explore options for regional transit service
- Review and update EnviroSmart, consultation with environmental review agencies

- Develop projects that address connectivity gaps
- Identify and find solutions to freight bottlenecks
- Identify and map transportation facilities that are susceptible to flooding
- Update TIM Strategic Plan
- Identify projects to improve signal timing, traffic bottlenecks, and capacity expansion needs
- Assist member communities with improving gateways to their cities and the region
- Use street typologies to better scope complete street projects

Year Four (2025)


- Explore alternatives to fixed route bus transit, such as light rail, streetcar/trolley, micro transit
- Begin update of *Destination 2045* for 2050

Year Five (2026)

- Adopt 2050 long range transportation plan update

Appendix 1

Planning Area and Urbanized Area Maps



Ozarks Transportation Organization Metropolitan Planning Area


Approved by the Governor of Missouri
2/8/2002

Legend

- Airport
- Major Road
- River
- Lake
- City Limits
- National Park
- OTO Study Area

0 1 2 4 6
Miles

DISCLAIMER
The Ozarks Transportation Organization is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the FederalTransit Administration (FTA), the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT), or the Ozarks Transportation Organization. This map does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.



Ozarks Transportation Organization Urbanized Area

U.S. Census Bureau
2010 Census Urban Area
Delineation Program

Legend

- Airport
- Major Road
- River
- Lake
- City Limits
- National Park
- Springfield Urbanized Area
- Willard Urbanized Area
- OTO Study Area

0 1 2 4 6
Miles

DISCLAIMER
The Ozarks Transportation Organization is responsible for the facts and accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the FederalTransit Administration (FTA), the Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT), or the Ozarks Transportation Organization. This map does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation.

Appendix 2

Project Prioritization Glossary

Destination 2045 Project Prioritization Glossary

Scoring Summary

Factor	Max Points
High Volume Corridors	8
Safety	40
Bike/Ped Safety	20
At-Grade RR Crossing	4
Multi-Modal	6
Environmental Justice	8
Current Congestion	15
Future Congestion	7
SW Freight Plan	2
Freight Traffic	4
Bridge Condition	6
Extending Life Cycle	4
Local Priority	15
TOTAL Points	**140**

Goals

Safe for all users on all modes

Asset management and fiscal responsibility

Connected, integrated, multi-modal system

Resilient and prepared for the future

Quality projects implementing best practices

1. **High Volume Corridors (8 points possible)**
   Corridors that have high volumes will be awarded additional points. Corridors are scored based upon AADT. This data is obtained annually from MoDOT. The most recent data is used.

   Over 40,000 = 8 Points
   30,000 to 40,000 = 6 Points
   20,000 to 30,000 = 4 Points
   10,000 to 20,000 = 2 Points

2. **Safety (40 points possible)**
   Safety Scores for Project Segments and Intersections – the MoDOT Average 3-Year Accident Rate, 3-Year Fatality Average, and 3-Year Injury Average for State System (SS) Roadway Segments in the SW District were included in an additive combination to produce the priority safety scores for proposed projects. Accident data for the 3-year period from 2017 to 2019 were provided by the MoDOT Central Office in GIS Segment & Intersection files. The accident rate for segments were calculated by MoDOT using a standard formula from the FHWA's *Roadway Departure Safety: A Manual for Local Rural Road Owners* as follows:

   $$\frac{\text{Crashes}*100{,}000{,}000}{3\ [\text{yrs}]*\ 365[\text{days}]*\ [\text{AADT}]\ *\ [\text{Length}]}$$

   The accident rate for State System Intersections is calculated by MoDOT according to the following formula:

Crashes*1,000,000
3 [yrs]* 365[days]* [ENTERING_VOLUME]

An average for accident rates by roadway type was calculated for state system segments within the MoDOT SW District area. Averages were calculated for intersections with the same number of approach legs. Individual rates for segments and intersections were then divided by the average for either roadway type or number of approach legs District-wide. This produced a value above or below one. Values above one indicated how many times greater the individual segment or intersection rate was above its type average. Conversely, values below one indicated that the segment or intersection rate was less than the average for its type in the SW District. Ultimately, this created a symmetrical value among all types suitable for reclassification. The fatality and injury averages by roadway or approach leg values were classed in to four quartiles based on percentile rank accordingly for these metrics:

Actual Rate by Type			***3-Year Fatality Avg.***			***3-Year Injury Avg.***	
= > 1.5	*= 4*	*+*	*75th – 100th*	*= 4*	*+*	*75th – 100th*	*= 4*
> 1.5 and => 1	*= 3*	*+*	*50th – 75th*	*= 3*	*+*	*50th – 75th*	*= 3*
> 1 and => 0.5	*= 2*	*+*	*25th – 50th*	*= 2*	*+*	*25th – 50th*	*= 2*
> .5 – 0	*= 1*	*+*	*0th – 25th*	*= 1*	*+*	*0th – 25th*	*= 1*

The reclassed rank values for 3-Year accident rates, average fatality crashes, and disabling or suspected serious Injury crashes were then added together creating a range of safety scores from 3 to 12. The safety scores are then rescaled from 1 – 10 corresponding to the original scale of 3 – 12. A multiplier of 4 was applied to the rescaled value of 1 – 10 to award safety points as depicted below:

Safety Score Value →	***Rescaled Safety Score →***	***Safety Score Multiplier →***	***Safety Points Awarded***
3	*1*	*x 4*	*4*
4	*2*	*X4*	*8*
5	*3*	*X4*	*12*
6	*4*	*X4*	*16*
7	*5*	*X4*	*20*
8	*6*	*X4*	*24*
9	*7*	*X4*	*28*
10	*8*	*X4*	*32*
11	*9*	*X4*	*36*
12	*10*	*X4*	*40*

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety (20 points possible)
All bike and ped crashes from the previous complete 5 years.

1 to 2 bike/ped crashes = 5 points
3 to 5 bike/ped crashes = 10 points
More than 5 bike/ped crashes = 20 points

4. **Improvement or Removal of At-Grade Railroad Crossing (4 points possible)**
   Yes = 4
   No = 0

5. **Multi-Modal (6 points possible)**
   Intermodal Benefit (Bike/Ped/Transit and Truck/Rail)

   No intermodal potential = 0 points
   Facilitates transfer or intermodal potential between 1 to 2 modes = 3 point x number of modes

   In this category, one point is awarded for each mode connected. A single-mode project receives no points in this category. Three points are awarded for each additional mode connected.

6. **Environmental Justice (8 points possible)**
   Environmental Justice Hexbins - In order to adequately consider historically disadvantaged groups. Each of these categories has been mapped by Census Tract percentages from the 2012 – 2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates and distributed using hexbins for a more refined analysis. If the value for one of these categories is greater than the average percentage for the MPO area, it is considered high percentage hexbin.

   Intersecting/adjacent to hexbin with a high percentage of minorities = 5 points
   Intersecting/adjacent to hexbin with a high percentage of low income = 5 points
   Intersecting or adjacent to hexbin with a high percentage of both minorities and low income = 8 points

7. **Congestion Management Current (15 points possible)**
   Current volume-to-capacity greater than or equal to 0.86 = 9 Points
   Current volume-to capacity greater than or equal to 0.92 = 12 Points
   Current Volume-to-Capacity Greater than or equal to 1 = 15 Points

   A volume-to-capacity ratio for roadways in the OTO region was calculated using 2018 Average Annual Daily Traffic totals and percentage of bus and combo semi-trailer traffic obtained from the MoDOT Central Office. A passenger car equivalent volume was calculated by multiplying the roadway AADT by the percent of bus and semi traffic. This value was subtracted from the AADT value, multiplied by 3 and then added back to the AADT value. The passenger car equivalent value was compared to roadway capacities stored in the travel demand model to determine the current V/C scoring. Capacity for roadway segments along Hwy 14, Route MM, US Hwy 60 east of US Hwy 65 and through Republic were revised using 24-hour capacities determined via a roadway capacity analysis conducted for the OTO by CJW Consultants. Capacities at other locations of known improvements, e.g., auxiliary lanes added to segments along James River Freeway were revised by OTO staff. The travel demand model no-build scenario for 2040 includes projects committed through 2018. The projected

volume to capacity ratio for the 2040 no-build scenario is used for the future V/C scoring. The ratio of 0.86 is considered Level of Service E (or at capacity).

Current volume-to-capacity ratios were calculated for total roadway volumes including all directions of travel. A project was awarded points based on the highest v/c ratio intersecting the project road segment or intersection. Projects with segments less than 0.86, current or future, received 0 points.

8. **Congestion Management Future (7 points possible)**
   Future (2045 or most recent model run) volume-to-capacity greater than or equal to 0.86 = 7 Points

   Future volume-to-capacity ratios were calculated for opposing directions. The segment with the highest future v/c ratio intersecting the project area was used to determine the score.

9. **Freight Corridor Statewide Freight Plan (2 points possible)**
   Project is on a corridor that is identified as a Tier I or Tier II facility in the State Freight Plan

   Tier 1 = 2 Points
   Tier 2 = 1 Point

10. **Percentage Freight Traffic (4 points possible)**
    Greater than 20% = 4
    Between 15% and 20% =3
    Between 10 and 15% = 2

11. **Bridge Condition (6 points possible)**
    Project corridor includes a structurally deficient bridge determined to be poor or very poor by MoDOT.

    Yes = 6 Points
    No = 0 Points

12. **Extending Life Cycle (4 points possible)**
    Project extends lifecycle of existing assets, delaying maintenance.

    Yes = 4 points
    No = 0 points

13. **Local Priority (15 points possible)**
    Community considers project a local priority. Each community can choose 2 projects as local priorities.

    Yes = 15 points
    No = 0 points

Appendix 3

Design Standards

Ozarks Transportation Organization

DESIGN Standards



Adopted Standards

The Board of Directors most recently amended these Design Standards on April 20, 2017. The Major Thoroughfare Plan may be amended separately from the standards. The most recent version can be found on the OTO website.

Learn More


The Ozarks Transportation Organization's Major Thoroughfare Plan (MTP) provides guidelines for designing a roadway network for the efficient movement of people and goods throughout the metropolitan area. The MTP classifies roadways based on their intended function and shows both existing and future roadways. These future major transportation corridors should serve as a general guide for securing street rights-of-way, though the locations are general in nature and final alignments will depend on a detailed location study. The classifications shown on the MTP map direct the application of the OTO Design Standards.

The OTO adopted design standards are desired minimums based on the recommendations of the MTP. These standards are intended for new construction or the retrofitting of existing roadways. In the event that a roadway project has not been constructed, but it has been designed and right-of-way has been purchased to previous standards, the project is not required to meet these standards. Otherwise, deviations from the OTO design standards require a variance from a special subcommittee of the OTO Technical Planning Committee.

About the OTO

The Ozarks Transportation Organization is the Springfield-regional Metropolitan Planning Organization, or MPO. The MPO is a body of elected and appointed members who work together with local, state, and federal elected officials and policy-makers, serving to make funding and planning decisions for transportation within the Springfield, MO region.

Freeway



*Medians and shoulders provide options for landscaping where appropriate.

Description

Design Service Volume	20,000 - 100,000
Design Speed	55 - 70 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	99/1
Facility Spacing	4 - 8 miles
Trip Length	Between cities and across metropolitan area (2+ miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	250’ minimum
Number of Lanes	4 - 8
Lane Width	12’ to 14’ per lane
Drainage/Shoulders	Variable. Minimum 10’ - 12’ shoulder


Access

Median	Varies
Full Median Break Spacing	Not permitted
Directional Median Break Spacing	Not permitted
Interchange Spacing	1 - 3 miles
Full Access Intersection Spacing	Not permitted
Residential Driveway Spacing	Not permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	Not permitted

Multi-Modal

On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	Pedestrians prohibited (no sidewalks required)
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycles not recommended
Transit Provisions	No stops, express routes only

Expressway



*Medians and shoulders provide options for landscaping where appropriate.

Description

Design Service Volume	20,000 - 50,000
Design Speed	40 - 55 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	90/10
Facility Spacing	3 - 5 miles
Trip Length	Across metropolitan area and between major activity centers (2+ miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	180’ + 40’ each side if frontage roads are needed
Number of Lanes	4 - 6
Turning Lanes	At intersections only
Lane Width	12’ (plus shoulders in rural areas only)
Drainage/Shoulders	Curb and gutter or shoulders (rural areas)


Access

Median	40’ landscaped
Median Breaks	Allowed at signalized intersections only
Full Access Intersection Spacing	1/2 mile
Intersection	Left and right turn lanes desired
Residential Driveway Spacing	No residential drives permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	660’ (right-in/right-out only)

Multi-Modal

On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	Sidewalks required on frontage roads
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle lane provided on frontage roads
Transit Provisions	Turnouts at major generators

Boulevard



*Medians and shoulders provide options for landscaping where appropriate.
*Utility and greenspace areas may switch locations if needed.
*Utilities may be placed under sidewalks.

Description

Design Service Volume	10,000 - 40,000
Design Speed	35 - 45 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	70/30
Facility Spacing	3 - 5 miles
Trip Length	Across metropolitan area and between major activity centers (2+ miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	120’ plus intersection triangles
Number of Lanes	4
Turning Lanes	At intersections only; left and right turn lanes desired
Lane Width	12’ per lane
Minimum Area Behind Curb	17’ used for sidewalks, utilities, and landscaping (where appropriate)
Drainage/Shoulders	Curb and gutter; 6’ -10’ for shoulders (if used)

Access


Median	28’ (landscaping desired)
Median Breaks	Allowed at signalized intersections only
Directional Median Break Spacing	660’
Full Access Intersection Spacing	1/4 mile
Intersection	Left and right turn lanes desired
Residential Driveway Spacing	No residential drives permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	330’ center-to-center (right-in/right-out only). Allowed only if internal circulation, cross access, and minimum driveway radii and grade are provided.

Multi-Modal

On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	4’ - 6’ (minimum) sidewalks on both sides
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle facilities provided according to adopted bicycle plan
Transit Provisions	Turnouts at major generators

Primary Arterial

*Medians and shoulders provide options for landscaping where appropriate.
*Utility and greenspace areas may switch locations if needed.
*Utilities may be placed under sidewalks.



