Taney County Transportation Advisory Board

Project Prioritization List

July 24, 2018

Current	TCTAB				Roadway/		
Ranking	Proj. No.	Project Name	Project Type	Scale	Intersection	Status of Project	Date
	9- ا	Taney County Expressway	Connectivity	Regional	Roadway	Grant Application Submitted	
2	6-10	76 Country Boulevard Complete Street	Facility Upgrade	Regional	Roadway	Planning and Design	
3	6-6	MO-165 (MO-76 to MO-265)	Capacity	Large	Roadway	Planning	
4	3-7	US-160 Widening through Forsyth	Capacity	Large	Roadway	Planning	
5	-3	MO-76 and Lakeshore Dr	Traffic Safety	Medium	Intersection	Planning and Design	2018
6	-	New Arterial Connector (Birch St to Maple St)	Traffic Safety	Large	Roadway	Grant Application Submitted	
7	4-3	Rockaway Beach and US-160 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning and Design	
	1_2	LIS Bus Bto 65 (Hww 76 to North Birch)	Geometric/Safety	Large	Boadway	Planning and Design	
	1-2	LIS 65 Lingrade to Eroeway Standards	Capacity	Rogional	Intersection		
	1-10 E 0	MO 248 and Brencon Hills Plans Intersection	Capacity Coordinates	Madium	Intersection		
	3-2			Madium	Intersection		
	2-4			Mada	Intersection		2010
	3-6	Hwy 76 & US-160			Intersection		2018
13	4-4	US-160 and MO-248 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
4	6-1	MO-165 and Fall Creek Road Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Intersection	Grant Application Submitted	
15	- 2	Hwy 86 at Amanda Road	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
6	7-1	Coon Creek Rd (Hwy Bb to MO-76)	Connectivity	Medium	Roadway	Construction	2018
7	۱-6	New Interchange at MO-86 & US-65	Capacity	Regional	Intersection	Planning	
8	6-4	Fall Creek Rd (Wildwood Drive to MO-165)	Geometric/Safety	Large	Roadway	Planning	
19	I -7	Access Rd (US-65 to Branson Creek Blvd)	Connectivity	Regional	Roadway	Planning	
20	-	Transload Facility	Multimodal	Regional	Intersection	Planning	
21	- 3	Hwy 86 Extension	Connectivity	Regional	Roadway	Planning	
22	3-4	Hulls Ford Rd (MO-76 to End of Road)	Traffic Calming	Small	Roadway	Planning	
23	I-8	New Interchange at US-65 & connection to JJ	Connectivity	Regional	Roadway	Planning	
24	4-2	MO-176 and US-160 Rockaway Turnoff Int.	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
25	6-2	Fall Creek Rd and Summer Ln	, Geometric/Safety	Medium	Intersection	Planning	
26	-5	New Interchange at MO-265 & US-65	Capacity	Regional	Intersection	Planning	
27	6-5	MO-165 and Pointe Royale Dr Intersection	Operations	Small	Intersection	Planning	
28	6-8	Tablerock Acres Subdivision	Facility Upgrade	Medium	Boadway	Planning	
29	6-11	New Interchange at $MO_76 \& MO_376$	Capacity	Regional	Intersection	Planning	
30	6-9	Improve Skywiew Drive (MO-265 to Luster Dr)	Traffic Safety	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
30	6.2	Safari Bd (Sharp Curve Area to MO 165)	Geometric/Sefety	Modium	Roadway		
31	0-5	Devend Meuropein Deed Duidee		Madium	Roadway Daadway		2010
32	-+-J			S	Roadway		2019
33	5-1	MO-248 and Buchanan Rd Intersection		Small	Intersection		
34	2-6	Hwy 76 - Kirbyville School Turn Lanes	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection		
35	3-8		Quality of Communities	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
36	7-5	Hwy Bb (Hill Billy Lane to Gobbler's Knob)	Traffic Safety	Large	Roadway	Planning	
37	5-3	MO-248 and Hynn Road Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Intersection	Planning	
38	3-1	Forsyth/Taneyville Rd (Strawberry Rd to MO-76)	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
39	2-5	J-Hwy at Trigger Creek	Connectivity	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
40	5-6	MO-248 and Emory Creek Blvd	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
41	5-4	MO-248 and Buena Vista Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
42	5-7	Buchanan Rd and Sunrise Dr Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Planning	
43	3-2	Garrison Cutoff Road (MO-76 to County Line)	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
44	5-5	Bee Creek Road and Rinehart Road	Capacity	Small	Intersection	Planning	
	3-5	Caney Creek Rd (W Hwy to Skyline Dr)	Traffic Safety	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
	6-7	Spring Creek Road at Branson City Limits	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Roadway	Planning	
	4-1	F Hwy and US-160 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small	Intersection	Completed	2016
	2-1	K Hwy/Warren Rd at Bull Shoals Lake	Connectivity	Medium	Intersection	Completed	2012
	-4	Acacia Club Rd (Sun Valley Circle to MO-165/V Hwy)	Connectivity	Medium	Roadway	Completed	2017
	3-3	Brace Hill Rd (Slough Hollow Rd to M Hwy)	, Geometric/Safety	Medium	, Roadway	Completed	2016
<u> </u>	7-7	lowa Colony Rd (MO-165 to Diamond Hill Crt)	Traffic Safety	Medium	, Roadway	Completed	2010
	· -	Slough Hollow Rd (Fishermans Nose to Brace Hill)	Connectivity	large	Roadway	Completed	2013
<u> </u>	2.2	M Hwy at Brace Hill and Nazarene Church Rd	Geometric/Safety	Medium	Intersection	Completed	
<u> </u>	7_4	MO-165 and MO-265 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Medium	Intersection	Completed	

7-3	Lakeshore Drive (End)	Traffic Safety	Small	Roadway	Completed	

Taney County Transportation Advisory Board Project Prioritization List July 24, 2018

									INPUTS								5CORING				
					Access to Opportunity	Congestion Relief	Economic Compet.	Efficient Movement of Freight	Quality of Communities	Environmental Protection	Safety	Taking Care of the System	Access to Opportunity	Congestion Relief	Economic Compet.	Efficient Movemen of Freight	t Quality of Communities	Environmental Protection	Safety	Taking Care of the System	
No	. Projezz	Туре	Ro Scale Inte	sadway/ rsection Status of Project.	Local Factors Transk Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	Local Fatters Daily Unage Functional Class LOS	Local Factors Level af Essnenic Dittress Support Regional Economic Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Local Factors Truck Usage Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Local Factors Scenic and Visual Connectivity Local/Regional Lund Use Plan	Local Factors Avide Historical Impets Consistent with Environmental Goals Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Local Factors Energency Response Safety Enhancements Safety Concern Safety Index	Lead Factors Daily Vehicle Unge Fuurdional Cheshltantor Substandurd Rosdwuy or Bridge Rosdway Bridge Conditions	Local Factors Transit Eliminate BikoPed Burriers (ADA)	Local Factors Daily Utage Functional Class LOS	Local Factors Level of Economic Distress Support Regions Economic Strategic Regional Economic Correlate	Local Factors Truck Usage Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Local Factors Scenic and Visual Connectivity Local/Regional Land Use Flan	Local Factors Avaids Historical Impacts Consistent with Environmental Goals Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Local Factory Energincy Response Safety Enhanzements Safety Concern Safety Index	Daily Vehide Utage Functional Classification Subsandard Rdwy or Bridge Feature Readway Bridge Contributors	Runk Total Score
1 1-9	Taney County Expressway	Connectivity	Regional Road	Iway Grant Application Submitted	20% No 100%	F 50% 2000 100%	Yes Yes 100% 100%	Yes 100 100%	Yes Yes No 100%	Yes Yes Yes 25%	0.8 Yes Yes Yes 75%	Good Yes lajor Arteri 2000 25%	0.3 0.0 2.5	3.8 1.9 0.1 3.8	4 6 4.0 6.0	3.0 0.7 4	3 3 0 2.0	4.5 4.5 3 0.8	6.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 5.3	0.3 1.0 0.3 0.0 0.	5 76.89 I
2 6-10	76 Country Boulevard Complete Street	Facility Upgrade	Regional Road	Iway Planning and Design	100% Yes 100%	F 50% 11850 100%	Yes Yes 30% 75%	No 355 25%	Yes No Yes 75%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	1.2 Yes Yes No 75%	Good No lajor Arteri 11850 1005	4 I.3 I.3 2.5	3.8 1.9 2.3 3.8	4 6 1.2 4.5	0.0 1.3 1	3 0 2 1.5	4.5 4.5 3 2.3	8.9 1.0 1.0 0.0 5.3	0.3 0.0 0.3 0.3 2.	0 74.40 2
3 6-6	MO-165 (MO-76 to MO-265) US-160 Widening through Forsyth	Capacity	Large Road	Iway Planning Iway Planning	20% No 50% 40% No 75%	C 40% 4550 100% E 40% 4750 75%	Yes Yes 15% 100% Yes Yes 30% 100%	Yes 230 75% Yes 237.5 75%	Yes Yes No 75% Yes Yes No 75%	Yes Yes Yes 25% Yes Yes Yes 50%	1.2 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Good No linor Arteri 4550 1003 Good No linor Arteri 4750 1003	% 0.3 0.0 1.3 % 0.5 0.0 1.9	1.5 1.5 0.5 3.8	4 6 0.6 6.0	3.0 1.0 3	3 3 0 1.5	4.5 4.5 3 0.8	8.8 1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0 5.4 1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	0.3 0.0 0.2 0.1 2.	0 73.98 3
5 1-3	MO-76 and Lakeshore Dr	Traffic Safety	Medium Inter	section Planning and Design	20% No 0%	F 40% 8350 100%	Yes Yes 85% 50%	rtial 167 50%	No Yes No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	1.2 Yes Yes No 100%	Good Yes linor Arteri 8350 1005	\$ 0.3 0.0 0.0	2.5 1.0 1.7 2.5	3 2 1.7 1.5	1.5 0.9 2	0 3 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	13.2 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	1.0 4.0 0.8 1.4 8	0 70.98 6
6 1-1	New Arterial Connector (Birch St to Maple St)	Traffic Safery	Large Road	way Grant Application Submitted	100% No 100%	F 40% 625 100%	Yes Yes 85% 100%	Yes 12.5 100%	Yes Yes No 100%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.2 Yes Yes Yes 25%	Fair No linor Arteri 625 50%	1.3 0.0 2.5	3.8 1.5 0.0 3.8	4 6 3.4 6.0	3.0 0.2 4	3 3 0 2.0	4.5 4.5 3 2.3	1.2 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.8	0.5 0.0 0.2 0.0 1	0 69.28 7
7 4-3	Rockaway Beach and US-160 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Planning and Design	20% No 75%	C 40% 5500 50%	Yes No 60% 100%	rtial 275 50%	No Yes No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	1.4 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Fair No linor Arteri 5500 75%	0.3 0.0 1.9	1.0 1.0 2.5 1.3	3 0 1.2 3.0	1.5 1.1 2	0 3 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	15.0 1.5 1.5 1.5 10.5	2.0 0.0 0.8 2.0 6	0 69.24 8
8 1-2	US Bus Rte 65 (Hwy 76 to North Birch)	Geometric/Safety	Large Road	Iway Planning and Design	40% No 75%	F 40% 7050 100%	Yes No 85% 100%	Yes 423 50%	No Yes No 75%	Yes Yes Yes 25%	0.8 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Good No linor Arteri 7050 1009	6 0.5 0.0 I.9	3.8 1.5 1.3 3.8	4 0 3.4 6.0	3.0 1.4 2	0 3 0 1.5	4.5 4.5 3 0.8	6.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	0.3 0.0 0.2 0.2 2	0 68.34 9
10 5-2	MO-248 and Branson Hills Pkwy Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Medium Inter	section Planning	40% No 50%	C 30% 3300 75%	No Yes 0% 100%	rtial 65 50%	No No Yes 75%	Yes No Yes 75%	1.8 Yes Yes No 100%	Fair Yes Collector 3300 100	\$ 0.5 1.3 0.8	1.0 0.8 0.3 1.9	0 2 0.0 3.0	1.5 0.5 2	0 0 2 1.5	1.5 0.0 1 0.8	15.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	2.0 4.0 0.6 0.2 8	.0 64.76 11
11 2-4	US-160 and Y Hwy	Traffic Safety	Medium Inter	section Planning	40% No 100%	F 40% 5350 100%	Yes Yes 100% 100%	rtial 105 50%	Yes Yes Yes 100%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.3 Yes Yes No 50%	Good Yes linor Arteri 5350 100	6 0.5 0.0 2.5	2.5 1.0 0.7 2.5	3 2 2.0 3.0	1.5 0.7 2	3 3 2 2.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6 8	0 64.19 12
12 3-6	Hwy 76 & US-160	Traffic Safety	Medium Inter	section Construction	40% No 50%	D 40% 4000 100%	Yes Yes 85% 100%	rtial 320 75%	Yes Yes Yes 100%	Yes No Yes 50%	0.9 No Yes No 50%	Good No linor Arteri 4000 1005	\$ 0.5 0.0 1.3	1.5 1.0 0.4 2.5	3 2 1.7 3.0	1.5 1.2 3	3 3 2 2.0	1.5 0.0 1 0.5	9.8 0.0 1.5 0.0 5.3	1.0 0.0 0.8 0.3 8	0 62.19 13
13 4-4	US-160 and MO-248 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Planning	20% No 50%	A 30% 1350 50%	Yes No 85% 100%	retal IIO 75%	Yes Yes No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.8 Yes Yes No 75% V	ry Goc Yes Collector 1350 75%	0.3 0.0 1.3	0.0 0.8 0.2 1.3	3 0 1.7 3.0	1.5 0.7 3	3 3 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	9.2 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	0.0 4.0 0.6 0.1 6.	0 59.08 14
14 6-1	MO-165 and Fall Creek Road Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Medium Inter	section Grant Application Submitted	40% No 50%	F 30% 4550 100%	Yes No 0% 50%	rtial 230 50%	Yes Yes No 75%	Yes No Yes 25%	0.7 Yes Yes No 75%	Good Yes Collector 4550 75%	0.5 0.0 1.3	2.5 0.8 0.5 2.5	3 0 0.0 1.5	1.5 1.0 2	3 3 0 1.5	1.5 0.0 1 0.3	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4 6.	0 58.31 15
16 7-1	Coon Creek Rd (Hwy Bb to MO-76)	Connectivity	Medium Road	way Construction	0% No 25%	B 30% 1500 100%	No No 85% 100%	rtial 120 50%	No Yes No 100%	Yes No Yes 75%	0.9 Yes Yes Yes 75%	Good Yes Collector 1500 100	6 0.0 0.0 1.3 % 0.0 0.6	0.5 0.8 0.1 2.5	0 0 1.7 3.0	1.5 0.7 2	0 3 0 2.0	1.5 0.0 1 0.8	9.6 1.5 1.5 1.5 7.9	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.0 8	0 57.26 17
17 1-6	New Interchange at MO-86 & US-65	Capacity	Regional Inter	section Planning	100% No 50%	B 100% 4450 50%	Yes Yes 45% 100%	Yes 275 75%	Yes Yes No 100%	Yes No Yes 0%	0.5 No Yes No 25%	Good No Freeway 4450 0%	1.3 0.0 1.3	0.8 3.8 0.3 1.9	4 6 1.8 6.0	3.0 1.1 3	3 3 0 2.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	3.9 0.0 1.0 0.0 1.8	0.3 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.	0 57.05 18
18 6-4	Fall Creek Rd (Wildwood Drive to MO-165)	Geometric/Safety	Large Road	dway Planning	20% No 75%	D 30% 2600 50%	No No 70% 50%	Yes 50 50%	Yes Yes No 75%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.5 Yes Yes No 100%	Fair Yes Collector 2600 1005	¥ 0.3 0.0 1.9	2.3 1.1 0.2 1.9	0 0 2.8 3.0	3.0 0.5 2	3 3 0 1.5	4.5 4.5 3 2.3	3.5 1.0 1.0 0.0 7.0	0.5 1.0 0.2 0.0 2	0 56.80 19
19 1-7	Access Rd (US-65 to Branson Creek Blvd)	Connectivity	Regional Road	dway Planning	100% Yes 100%	B 40% 4000 75%	Yes Yes 85% 60%	Yes 400 100%	Yes Yes Yes 100%	Yes No Yes 0%	-1.0 No No Yes 25% V	ry Goc No linor Arteri 4000 0%	1.3 1.3 2.5	0.8 1.5 0.3 2.8	4 6 3.4 3.6	3.0 1.3 4	3 3 2 2.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	0.0 0.0 0.0 1.0 1.8	0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.	0 56.16 20
20 1-11	Transload Facility	Multimodal	Regional Inter	section Planning	0% No 0%	B 0% 250 25%	Yes Yes 85% 100%	Yes 125 100%	Yes No No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	-1.0 No No No 75%	Fair No Other 250 75%	0.0 0.0 0.0	0.8 0.0 0.0 0.9	4 6 3.4 6.0	3.0 3.0 4	3 0 0 1.0	4.5 4.5 3 1.5	0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 5.3	0.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 1.	5 55.84 21
21 1-13	Hwy 86 Extension Hulls Ford Rd (MO-76 to End of Road)	Connectivity Traffic Calming	Small Road	Iway Planning Iway Planning	20% No 100%	A 20% 250 50%	No No 100% 25%	No 5 0%	No No Yes 100%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	-1.0 No tes tes 25% vi	Fry God No Tajor Antens 4000 0% Fair Yes Local 250 50%	0.3 0.0 2.5	3.8 1.9 0.3 1.9 0.0 0.5 0.0 1.3	4 6 2.8 4.5	3.0 1.3 4	a a 0 2.0 0 0 2 2.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	150 15 15 00 105	2.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 4	0 55.69 22
23 1-8	New Interchange at US-65 & connection to JJ	Connectivity	Regional Road	fway Planning	100% No 50%	B 30% 2000 50%	Yes Yes 85% 100%	Yes 200 100%	No No No 50%	Yes No Yes 0%	1.0 No Yes No 50% V	ry Goc No Collector 2000 0%	1.3 0.0 1.3	0.8 1.1 0.1 1.9	4 6 3.4 6.0	3.0 0.9 4	0 0 0 1.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	7.9 0.0 1.0 0.0 3.5	0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.	0 54.70 24
24 4-2	MO-176 and US-160 Rockaway Turnoff Int.	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Planning	20% No 50%	D 40% 5250 50%	Yes No 100% 100%	rtial 265 50%	No Yes No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.7 Yes Yes No 50%	Good No linor Arteri 5250 75%	0.3 0.0 1.3	1.5 1.0 2.3 1.3	3 0 2.0 3.0	1.5 1.1 2	0 3 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	7.6 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	1.0 0.0 0.8 1.8 6	0 54.33 25