Description

Design Service Volume	10,000 - 30,000
Design Speed	35 - 45 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	70/30
Facility Spacing	1 - 2 miles
Trip Length	Between and through major activity centers (2 - 8 miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	110’ plus intersection triangles
Number of Lanes	4 - 6
Turning Lanes	At intersections only
Lane Width	12’ per lane
Minimum Area Behind Curb	17’ used for sidewalks, utilities, and landscaping (where appropriate)
Drainage/Shoulders	Curb and gutter; shoulders permitted in rural areas (6’ - 10’)

Access


Median	18’
Median Breaks	Allowed at signalized intersections only
Directional Median Break Spacing	660’
Full Access Intersection Spacing	1/4 mile
Intersection	Left and right turn lanes desired
Residential Driveway Spacing	No residential drives permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	330’ center-to-center (right-in/right-out only). Allowed only if internal circulation, cross access, and minimum driveway radii and grade are provided.

Multi-Modal


On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	4’ - 5’ (minimum) sidewalks on both sides
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle facilities provided according to adopted bicycle plan
Transit Provisions	Scheduled stops every 1/4 mile (where transit service is provided)

Secondary Arterial

*Medians and greenspace provide options for landscaping where appropriate.
*Utility and greenspace areas may switch locations if needed.
*Utilities may be placed under sidewalks.



Bike Lane Option



Description

Design Service Volume	6,000 - 20,000
Design Speed	30 - 35 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	60/40
Facility Spacing	1/2 - 1 mile
Trip Length	Between and within activity centers (1 - 4 miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	80’ plus intersection triangles
Number of Lanes	2 - 3
Turning Lanes	Left turn lane
Lane Width	12’ (bicycle routes: 11’ vehicle and 4’ bicycle lanes)
Minimum Area Behind Curb	19.5’ (17’ when bicycle lanes are provided) used for sidewalks, utilities, and landscaping (where appropriate)
Drainage/Shoulders	Curb and gutter; shoulders permitted in rural areas (6’ - 10’)

Access


Median	Not required
Full Access Intersection Spacing	660’
Intersection	4 lanes
Residential Driveway Spacing	No residential drives permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	210’ center-to-center. Allowed only if internal circulation, cross access, and minimum driveway radii and grade are provided.

Multi-Modal


On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	4’ - 5’ (minimum) sidewalks on both sides
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle facilities provided according to adopted bicycle plan
Transit Provisions	Scheduled stops every 1/4 mile (where transit service is provided)

Collector

*Medians and greenspace provide options for landscaping where appropriate.
*Utility and greenspace areas may switch locations if needed.
*Utilities may be placed under sidewalks.



Bike Lane Option



Description

Design Service Volume	1,500 - 8,000
Design Speed	30 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	30/70
Facility Spacing	1/4 - 1/2 mile
Trip Length	Local street to arterial street (1/2 to 2 miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	65’ plus intersection triangles
Number of Lanes	2
Turning Lanes	Left turn lane when needed
Lane Width	12’ (bicycle routes: 11’ vehicle and 4’ bicycle lanes)
Minimum Area Behind Curb	18’ (15’ when bicycle lanes are provided) used for sidewalks, utilities, and landscaping (where appropriate)
Drainage/Shoulders	Curb and gutter; shoulders permitted in rural areas (6’ - 10’)


Access

Median	Not required
Full Access Intersection Spacing	660’
Intersection	Up to 4 lanes
Residential Driveway Spacing	No residential drives permitted
Commercial Driveway Spacing	160’ center-to-center

Multi-Modal

On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	4’ - 5’ (minimum) sidewalks on both sides
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle facilities provided according to adopted bicycle plan
Transit Provisions	Scheduled regular and paratransit service

Rural Collector



Description

Design Service Volume	1,500 - 8,000
Design Speed	30 mph
Traffic Flow/Access Priority	30/70
Facility Spacing	1/4 - 1/2 mile
Trip Length	Local street to arterial street (1/2 to 2 miles)

Basics

Minimum Right-of-Way	50’
Number of Lanes	2
Turning Lanes	Left turn lane when needed
Lane Width	12’
Minimum Area Behind Curb	13’ used for utilities and open ditch (where appropriate)
Drainage/Shoulders	Open ditch


Access


Median	Not required
Full Access Intersection Spacing	660’
Intersection	up to 4 lanes
Residential Driveway Spacing	Residential driveways are discouraged; 200’ center-to-center if no other alternative is available
Commercial Driveway Spacing	160’ center-to-center

Multi-Modal

On-Street Parking	Not permitted
Pedestrian Provisions	No sidewalks required
Bicycle Provisions	Bicycle facilities provided according to adopted bicycle plan

Major Thoroughfare Plan





OZARKS TRANSPORTATION ORGANIZATION

A METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

2208 W. Chesterfield Blvd., Suite 101
417-865-3042

This report was prepared in cooperation with the USDOT, including FHWA and FTA, as well as the Missouri Department of Transportation. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission, the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration.

Appendix 4

Visioning Results

OTO Board of Directors and Technical Planning Committee Visioning Results


Are we there yet? This is the question the Ozarks Transportation Organization has asked its Board and Technical Planning Committee members at recent visioning workshops. The OTO kicked off a long range transportation planning process, dubbed *Destination 2045*, on January 30th by asking Board members to envision the future of transportation in the Ozarks. The Technical Planning Committee considered these same questions on February 24th.


Destination 2045 will outline actions for the next 25 years which make sure the region develops the robust transportation system needed to support growth, while effectively moving people and freight in diverse ways. OTO will build on the public input and significant effort already captured with Springfield's *Forward SGF*, Republic's *SOAR 2045*, Ozark's *Comprehensive Plan 2019*, Willard *2019 Comprehensive Plan*, and *Imagine Nixa*, as well as other planning activities from around the region.

The Plan will identify needed improvements to the transportation system and will prioritize federal and state funds allocated for these projects. Federal law requires metropolitan planning organizations, like the OTO, to update the metropolitan transportation plan every five years in order to continue receiving federal transportation dollars.

Visioning Workshops

Both the Board and TPC workshops followed the same format. Each workshop started by asking members to participate in a word cloud answering the question, "Using one word, what will the transportation system look like in 2045?" The larger





the word, the more often it was submitted by members. Words that stand out relate to automated and electric vehicles.

Here are the results when the results from both workshops are combined:

Rank	Category
1	Autonomous
2	Connected/Intelligent
3	Electric
3	Efficient
5	Walkable/Active
5	Multimodal
7	Transit
7	Safe
9	Congested

There was also a variety of alternative/forward looking transportation suggestions, including personal rapid transit, drones, flying, hyperloop, and micro-mobility options such as scooters and Segways.

The word cloud exercise was followed by a presentation on current and future conditions around the region, and then the attendees were asked a series of questions to help inform *Destination 2045's* vision. Each person was given the opportunity to share their answers to the questions and then the group voted to identify a most common or important theme among the answers.

Results

Below are the questions and answers provided by workshop attendees. All topics which received votes are highlighted. These topics also informed the survey which is available through May 4, 2020.

Board of Directors – January 30, 2020

Where are we? What makes moving around the Ozarks great? What are the region's transportation strengths?

Flow of traffic on highways	**7**
Partnerships/collaboration	6
Airport growth	1
Roads are well maintained	1
Springfield's grid layout	1
Airport	
Alternate routes	
Collaboration between communities and agencies	
Complete streets	

Diverging diamonds
Forward thinking
Good, buildable transportation system
Keeping up with growth
OTO
Planning
Regional ease of movement
Scenery
Smooth roads
Trails
Variety of destinations
Well connected with rural areas

Why can't we get there? What are the challenges facing the region today? What is the hardest part about getting around?

Limited funding	**11**
Civic knowledge/education/driver's ed	4
Infrastructure waning	3
Lack of innovation and inclusiveness	1

Access management – lack of
Automated vehicles
Bridges
Capacity
CAVE people
Center city freeway
Congestion
Corridor preservation
Culture – risk adverse
Density
Drivers
Electric vehicles and supporting infrastructure
Increased traffic
Lack of EV charging stations
Lack of sidewalks and crosswalks
Loud vehicles
Modernize
Narrow ROW in built up areas
No law for hands free driving
Not pedestrian friendly/ADA
Parking
Politics
Speed limits on highways
Speeding/reckless driving and pedestrians/distracted

Where are we going? If there were no obstacles, what would you like us to accomplish by 2045? What will the region be like in 20 years? What will help the region attract new residents, entrepreneurs, businesses, and development?

Regional Transit System	**8**
Proactive decision making (now)	4
Diverging diamonds and roundabouts	2
Growing population and jobs	1
Innovative and inclusive culture	1
Leverage technology	1

Additional lanes (auxiliary)
Additional North/South/East/West primary/secondary arterials
Enhanced transit (air and rail)
Increase capacity
Increase transit
Increased density
Maintain maintenance levels
Maintain quality of life
Maximize technology
Mixed use neighborhoods
More complete streets
North/south express
Perpetual pavements
Quit playing catch-up
Rail
Seamless multimodal system
Smart/Regionally coordinated landscape planning
Transportation for the aging

How can we get there? What opportunities should we use to our advantage? What actions are needed to ensure the region is strong and viable in the future?

Education/Analysis/Forecasting	**7**
Increased funding	5
Collaboration/cost shares	1
Plan ahead for projects	1
Regional planning/branding	1

Corridor preservation
Focus on access management
Maximize exiting systems
Strategic decision making

Where are we? What makes moving around the Ozarks great? What are the region's transportation strengths?

Connectivity	**5**
Growing trail system	**5**
Alternative routes	4
Engaged communities	2
Low travel times	2
Regional cooperation	2
Space to see and explore	2
Regional ITS	1
Suburban connection	1

Accessible
Airport
Auxiliary lanes
Connection to I-44
Continually striving to improve
Good roadway conditions
Grid system
Independent mobility
Innovation
Local trust
Low gas prices
Natural environment
Passionate planning
Rail
Safe travels
Strong growth
Strong MPO
Uncrowded highways
Walkable downtown

Why can't we get there? What are the challenges facing the region today? What is the hardest part about getting around?

Funding	**21**
Development	1
Gaps in connectivity	1
Land use patterns	1

Access management
Bike/ped connectivity
Distracted driving
Driver education
Environmental constraints

Forcing change
Growth of area
Inconsistent local regulations
Increased cost
Insufficient ROW
Lack of alternate routes
Lack of construction competition
Lack of state funding
Lack of TOD (transit-oriented development)
Lack of voice for under-resourced
Legislative regulatory issues
Maintain assets
More involvement
Poor interstate reliability
Public buy-in
Public education
Public support
Public understanding
Railroad
Regional transit
Short public attention span
Transportation for disadvantaged

Where are we going? If there were no obstacles, what would you like us to accomplish by 2045? What will the region be like in 20 years? What will help the region attract new residents, entrepreneurs, businesses, and development?

Capacity improvements equaling growth	**3**
Increased drone deliveries	**3**
Multimodal connection to the rest of the nation	**3**
Additional lanes on freeways and expressways	2
Connected vehicle network/early adoption	2
Increased public-buy-in	2
Lowering drive times	2
Sustainable transportation funding sources	2
Connected modes	1
Connected trail system	1
Enhanced landscaping	1
Fully accessible sidewalk system	1

Access management
Aesthetics in design in infrastructure
Alternative transportation modes for the aging
Better N/S connection between Springfield and Christian County
Decreased motor vehicle use
Ease of access
Hovercrafts

Impact fees in development
Less time behind the wheel
Little to no fossil fuel in use
Lower fatality rates
Maintaining highway speeds
Mixed-use development
No deficient bridges
Non-essential transportation options (e.g., a trolley)
Regional transit
Transit frequency

How can we get there? What opportunities should we use to our advantage? What actions are needed to ensure the region is strong and viable in the future?

Sustainable long-term funding	**4**
Traffic impact fees and gas tax	**4**
Future looking laws and regulations	3
Aligned policies	2
Public education strategies	2
Use fees for all modes	2
Better land use planning for density	1
Continued regional collaboration	1
Expansion of trail system	1
Reduce regulatory constraints	1
Strong city identity	1
Utilizing funds efficiently	1

Additional regional transportation funding advocacy in state capital
Aggressively progressive transportation system
Clear priorities
Community engagement
Construction workforce development
Decision-maker buy-in
Incentives for smart development
Increased connectivity
Planning for life cycle costs
Proactive research in innovative transportation opportunities
Public private partnerships
Rails to trails
Relationship between EVs and CU
Stronger regional partnerships
Voter education on transportation issues

Appendix 5

TIP Projects

D) Aviation Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NA1206		**GENERAL AVIATION REDEVELOPMENT PHASES II/III**					
	CON	LOCAL	0	75,000	0	0	75,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	675,000	0	0	675,000
		Total	**0**	**750,000**	**0**	**0**	**750,000**
NA1300-20A5		**RUNWAY PAVEMENT CONDITION STUDY AND MASTER PLAN UPDATE**					
	PLAN	FAA (AIP)	787,500	0	0	0	787,500
	PLAN	LOCAL	87,500	0	0	0	87,500
		Total	**875,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**875,000**
NA1301-20A5		**REPLACE PERIMETER FENCING**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	405,000	405,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	45,000	45,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**450,000**	**450,000**
NA1501-20A5		**RUNWAY 32 RSA, OFA AND APPROACH GRADING IMPROVEMENTS**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	765,000	765,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	85,000	85,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**850,000**	**850,000**

D) Aviation Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NA1503-20A5		**TAXIWAY ALPHA AND PAPA DIRECT ACCESS MITIGATION AT TAXIWAY NOVEMBER**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	1,500,300	1,500,300
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	166,700	166,700
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,667,000**	**1,667,000**
NA1603-20A5		**TAXIWAY BRAVO RECONSTRUCTION AND DIRECT ACCESS MITIGATION**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	1,417,500	0	0	0	1,417,500
	CON	LOCAL	157,000	0	0	0	157,000
		Total	**1,574,500**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,574,500**
NA1801-20A5		**RECONSTRUCTION OF THE CARGO APRON**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	2,520,000	2,520,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	280,000	280,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,800,000**	**2,800,000**
NA1903-20A5		**TAXIWAY NOVEMBER AND DELTA RECONSTRUCTION**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	9,900,000	0	0	9,900,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	1,100,000	0	0	1,100,000
		Total	**0**	**11,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**11,000,000**

D) Aviation Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NA1904-20A5		**RUNWAY 2-20 LIGHTING REHABILITATION**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	360,000	360,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	40,000	40,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**400,000**	**400,000**
NA1907-20A5		**CONSTRUCT T-HANGAR TAXILANES (FUEL FARM AREA)**					
	CON	LOCAL	93,000	0	0	0	93,000
	CON	MoDOT	837,000	0	0	0	837,000
		Total	**930,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**930,000**
NA2102-20A5		**TAXIWAY NOVEMBER AND SIERRA RECONSTRUCTION AT RUNWAY 14-32**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	7,650,000	0	7,650,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	850,000	0	850,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**8,500,000**	**0**	**8,500,000**
NA2103-22		**TAXIWAY NOVEMBER RECONSTRUCTION FROM TAXIWAY ALPHA TO RUNWAY 20**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	2,802,960	0	0	0	2,802,960
	CON	LOCAL	311,440	0	0	0	311,440
		Total	**3,114,400**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,114,400**

D) Aviation Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NA2304-22		**RUNWAY 14-32 JOINT SEALANT REPLACEMENT AND SPALL REPAIR**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	720,000	0	0	720,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	80,000	0	0	80,000
		Total	**0**	**800,000**	**0**	**0**	**800,000**
NA2501-22		**TERMINAL APRON EXPANSION**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	5,067,000	5,067,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	563,000	563,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5,630,000**	**5,630,000**
NA2503-22		**TAXIWAY ROMEO RECONSTRUCTION**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	990,000	990,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	110,000	110,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,100,000**	**1,100,000**
NA2505-22		**RECONSTRUCT GA APRON**					
	CON	FAA (AIP)	0	0	0	2,790,000	2,790,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	310,000	310,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,100,000**	**3,100,000**

E) Sponsored by OTO Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
BA2201-22		**ROUTE FF THROUGH BATTLEFIELD STUDY**					
	PLAN	FHWA (STBG-U)	32,000	0	0	0	32,000
	PLAN	LOCAL	8,000	0	0	0	8,000
		Total	**40,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**40,000**
EN2205-22		**WILSON'S CREEK BOULEVARD TRAIL**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	138,198	0	0	0	138,198
	ENG	LOCAL	34,550	0	0	0	34,550
	CON	FHWA (CRRSSA)	1,246,730	0	0	0	1,246,730
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	246,402	0	0	0	246,402
	CON	LOCAL	61,600	0	0	0	61,600
		Total	**1,727,480**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,727,480**
OK2206-22		**CHADWICK FLYER HIGHWAY CROSSING STUDY**					
	PLAN	FHWA (STBG-U)	28,000	0	0	0	28,000
	PLAN	LOCAL	7,000	0	0	0	7,000
		Total	**35,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**35,000**

E) Sponsored by OTO Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
OT1901-19A5		**OTO OPERATIONS AND PLANNING**					
	PLAN	FHWA (STBG-U)	16,000	231,525	243,101	255,256	745,882
	PLAN	LOCAL	4,000	57,881	60,775	63,814	186,470
		Total	**20,000**	**289,406**	**303,876**	**319,070**	**932,352**
SP2216-22		**NORTH 13 CORRIDOR STUDY**					
	PLAN	FHWA (STBG-U)	240,000	0	0	0	240,000
	PLAN	LOCAL	60,000	0	0	0	60,000
		Total	**300,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**300,000**

E) Cost Shares Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2104-20AM10	**8Q3181**	**ITS OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT (2022)**					
	PMT	FHWA (STBG)	541,600	0	0	0	541,600
	PMT	MoDOT	135,400	0	0	0	135,400
	OPER	FHWA (STBG-U)	360,000	0	0	0	360,000
	OPER	LOCAL	90,000	0	0	0	90,000
		Total	**1,127,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,127,000**
MO2301-20A5	**8Q3208**	**ITS OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT (2023)**					
	PMT	MoDOT	0	154,200	0	0	154,200
	PMT	MoDOT-AC	0	616,800	0	0	616,800
	OPER	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	344,000	0	0	344,000
	OPER	LOCAL	0	86,000	0	0	86,000
		Total	**0**	**1,201,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,201,000**
SP1815-20A5	**8P3087D**	**KEARNEY AND WEST BYPASS INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	216,800	0	0	0	216,800
	ENG	MoDOT	54,200	0	0	0	54,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	519,454	0	0	0	519,454
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	965,346	0	0	0	965,346
	CON	LOCAL	241,337	0	0	0	241,337
	CON	MoDOT	129,863	0	0	0	129,863
		Total	**2,127,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,127,000**

E) Cost Shares Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1816-20A6	**8P3087E**	**KANSAS EXPRESSWAY AND SUNSET STREET**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	228,800	192,800	0	0	421,600
	ENG	MoDOT	57,200	48,200	0	0	105,400
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	49,428	0	0	0	49,428
	ROW	FHWA (STBG-U)	106,572	0	0	0	106,572
	ROW	LOCAL	26,643	0	0	0	26,643
	ROW	MoDOT	12,357	0	0	0	12,357
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	716,353	0	0	716,353
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	805,575	0	0	805,575
	CON	LOCAL	0	201,394	0	0	201,394
	CON	MoDOT	0	179,088	0	0	179,088
		Total	**481,000**	**2,143,410**	**0**	**0**	**2,624,410**
SP1817-20A6	**8P3087F**	**KANSAS EXPRESSWAY AND WALNUT LAWN**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	167,200	256,800	0	0	424,000
	ENG	MoDOT	41,800	64,200	0	0	106,000
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	107,465	0	0	0	107,465
	ROW	FHWA (STBG-U)	183,735	0	0	0	183,735
	ROW	LOCAL	45,934	0	0	0	45,934
	ROW	MoDOT	26,866	0	0	0	26,866
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	858,952	0	0	858,952
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	1,002,464	0	0	1,002,464
	CON	LOCAL	0	250,616	0	0	250,616
	CON	MoDOT	0	214,738	0	0	214,738
		Total	**573,000**	**2,647,770**	**0**	**0**	**3,220,770**

E) Cost Shares Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1818-20AM5	**8P3087C**	**CAMPBELL AND REPUBLIC ROAD INTERSECTION**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	8,000	0	0	0	8,000
	ENG	LOCAL	343,000	0	0	0	343,000
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	0	0	0	2,000
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	1,875,200	0	0	0	1,875,200
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,160,800	0	0	0	1,160,800
	CON	LOCAL	230,200	0	0	0	230,200
	CON	MoDOT	468,800	0	0	0	468,800
		Total	**4,088,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**4,088,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CC2103-20A7		**NELSON MILL BRIDGE**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	368,000	0	0	0	368,000
	CON	LOCAL	92,000	0	0	0	92,000
		Total	**460,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**460,000**
EN1803-20A6		**JEFFERSON AVENUE FOOTBRIDGE**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	80,000	0	0	0	80,000
	ENG	LOCAL	20,000	0	0	0	20,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	2,480,000	0	0	0	2,480,000
	CON	LOCAL	620,000	0	0	0	620,000
		Total	**3,200,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,200,000**
EN1904-20AM6		**BATTLEFIELD THIRD ST. SIDEWALK CONNECTION**					
	CON	FHWA (TAP)	244,000	0	0	0	244,000
	CON	LOCAL	61,000	0	0	0	61,000
		Total	**305,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**305,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN2008-20AM6		**CHADWICK FLYER JACKSON TO CLAY**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	18,967	0	0	0	18,967
	ENG	LOCAL	4,742	0	0	0	4,742
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	773,982	0	0	0	773,982
	CON	LOCAL	289,258	0	0	0	289,258
		Total	**1,086,949**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,086,949**
EN2009-20A3		**FASSNIGHT CLAY TO BROOKSIDE**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	217,461	0	0	0	217,461
	CON	LOCAL	54,365	0	0	0	54,365
		Total	**271,826**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**271,826**
EN2010-20AM6		**SHUYLER CREEK TRAIL**					
	ROW	FHWA (STBG-U)	315,486	0	0	0	315,486
	ROW	LOCAL	78,872	0	0	0	78,872
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	412,493	0	0	0	412,493
	CON	FHWA (TAP)	59,392	0	0	0	59,392
	CON	LOCAL	117,971	0	0	0	117,971
		Total	**984,214**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**984,214**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN2011-20A3		**TRAIL OF TEARS ELM TO SOMERSET**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	253,283	0	0	0	253,283
	CON	LOCAL	63,321	0	0	0	63,321
		Total	**316,604**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**316,604**
EN2203-22		**CHADWICK FLYER PHASE III**					
	ENG	FHWA (TAP)	96,000	0	0	0	96,000
	ENG	LOCAL	24,000	0	0	0	24,000
	CON	FHWA (CRRSSA)	863,750	0	0	0	863,750
	CON	FHWA (TAP)	173,000	0	0	0	173,000
	CON	LOCAL	43,250	0	0	0	43,250
		Total	**1,200,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,200,000**
EN2204-22		**CHADWICK FLYER PHASE II**					
	ENG	FHWA (TAP)	64,000	0	0	0	64,000
	ENG	LOCAL	16,000	0	0	0	16,000
	CON	FHWA (CRRSSA)	573,750	0	0	0	573,750
	CON	FHWA (TAP)	117,000	0	0	0	117,000
	CON	LOCAL	29,250	0	0	0	29,250
		Total	**800,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**800,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR1502		**EAST/WEST ARTERIAL (RIVERBLUFF BLVD) PHASE I**					
	ENG	LOCAL	0	0	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,000,000**	**1,000,000**
GR1707-17A6		**EAST/WEST ARTERIAL-CAMPBELL TO KISSICK**					
	ENG	LOCAL	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
		Total	**1,000**	**1,000**	**1,000**	**1,000**	**4,000**
GR1901-20AM6		**KANSAS EXTENSION PHASE I**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	14,735,589	0	0	0	14,735,589
	CON	LOCAL	7,264,411	0	0	0	7,264,411
		Total	**22,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**22,000,000**
GR1902-20AM6		**KANSAS EXTENSION PHASE II**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	3,246,479	0	0	0	3,246,479
	CON	LOCAL	1,253,521	4,000,000	0	0	5,253,521
		Total	**4,500,000**	**4,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**8,500,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2105-20A5		**FARM ROAD 175 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	480,000	0	0	0	480,000
	CON	LOCAL	120,000	0	0	0	120,000
		Total	**600,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**600,000**
GR2106-20A5		**MILL/FILL AND ADA UPGRADES ON FR 135 AND FR 102**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	560,000	0	0	0	560,000
	CON	LOCAL	140,000	0	0	0	140,000
		Total	**700,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**700,000**
MS2201-20A10		**GRAND STREET PEDESTRIAN UNDERPASS & STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS**					
	CON	LOCAL	3,536,748	0	0	0	3,536,748
		Total	**3,536,748**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**3,536,748**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NX2101-20AM7		**N. MAIN STREET**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	170,286	0	0	0	170,286
	ENG	LOCAL	42,571	0	0	0	42,571
	ROW	FHWA (STBG-U)	113,524	0	0	0	113,524
	ROW	LOCAL	28,381	0	0	0	28,381
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,589,336	0	0	0	1,589,336
	CON	LOCAL	397,334	0	0	0	397,334
		Total	**2,341,432**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,341,432**
NX2102-20A5		**NORTH STREET MAPLEWOOD HILLS TO CHEYENNE**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	437,506	0	0	0	437,506
	ENG	LOCAL	109,376	0	0	0	109,376
		Total	**546,882**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**546,882**
NX2201-20A8		**TRUMAN FROM HEATHER GLENN TO PEMBROOK/NORTON**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,530,550	0	0	0	1,530,550
	CON	LOCAL	382,638	0	0	0	382,638
		Total	**1,913,188**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,913,188**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
NX2301-20A5		**DOWNTOWN N. MAIN STREET**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	206,064	0	0	206,064
	ENG	LOCAL	0	51,516	0	0	51,516
		Total	**0**	**257,580**	**0**	**0**	**257,580**
SP1902-20AM5		**REPUBLIC ROAD LANE WIDENING**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	129,949	0	0	0	129,949
	CON	LOCAL	32,487	0	0	0	32,487
		Total	**162,436**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**162,436**
SP2014-20A7		**ADA IMPROVEMENTS SUNSHINE, NATIONAL, BATTLEFIELD**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,288,000	0	0	0	1,288,000
	CON	LOCAL	322,000	0	0	0	322,000
		Total	**1,610,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,610,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2015-20A5		**GRANT AVENUE CONNECT PARKWAY PROJECT**					
	ENG	FHWA(BUILD)	1,073,095	0	0	0	1,073,095
	ENG	LOCAL	268,274	0	0	0	268,274
	ROW	FHWA(BUILD)	3,824,000	0	0	0	3,824,000
	ROW	LOCAL	956,000	0	0	0	956,000
	CON	FHWA(BUILD)	14,381,327	0	0	0	14,381,327
	CON	LOCAL	3,595,332	0	0	0	3,595,332
		Total	**24,098,028**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**24,098,028**
SP2016-20AM6		**TRAFFIC SIGNAL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS**					
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	760,000	0	0	0	760,000
	CON	LOCAL	190,000	0	0	0	190,000
		Total	**950,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**950,000**
SP2104-20A7		**WALNUT STREET BRIDGE**					
	ROW	FHWA (STBG-U)	240,000	0	0	0	240,000
	ROW	LOCAL	60,000	0	0	0	60,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,360,000	0	0	0	1,360,000
	CON	LOCAL	340,000	0	0	0	340,000
		Total	**2,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,000,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2114-20A5	**GOVCS03**	**GALLOWAY STREET IMPROVEMENTS - GOVCS**					
	CON	LOCAL	3,500,000	0	0	0	3,500,000
	CON	MoDOT	1,500,000	0	0	0	1,500,000
		Total	**5,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5,000,000**
SP2202-20A5		**TMC SIGNAL REPLACEMENTS, VARIOUS LOCATIONS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	112,000	0	0	0	112,000
	ENG	LOCAL	28,000	0	0	0	28,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	1,232,000	0	0	0	1,232,000
	CON	LOCAL	308,000	0	0	0	308,000
		Total	**1,680,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,680,000**
SP2501-22		**GRAND STREET SAFETY AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	0	0	400,000	400,000
	ENG	LOCAL	0	0	0	100,000	100,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	0	0	0	1,200,000	1,200,000
	CON	LOCAL	0	0	0	300,000	300,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,000,000**	**2,000,000**