25 6-2	Fall Creek Rd and Summer Ln	Geometric/Safety	Medium Inter	section Planning	20% No 25%	C 20% 2650 50%	No Yes 70% 75%	rtial 55 50%	Yes No Yes 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.6 Yes Yes No 75%	Fair Yes Local 2650 75%	0.3 0.0 0.6	1.0 0.5 0.2 1.3	0 2 1.4 2.3	1.5 0.5 2	3 0 2 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	6.3 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	2.0 4.0 0.4 0.1 6.	0 53.71 26
26 1-5	New Interchange at MO-265 & US-65	Capacity	Regional Inter	section Planning	100% No 50%	B 100% 4450 50%	Yes Yes 85% 100%	Yes 275 100%	No Yes No 50%	Yes No Yes 0%	0.2 No Yes No 25%	Good No Freeway 4450 0%	1.3 0.0 1.3	0.8 3.8 0.3 1.9	4 6 3.4 6.0	3.0 1.1 4	0 3 0 1.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	1.7 0.0 1.0 0.0 1.8	0.3 0.0 0.5 0.0 0.	0 53.41 27
27 5-5	Tablerock Acres Subdivision	Eacility Lingrade	Medium Road	section Planning Iway Planning	40% No 100%	C 20% 1500 25%	No No 0% 25%	No 15 0%	No No Yes 100%	Yes Yes Yes 100%	1.8 Yes Yes No 50%	Poor Yes Local 1500 75%	6 0.3 0.0 1.3 C 13 00 25	2.0 0.8 1.7 2.5	0 0 00 08	0.0 03 0	3 0 2 1.3	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	5.3 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	30 40 04 00 6	0 53.04 28
29 6-11	New Interchange at MO-76 & MO-376	Capacity	Regional Inter	section Planning	100% No 25%	E 50% 6400 75%	Yes Yes 30% 50%	Yes 125 50%	No Yes No 50%	Yes No Yes 0%	0.5 No Yes No 25%	Good No lajor Arteri 6400 25%	1.3 0.0 0.6	3.0 1.9 0.7 2.8	4 6 1.2 3.0	3.0 0.8 2	0 3 0 1.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	4.0 0.0 1.0 0.0 1.8	0.3 0.0 0.3 0.1 0.	5 49.51 30
30 <mark>6-9</mark>	Improve Skyview Drive (MO-265 to Luster Dr)	Traffic Safety	Medium Road	lway Planning	20% No 75%	B 20% 750 25%	No No 0% 25%	No 0 25%	No No No 25%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	1.6 Yes Yes No 50%	Fair Yes Local 750 1005	6 0.3 0.0 1.9	0.5 0.5 0.0 0.6	0 0 0.0 0.8	0.0 0.0 I	0 0 0 0.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	15.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	2.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 8	0 48.43 32
31 6-3	Safari Rd (Sharp Curve Area to MO-165)	Geometric/Safety	Medium Road	lway Planning	40% No 50%	C 20% 1300 50%	No No 0% 50%	rtial 25 0%	No Yes No 75%	Yes No Yes 0%	0.8 Yes Yes No 100%	Good Yes Local 1300 75%	0.5 0.0 1.3	1.0 0.5 0.0 1.3	0 0 0.0 1.5	1.5 0.3 0	0 3 0 1.5	1.5 0.0 I 0.0	8.6 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	1.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 6.	.0 48.41 33
32 4-5	Round Mountain Road Bridge	Quality of Communit	ies Medium Road	Iway Construction	20% No 50%	A 20% 100 100%	No Yes 30% 100%	No 2 25%	No Yes No 25%	Yes No Yes 25%	11.5 No Yes No 25%	Poor Yes Local 100 50%	0.3 0.0 1.3	0.0 0.5 0.0 2.5	0 2 0.6 3.0	0.0 0.1 1	0 3 0 0.5	1.5 0.0 1 0.3	15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	3.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 4.	0 47.97 35
33 5-1	MO-248 and Buchanan Kd Intersection Hwy 76 - Kirbyville School Turn Lanes	Traffic Safery	Small Inter Small Inter	section Planning	40% No 50%	B 30% 2650 100%	No No 0% 25% Yes No 70% 100%	Ttal 55 25%	No No No 75%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	U.5 Yes Yes No 100%	Good Yes Collector 2650 75% Good No liner Arteri 3100 75%	6 0.5 0.0 1.3 6 0.0 0.0 1.3	0.5 0.8 0.6 2.5	3 0 14 30	30 10 2	0 0 0 1.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.5 6.	0 47.07 36
35 3-8	Hulls Ford Bridge	Quality of Communiti	ies Medium Road	dway Planning	20% No 50%	A 20% 100 100%	No No 100% 50%	No I 0%	No No Yes 25%	Yes No Yes 25%	11.5 No Yes No 25%	Poor Yes Local 100 75%	0.3 0.0 1.3	0.0 0.5 0.0 2.5	0 0 2.0 1.5	0.0 0.1 0	0 0 2 0.5	1.5 0.0 1 0.3	15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	3.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 6.	0 45.84 40
36 7-5	Hwy Bb (Hill Billy Lane to Gobbler's Knob)	Traffic Safety	Large Road	Iway Planning	20% No 100%	C 30% 1750 50%	No No 85% 50%	rtial 133 50%	No No No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.5 Yes Yes No 75% 🗸	ry Goc No Collector 1750 25%	0.3 0.0 2.5	1.5 1.1 0.1 1.9	0 0 3.4 3.0	1.5 0.8 2	0 0 0 1.0	4.5 4.5 3 2.3	3.8 1.0 1.0 0.0 5.3	0.0 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.	5 44.96 41
37 5-3	MO-248 and Flynn Road Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Medium Inter	section Planning	20% No 75%	E 30% 6500 75%	No No 0% 0%	rtial I30 25%	No No No 75%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.0 Yes Yes No 75%	Fair Yes Collector 6500 1005	4 0.3 0.0 I. 9	2.0 0.8 1.1 1.9	0 0 0.0 0.0	1.5 0.8 I	0 0 0 1.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	2.0 4.0 0.6 0.8 8	0 43.39 42
38 3-1	Forsyth/Taneyville Rd (Strawberry Rd to MO-76)	Geometric/Safety	Medium Road	Iway Planning	20% No 50%	B 20% 750 75%	No No 100% 50%	real 15 25%	No Yes No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	U.4 Yes Yes No 50%	Fair No Local 750 1005	6 0.3 0.0 1.3	0.5 0.5 0.0 1.9	0 0 2.0 1.5	1.5 0.3 1	0 3 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	4.8 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	2.0 0.0 0.4 0.0 8	0 42.63 43
40 5-6	MO-248 and Emory Creek Blvd	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Planning	20% No 50%	A 30% 1200 50%	No No 100% 50%	rtial 5 25%	No No No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.1 Yes Yes No 75%	Good Yes Collector 1200 75%	6 0.3 0.0 1.3	0.0 0.8 0.1 1.3	0 0 2.0 1.5	1.5 0.7 1	0 0 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	0.0 1.5 1.5 1.5 3.3	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.1 6.	0 39.23 45
41 5-4	MO-248 and Buena Vista Intersection	Geometric/Safety	Small Inter	section Planning	0% No 0%	D 30% 5050 50%	No Yes 0% 75%	rtial 100 75%	No No No 25%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.2 Yes Yes No 50%	Fair No Collector 5050 50%	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.5 0.8 2.1 1.3	0 2 0.0 2.3	1.5 0.7 3	0 0 0 0.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	2.3 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	2.0 0.0 0.6 1.7 4	0 38.90 46
42 5-7	Buchanan Rd and Sunrise Dr Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Planning	20% No 50%	B 20% 1400 100%	No No 0% 25%	rtial 70 25%	No No No 100%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	-0.2 Yes Yes No 100%	Fair No Local 1400 75%	0.3 0.0 1.3	0.5 0.5 0.2 2.5	0 0 0.0 0.8	1.5 0.6 1	0 0 0 2.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	2.0 0.0 0.4 0.1 6	0 37.75 47
43 3-2	Garrison Cutoff Road (MO-76 to County Line)	Geometric/Safety	Medium Road	Iway Planning	20% No 25%	A 20% 100 50%	No No 100% 25%	rtial 2 25%	No Yes No 25%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.0 Yes Yes Yes 25%	Good Yes Local 100 100	6 0.3 0.0 0.6	0.0 0.5 0.0 1.3	0 0 2.0 0.8	1.5 0.1 1	0 3 0 0.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	0.0 1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6	1.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 8.	0 36.75 48
44 5-5	Bee Greek Road and Rinehart Road	Capacity Traffic Sefere	Small Inter Medium Prod	section Planning	0% No 0%	C 20% 2450 75%	No Yes 70% 100%	retal 25 75%	No No No 25%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.0 Yes Yes No 50% V	ry Goc No Local 2450 75% Root No Local 50 500	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.0 0.5 0.5 1.9	0 2 1.4 3.0	1.5 0.3 3	0 0 0 0.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	0.0 0.0 0.4 0.4 6.	0 35.15 49
46 6-7	Spring Creek Road at Branson City Limits	Geometric/Safety	Medium Road	tway Planning	0% No 25%	B 20% 600 25%	No No 0% 0%	No 10 25%	No No No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	-1.0 Yes Yes No 50%	Fair Yes Local 600 50%	0.0 0.0 0.6	0.5 0.5 0.0 0.6	0 0 0.0 0.0	0.0 0.2 1	0 0 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	2.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 4	0 27.63 55
47 4-1	F Hwy and US-160 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Small Inter	section Completed	20% No 50%	D 40% 5250 75%	Yes No 100% 100%	rtial 265 75%	Yes Yes No 100%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	2.0 Yes Yes No 100%	Fair No linor Arteri 5250 75%	0.3 0.0 1.3	1.5 1.0 2.3 1.9	3 0 2.0 3.0	1.5 1.1 3	3 3 0 2.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	15.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	2.0 0.0 0.8 1.8 6.	0 73.62 4
48 2-1	K Hwy/Warren Rd at Bull Shoals Lake	Connectivity	Medium Inter	section Completed	0% No 50%	B 30% 350 75%	No No 85% 50%	No 7 0%	No Yes Yes 100%	Yes No Yes 25%	-1.0 Yes Yes Yes 100% V	ery Poc. Yes. Collector 350 1009	6 0.0 0.0 1.3	0.5 0.8 0.0 1.9	0 0 1.7 1.5	0.0 0.2 0	0 3 2 2.0	1.5 0.0 (1) 0.3	0.0 1.5 1.5 1.5 10.5	4.0 4.0 0.6 0.0 8.	0 49.11 31
49 -4	Acacia Club Rd (Sun Valley Circle to MO-165/V Hwy)	Connectivity	Medium Road	dway Completed	40% No 50%	B 20% 1300 25%	No Yes 85% 75%	Yes 26 25%	No No Yes 50%	Yes No Yes 50%	0.4 Yes Yes Yes 50%	Fair Yes Local 1300 100	6 0.5 0.0 1.3	0.5 0.5 0.0 0.6	0 2 1.7 2.3	3.0 0.3 1	0 0 2 1.0	1.5 0.0 1 0.5	4.2 1.5 1.5 1.5 5.3	2.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 8	0 48.14 34
50 3-3	Brace Hill Rd (Slough Hollow Rd to M Hwy)	Geometric/Safety	Medium Road	Iway Completed	20% No 50%	A 20% 100 50%	No No 100% 25%	rtial 2 25%	No Yes No 25%	Yes Yes Yes 50%	0.4 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Poor Yes Local 100 50%	0.3 0.0 1.3	0.0 0.5 0.0 1.3	0 0 2.0 0.8	1.5 0.1 1	0 3 0 0.5	1.5 1.5 1 0.5	4.0 1.5 1.5 1.5 10.5	3.0 4.0 0.4 0.0 4.	0 47.00 37
52 2-2	Slough Hollow Rd (Fishermans Nose to Brace, Hill)	Connectivity	Large Road	Iway Completed	0% No 25%	A 20% 100 100%	No No 100% 0%	No 2 0%	No Yes No 50%	Yes No Yes 0%	0.6 Yes Yes No 50% V	Poor Yes Local 100 100	\$ 0.0 0.0 0.6	0.0 0.8 0.0 3.8	0 0 4.0 0.0	0.0 0.1 0	0 3 0 1.0	4.5 0.0 3 0.0	4.6 1.0 1.0 0.0 3.5	0.8 1.0 0.1 0.0 2	.0 34.67 50
53 2-3	M Hwy at Brace Hill and Nazarene Church Rd	Geometric/Safety	Medium Inter	section Completed	20% No 50%	A 30% 150 0%	No No 100% 0%	rtial 3 25%	No No No 50%	Yes Yes Yes 75%	0.0 Yes Yes No 50%	Good Yes Collector 150 100	4 0.3 0.0 I.3	0.0 0.8 0.0 0.0	0 0 2.0 0.0	1.5 0.1 1	0 0 0 1.0	1.5 1.5 1 0.8	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.0 8	.0 34.47 51
54 7-4	MO-165 and MO-265 Intersection	Traffic Safety	Medium Inter	section Completed	0% No 0%	C 30% 2150 0%	No No 85% 50%	rtial 120 50%	No No No 0%	Yes Yes Yes 100%	0.0 Yes Yes No 50%	Good Yes Collector 2150 75%	0.0 0.0 0.0	1.0 0.8 0.1 0.0	0 0 1.7 1.5	1.5 0.7 2	0 0 0 0.0	1.5 1.5 1 1.0	0.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	1.0 4.0 0.6 0.1 6.	0 34.24 52