E) Sponsored by Local Public Agencies

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
ST2202-20A10		**N. OLD ORCHARD ROAD IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	LOCAL	66,153	0	0	0	66,153
	CON	FHWA (STBG-U)	481,362	0	0	0	481,362
	CON	LOCAL	120,341	0	0	0	120,341
		Total	**667,856**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**667,856**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CC0901	**8S0736**	**ROUTES CC/J/NN SCOPING**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	8,000	8,000	8,000	0	24,000
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	8,000	8,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
CC1703	**8P0588**	**SCOPING FOR ROUTE 14 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
CC1802	**8S3138**	**ROUTE 160 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	118,400	437,600	0	0	556,000
	ENG	MoDOT	29,600	109,400	0	0	139,000
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	240,000	0	0	0	240,000
	ROW	MoDOT	60,000	0	0	0	60,000
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	3,040,000	0	0	3,040,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	760,000	0	0	760,000
		Total	**448,000**	**4,347,000**	**0**	**0**	**4,795,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CC1901-19	**8P0605I**	**US 65 CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS FROM CC TO 14**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
		Total	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**20,000**
CC1902-19	**8P0605J**	**US 65 CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS FROM 14 TO F**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
CC2101-20A5	**8P3206**	**ROUTE 14 HIGH FRICTION SURFACE TREATMENT**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	27,900	0	0	0	27,900
	ENG	MoDOT	3,100	0	0	0	3,100
	CON	FHWA (SAFETY)	196,200	0	0	0	196,200
	CON	MoDOT	21,800	0	0	0	21,800
		Total	**249,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**249,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CC2102-20A7	**8S3138B**	**US 160 BRIDGE REHABILITATION AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT RT AA**					
	ENG	MoDOT	77,200	159,800	0	0	237,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	308,800	639,200	0	0	948,000
	ROW	MoDOT	2,000	0	0	0	2,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	8,000	0	0	0	8,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	878,200	0	0	878,200
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	3,512,800	0	0	3,512,800
		Total	**396,000**	**5,190,000**	**0**	**0**	**5,586,000**
EN1706	**8P3065**	**SCOPING FOR ADA IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	12,800
	ENG	MoDOT	800	800	800	800	3,200
		Total	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**16,000**
EN1901-19	**8S3149**	**ROUTE 744 ADA IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	324,000	250,400	0	0	574,400
	ENG	MoDOT	81,000	62,600	0	0	143,600
	ROW	FHWA (STBG)	83,200	0	0	0	83,200
	ROW	MoDOT	20,800	0	0	0	20,800
	CON	FHWA (STBG)	0	1,252,800	0	0	1,252,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	313,200	0	0	313,200
		Total	**509,000**	**1,879,000**	**0**	**0**	**2,388,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN1914-19AM2	**8S3175**	**ADA IMPROVEMENTS ON NATURE CENTER WAY**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	78,400	0	0	0	78,400
	ENG	MoDOT	19,600	0	0	0	19,600
	ROW	FHWA (STBG)	7,200	0	0	0	7,200
	ROW	MoDOT	1,800	0	0	0	1,800
	CON	FHWA (STBG)	272,800	0	0	0	272,800
	CON	MoDOT	68,200	0	0	0	68,200
		Total	**448,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**448,000**
EN2002-20A5	**8P3192**	**ADA IMPROVEMENTS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	6,000	41,000	0	48,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	4,000	24,000	164,000	0	192,000
	ROW	MoDOT	0	4,200	0	0	4,200
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	16,800	0	0	16,800
	CON	FHWA (STAP)	0	0	252,000	0	252,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	216,400	0	216,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	613,600	0	613,600
		Total	**5,000**	**51,000**	**1,287,000**	**0**	**1,343,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN2003-20AM5	**8S3173**	**KANSAS EXPY ADA UPGRADES I-44 TO 60**					
	ENG	MoDOT	258,600	128,400	0	0	387,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,034,400	513,600	0	0	1,548,000
	ROW	MoDOT	10,000	0	0	0	10,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	40,000	0	0	0	40,000
	CON	FHWA (STAP)	0	329,000	0	0	329,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	593,800	0	0	593,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	2,046,200	0	0	2,046,200
		Total	**1,343,000**	**3,611,000**	**0**	**0**	**4,954,000**
EN2005-20	**8S3172**	**KEARNEY AND MULROY ADA IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	143,200	188,000	0	0	331,200
	ENG	MoDOT	35,800	47,000	0	0	82,800
	ROW	FHWA (STBG)	40,000	0	0	0	40,000
	ROW	MoDOT	10,000	0	0	0	10,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG)	0	905,600	0	0	905,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	226,400	0	0	226,400
		Total	**229,000**	**1,367,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,596,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN2006-20	**8S3190**	**KEARNEY ADA IMPROVEMENTS WEST BYPASS TO KANSAS EXPY**					
	ENG	MoDOT	57,200	60,800	0	0	118,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	228,800	243,200	0	0	472,000
	ROW	MoDOT	21,400	0	0	0	21,400
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	85,600	0	0	0	85,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	293,800	0	0	293,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	1,175,200	0	0	1,175,200
		Total	**393,000**	**1,773,000**	**0**	**0**	**2,166,000**
EN2007-20	**8S3171**	**ADA SIDEWALK UPGRADE ON CHESTNUT AND GLENSTONE**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	5,000	4,400	0	9,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	20,000	17,600	0	39,200
	ROW	MoDOT	0	2,000	0	0	2,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	8,000	0	0	8,000
	CON	FHWA (TAP)	0	0	79,000	0	79,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	21,000	0	21,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	5,000	0	5,000
		Total	**2,000**	**35,000**	**127,000**	**0**	**164,000**
EN2103-20A5	**8S3179**	**NORTON ROAD ADA IMPROVEMENTS IN SPRINGFIELD**					
	ENG	MoDOT	12,000	0	0	0	12,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	48,000	0	0	0	48,000
	CON	MoDOT	43,400	0	0	0	43,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	173,600	0	0	0	173,600
		Total	**277,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**277,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
EN2202-22	**8S3200**	**RT P ADA TRANSITION PLAN IMPROVEMENTS US 60 TO GRACE STREET IN REPUBLIC**					
	ENG	MoDOT	10,600	9,800	0	0	20,400
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	42,400	39,200	0	0	81,600
	ROW	MoDOT	400	0	0	0	400
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	1,600	0	0	0	1,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	45,600	0	0	45,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	182,400	0	0	182,400
		Total	**55,000**	**277,000**	**0**	**0**	**332,000**
GR1403-18A1	**8P0683G**	**SCOPING FOR FREEWAY IMPROVEMENTS ON RTE. 60 EAST**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	64,000
	ENG	MoDOT	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
		Total	**20,000**	**20,000**	**20,000**	**20,000**	**80,000**
GR1801-18	**8I3134**	**SCOPING FOR I-44 SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	1,800	0	1,800	0	3,600
	ENG	MoDOT	200	200	200	0	600
	ADMIN	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	1,800	0	0	1,800
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**0**	**6,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR1907-19	**8P3122B**	**ROUTE 60 RESURFACING HIGHLAND SPRINGS TO 125**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	32,400	0	0	32,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	129,600	0	0	131,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	336,400	0	0	336,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	1,345,600	0	0	1,345,600
		Total	**2,000**	**1,844,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,846,000**
GR1912-19	**673253R**	**BNSF RR CROSSING AT FR 245**					
	CON	FHWA (130)	200,000	0	0	0	200,000
	CON	MoDOT-GCSA	50,000	0	0	0	50,000
		Total	**250,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**250,000**
GR2003-20	**8P3164**	**US 65 PAVEMENT RESURFACING I-44 TO KK**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	3,200	9,600	107,200	0	120,000
	ENG	MoDOT	800	2,400	26,800	0	30,000
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	1,143,200	0	1,143,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	285,800	0	285,800
		Total	**4,000**	**12,000**	**1,563,000**	**0**	**1,579,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2004-20	**8S3162**	**744 PAVEMENT RESURFACING**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	2,400	124,000	0	0	126,400
	ENG	MoDOT	600	31,000	0	0	31,600
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	1,304,000	0	0	1,304,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	326,000	0	0	326,000
		Total	**3,000**	**1,785,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,788,000**
GR2007-20	**8S3165**	**KANSAS EXPY RESURFACING I-44 TO 60**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	32,000	216,800	0	0	248,800
	ENG	MoDOT	8,000	54,200	0	0	62,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	2,368,800	0	0	2,368,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	592,200	0	0	592,200
		Total	**40,000**	**3,232,000**	**0**	**0**	**3,272,000**
GR2010-20A1	**8S3194**	**ROUTE ZZ AND FR 182 ADD ROUNDABOUT**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	121,600	122,400	0	0	244,000
	ENG	MoDOT	30,400	93,600	0	0	124,000
	CON	OTHER	0	970,000	0	0	970,000
		Total	**152,000**	**1,186,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,338,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2011-20A5	**8P3197**	**ROUTE 60 CRISI PROJECT**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	47,200	0	0	0	47,200
	ENG	FRA (CRISI)	38,500	0	0	0	38,500
	ENG	MoDOT	11,800	0	0	0	11,800
	ENG	MoDOT-GCSA	38,500	0	0	0	38,500
	ROW	FRA (CRISI)	12,000	0	0	0	12,000
	ROW	MoDOT-GCSA	12,000	0	0	0	12,000
	CON	FRA (CRISI)	323,000	0	0	0	323,000
	CON	MoDOT-GCSA	323,000	0	0	0	323,000
		Total	**806,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**806,000**
GR2101-20	**673269M**	**FR 140 RR GATE INSTALLATION**					
	CON	FHWA (130)	240,000	0	0	0	240,000
	CON	MoDOT-GCSA	60,000	0	0	0	60,000
		Total	**300,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**300,000**
GR2201-22	**8I3225**	**I-44 PAVEMENT RESURFACING CHESTNUT TO GLENSTONE AND US 65 TO MO 125**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	45,000	49,500	484,200	0	578,700
	ENG	MoDOT	5,000	5,500	53,800	0	64,300
	CON	FHWA (I/M)	0	0	5,796,000	0	5,796,000
		Total	**50,000**	**55,000**	**6,334,000**	**0**	**6,439,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2202-22	**8S3226**	**RT C PAVEMENT RESURFACING US 65 TO MO 125 IN STRAFFORD**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	1,200	5,400	0	7,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	4,800	21,600	0	28,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	55,000	0	55,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	220,000	0	220,000
		Total	**2,000**	**6,000**	**302,000**	**0**	**310,000**
GR2203-22	**8S3215**	**RT D PAVEMENT RESURFACING BLACKMAN ROAD TO MO 125**					
	ENG	MoDOT	4,400	24,000	0	0	28,400
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	17,600	96,000	0	0	113,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	253,400	0	0	253,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	1,013,600	0	0	1,013,600
		Total	**22,000**	**1,387,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,409,000**
GR2204-22	**8S3228**	**RT DD PAVEMENT RESURFACING MO 125 TO WEBSTER COUNTY**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	1,200	4,200	0	5,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	4,800	16,800	0	23,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	42,600	0	42,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	170,400	0	170,400
		Total	**2,000**	**6,000**	**234,000**	**0**	**242,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2205-22	**8S3211**	**RT J PAVEMENT RESURFACING RT D TO NORTH OF US 60**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,600	9,400	0	0	11,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	6,400	37,600	0	0	44,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	95,000	0	0	95,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	380,000	0	0	380,000
		Total	**8,000**	**522,000**	**0**	**0**	**530,000**
GR2206-22	**8S3222**	**RT KK CULVERT REPLACEMENT EAST OF HIDDEN LAKE LANE**					
	ENG	MoDOT	16,000	0	0	0	16,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	64,000	0	0	0	64,000
	ROW	MoDOT	400	0	0	0	400
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	1,600	0	0	0	1,600
	CON	MoDOT	41,400	0	0	0	41,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	165,600	0	0	0	165,600
		Total	**289,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**289,000**
GR2207-22	**8S3227**	**RT WW PAVEMENT RESURFACING MO 13 TO RT H**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	1,200	5,600	0	7,200
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	4,800	22,400	0	28,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	55,200	0	55,200
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	220,800	0	220,800
		Total	**2,000**	**6,000**	**304,000**	**0**	**312,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
GR2208-22	**8P3251**	**US 60 SCOPING FOR ITS EXTENSION TO ROGERSVILLE**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
		Total	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**20,000**
GR2209-22	**8P3223**	**MO 360/US 60 BRIDGE REHABILITATIONS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	38,400	0	0	0	38,400
	ENG	MoDOT	9,600	0	0	0	9,600
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	226,400	0	0	0	226,400
	CON	MoDOT	56,600	0	0	0	56,600
		Total	**331,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**331,000**
MO1105	**5B0800X**	**SAFE AND SOUND BRIDGE PROGRAM**					
	PMT	MoDOT	292,000	292,000	292,000	292,000	1,168,000
		Total	**292,000**	**292,000**	**292,000**	**292,000**	**1,168,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO1405	**8P3027**	**SURVEYING FOR EXCESS RIGHT-OF-WAY**					
	ENG	MoDOT	15,000	15,000	0	0	30,000
		Total	**15,000**	**15,000**	**0**	**0**	**30,000**
MO1719-18A5	**8P3067**	**SCOPING FOR BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	40,000	40,000	0	0	80,000
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	0	0	20,000
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**0**	**0**	**100,000**
MO1720	**8P3068**	**SCOPING FOR BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	12,800
	ENG	MoDOT	800	800	800	800	3,200
		Total	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**16,000**
MO1721-18A5	**8P3069**	**SCOPING FOR SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	54,000	54,000	0	0	108,000
	ENG	MoDOT	6,000	6,000	0	0	12,000
		Total	**60,000**	**60,000**	**0**	**0**	**120,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO1722	**8P3099**	**SCOPING FOR PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS ON MAJOR ROUTES**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	40,000	40,000	0	0	80,000
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	0	0	20,000
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**0**	**0**	**100,000**
MO1723	**8S3066**	**SCOPING FOR PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS ON MINOR ROUTES**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	40,000	40,000	0	0	80,000
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	0	0	20,000
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**0**	**0**	**100,000**
MO1905-19		**BRIDGE INSPECTIONS**					
	MAINT	MoDOT	40,000	20,000	85,000	60,000	205,000
		Total	**40,000**	**20,000**	**85,000**	**60,000**	**205,000**
MO2008-20	**8I3184**	**ON-CALL WORK ZONE ENFORCEMENT (2022)**					
	PMT	FHWA (SAFETY)	180,900	0	0	0	180,900
	PMT	MoDOT	20,100	0	0	0	20,100
		Total	**201,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**201,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2106-20A7	**8P3207**	**ADD ITS FOR OZARKS TRAFFIC IN VARIOUS LOCATIONS IN OTO AREA**					
	ENG	MoDOT	13,800	0	0	0	13,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	55,200	0	0	0	55,200
	CON	MoDOT	188,000	0	0	0	188,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	752,000	0	0	0	752,000
		Total	**1,009,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,009,000**
MO2107-20A7	**8Q3181B**	**UPGRADE ITS MESSAGE BOARDS IN OTO AREA**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,400	0	0	0	2,400
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	9,600	0	0	0	9,600
	CON	MoDOT	18,800	0	0	0	18,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	75,200	0	0	0	75,200
		Total	**106,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**106,000**
MO2202-22	**8P3229**	**VARIOUS ROUTES PAVEMENT PRESERVATION**					
	ENG	MoDOT	9,200	0	0	0	9,200
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	36,800	0	0	0	36,800
	CON	MoDOT	45,400	0	0	0	45,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	181,600	0	0	0	181,600
		Total	**273,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**273,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2203-22	**8P3248**	**VARIOUS ROUTES SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	45,000	90,000	162,000	0	297,000
	ENG	MoDOT	5,000	10,000	18,000	0	33,000
	CON	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	0	1,000,800	0	1,000,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	111,200	0	111,200
		Total	**50,000**	**100,000**	**1,292,000**	**0**	**1,442,000**
MO2204-22	**8I3210**	**JOB ORDER CONTRACTING PAVEMENT REPAIR (2022)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	3,800	0	0	0	3,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	34,200	0	0	0	34,200
	CON	MoDOT	40,000	0	0	0	40,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	360,000	0	0	0	360,000
		Total	**438,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**438,000**
MO2205-22	**8I3243**	**REPLACE SIGNS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS**					
	ENG	MoDOT	6,000	8,000	0	0	14,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	24,000	32,000	0	0	56,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	73,600	0	0	73,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	294,400	0	0	294,400
		Total	**30,000**	**408,000**	**0**	**0**	**438,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2206-22	**8I3246**	**BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	28,000	147,200	0	176,800
	ENG	MoDOT	400	7,000	36,800	0	44,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	802,400	0	802,400
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	200,600	0	200,600
		Total	**2,000**	**35,000**	**1,187,000**	**0**	**1,224,000**
MO2207-22	**8P3213**	**JOB ORDER CONTRACTING FOR GUARD CABLE AND GUARDRAIL REPAIR (2023)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,200	16,800	0	0	18,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	4,800	67,200	0	0	72,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	168,000	0	0	168,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	672,000	0	0	672,000
		Total	**6,000**	**924,000**	**0**	**0**	**930,000**
MO2208-22	**8P3233**	**JOB ORDER CONTRACTING FOR BRIDGE REPAIRS (2022)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	8,000	0	0	0	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	32,000	0	0	0	32,000
	CON	MoDOT	40,000	0	0	0	40,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	160,000	0	0	0	160,000
		Total	**240,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**240,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2209-22	**8P3236**	**REPLACE SIGNALS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (2024)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	41,200	71,200	0	122,400
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	40,000	164,800	284,800	0	489,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	324,600	0	324,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	1,298,400	0	1,298,400
		Total	**50,000**	**206,000**	**1,979,000**	**0**	**2,235,000**
MO2210-22	**8P3237**	**REPLACE SIGNALS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (2026)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	45,200	51,200
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	180,800	204,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	0	0
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**226,000**	**256,000**
MO2211-22	**8P3241**	**CONCRETE REPAIRS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (2022)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	9,000	0	0	0	9,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	36,000	0	0	0	36,000
	CON	MoDOT	102,000	0	0	0	102,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	408,000	0	0	0	408,000
		Total	**555,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**555,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2212-22	**8P3242**	**CONCRETE REPAIRS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS (2023)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	8,000	0	0	9,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	4,000	32,000	0	0	36,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	105,000	0	0	105,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	420,000	0	0	420,000
		Total	**5,000**	**565,000**	**0**	**0**	**570,000**
MO2213-22	**8P3234**	**JOB ORDER CONTRACTING FOR BRIDGE REPAIRS (2024)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	0	0	8,000	0	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	0	0	32,000	0	32,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	42,400	0	42,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	169,600	0	169,600
		Total	**0**	**0**	**252,000**	**0**	**252,000**
MO2302-22	**8I3214**	**ON-CALL WORK ZONE ENFORCEMENT (2023)**					
	PMT	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	180,900	0	0	180,900
	PMT	MoDOT	0	20,100	0	0	20,100
		Total	**0**	**201,000**	**0**	**0**	**201,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2401-22	**8I3232**	**JOB ORDER CONTRACTING PAVEMENT REPAIR (2024)**					
	ENG	MoDOT	0	0	3,800	0	3,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	0	0	34,200	0	34,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	42,400	0	42,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	381,600	0	381,600
		Total	**0**	**0**	**462,000**	**0**	**462,000**
MO2402-22	**8Q3231**	**ITS OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT (2024)**					
	PMT	MoDOT	0	0	154,200	0	154,200
	PMT	MoDOT-AC	0	0	616,800	0	616,800
		Total	**0**	**0**	**771,000**	**0**	**771,000**
MO2403-22	**0P3024I**	**SAFETY PROJECTS AT VARIOUS LOCATIONS**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	0	53,100	0	53,100
	ENG	MoDOT	0	0	5,900	0	5,900
	CON	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	0	801,900	0	801,900
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	89,100	0	89,100
		Total	**0**	**0**	**950,000**	**0**	**950,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO2404-22	**8I3230**	**ON-CALL WORK ZONE ENFORCEMENT (2024)**					
	PMT	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	0	180,900	0	180,900
	PMT	MoDOT	0	0	20,100	0	20,100
		Total	**0**	**0**	**201,000**	**0**	**201,000**
NX1704	**8P3033**	**SCOPING FOR RTE 160 CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS PLAINVIEW TO SOUTH**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	6,400
	ENG	MoDOT	400	400	400	400	1,600
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**8,000**
NX2202-22	**8S0736F**	**RT CC SCOPING AT MAIN STREET IN NIXA**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
NX2203-22	**8S0736G**	**RT CC SCOPING US 160 TO MAIN STREET IN NIXA**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
OK2002-20A9	**8P0583**	**ROUTE 14 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS 6TH TO W ON SOUTH**					
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	10,000	10,000	0	40,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	80,000	40,000	40,000	0	160,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	**100,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**0**	**200,000**
OK2102-20A9	**8S0736D**	**ROUTE CC CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	160,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**200,000**
OK2201-22	**8P0583B**	**MO 14 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS 6TH AVENUE TO 14TH AVENUE**					
	ENG	MoDOT	5,000	5,000	10,000	61,600	81,600
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	20,000	20,000	40,000	246,400	326,400
	ROW	MoDOT	0	0	0	202,800	202,800
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	811,200	811,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	0	0
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	**25,000**	**25,000**	**50,000**	**1,322,000**	**1,422,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
OK2202-22	**8S0736E**	**RT CC INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS IN OZARK**					
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	20,000	45,400	58,800	134,200
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	40,000	80,000	181,600	235,200	536,800
	ROW	MoDOT	0	0	64,000	0	64,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	0	256,000	0	256,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	425,800	425,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	1,703,200	1,703,200
		Total	**50,000**	**100,000**	**547,000**	**2,423,000**	**3,120,000**
OK2203-22	**8S3245**	**RT J BRIDGE REHABILITATION IN OZARK**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	10,400	56,800	0	68,800
	ENG	MoDOT	400	2,600	14,200	0	17,200
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	0	1,600	0	0	1,600
	ROW	MoDOT	0	400	0	0	400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	428,800	0	428,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	107,200	0	107,200
		Total	**2,000**	**15,000**	**607,000**	**0**	**624,000**
OK2204-22	**8P3249**	**MO 14 SCOPING FOR WESTBOUND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
OK2205-22	**8P3235**	**US 65 SCOPING FOR RAMP AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT RT CC/J**					
	ENG	MoDOT	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	8,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	32,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
RG0901-20A9	**8P0683E**	**INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 60 & ROUTE 125**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	180,000	679,500	0	0	859,500
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	75,500	0	0	95,500
	ROW	FHWA (SAFETY)	3,056,400	0	0	0	3,056,400
	ROW	MoDOT	339,600	0	0	0	339,600
	CON	FHWA (SAFETY)	0	15,238,800	0	0	15,238,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	1,693,200	0	0	1,693,200
		Total	**3,596,000**	**17,687,000**	**0**	**0**	**21,283,000**
RP1701	**8P0865**	**SCOPING FOR ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS ON ROUTE 60 FROM FR 194 TO WEST**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
		Total	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**5,000**	**20,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
RP1703-17A3	**8S0836B**	**SCOPING FOR ROUTE MM IMPROVEMENTS - I-44 TO MORNING STAR LANE**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	80,000	80,000	0	0	160,000
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	20,000	0	0	40,000
		Total	**100,000**	**100,000**	**0**	**0**	**200,000**
RP1704-20A9	**8S0836; 8S0836D**	**RT MM ROAD RELOCATION AND RAILROAD GRADE SEPARATION**					
	ENG	MoDOT	120,000	120,000	62,200	163,400	465,600
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	480,000	480,000	24,800	653,600	1,638,400
	ROW	MoDOT	0	0	794,000	0	794,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	0	3,176,000	0	3,176,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	0	4,782,800	4,782,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	0	19,131,200	19,131,200
		Total	**600,000**	**600,000**	**4,057,000**	**24,731,000**	**29,988,000**
RP2201-22	**8S3239**	**RT MM RAMP INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT I-44**					
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	14,000	0	0	24,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	40,000	56,000	0	0	96,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	84,000	0	0	84,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	336,000	0	0	336,000
		Total	**50,000**	**490,000**	**0**	**0**	**540,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
RP2202-22	**8P3198**	**US 60 PAVEMENT RESURFACING FR 194 TO ILLINOIS STREET IN REPUBLIC**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,600	5,000	0	0	6,600
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	6,400	20,000	0	0	26,400
	CON	MoDOT	0	48,400	0	0	48,400
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	193,600	0	0	193,600
		Total	**8,000**	**267,000**	**0**	**0**	**275,000**
RP2203-22	**8S3199**	**RT P PAVEMENT RESURFACING US 60 TO FARM ROAD 194**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,600	4,400	0	0	6,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	6,400	17,600	0	0	24,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	42,000	0	0	42,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	168,000	0	0	168,000
		Total	**8,000**	**232,000**	**0**	**0**	**240,000**
SP1405-18A1	**8P3032**	**SCOPING FOR JAMES RIVER FREEWAY CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	80,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	200,000
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
		Total	**100,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**250,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1413-19	**8S3024, 8S3153**	**SUNSHINE STREET ADA IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	MoDOT	42,800	26,800	0	0	69,600
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	171,200	107,200	0	0	278,400
	ROW	MoDOT	10,600	0	0	0	10,600
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	42,400	0	0	0	42,400
	CON	MoDOT	0	132,200	0	0	132,200
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	528,800	0	0	528,800
		Total	**267,000**	**795,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,062,000**
SP1419-18A1	**8I3044**	**SCOPING FOR I-44 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (I/M)	135,000	90,000	90,000	135,000	450,000
	ENG	MoDOT	15,000	10,000	10,000	15,000	50,000
		Total	**150,000**	**100,000**	**100,000**	**150,000**	**500,000**
SP1708	**8P3050C**	**KEARNEY PAVEMENT RESURFACING KANSAS TO GLENSTONE**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	77,600	0	0	79,200
	ENG	MoDOT	400	19,400	0	0	19,800
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	722,400	0	0	722,400
	CON	MoDOT	0	180,600	0	0	180,600
		Total	**2,000**	**1,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,002,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1709	**8P3103**	**SCOPING FOR INTERSTATE DESIGNATION ON FREEWAYS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	3,200	3,200	3,200	3,200	12,800
	ENG	MoDOT	800	800	800	800	3,200
		Total	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**4,000**	**16,000**
SP1710	**8P3050B**	**GLENSTONE AVENUE PAVEMENT IMPROVEMENTS**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	87,200	0	0	0	87,200
	ENG	MoDOT	21,800	0	0	0	21,800
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	851,200	0	0	0	851,200
	CON	MoDOT	212,800	0	0	0	212,800
		Total	**1,173,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,173,000**
SP1802-18	**8S3133**	**SCOPING FOR SAFETY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS ON SUNSHINE STREET**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	1,600	1,600	1,600	6,400
	ENG	MoDOT	400	400	400	400	1,600
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**8,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1811-18	**8S3145**	**KEARNEY STREET SAFETY SCOPING**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	9,000	9,000	9,000	9,000	36,000
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	4,000
		Total	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**10,000**	**40,000**
SP1812-18	**8P3144**	**CHESTNUT EXPRESSWAY SAFETY SCOPING**					
	ENG	FHWA (SAFETY)	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	7,200
	ENG	MoDOT	200	200	200	200	800
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**2,000**	**8,000**
SP1903-19	**8S3112**	**GLENSTONE PAVEMENT RESURFACING BATTLEFIELD TO 60**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	72,800	0	0	0	72,800
	ENG	MoDOT	18,200	0	0	0	18,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	624,800	0	0	0	624,800
	CON	MoDOT	156,200	0	0	0	156,200
		Total	**872,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**872,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1904-19	**8S3117**	**GLENSTONE PAVEMENT RESURFACING RR S. OF CHESTNUT TO BATTLEFIELD**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	125,600	0	0	0	125,600
	ENG	MoDOT	31,400	0	0	0	31,400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	1,049,600	0	0	0	1,049,600
	CON	MoDOT	262,400	0	0	0	262,400
		Total	**1,469,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,469,000**
SP1906-19	**8S0745**	**RTE D PAVEMENT RESURFACING GLENSTONE TO BLACKMAN**					
	ENG	MoDOT	400	22,400	0	0	22,800
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	1,600	89,600	0	0	91,200
	CON	MoDOT	0	238,000	0	0	238,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	952,000	0	0	952,000
		Total	**2,000**	**1,302,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,304,000**
SP1908-19A2	**8S3157**	**SUNSHINE STREET BRIDGE OVER MNA RAILROAD**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	332,800	636,800	0	0	969,600
	ENG	MoDOT	83,200	159,200	0	0	242,400
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	270,400	0	0	0	270,400
	ROW	MoDOT	67,600	0	0	0	67,600
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	3,116,000	0	0	3,116,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	779,000	0	0	779,000
		Total	**754,000**	**4,691,000**	**0**	**0**	**5,445,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP1909-19A2	**8S3159**	**WEST SUNSHINE/RTE. 60 CORRIDOR**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	160,000
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	40,000
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**200,000**
SP1910-19A2	**8S3158**	**EASTGATE BRIDGE OVER BNSF**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	80,000	125,600	208,800	0	414,400
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	31,400	52,200	0	103,600
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	0	169,600	0	0	169,600
	ROW	MoDOT	0	42,400	0	0	42,400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	1,734,400	0	1,734,400
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	433,600	0	433,600
		Total	**100,000**	**369,000**	**2,429,000**	**0**	**2,898,000**
SP1911-19A2	**8S3156**	**MELVILLE ROAD BRIDGE OVER I-44**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	80,000	172,000	248,000	0	500,000
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	43,000	62,000	0	125,000
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	0	25,600	0	0	25,600
	ROW	MoDOT	0	6,400	0	0	6,400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	2,445,000	0	2,445,000
		Total	**100,000**	**247,000**	**2,755,000**	**0**	**3,102,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2002-20	**8S3167**	**PAVEMENT RESURFACING ON GLENSTONE AND CHESTNUT**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	7,200	5,600	88,000	0	100,800
	ENG	MoDOT	1,800	1,400	22,000	0	25,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	940,000	0	940,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	235,000	0	235,000
		Total	**9,000**	**7,000**	**1,285,000**	**0**	**1,301,000**
SP2003-20A7	**8S3160**	**OPERATIONAL, SAFETY, AND ADA IMPROVEMENTS ON GLENSTONE ST. LOUIS TO 60**					
	ENG	FHWA (STBG)	1,976,800	0	0	0	1,976,800
	ENG	MoDOT	494,200	0	0	0	494,200
	ROW	FHWA (STBG)	176,800	0	0	0	176,800
	ROW	MoDOT	44,200	0	0	0	44,200
	CON	FHWA (SAFETY)	677,000	0	0	0	677,000
	CON	FHWA (STAP)	315,000	0	0	0	315,000
	CON	FHWA (STBG)	3,637,600	0	0	0	3,637,600
	CON	LOCAL	67,500	0	0	0	67,500
	CON	MoDOT	1,089,900	0	0	0	1,089,900
		Total	**8,479,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,479,000**
SP2006-20	**8S3169**	**KEARNEY RESURFACING FROM AIRPORT TO KANSAS EXPY**					
	ENG	MoDOT	600	25,400	0	0	26,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	2,400	101,600	0	0	104,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	261,800	0	0	261,800
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	1,047,200	0	0	1,047,200
		Total	**3,000**	**1,436,000**	**0**	**0**	**1,439,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2008-20	**8P3170**	**WEST BYPASS RESURFACING I-44 TO SUNSHINE**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	124,800	0	0	0	124,800
	ENG	MoDOT	31,200	0	0	0	31,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	1,223,200	0	0	0	1,223,200
	CON	MoDOT	305,800	0	0	0	305,800
		Total	**1,685,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,685,000**
SP2009-20AM5	**8S3168**	**WEST BYPASS RESURFACING SUNSHINE TO 60**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	56,800	0	0	0	56,800
	ENG	MoDOT	14,200	0	0	0	14,200
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	554,400	0	0	0	554,400
	CON	MoDOT	138,600	0	0	0	138,600
		Total	**764,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**764,000**
SP2013-20	**8S3166**	**CHESTNUT PAVEMENT RESURFACING COLLEGE TO KANSAS EXPY**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	1,600	30,400	0	33,600
	ENG	MoDOT	400	400	7,600	0	8,400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	312,000	0	312,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	78,000	0	78,000
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**428,000**	**0**	**432,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2101-20A6	**8S3219**	**OR 44 PAVEMENT RESURFACING IN SPRINGFIELD**					
	ENG	MoDOT	341,000	0	0	0	341,000
		Total	**341,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**341,000**
SP2102-20A5	**8S3218**	**NORTON ROAD PAVEMENT RESURFACING**					
	ENG	MoDOT	159,000	0	0	0	159,000
		Total	**159,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**159,000**
SP2103-20A5	**8S3217**	**I-44 OUTER ROAD PAVEMENT RESURFACING**					
	ENG	MoDOT	576,000	0	0	0	576,000
		Total	**576,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**576,000**
SP2201-20	**664172S**	**RR AND INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS AT NATIONAL AND DIVISION**					
	CON	FHWA (130)	800,000	0	0	0	800,000
	CON	MoDOT-GCSA	200,000	0	0	0	200,000
		Total	**1,000,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,000,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2203-22	**8I3044C**	**I-44 ROADWAY IMPROVEMENTS GLENSTONE TO US 65 IN SPRINGFIELD**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	323,200	164,800	496,000	0	984,000
	ENG	MoDOT	80,800	41,200	124,000	0	246,000
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	8,420,000	0	8,420,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	2,105,000	0	2,105,000
		Total	**404,000**	**206,000**	**11,145,000**	**0**	**11,755,000**
SP2204-22	**8P3032D**	**JAMES RIVER FREEWAY ADD LANES KANSAS TO CAMPBELL**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	814,400	0	0	0	814,400
	ENG	MoDOT	203,600	0	0	0	203,600
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	4,660,800	0	0	0	4,660,800
	CON	MoDOT	1,165,200	0	0	0	1,165,200
		Total	**6,844,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**6,844,000**
SP2205-22	**8P3032C**	**JAMES RIVER FREEWAY ADD LANES CAMPBELL TO NATIONAL**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,160,000	0	0	0	1,160,000
	ENG	MoDOT	290,000	0	0	0	290,000
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	6,658,400	0	0	0	6,658,400
	CON	MoDOT	1,664,600	0	0	0	1,664,600
		Total	**9,773,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**9,773,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP # / Phase	Project Name / Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2206-22	**8S3224**	**CHESTNUT EXPRESSWAY PAVEMENT RESURFACING**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	4,000	24,000	151,200	0	179,200
	ENG	MoDOT	1,000	6,000	37,800	0	44,800
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	1,620,800	0	1,620,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	405,200	0	405,200
		Total	**5,000**	**30,000**	**2,215,000**	**0**	**2,250,000**
SP2207-22	**8P3201**	**US 60 PAVEMENT RESURFACING ON AUX RAMPS KANSAS TO CAMPBELL**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	18,400	0	0	0	18,400
	ENG	MoDOT	4,600	0	0	0	4,600
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	104,800	0	0	0	104,800
	CON	MoDOT	26,200	0	0	0	26,200
		Total	**154,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**154,000**
SP2208-22	**8P3043**	**US 65 PAVEMENT RESURFACING AT SUNSHINE INTERCHANGE**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,600	7,400	0	0	9,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	6,400	29,600	0	0	36,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	72,600	0	0	72,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	290,400	0	0	290,400
		Total	**8,000**	**400,000**	**0**	**0**	**408,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2209-22	**8S3212**	**BATTLEFIELD ROAD RESURFACING AT US 65 IN SPRINGFIELD**					
	ENG	MoDOT	1,600	4,800	0	0	6,400
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	6,400	19,200	0	0	25,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	46,000	0	0	46,000
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	184,000	0	0	184,000
		Total	**8,000**	**254,000**	**0**	**0**	**262,000**
SP2210-22	**8S3221**	**CHERRY STREET BRIDGE REHABILITATION OVER US 65**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	3,200	18,400	0	0	21,600
	ENG	MoDOT	800	4,600	0	0	5,400
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	0	0	0	1,600
	ROW	MoDOT	400	0	0	0	400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	125,600	0	0	125,600
	CON	MoDOT	0	31,400	0	0	31,400
		Total	**6,000**	**180,000**	**0**	**0**	**186,000**
SP2211-22	**8S3240**	**REPUBLIC STREET BRIDGE REHABILITATION OVER JAMES RIVER FREEWAY**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	3,200	25,600	137,600	0	166,400
	ENG	MoDOT	800	6,400	34,400	0	41,600
	ROW	FHWA (NHPP)	0	1,600	0	0	1,600
	ROW	MoDOT	0	400	0	0	400
	CON	FHWA (NHPP)	0	0	1,052,800	0	1,052,800
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	263,200	0	263,200
		Total	**4,000**	**34,000**	**1,488,000**	**0**	**1,526,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
SP2212-22	**8S3195**	**MO 13 SCOPING FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BENNETT TO JAMES RIVER FREEWAY**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	80,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	200,000
	ENG	MoDOT	20,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	50,000
		Total	**100,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**250,000**
SP2213-22	**8S3244**	**US 160 SCOPING FOR BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE OVER JAMES RIVER OVERFLOW**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	1,600	1,600	0	0	3,200
	ENG	MoDOT	400	400	0	0	800
		Total	**2,000**	**2,000**	**0**	**0**	**4,000**
SP2214-22	**8P3220**	**US 65 SCOPING FOR INTERCHANGE AND BRIDGE IMPROVEMENTS AT KEARNEY STREET**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	64,000
	ENG	MoDOT	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	16,000
		Total	**20,000**	**20,000**	**20,000**	**20,000**	**80,000**
SP2215-22	**8P3252**	**I-44 AND KANSAS EXPRESSWAY**					
	ENG	FHWA (NHPP)	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	120,000
	ENG	MoDOT	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	30,000
		Total	**50,000**	**50,000**	**50,000**	**0**	**150,000**