Proj. #: 1-1 Project Name:	New Arterial Co	onnector (Birch St to Maple St)									
Project Type: Traffic Safety	Total Score	69.3 out of 100									
Project Description: Construct a new 3,400 foot connector from Birch Street east to Maple Street. The roadway is proposed as a five-lane highway with pedestrian and bicycle facilites. Approximaetly 1,500 feet of Birch Street, from just south of the new connection north to Industrial Park Dr, would also be upgraded to a five-lane section with pedestrian and bicycle provisions.											
Status: Grant Application Submitte	ed	Length: 0.93 miles									
Project Scale: Large	Roadway	y or Intersection Roadway									
Functional Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the major street)									
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 2,500 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)											
Daily Truck Traffic: 50 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)											
Through Lanes:	4	(through lanes on major street)									
Project Discussion: Project provide	roject Discussion: Project provides a needed connection between the L65 / Industrial										

Project Discussion: Project provides a needed connection between the I-657 Industrial Park Dr interchange and the existing and future residential development on Maple Street. It reduces travel time for residents on Maple Street; provides a more safe travel route (diverting traffic from the Bus 65 / Maple St intersection); opens development opportunities (commercial, industrial, and residential); and potentially initiates the proposed East-West Roadway project linking southern Hollister with MO-76 in Kirbyville.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.2	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Widens Road	Yes							
Improves Geometry	Yes							
Improves Load Rating	Yes							
Truck Usage	12.5	30	2.4	0.2	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to be built	to meet criteria for	trucks	

Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
Consistent with Local Plans	Yes				On local plans and submitted as TIGER I & II Applications
Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes				East-West Roadway listed as need in SMCOG regional plan
Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	First section of the East-West Roadway (Hollister to Kirbyville)
Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual elements
Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Important to the local and regional community quality

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 14.3 of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mitigated(new stormwater detention faciliti
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmental impacts are not expected
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	2.3	Few small wetlands in area, project includes stormwater BMP

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.8 of 5	11	
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	100%	25	25.0	1.3				11	
	Project provides bike connections	Yes				Roadway will include bike	e facilities (per TIG	GER II app.)	11	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				Roadway will include peo	destrian facilities (p	per TIGER II app)	Safety
Project br	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply				[oad
Pr	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply				П	or R(
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson L	lines	П	(Maj ersec
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	100%	50	50.0	2.5	Directly connects year-ro	und housing with	jobs and shoppir		hes Inte

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	9.0	of 15
	L	_evel of Service	F	25	25.0	3.8	Estimated current LOS for	r left-out at Maple a	& BUS	65
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.5				
		Daily Usage	625	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	3.8	diverts traffic from conges	sted area, new dire	ct conn	ection

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 19.4 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Affects BUS 65
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Future development area, prior initiatives in corridor
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	18.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	Important future development area, important linkage

Safe [®]	ty				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 5.9 of 20
oad	PDO	10	Safety Index	0.16	50	5.9	1.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	j Injury	3	Crash Rate	92.72				Crash data 2009-2011, used vol data from Bus 65 at Maple Int.
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.53				used crashes for Bus 65 at Maple intersection
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.58				
Cras	2010 AADT	13768	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Safety mentioned as important issue in TIGER II application
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Shift traffic from BUS 65 and new ped/bike connections
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Could improve emergency response times and access/egress
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	1.8	Improves safety for area residents

Takin g	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.	7 of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	0.5	Existing portion of Birch Street	
	Substandard Roadv	vay or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0		
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.2		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	625	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	1.0	Mainly new roadway, but benefits existing roadwa	ys

Proj. #: 1-2 Project Name: US	6 Bus Rte 65 (Hwy 76 to	North	Birch)
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	68.3	out of	100
Project Description: Widen Business 6 Birch. The widening would add a cente Hollister. It is assumed that the widenin improvements.	65 from the Ro er two-way left- ng project will a	undabout turn lane f also includ	at Hwy hrough e appro	76 to North the center of opriate pedestrian
Status: Planning and Design		Length:	1.5	miles
Project Scale: Large	Roadway	or Inters	ection	Roadway
Functional Classification: Mi	inor Arterial	(for the m	ajor str	eet)
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 14	,100	(estimate	d, avg.	for major street)
Daily Truck Traffic: 84	6	(estimate	d, avg.	for major street)
Through Lanes: 2		(through	lanes o	n major street)
Project Discussion: This portion of Bu	isiness 65 had	2013 volu	imes of	12,000 to 16,000

vehicles per day. This is a considerable increase over prior counts, therefore these volumes were used in the ratings. There are safety issues on this segment of highway. There is a need for left-turn storage as well as improved pedestrian faciities. This project would connect the improved segments at either end of the project.



Efficie	nt Movement of Freight	Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.4	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Ye	s 30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road Ye	5			roadway widening project			
	Improves Geometry Ye	5			adds turn lanes			
	Improves Load Rating No)						
	Truck Usage 42	30	13.8	1.4	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 509	6 40	20.0	2.0	Should benefit truck traffic	; important connec	tor in Ta	aney County
								-
Qualit	y of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
Qualit <u></u>	y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	Max 30	Actual	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
<mark>Qualit</mark>	y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans No Consistent with Local Plans No	Max 30	Actual 0.0	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5 local pro	of 10 Dject exists)
Qualit <u></u>	y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans No Consistent with Local Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No	Max 30	Actual	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not shown in applicable log not mentioned in SMCOG	Total Points = cal plan (though a regional plan	4.5 local pro	of 10 Dject exists)
Qualit	y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans No Consistent with Local Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Connectivity Ye	Max 30	Actual 0.0 30.0	Weighted 0.0 3.0	Weight Factor = 10% not shown in applicable loo not mentioned in SMCOG important Hollister through	Total Points = cal plan (though a regional plan route	4.5 local pro	of 10 Dject exists)
Qualit	y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans No Consistent with Local Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Connectivity Ye Scenic and Visual No	Max 30 30 30 30 20	Actual 0.0 30.0 0.0	Weighted 0.0 3.0 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not shown in applicable loo not mentioned in SMCOG important Hollister through limited scenic benefits	Total Points = cal plan (though a regional plan route	4.5 local pro	of 10 bject exists)

Efficie	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.4	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes				roadway widening project			
	Improves Geometry	Yes				adds turn lanes			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	423	30	13.8	1.4	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Should benefit truck traffic	; important connec	tor in Ta	ney County
Qualit	y of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No							
	Consistent with Local Frans	NO				not shown in applicable loo	cal plan (though a	local pro	ject exists)
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not shown in applicable loo not mentioned in SMCOG	cal plan (though a regional plan	local pro	ject exists)
	Consistent with Regional Plans Consistent with Regional Plans	No Yes	30	30.0	3.0	not shown in applicable loo not mentioned in SMCOG important Hollister through	cal plan (though a regional plan route	local pro	ject exists)
	Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity Scenic and Visual	No Yes No	30 20	30.0 0.0	3.0 0.0	not shown in applicable loo not mentioned in SMCOG important Hollister through limited scenic benefits	cal plan (though a regional plan route	local pro	ject exists)

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 12.8 of 15	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mitigated	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmental impacts are not expected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.8	No known environmental impacts, historical impacts possible	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%
oad	PDO	54	Safety Index	0.80	50	30.1	6.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R stion)	Injury	22	Crash Rate	336.09				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.92				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.72				
Cras	Avg AADT	13768	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened road and other improvements
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	will improve response time, fire dept. < 1 mile east of project
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	7.0	High number of crashes confirms local safety concern

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.6 of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	Both the Roadway and Bridges are in good condition
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	
Fu	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.2	
		Daily Vehicle Usage	7050	10	3.5	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	improving roadway operations benefits existing system

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 2.4 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5		
Project provides bike connections	No				assume no bike facility v	vill be included with the project
Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				assumes pedestrian fac	ilities inc. ped signals
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply		
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply		
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	nuttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	75%	50	37.5	1.9	Improved roadway and i	ntersection could benefit ped acc

Conge	stion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 10.3 o	f 15
	Level of Ser	vice F	25	25.0	3.8	based on volume/capacity on roadway	
	Functional Classification1 Minor Arte	erial 40%	25	10.0	1.5		
	Daily Us	sage 7050	25	8.6	1.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion Relief Fac	tors 100%	25	25.0	3.8	moderate to high traffic, key location	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 13.4 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Business 65
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	30	0.0	0.0	No directly linked to regional economic dev. opportunities
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 7.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	Business 65 is an important economic corridor