E) Sponsored by MoDOT Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
ST2201-22	**8S3238**	**MO 125 INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS IN STRAFFORD**					
	ENG	MoDOT	24,000	26,000	72,000	0	122,000
	ENG	MoDOT-AC	96,000	104,000	288,000	0	488,000
	ROW	MoDOT	0	2,000	0	0	2,000
	ROW	MoDOT-AC	0	8,000	0	0	8,000
	CON	MoDOT	0	0	322,600	0	322,600
	CON	MoDOT-AC	0	0	1,290,400	0	1,290,400
		Total	**120,000**	**140,000**	**1,973,000**	**0**	**2,233,000**

F) Transit Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CU2008-20A6		**2020 CARES ACT**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5307)	2,000,000	1,633,199	0	0	3,633,199
		Total	**2,000,000**	**1,633,199**	**0**	**0**	**3,633,199**
CU2200-19		**FY 2022 OPERATING ASSISTANCE - FIXED ROUTE**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	1,799,523	0	0	0	1,799,523
	OPER	LOCAL	5,991,692	0	0	0	5,991,692
	OPER	MoDOT	43,500	0	0	0	43,500
		Total	**7,834,715**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**7,834,715**
CU2201-19		**FY 2022 PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE**					
	MAINT	FTA (5307)	760,000	0	0	0	760,000
	MAINT	LOCAL	190,000	0	0	0	190,000
		Total	**950,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**950,000**
CU2202-19		**FY 2022 TRANSIT PLANNING - FTA 5307**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	168,001	0	0	0	168,001
	OPER	LOCAL	42,000	0	0	0	42,000
		Total	**210,001**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**210,001**

F) Transit Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CU2203-19		**FY 2022 TRANSIT SECURITY - FTA 5307**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5307)	27,551	0	0	0	27,551
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	7,200	0	0	0	7,200
		Total	**34,751**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**34,751**
CU2204-19		**FY 2022 PURCHASE 2 PARATRANSIT BUSES**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5339)	311,756	0	0	0	311,756
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	55,016	0	0	0	55,016
		Total	**366,772**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**366,772**
CU2205-22		**FY 2022 ADA PROJECT**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5310)	120,000	0	0	0	120,000
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	30,000	0	0	0	30,000
		Total	**150,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**150,000**
CU2300-20		**FY 2023 OPERATING ASSISTANCE - FIXED ROUTE**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	0	1,854,074	0	0	1,854,074
	OPER	LOCAL	0	5,991,692	0	0	5,991,692
	OPER	MoDOT	0	43,500	0	0	43,500
		Total	**0**	**7,889,266**	**0**	**0**	**7,889,266**

F) Transit Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CU2301-20		**FY 2023 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE**					
	MAINT	FTA (5307)	0	760,000	0	0	760,000
	MAINT	LOCAL	0	190,000	0	0	190,000
		Total	**0**	**950,000**	**0**	**0**	**950,000**
CU2302-20		**FY 2023 TRANSIT PLANNING**					
	PLAN	FTA (5307)	0	168,001	0	0	168,001
	PLAN	LOCAL	0	42,000	0	0	42,000
		Total	**0**	**210,001**	**0**	**0**	**210,001**
CU2303-20		**FY 2023 TRANSIT SECURITY**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5307)	0	28,102	0	0	28,102
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	0	7,200	0	0	7,200
		Total	**0**	**35,302**	**0**	**0**	**35,302**
CU2401-22		**FY 2024 PURCHASE PARATRANSIT BUSES**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5339)	0	0	470,000	0	470,000
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	0	0	113,824	0	113,824
		Total	**0**	**0**	**583,824**	**0**	**583,824**

F) Transit Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CU2402-22		**FY 2024 OPERATING ASSISTANCE - FIXED ROUTE**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	0	0	1,909,820	0	1,909,820
	OPER	LOCAL	0	0	5,991,692	0	5,991,692
	OPER	MoDOT	0	0	43,500	0	43,500
		Total	**0**	**0**	**7,945,012**	**0**	**7,945,012**
CU2403-22		**FY 2024 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE**					
	MAINT	FTA (5307)	0	0	760,000	0	760,000
	MAINT	LOCAL	0	0	190,000	0	190,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**950,000**	**0**	**950,000**
CU2404-22		**FY 2024 TRANSIT PLANNING**					
	PLAN	FTA (5307)	0	0	168,001	0	168,001
	PLAN	LOCAL	0	0	42,000	0	42,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**210,001**	**0**	**210,001**
CU2405-22		**FY 2024 TRANSIT SECURITY**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5307)	0	0	28,665	0	28,665
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	0	0	7,000	0	7,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**35,665**	**0**	**35,665**

F) Transit Section


TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
CU2501-22		**FY 2025 OPERATING ASSISTANCE - FIXED ROUTE**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	0	0	0	1,966,577	1,966,577
	OPER	LOCAL	0	0	0	5,991,692	5,991,692
	OPER	MoDOT	0	0	0	43,500	43,500
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8,001,769**	**8,001,769**
CU2502-22		**FY 2025 PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE**					
	MAINT	FTA (5307)	0	0	0	760,000	760,000
	MAINT	LOCAL	0	0	0	190,000	190,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**950,000**	**950,000**
CU2503-22		**FY 2025 TRANSIT PLANNING**					
	OPER	FTA (5307)	0	0	0	168,001	168,001
	OPER	LOCAL	0	0	0	42,000	42,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**210,001**	**210,001**
CU2504-22		**FY 2025 TRANSIT SECURITY**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5307)	0	0	0	29,238	29,238
	OPER	LOCAL	0	0	0	7,000	7,000
		Total	**0**	**0**	**0**	**36,238**	**36,238**

F) Transit Section

TIP #	STIP #/ Phase	Project Name/ Fund Source	Funding Data FY2022	FY2023	FY2024	FY2025	Total
MO1729-19A4		**5310-TRADITIONAL PROJECTS RESERVE 2020-2022**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5310)	352,413	0	0	0	352,413
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	88,102	0	0	0	88,102
		Total	**440,515**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**440,515**
MO1901-17A5		**5310-MODOT ADMIN 2019-2022**					
	ADMIN	FTA (5310)	55,146	0	0	0	55,146
		Total	**55,146**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**55,146**
MO2304-22		**5310-MODOT/OTO ADMIN 2023-2025**					
	ADMIN	FTA (5310)	0	23,075	23,459	23,850	70,384
		Total	**0**	**23,075**	**23,459**	**23,850**	**70,384**
MO2305-22		**5310-TRADITIONAL PROJECTS RESERVE 2023-2025**					
	CAPITAL	FTA (5310)	0	172,700	176,154	179,677	528,531
	CAPITAL	LOCAL	0	43,175	44,039	44,919	132,133
		Total	**0**	**215,875**	**220,193**	**224,596**	**660,664**