Proi. #: 1-3 Project Name:	MO-76 and Lake	shore	Dr			Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actu
Project Type: Traffic Safety	Total Score	71.0	out of	100		Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	artial Yes	30	15.(
Project Description: Improve inter	section to address	safety i	ssues. I	mprover	nents	Widens Road	No		
include possible turn lanes, raised i	slands, and modifie	ed traffic	control.	A conti	inuous		Yes		
Green-T intersection could also be	considered at this lo	ocation				Improves Load Rating	No		
						Truck Usage	167	30	87
Status: Planning and Design	2018	Length	: NA			Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	or Inte	rsection	Interse	ection				
Functional Classification	Minor Arterial	(for the	major st	reet)		Quality of Communities		Max	Actu
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	16,700	(estima	ted, avg.	for maj	or street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0
Daily Truck Traffic	334	(estima	ted, avg.	for maj	or street)	Consistent with Local Plans	No		
Through Lanes	2	(throug	h lanes d	on major	street)	Consistent with Regional Plans	No		
Project Discussion: Both roads ar	e two lane roads. N	/IO-76 h	ns a high	volume	of traffic.	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0
There are no turn lanes on MO-76.	The intersection is	large a	and is no	t level (it	slopes	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0
from northeast to southwest). The ce east, Lakeshore is stop controlled.	curvature of the roa The posted speed	ad and g on MO-	grade lim -76 is 35	it sight li mph. the	ines to the ough the	Local Quality of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.(
85th percentile traffic liekly exceeds	that speed. Left tu	urn traff	ic during	peak pe	eriods can				
have a longer than desirable delay.	Traffic volumes flu	ictuate	with sea	sonal ac	tivity and	North / NTS Environmental Protection		Max	Actu
may meet signal warrants during pe	ak times.					Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0
						Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0
Access to Opportunity			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 0.3 of 5 Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0
Eliminate Bike/Pe	d Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3	Local Environmental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0
Project provides	bike connections	No				does not apply			
Project provides pedes	strian connections	No				does not apply Safety		Max	Actu
Project brings existing facilities up to	ADA Regulations	No	use if f	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes 문화 PDO 14 Safety Index	1.18	50	44. <i>*</i>
Project provides some bike/p	edestrian facilities	Yes	use if f	irst two d	o not apply	assume int control would incorporate ped provisions 2° $\overline{6}$ Injury 12 Crash Rate 1	145.61		

	r reject provideo podeosran connectorio					dooo not apply
ct br	rings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fir:	st two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes
Pr	roject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fir:	st two do	not apply	assume int control would incorporate ped provision
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	0%	50	0.0	0.0	no bike/ped improvements are currently assumed

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.7 of 10
	-	Level of Service	F	25	25.0	2.5	westbound left turn LOS for stop control (Synchro)
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0	
		Daily Usage	8350	25	17.4	1.7	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	moderate to high traffic, key location, can have high delay

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.2 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	MO-76
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	supports rec development in the Lakeshore corridor
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 4.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 4 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	7.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 3 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	important local intersection

Efficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.4	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	167	30	8.7	0.9	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	MO-76 is an important com	merce route, Lake	eshore is	s not
uality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
•		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans (n	ot in Hollister or E	Branson)	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG r	egional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Important connection for the	e Branson, Hollist	er & Kirb	yville ar
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no major scenic or visual b	enefits, except po	ssibly lar	ndscapir
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	this is an important intersec	ction in the area		
											_
nviro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormw	vater issues expec	sted	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Unmitigated environmental	impacts are not e	xpected	
		A1	olds Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	S		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no major mitigation expected	đ		
afetv					Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	26.7	of 30
3	PDO	14	Safety Index	1.18	50	44.1	13.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ion)	Injury	12	Crash Rate	145.61				Crash data 2009-2011			
rsect	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.21							
) on the line	Years	3	Severity Index	2.15							
S D	Ava AADT	16306	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	iders		
	<u> </u>		Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	improvements expected to	address safetv co	ncerns	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	no maior effect on response	e times		
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	crash data confirms local co	oncerns		
			-								
aking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	15.2	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	MO-76 assumed to be goo	d or very good, La	keshore	Fair
	Substa	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	alignment decreases sight	distance east of ir	tersectio	on		
	nctional Classification2 Minor Arterial 40%					4.0	0.8				
Fu			Daily Vehicle Usage	8350	10	7.0	1.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
Fu			Duny remote couge								

1 IOJ. #. I- -	Project Name:	Acacia Ciub Rd (Sun Valley	Circle	(0 WO-165/V HWY)
Project Type:	Connectivity	Total Score	48.1	out of	100
Project Descri existing alignme traffic.	ption: Construct Aca ent. This would esse	cia Club Rd along ntially replace the	g a new ali existing to	gnmen wo-lane	t south of the e road for through
Status: Com	pleted	2017	Length:	0.89	miles
Status: Com Project Scale:	bleted Medium	2017 Roadway	Length: or Inters	0.89 ection	miles Roadway
Status: Comp Project Scale: Functi	oleted Medium onal Classification:	2017 Roadway Local	Length: or Inters (for the m	0.89 ection ajor sti	miles Roadway reet)
Status: Comp Project Scale: Functi Avg. Annual D	Dieted Medium onal Classification: aily Traffic (AADT):	2017 Roadway Local 2,600	Length: or Inters (for the m (estimated	0.89 ection ajor str d, avg.	miles Roadway reet) for major street)
Status: Comp Project Scale: Functi Avg. Annual D	Medium onal Classification: aily Traffic (AADT): Daily Truck Traffic:	2017 Roadway Local 2,600 52	Length: or Inters (for the m (estimated (estimated	0.89 ection ajor sti d, avg. d, avg.	miles Roadway reet) for major street) for major street)

Project Discussion: The existing two-lane road is narrow (<20 ft) and has limited shoulders. This new roadway could be constructed to current design standards and could safely and efficiently accommodate additional traffic and development. It is possible that most if not all of the right-of-way required for the project could be obtained at minimal cost to the County. College of the Ozarks is currently working on relocating a portion of this road so a partnering opportunity may be available for the County.



fficie	nt Movement	of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Widens Road	Yes							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of the roadway			
			Improves Load Rating	Yes							
			Truck Usage	26	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
ualit	v of Commun	ities			Мах	Actual	Waighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
aant	y or commun	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			0.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No		0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG re	egional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Project begins and ends in H	Hollister		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	shifts traffic away from the w	vater		
	Loca	l Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
nviro	onmental Prot	ection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0	of 5
	C	consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigated	d (new stormwat	er deten	tion facil
	Con	sistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation pos	ssible		
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts			
	Local E	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	unknown environmental issu	IES		
fotu	,				Max	Actual	Maightad	Mainht Factor - 30%	Total Painta -	14.0	of 30
ilety	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.38	50		A 2	(Modified MoDOT formula)		14.0	01 30
(uo	Iniury	1	Crash Rate	121.26	00	17.1	7.2	Crash data 2009-2011			
secti	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.69							
Inter	Veare	3	Severity Index	1.83							
P		2530	Safety Concern	Vec	5	5.0	15	Concern raised by local lead	lore		
,	AVY AAD I	2000	Safety Enhancements	Vae	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new road	d that meets des	ian etde	
			Salety Limancements	Vee	5	5.0	1.5	no major impost on response	o timos or corvio	ngn stus S	
			Local Safety Eastern	Tes	25	17.5	1.0	no major impact on response	e unies or service	5	
				JU /0	55	17.5	0.0		gir better design		
ıking	g Care of the S	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	existing road assumed to be	in fair condition		
	Substar	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	existing road narrower than	current standard	s	
Fu	Inctional Class	ification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
								,			

fficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Widens Road	Yes							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of the roadway	y		
			Improves Load Rating	Yes							
			Truck Usage	26	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
ualit	v of Commur	nities			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
	,	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Project begins and ends in	Hollister		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	shifts traffic away from the	water		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
nviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ed (new stormwat	er deten	tion facil
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation p	ossible		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	unknown environmental iss	sues		
£ . 4 .	_									44.0	
атету	DDO		O fatala dar	0.00	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	14.0	of 30
(u	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.38	50	14.1	4.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ectio	injury Estal	1		121.20							
ters	Fatal	U		0.69							
or	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83	-			· · · · ·			
5	Avg AADT	2539	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new ro	ad that meets des	ign stds	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	no major impact on respon	ise times or servic	e	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project benefits safety thro	ugh better design		
akino	d Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	existing road assumed to b	be in fair condition		
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	existing road narrower than	n current standard	S	
Fu	unctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
	Local 1	akina Car	e of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	opportunity to upgrade the	existing system		
	2004.1	unnig our			10	10.0	0.0	opportantity to apgrade are	on a ching of orderin		