Appendix 6

MTP Changes



Major Thoroughfare Amendments Republic, Battlefield, & Springfield

Existing Street Class

- Freeway
- Expressway
- Primary Arterial
- Secondary Arterial
- Collector
- Boulevard
- Rural Collector
- Local

Proposed Roads

- Prposed Expressway
- Proposed Primary Arterial
- Proposed Secondary Arterial
- Proposed Collector
- Proposed Local

0 0.5 1 2

Miles

Appendix 7

Referenced Resources

Referenced Resources

OTO Website - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/

Transportation Management Area Requirements - https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/23/134#:~:text=(k)Transportation%20Management%20Areas

FAST Act - https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/legislation.cfm

MPO Code of Federal Regulations - https://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/retrieveECFR?gp=&SID=60b90918085bff6a4c6c38a58772d8ec&n=23y1.0.1.5.11&r=PART&ty=HTML#sp23.1.450.c

Transportation Planning Management - https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/tpm/

OTO 2020 Growth Trends Report - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#b-growth-trends

American Community Survey - https://www.census.gov/acs/www/data/data-tables-and-tools/subject-tables/

ACS Means of Transportation to Work by Selected Characteristics - https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=S0802&tid=ACSST1Y2019.S0802

MoDOT Data Zone - http://modatazone.modot.org/

Show-Me Zero - https://www.savemolives.com/mcrs

Traffic Management Center of the Ozarks - https://www.ozarkstraffic.com/

Springfield-Branson National Airport - https://www.flyspringfield.com/

MoDOT Missouri State Freight and Rail Plan - https://www.modot.org/missouri-state-freight-and-rail-plan

Heartland Freight Technology Plan - https://www.marc.org/Transportation/Plans-Studies/Transportation-Plans-and-Studies/Heartland-Freight-Technology-Plan

OTO Congestion Management Process - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#b-cmp

Traffic Incident Management - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/what-we-do/tim

MoDOT Transportation Systems Management and Operations Program and Action Plan - https://epg.modot.org/files/0/08/910_TSMO.pdf

City Utilities Transit - https://www.cutransit.net/

Missouri State University Bear Line - https://www.missouristate.edu/Transportation/BearLine/

OATS Transit - https://www.oatstransit.org/

Greyhound - https://www.greyhound.com/en

Jefferson Lines - https://www.jeffersonlines.com/

Amtrak 2007 St. Louis to Springfield Feasibility Study - https://www.modot.org/media/4786

OTO 2012 Fixed Route Operations Analysis - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#:~:text=FIXED%20ROUTE%20OPERATIONS%20ANALYSIS%202012

OTO Transit Coordination Plan - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#:~:text=%2B-,TRANSIT%20COORDINATION%20PLAN,-Transit%20Coordination%20Plan

OTO Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Trail Investment Study - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#:~:text=REGIONAL%20BICYCLE%20AND%20PEDESTRIAN%20TRAIL%20INVESTMENT%20STUDY

OTO State of Transportation Report - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/what-we-do/state-of-transportation

OTO Complete Streets Toolbox - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/planning-tools/cstools

EPA Ecoregions - https://www.epa.gov/eco-research/ecoregions

MDC Endangered Species - https://mdc.mo.gov/field-guide/statuses?status=994

Ozarks Clean Air Alliance - https://cpozarks.org/programs/environmental-collaborative/

EPA Advance Program - https://www.epa.gov/advance/advance-participants-southwest-missouri

OCAA Clean Air Action Plan - https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2021-04/documents/mo_southwest_2020_update.pdf

Ozone Design Values - https://dnr.mo.gov/env/apcp/docs/ozonemonitordata.pdf

$PM_{2.5}$ Design Values - https://dnr.mo.gov/env/apcp/docs/pm2.5monitordata.pdf

Waters of the US - https://www.epa.gov/wotus/intention-revise-definition-waters-united-states

Christian County Hazard Mitigation Plan - https://6191b684-bdc4-452f-a0f3-dd39f3c46392.filesusr.com/ugd/ff9185_1fb371d0e6854cbb80fd671c75af658a.pdf

Greene County Hazard Mitigation Plan - https://greenecountymo.gov/oem/community_programs/mitigation.php

MoDOT Statewide Long Range Transportation Plan - https://www.modot.org/sites/default/files/documents/TechMemo_MoDOT_053018.pdf

National Register Listings - https://mostateparks.com/page/85341/national-register-historic-places

Resources for Environmental Justice - https://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice

OTO/City Utilities Transit Origin-Destination Accessibility Study - https://media.ozarkstransportation.org/documents/Final-City-Utilities-of-Springfield-Transit-OD-Accessibility-Study-2018.pdf

City of Nixa Strategic Plan - https://www.imaginenixa.com/

City of Ozark Comprehensive Plan - https://6191b684-bdc4-452f-a0f3-dd39f3c46392.filesusr.com/ugd/b7acd2_764504159cdc44448bc67934279d9f18.pdf

City of Republic Comprehensive Plan (*SOAR 2040*) - https://www.soar2040.com/

City of Springfield Comprehensive Plan (*Forward SGF*) - https://www.forwardsgf.com/

City of Strafford Comprehensive Plan - https://6191b684-bdc4-452f-a0f3-dd39f3c46392.filesusr.com/ugd/b7acd2_28cc348afeb4403fb6a7375439a9e199.pdf

City of Willard Comprehensive Plan - https://6191b684-bdc4-452f-a0f3-dd39f3c46392.filesusr.com/ugd/b7acd2_f04f8af697d548bfacca7c91e63362e7.pdf

MoDOT Citizen's Guide to Transportation - https://www.modot.org/citizens-guide-transportation-funding-missouri

Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation - https://www.modot.org/missouri-transportation-finance-corporation-mtfc

Statewide Transportation Assistance Revolving (STAR) Fund - https://www.modot.org/statewide-transportation-assistance-revolving-star-fund

Cost Share Programs - https://www.modot.org/partnership-development

INFRA Financing Program - https://www.transportation.gov/buildamerica/financing/infra-grants/infrastructure-rebuilding-america

RAISE (TIGER/BUILD) Grant Program - https://www.transportation.gov/RAISEgrants

FTA Grant Programs - https://www.transit.dot.gov/funding/grants/grant-programs

MoDOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program - https://www.modot.org/statewide-transportation-improvement-program-stip

OTO Transportation Improvement Program - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/what-we-do/transportation-improvement-program

OTO Unified Planning Work Program - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/what-we-do/upwp

SGF Yields - https://www.springfieldmo.gov/3519/Pedestrian-Safety---SGF-Yields

ITS Regional Architecture - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/reports-and-studies#b-its

Alternative Fuel Corridors - https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/alternative_fuel_corridors/

OTO Major Thoroughfare Plan - https://www.ozarkstransportation.org/our-resources/maps

Amendments

Amendment 1

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on May 19, 2022
Removed proposed collector Farm Road 119 between Farm Roads 174 and 178

Amendment Number 1 to *Destination 2045*

Ozarks Transportation Organization
(Springfield, MO Area MPO)

DESCRIPTION:

Greene County has requested a change to the Major Thoroughfare Plan:

- Remove proposed collector Farm Road 119 between Farm Roads 174 and 178

The Greene County Commission approved this change on May 2, 2022.

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE ACTION TAKEN:


At its regularly scheduled meeting on April 20, 2022, the Technical Planning Committee recommended the Board of Directors approve *Destination 2045* Amendment 1, pending approval by the Greene County Commission, which occurred on May 2, 2022.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS ACTION TAKEN:


At its regularly scheduled meeting on May 19, 2022, the Board of Directors approved *Destination 2045* Amendment 1.

Major Thoroughfare Plan
Ozarks Transportation Organization

As Approved by the OTO Board of Directors
September 16, 2021



Proposed



Street Class
- Freeway
- Expressway
- Primary Arterial
- Secondary Arterial
- Collector
- Rural Collector
- Boulevard
- Local

Proposed Roads
- Prposed Expressway
- Proposed Primary Arterial
- Proposed Secondary Arterial
- Proposed Collector
- Proposed Local

Boundaries
- Battlefield
- Fremont Hills
- Nixa
- Ozark
- Republic
- Springfield
- Strafford
- Willard
- OTO Study Area
- Wilson's Creek Nat'l Battlefield
- World Hillshade

N

Miles
0 0.1 0.2 0.4

County of GREENE State of Missouri

GREENE COUNTY HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT
2065 N CLIFTON, SPRINGFIELD, MO 65803
FAX (417) 831-5216
(417) 831-3591

BOB DIXON
Presiding Commissioner

RUSTY MACLACHLAN
Commissioner 1st District

JOHN C. RUSSELL
Commissioner 2nd District

RICK ARTMAN
Administrator

March 30, 2022

Attention: Natasha Longpine
Ozarks Transportation Organization
2208 W. Chesterfield St. #101
Springfield, MO 65807

RE: Proposed Amendment to Major Thoroughfare Plan
Farm Road 119 between FR 174 and FR 178

Ms. Longpine,


The Greene County Highway Department has recently proposed a change to our county's Major Thoroughfare Plan, which would eliminate a future collector route along Farm Road 119 between Farm Road 174 and Farm Road 178 west of the City of Battlefield. This proposed change has been recommended by our Highway Department staff, but will require the formal approval of the Greene County Planning and Zoning board before it would become effective.

The Planning and Zoning Board completed the first reading of this proposed Major Thoroughfare Plan (MTP) amendment at their last public hearing held on March 15, 2022. Typically, these proposed MTP amendments necessitate three (3) public hearings prior to a vote being taken by the Planning Board members. The final hearing date upon which we anticipate the board members will vote on this proposed MTP amendment would take place on Tuesday, May 17th.

In an effort to try and reduce the overall timeline for adoption of this proposed amendment, we are hereby requesting that the OTO Technical Planning Committee proceed with reviewing this matter concurrently while the Greene County Planning Board is in process of considering this change. If the OTO Technical Planning Committee and the OTO Board of Directors is favorable to adopting this proposed change to the Major Thoroughfare Plan, we would ask that OTO's final approval would ultimately be contingent upon Greene County's formal adoption of this change. This will help to ensure consistency between both the Greene County and the OTO Major Thoroughfare Plans throughout these concurrent approval processes.

Attached is a staff report identifying the specific details and our Highway Department's reasoning for recommending this proposed amendment. Thank you in advance for your staff's consideration of this agenda item request.

Sincerely,



Adam Humphrey, P.E.
Assistant Administrator
Greene County Highway Department

Amendment Request

Major Thoroughfare Plan

Roadway Data

Roadway Name: **FUTURE** Farm Road 119
From: Farm Rd 174 west of Farm Rd 123
To: Farm Rd 178 west of Hutchison Street in the City of Battlefield
Length (miles): 0.51
Number of Lanes: 2
Lane Width: 12 ft.

Amendment Requested and Justification

Current Classification: Collector

Requested Change: Remove the future collector route that is shown on the current Greene County Major Thoroughfare Plan.

Describe Process for Justification Approval:
Requires Planning and Zoning Board Approval

Date of Approval by Jurisdiction
Estimated date of March 2022

Please describe the history causing need for the amendment:
Greene County is recommending the removal of a future collector route (*future FR 119*) shown on the Greene County Major Thoroughfare Plan between FR 174 and FR 178 west of the City of Battlefield. Due to the platting of the large-lot subdivisions (*Butterfield Estates and Hidden Tree Subdivision*) without any right-of-way or easements reserved for the future roadway, we believe the MTP depiction should be removed. Any roadway network that may be built in the future will be developer driven and will consist of "local" connections.

What impacts would this amendment have on future ability to comply with the OTO MTP?
No future impacts on the ability to comply with OTO's Major Thoroughfare Plan are foreseen. If approved by the Planning Board, Greene County staff will recommend that the Ozarks Transportation Organization amend their Major Thoroughfare Plan to reflect this change.

Additional information you would like to include:
The depiction of a future collector route in this area tends to offer no improvement to the mobility of a driver to get to their destination. Given the large lot subdivisions platted and the construction of the existing upper scale homes on these lots, It will be cost prohibitive to the county (*and will likely involve condemnation*) to purchase necessary right-of-way and construct a collector status road with little if any benefit to the targeted user.

Amendment 2

Adopted by the OTO Board of Directors on July 21, 2022
Remove proposed collector in the 1800 block of N. West Bypass, between Eldon and West Bypass

***Destination 2045* Amendment Number 2**

Ozarks Transportation Organization
(Springfield, MO Area MPO)

DESCRIPTION:

Springfield has requested a change to the Major Thoroughfare Plan:

- Remove proposed collector in the 1800 block of N. West Bypass, between Eldon and West Bypass


This request has been approved by Springfield City Council at their regular meeting on May 2, 2022.

TECHNICAL PLANNING COMMITTEE ACTION TAKEN:
At its regularly scheduled meeting on June 15, 2022, the Technical Planning Committee recommended the Board of Directors approve *Destination 2045* Amendment 2.


BOARD OF DIRECTORS ACTION TAKEN:
At its regularly scheduled meeting on July 21, 2022, the Board of Directors approved *Destination 2045* Amendment 2.

Major Thoroughfare Plan
Ozarks Transportation Organization

As Approved by the OTO Board of Directors
May 19, 2022



Proposed




Existing Roads
- Freeway
- Expressway
- Primary Arterial
- Secondary Arterial
- Collector
- Rural Collector
- Boulevard
- Local

Proposed Roads
- Prposed Expressway
- Proposed Primary Arterial
- Proposed Secondary Arterial
- Proposed Collector
- Proposed Local

N

Miles
0 0.17 0.35 0.7

Exhibit B



City of Springfield, Missouri

DISCLAIMER: All information included on this map or digital file is provided "as-is" for general information purposes only. The City of Springfield, and all other contributing data suppliers, make no warranties, expressed or implied, concerning the accuracy, completeness, reliability, or suitability of the data for any particular use. Furthermore, the City of Springfield, and all other contributing data suppliers, assume no liability whatsoever associated with the use or misuse of the data.

One-rdg. X
P. Hrngs. _____
Pgs. 10
Filed: 04-26-22

Sponsored by: Hardinger

COUNCIL BILL 2022-093 RESOLUTION _____

A RESOLUTION

AMENDING the Major Thoroughfare Plan, a portion of the Transportation Plan element of the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan, by removing a future collector from Figures 20-2 and 20-9. (Planning and Zoning Commission and Staff recommends approval.)

_____

WHEREAS, City Council adopted the Transportation Plan as an element of the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan, the master plan for development of the City, on June 11, 2001; and

WHEREAS, the Major Thoroughfare Plan, a portion of the Transportation Plan, provides an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions, identifies locations of future major transportation corridors, and serves as a general guide for securing street rights-of-way; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have the authority to amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan per Section 11.6 in the City Charter; and

WHEREAS, staff has determined that the proposed collector between North Eldon Avenue and the 1800 block of North West Bypass does not provide for an adequate system of thoroughfares to ensure logical development of the community, safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and economical expenditure of public funds, and therefore should be removed from the Major Thoroughfare Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on April 7, 2022, and recommended approval of the above revision.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI, as follows, that:

Section 1 – City Council hereby amends the Transportation Plan of the Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan by removing the proposed collector between North Eldon Avenue and the 1800 block of North West Bypass, as depicted on "Exhibit 1-B," which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference, from the Major

Thoroughfare Plan, which is attached hereto and incorporated by reference as “Exhibit 1-A.”

Section 2 – The Director of Planning and Development and the City Clerk are directed to maintain official copies of the Major Thoroughfare Plan in their offices.

Section 3 – This Resolution shall be in effect immediately upon adoption.

Passed at meeting: _____

_____
Mayor

Attest: _____, City Clerk

Filed as Resolution: _____

Approved as to form: _____, Assistant City Attorney

Approved for Council action: _____, City Manager

EXPLANATION TO COUNCIL BILL 2022- 093

FILED: 04-26-22

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENTS: Public Works and Planning and Development

PURPOSE: To amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan in the City of Springfield Transportation Plan to remove a future collector ("Exhibit 1-A").

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: The Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Element was adopted by City Council on June 11, 2001. A portion of this document identifies the major thoroughfares within the City. It is intended to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions; identifies locations of future major transportation corridors and serves as a general guide for securing street rights-of-way.

The Transportation Plan states that the street classifications for the Major Thoroughfare Plan should be regularly updated by the Springfield Metropolitan Planning Organization and subsequently adopted by Springfield City Council, the Missouri Department of Transportation, and the Greene County Commission as part of their policies concerning the location and function of all major streets.

REMARKS:

1. The Major Thoroughfare Plan represents future roadway functions. It is intended to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions. It identifies locations of future major transportation corridors and serves as a general guide for securing rights-of-way. Future roads are shown in general locations, the actual location may vary.
2. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have the authority to amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan per Section 11.6 of the City Charter.
3. Staff has determined that the proposed collector between North Eldon Avenue and the 1800 Block of North West Bypass does not provide for an adequate system of thoroughfares to ensure logical development of the community, safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and economical expenditure of Public Funds and therefore should be removed from the Major Thoroughfare Plan.
4. There is no financial impact to the City with the adoption of the updated plan.

Supports the following City Council Priorities:

- Economic Vitality

RECOMMENDATION: The Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on April 7, 2022, and recommended approval by a vote of 8 to 0 ("Attachment 1"). The Departments of Public Works and Planning and Development recommend passage of this Resolution.

Submitted by:

Martin Gugel, P.E.
Assistant Director of Public Works

Recommended by:

Dan Smith, P.E.
Director of Public Works

Recommended by:

Susan Istenes, AICP Director
of Planning and Development

Approved by:

Jason Gage,
City Manager


Exhibit 1

Development Review Staff Report

CITY OF Springfield

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING: APRIL 7, 2022

CITY COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING: May 2, 2022



CASE: Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendment

LOCATION: 1800 Block N. West Bypass

STAFF: Dawne Gardner, AICP 864-1863
Choose an item.

STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:
Approve

PROPOSED MOTION: Move to approve as submitted in the staff report. Required vote is a majority of those present (5 members are a quorum).

SUMMARY OF REQUEST:

To amend the Major Throughfare Plan Figure 20-2 and 20-9 in the City of Springfield Transportation Plan to remove a future collector (extension of Atlantic Street from West Bypass to Eldon Avenue).

FINDINGS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Element was adopted by City Council on June 11, 2001. A portion of this document identifies the Major Thoroughfares within the City.
2. The Major Thoroughfare Plan ("Exhibit A") represents future roadway functions. It is intended to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions. It identifies locations of future major transportation corridors and serves as a general guide for securing rights-of-ways. Future roads are shown in general locations, the actual location may vary.
3. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have the authority to amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan per Section 11.6. in the City Charter.
4. Staff has determined that the proposed collector in the 1800 block of N. West Bypass (extension of Atlantic Street from West Bypass to Eldon Avenue) do not provide for an adequate system of thoroughfares to ensure logical development of the community, safe and efficient movement of people and goods, and economical expenditure of Public Funds and therefore should be removed from the Major Thoroughfare Plan Figure 20-2 and 20-9.


Development Review Staff Report

CITY OF Springfield

Transportation Plan:

Exhibit A

Major Thoroughfare Plan
Ozarks Transportation Organization
As approved by the OTO Board of Directors



DISCLAIMER

Amended:

June 16, 2005	April 17, 2008
August 18, 2005	August 21, 2008
December 15, 2005	December 15, 2011
April 19, 2007	February 19, 2015

N

Development Review Staff Report

CITY OF Springfield

PLAN AMENDMENTS:




Exhibit C

Development Review Staff Report

TRANSPORTATION PLAN RECOMENDATIONS:

The Street Classifications for the Major Thoroughfare Plan should be regularly updated by the Springfield MPO, and subsequently adopted by the Springfield City Council, the Missouri Department of Transportation, and the Greene County Commission, as part of their policies concerning the location and function of all major streets. (Page 20-25)

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION AUTHORITY:

Section 11.2. Planning and zoning commission—Powers and duties.

The city planning and zoning commission shall have the power and shall be required to:

(1) Prepare and recommend to the city council a master plan, and amendments thereto, for the physical development of the City, as defined in this Article.

(2) Prepare and recommend regulations pertaining to subdivision and development of land to the city council.

(3) Review and approve subdivisions and development of land in accordance with the authority and procedures established by the city council.

(4) Prepare for the city council an official map of the City and make recommendations with respect to proposed changes in such map.

(5) Review and make recommendations with respect to proposed changes in the zoning ordinance and zoning map.

(6) Hold public hearings on requests for rezoning, amendments to the zoning ordinance, amendments to the comprehensive plan, and such other planning and zoning matters as may be required by law or the provisions of this Charter. Rules with respect to the conduct of public hearings shall be adopted by the commission.

(7) Review and recommend proposed capital improvements which in the opinion of the commission are necessary or desirable to be constructed.

(8) Promote public interest in and understanding of the comprehensive plan and of zoning and planning.

(9) Perform such other investigations and studies as may be referred to it by the city council or the city manager and make recommendations thereto.

(10) Meet not less than once each month and keep a public record of its resolutions, findings and determinations.

Section 11.6. Adoption of master plan.

The commission may adopt the master plan as a whole by a single resolution or may by successive resolutions adopt successive parts of the plan, said parts corresponding to major geographical sections of the city or to functional divisions of the subject matter of the plan, and may adopt any amendment or extension thereof or addition thereto. The adoption of the plan, or any such part, amendment, extension or addition shall be by resolution carried by the affirmative vote of not less than a majority of the commission, but before the adoption of the plan or any such part or any modification, extension or addition, the commission shall hold at least one public hearing on the proposed action. An attested copy of the plan or part thereof shall be certified to the council. Neither the master plan, nor any element of the plan, shall have the legal effect set out in Section 11.7 of this chapter unless the plan, or the element of the plan in question, shall have been approved by the city council.

Section 11.7. Legal status of master plan.

(1) *Master plan to provide general guidelines.* The master plan shall be prepared and maintained as a general guide for the orderly and efficient development and redevelopment of the City of Springfield. The master plan shall be kept current through review not less than every five years. When required by this Charter or otherwise deemed necessary, such review shall include proposed revisions or alterations in the master plan and public hearings thereon.

(2) *Regulations to generally conform to master plan.* All rezoning of land, subdivision plats, development proposals, and the zoning ordinance, subdivision ordinance and the zoning map should generally conform with the guidelines set forth in the master plan and should be reviewed for consistency with the master plan; provided, however, inconsistencies with the master plan shall not constitute cause to invalidate any such matter. The master plan shall not have the effect of a regulatory ordinance.

(3) *Master plan to guide public improvements.* The master plan shall provide guidelines for the location of public streets, parks and other public ways, grounds and spaces, public buildings and structures, facilities of public or private utilities, and the acquisition of real property by the city for public use. To that end the planning and zoning commission shall review the following:

- (a) All proposals to construct or extend public streets.
- (b) All proposals to improve land as a park.
- (c) All proposals to lay out or improve other public ways, grounds or spaces.
- (d) All proposals to construct public buildings and structures.
- (e) All proposals to lay out and construct facilities of public utilities, whether publicly or privately owned.

(f) All proposals to acquire real property for public purposes.

In reviewing and approving all such proposals, the function of the planning and zoning commission shall be to determine whether they are generally consistent with the master plan of the city. No such proposals shall be constructed or authorized until the location, extent and character thereof has been submitted and approved by the planning and zoning commission.

In case of disapproval, the commission shall communicate its reasons to the city council, and the city council, by vote of not less than two-thirds of its entire membership, may overrule the disapproval and, upon the overruling, the city council or the appropriate board or officer may proceed, except that if the proposal is by an agency other than an agency of the city and the authorization or financing does not fall within the province of the city council, then the submission to the planning commission shall be by the agency having jurisdiction, and the planning commission's disapproval may be overruled by that agency by a vote of not less than two-thirds of its entire membership. The acceptance, widening, removal, extension, relocation, narrowing, vacation, abandonment, change of use, acquisition of land, sale or lease of any street or other public facility is subject to similar submission and approval, and the failure to approve may be similarly overruled.

In the event the commission shall fail to act within thirty days after the date of official submission of a proposal (which date shall be the date that the matter is placed upon the agenda of the commission) to the commission, then the proposal shall be deemed to have been approved by the commission, unless a longer period for review by the commission shall have been authorized by the council or by the public officials submitting the proposal. In any case in which the commission finds that it is not reasonably able to complete its review of a proposal within thirty days, it may extend the time for such review for not more than thirty days.

STAFF COMMENTS:

1. The Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Element was adopted by City Council on June 11, 2001. A portion of this document identifies the Major Thoroughfares within the City.
2. The Major Thoroughfare Plan (“Exhibit A”) represents future roadway functions. It is intended to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions. It identifies locations of future major transportation corridors and serves as a general guide for securing rights-of-ways. Future roads are shown in general locations, the actual location may vary.
3. The property in the 1800 Block of N. West Bypass (“Exhibit B”) is prime development property currently zoned General Manufacturing, split into two lots and owned by the same LLC. To market and develop this property as one lot or multiple lots, the future collector through this property does not serve a purpose for connectivity.
4. The Major Thoroughfare Plan map currently exists as Figure 20-2 and Figure 20-9 in the Transportation Plan.
5. The proposed amendments follow the goals set forth in the Transportation Plan which are:

    i. Identify and establish future thoroughfare systems that integrates land uses with transportation system needs.
    ii. Recognize a distinct hierarchy of street classification as thoroughfare improvements and development definitions are made.
    iii. Work with Ozarks Transportation Organization to review and update the plan every 5 years in conjunction with their Long Range Transportation Plan review/update.

7. Missouri State Statute Chapter 89.400.1 requires a municipality to file a certified copy of any adopted major street plan in the office of the county recorder. The city will file a copy of the Major Thoroughfare Plan with the Greene County Recorder's office upon adoption by the Planning & Zoning Commission and the Springfield City Council.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING:

A neighborhood meeting is not required.

PUBLIC NOTIFICATIONS:

The public notice was advertised in the Daily Events at least 15 days prior to the public hearing.

Attachment 1

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
Planning and Zoning Commission – April 7, 2022

Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendments – West Bypass
1800 blk Northwest Bypass (between West Bypass and Eldon Avenue)
Applicant: City of Springfield

Mr. Hosmer states that this is a request to amend Figure 20-2 and 20-9 in the City of Springfield Transportation Plan to remove a future collector (extension of Atlantic Street from West Bypass to Eldon Avenue). The Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Plan Element was adopted by City Council on June 11, 2001. The Major Thoroughfare Plan ("Exhibit A") represents future roadway functions. It is intended to provide an overall framework for making decisions on thoroughfare improvements and extensions. It identifies locations of future major transportation corridors and serves as a general guide for securing rights-of-ways. Future roads are shown in general locations, the actual location may vary. The Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council have the authority to amend the Major Thoroughfare Plan per Section 11.6. in the City Charter. The proposed amendments follow the goals set forth in the Transportation Plan which are:

- Identify and establish future thoroughfare systems that integrates land uses with transportation system needs.
- Recognize a distinct hierarchy of street classification as thoroughfare improvements and development definitions are made.
- Work with Ozarks Transportation Organization to review and update the plan every 5 years in conjunction with their Long-Range Transportation Plan review/update.

The property in the 1800 Block of West Bypass ("Exhibit B") is prime development property currently zoned General Manufacturing, is currently split into two lots but owned by the same LLC. In order to market and develop this property as one lot or multiple lots, the future collector through this property does not serve a purpose for connectivity. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Colony asks if this is for a regular check-up.

Mr. Hosmer noted that it is development driven to make the property marketable.

Mr. Colony asked about a replacement corridor across the area.

Mr. Foster noted that it will not need to be replaced because it has access to West Bypass and Kearney. By taking it off the Major Thoroughfare Plan it takes away any component for a future developer and the collector would serve no use to the city.

Mr. Doennig opened the public hearing.

No speakers.

Mr. Doennig closed the public hearing.

COMMISSION ACTION:
Mr. Colony motioned to recommend **approval** for Major Thoroughfare Plan Amendments – West Bypass (800 blk Northwest Bypass (between West Bypass and Eldon Avenue)). Mr. Knuckles seconded the motion. Ayes: Doennig, Coltrin, Knuckles, Colony, Bruce, Jobe, Broekhoven, and Lebeck. Nays: None. Abstain: None. Absent: None.

Bob Hosmer, AICP
Planning Manager



This report was prepared in cooperation with the USDOT, including FHWA and FTA, as well as the Missouri Department of Transportation. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission, the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration.

Ozarks Transportation Organization

2208 W. Chesterfield Boulevard, Suite 101
Springfield, Missouri 65807
(417) 865-3042
(417) 862-6013 Fax
www.OzarksTransportation.org