fficie	nt Movement of	of Freigh	t		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points	= 4.3	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0			
			Widens Road	Yes						
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of the roadway		
			Improves Load Rating	Yes						
			Truck Usage	26	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula		
	Local Efficie	ent Mover	nent of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route		
Jalit	v of Communit	ties			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points	= 3.0	of 10
aame	j er cennun	Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			
		Co	nsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan		
		Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Project begins and ends in Hollister		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	shifts traffic away from the water		
	Local	Quality o	f Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents		
viro	onmental Prote	ection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points	= 3.0	of 5
	Co	onsistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigated (new storm)	vater deter	ntion faci
	Cons	sistent wit	h Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation possible		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts		
	Local E	nvironme	ntal Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	unknown environmental issues		
foty	,				Mox	Actual	Maightad	Weight Factor - 30% Total Points	- 14 0	of 30
icty	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.38	50	14.1	4 2	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
(uo	Iniury	1	Crash Rate	121.26	00		1.2	Crash data 2009-2011		
secti	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.69						
Inter	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83						
P		2539	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	15	Concern raised by local leaders		
	////////	2000	Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new road that meets	tesian stas	
			Emergency Response	Vac	5	5.0	1.5	no major impact on response times or ser		
			Linergency Response	50%	35	17.5	53	no ingoi impact on response times or ser	an	
				0070	00	17.0	0.0	project benefite surety an ough better user	911	
king	g Care of the S	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points	= 14.4	of 20
		Roadwa	y or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	existing road assumed to be in fair conditi	on	
	Substan	dard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	existing road narrower than current stand	ards	
	Inctional Classif	fication2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4			
Fι			Daily Vehicle Usage	1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
Fı										

icie	ent Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Widens Road	Yes							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of the roadway	/		
			Improves Load Rating	Yes							
			Truck Usage	26	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
ıəlif	v of Commu	nitios			Max	Actual	Maightad	Weight Easter = 10%	Total Pointe -	3.0	of 10
	y or commu	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30		0.0			0.0	
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Project begins and ends in	Hollister		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	shifts traffic away from the	water		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
		-									
viro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ed (new stormwa	er deten	ition faci
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation p	ossible		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	S		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	unknown environmental iss	sues		
-f - f									TIDIC	14.0	
arety	DDO	0	Cofety Index	0.00	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	14.0	of 30
(u	PDU	2	Creek Dete	0.38	50	14.1	4.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
sectic	Injury Fotol	0		0.60				Crash data 2009-2011			
nters	Fala	0		0.09							
P		3	Seventy maex	1.03	F	FO	4 5		- down		
)	AVG AAD I	2039	Safety Concern	res	5	5.0	1.5				
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new ro	ad that meets des	ign stas	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	no major impact on respon	se times or servic	е	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project benefits safety thro	ugh better design		
akin	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	existing road assumed to b	e in fair condition		_
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	existing road narrower than	n current standard	s	
F	Inctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
		1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)					
			-								

Effici	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Widens Road	Yes							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of the roadway	y		
			Improves Load Rating	Yes							
			Truck Usage	26	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
uali	tv of Commu	nities			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
	.,	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Project begins and ends in	Hollister		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	shifts traffic away from the	water		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
		_									
nvir	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ed (new stormwat	er deten	tion facil
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation p	ossible		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	unknown environmental is	sues		
ofot	.,				Max	Astual	Mainhead	Mainht Fraten - 200/	Total Dointo -	14.0	of 20
2	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.38	50		A 2	(Modified MoDOT formula)		14.0	01 30
no (no	Iniury	1	Crash Rate	121.26	00	17.1	7.2	Crash data 2009-2011			
secti	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.69							
Inter	Vears	3	Severity Index	1.83							
or		2530	Safety Concern	Vec	5	5.0	15	Concern raised by local lea	adere		
2		2000	Safety Enhancements	Vae	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new ro	ad that meets dee	ian etde	
				Vee	5	5.0	1.5	project will result in new ro	au triat meets des	iyii sius	
			Emergency Response	Tes	25	17.5	1.0	no major impact on respon	ugh hotter design	5	
			Local Salety Factors	50%	30	17.5	0.0	project benefits safety thro	ugn beller design		
akin	<mark>g Care of the</mark>	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	existing road assumed to b	be in fair condition		
	Substa	andard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	existing road narrower that	n current standard	S	
F	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
		Takina Car	a af the Custom Fastons	1009/	40	40.0	8.0	opportunity to ungrado the	evieting evietem		

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.8 o	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5			
	Project provides bike connections	No				it is not assumed that bil	e facilities would be constru	ucted
	Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				it is assumed that sidewa	alks would be constructed	
Project bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply			
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply			
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	sidewalks and an improv	ed road offer more ped/bike	e option

Congestion Relie	əf			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	1.7	of 10			
	L	_evel of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	congestion is not expected to be a major issue					
Functional	Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5						
		Daily Usage	1300	25	0.4	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)					
L	ocal Congestion	n Relief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.6	congestion is not expected to be a major is	sue				

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 6.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	expected to support education/business/residential dev
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	17.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	2.3	would support continued development in the project area

Proi. #: 1-5 Project Name: New Interch	ange at MC	D-265 &	US-65			Effici	ent Movemer	nt of Freia	ht		Max	Actual	Wejahted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.1 of 10
Project Type: Capacity Total Sco	ore 53.4	outo	of 100		I a start and	1		Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0			
Project Description: Construct new interchange	o replace e	existing a	at-grade					-	Widens Road	No						
intersection.						1			Improves Geometry	Yes						
									Improves Load Rating	Yes						
									Truck Usage	275	30	11.1	1.1	MoDOT formula		
Status: Planning	Length	n: NA				-	Local Eff	icient Move	ement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Interchange to meet crite	eria for freight; US-	65 is an important fac
Project Scale: Regional Road	way or Inte	ersection	n Interse	ction		2										
Functional Classification: Freeway	(for the	e major s	treet)			Quali	ity of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0 of 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 17,800	(est. 20	012, avg.	. for majo	r street)				Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Daily Truck Traffic: 1,100	(est. 20	012, avg.	. for majo	r street)	5 ////	2		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan	(not in Hollister or I	Branson)
Through Lanes: 4	(throug	h lanes	on major	street)		delet		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCO	G regional plan	
Project Discussion: Project will facilitate access/	egress and	develop	oment in th	ne	State of the second				Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-65 connects to Bran	son & Hollister and	points beyond
interchange vicinity. The project is proposed in co	njunction w	ith majoi	r econom	ic		1			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Interchange, no scenic b	enefits	
initiatives in the 03-03 confider.							Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	interchange could spur	rowth, could also d	cause more competiti
						Envir	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5 of 15
								Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitig	ated (new stormw	ater detention facilitie
						-	Co	onsistent w	ith Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	large project; environme	ntal mitigation pos	sible
Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	d Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.5 of 5			A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	no known historical impa	acts	
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (Al	A) 100%	6 25	25.0	1.3			Loca	l Environm	ental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	due to size of project, m	tigation likely	
Project provides bike connecti	ons Yes				assumes bike facilities will be part of project											
Project provides pedestrian connection	ons Yes				assumes sidewalks will be part of project	Safet	у				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	4.4 of 20
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulation	ons No	use if i	first two do	o not apply	/	ad	PDO	7	Safety Index	0.22	50	8.3	1.7	(Modified MoDOT formu	la)	· · · ·
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facili	ies No	use if i	first two do	o not apply	/	or Ro	Injury	2	Crash Rate	47.29				Crash data 2009-2011		
Trai	sit No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	Majc	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.72						
Local Access to Opportunity Fact	ors 50%	50	25.0	1.3	interchange could offer improved bike/ped crossing faci	ties) set	Years	3	Severity Index	1.56						
						Crast	; Ava AADT	17380	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0			
Congestion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighter	d Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 6.7 of 1				Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	50	10	Interchange will improve	safety over the at-	arade intersection
l evel of Serv	ce B	25	5.0	0.8	concestion is not a major issue at this location				Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0		and y and the de	0
Functional Classification 1 Freeway	100%	25	25.0	3.0					Local Safety Factore	25%	35	8.8	1.8	crash rate not significan	relative to other p	rojects
Deily Us	do 1150	25	20.0	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)				Local Galety 1 actors	20/0	55	0.0	1.0	ordon rate not orginitedit		0,0010
	ye 4400	20	40.5	1.0	moderate to high traffic but limited concertion	Takin	a Care of the	Sustam			Max	Actual	Moishish	Maight Frater - 50/	Total Dainta -	08
Local Congestion Relief Fact	ors <u>50</u> %	25	12.5	1.9	moderate to high traffic, but limited congestion	Takin	ig Care of the	system			Max	Actual	weighted	weight Factor = 5%	i otal Points =	C 10 01 5

Econo	omic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 19.4 of 20
	Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	US-65
	Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Interchange allows for large scale economic possibilities
	Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
	Poverty (Block Group)	14.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
	Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
	Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	US-65 is an important economic corridor

IVIAN	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points =	0.8	of 5
20	5.0	0.3			
20	0.0	0.0			
10	10.0	0.5			
10	0.9	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
40	0.0	0.0	system expansion / econ dev project		
	20 20 10 10 40	20 5.0 20 0.0 10 10.0 10 0.9 40 0.0	20 5.0 0.3 20 0.0 0.0 10 10.0 0.5 10 0.9 0.0 40 0.0 0.0	20 5.0 0.3 20 0.0 0.0 10 10.0 0.5 10 0.9 0.0 (Modified MoDOT formula) 40 0.0 0.0 system expansion / econ dev project	20 5.0 0.3 20 0.0 0.0 10 10.0 0.5 10 0.9 0.0 (Modified MoDOT formula) 40 0.0 0.0 system expansion / econ dev project

Proj. #: 1-6 Project Name: N	New Interchange	e at MO	-86 & U	S-65		Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual
Project Type: Capacity	Total Score	57.1	out of	f 100		Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0
Project Description: Construct new in	nterchange to re	place ex	kisting a	t-grade		Widens Road	No		
intersection.						Improves Geometry	Yes		
						Improves Load Rating	Yes		
						Truck Usage	275	30	11.1
Status: Planning		Length	: NA			North / NTS Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0
Project Scale: Regional	Roadway	or Inter	rsectior	n Inters	ection				
Functional Classification: F	reeway	(for the	major st	treet)		Quality of Communities		Max	Actual
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 1	7,800	(est. 20	12, avg.	for maje	or street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0
Daily Truck Traffic: 1	,100	(est. 20	12, avg.	for maje	or street)	Consistent with Local Plans	Yes		
Through Lanes: 4	k i l	(through	h lanes d	on majoi	r street)	Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes		
Project Discussion: Project will facilit	tate access/egre	ess and o	developi	ment in ⁻	the	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0
interchange vicinity. The project is pro	pposed in conjun	iction wi	th major	econon	nic	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0
						Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0
						Environmental Protection		Мах	Actual
						Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0
						Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0
Access to Opportunity			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.5 of 5 Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0
Eliminate Bike/Ped E	Barriers (ADA)	100%	25	25.0	1.3	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0
Project provides bi	ike connections	Yes				assumes bike facilities will be part of project			
Project provides pedestri	an connections	Yes				assumes sidewalks will be part of project Safety		Max	Actual
Project brings existing facilities up to Al	DA Regulations	No	use if f	first two a	lo not apply	· 문화 PDO 6 Safety Index	0.52	50	19.5
Project provides some bike/pede	estrian facilities	No	use if f	first two a	lo not apply	ਨੂੰ ਤਿੰ Injury 4 Crash Rate	52.54		
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines Fatal 0 Accident Index	0.80		
Local Access to Oppor	tunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	interchange could offer improved bike/ped crossing facilities	2.00		
						Avg AADT 17380 Safety Concern	No	5	0.0
Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 6.7 of 15	Yes	5	5.0
Le	evel of Service	В	25	5.0	0.8	congestion is not a major issue at this location Emergency Response	No	5	0.0
Functional Classification1	Freeway	100%	25	25.0	3.8	Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8
	Daily Usage	4450	25	22	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
Local Congestion	Relief Factore	50%	25	12.2	1 Q	moderate to high traffic, but limited congestion		Max	Actual
Lucar congestion	Neller Factors	50 /0	25	12.0	1.9	Indefate to high stalling outgestion		wax	Actual

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 17.8 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	US-65
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Interchange allows for large scale economic possibilities
Level of Economic Distress	45%	20	9.0	1.8	
Poverty (Block Group)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	essential to current regional econ dev efforts

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.8	of 5	
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3					
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0					
F	unctional Classification2	Freeway	100%	10	10.0	0.5					
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4450	10	0.9	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	system expansion / econ de	v project			

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.1	of 10
3.0				

1.1 *MoDOT formula* 3.0 Interchange to meet criteria for freight; US-65 is an important faci

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.0 of 10
3.0	
	correlated to the airport, which is mentioned in Branson plan airports in general are mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
3.0	US-65 connects to Branson & Hollister and points beyond
0.0	no scenic benefits
2.0	Interchange could serve new development and airport traffic

Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 7.5 of 15
4.5	Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities
0.0	large project; environmental mitigation possible
3.0	no known historical impacts
0.0	due to size of project, mitigation likely

Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	6.6	of 20
3.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Crash data 2009-2011			
0.0				
1.0	Interchange will improve sa	fety over the at-g	rade inter	section
0.0				
1.8	crash rate not significant re	lative to other pro	jects	

Proj. #: 1-7 Project Name:	Access Rd (US	-65 to Bra	inson Creek Blvd)				
Project Type: Connectivity	Total Score	56.2	out of 100				
Project Description: Construct a new 3-lane minor arterial between US-65 and the Branson Regional Airport. The project would serve new development in the corridor including a proposed new racetrack facility (Racetrack is likely not going to be constructed as of this update). It would also serve the airport with a second access/egress route.							
Status: Planning		Length:	3.3 miles				
Project Scale: Regional	Roadway	or Inters	section Roadway				
Functional Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the n	najor street)				
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	8,000	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)				
Daily Truck Traffic: 800 (estimated, avg. for major street)							
Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes on major street)				

Project Discussion: This roadway would provide a direct high-speed connection between US-65 and the airport. It could be designed with appropriate turn lanes and traffic control such that travel delay is minimized. If volumes grow past the assumed baseline of 8,000 ADT, the roadway could be expanded to 5 lanes with a center raised median.



Efficier	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.3	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes							
	Improves Geometry	Yes							
	Improves Load Rating	Yes							
	Truck Usage	400	30	13.4	1.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to meet cri	teria for freight; 65	is an im	portant facil

Quality	<i>r</i> of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 10.0 of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans Ye	s 30	30.0	3.0	
	Consistent with Local Plans Ye	S			correlated to the airport, which is mentioned in Branson plan
	Consistent with Regional Plans Ye	S			airports in general are mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
	Connectivity Ye	s 30	30.0	3.0	connects proposed development and airport to US-65 & beyond
	Scenic and Visual Ye	s 20	20.0	2.0	Landscaping, signage, art, etc.
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 100	<mark>%</mark> 20	20.0	2.0	Connects US-65 directly to airport

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater deten	tion facilities
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	new road, proximity to airport; environmental mitigate	on possible
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation likely	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 2.8 of 20
oad	PDO	N/A	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R ition)	Injury	N/A	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj ersec	Fatal	N/A	Accident Index	0.00				
shes ir Inte	Years	N/A	Severity Index	0.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	7811	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	Project driven by economic opportunities
			Safety Enhancements	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	could improve response time to / from airport
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	1.8	provides alt route to/from airport if needed

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.2	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Very Good	20	0.0	0.0	Future project			
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	Future project			
F	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.2				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4000	10	0.7	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	Future project			

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	5.0	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	100%	25	25.0	1.3				
	Project provides bike connections					assume bike provisions a	are incorporated in	to the p	roject
	Project provides pedestrian connections					assume ped provisions a	are incorporated int	o the p	roject
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations		No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
Pro	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
Transit Yes		25	25.0	1.3	Provides alternate route	for airport-hotel sh	uttles		
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors 100%		50	50.0	2.5	assumes new bike/ped f	acilities incorporate	d into d	corridor

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 5.3 of	15
	L	evel of Service	В	25	5.0	0.8	design LOS B, street access restricted to maintain flow	W
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.5		
		Daily Usage	4000	25	1.8	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	75%	25	18.8	2.8	moderate to high traffic	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 17.0 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	US-65
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Supports regional econ efforts (racetrack, commerce, airport
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	14.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 3 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	60%	30	18.0	3.6	Important to current regional econ efforts

New Interchan	nge at US-65 & connection to JJ	
Total Score	re 54.7 out of 100	
ew interchange r	near Ridgedale and a roadway	
-JJ.		
	Length: 1.7 miles	
Roadwa	ay or Intersection Roadway	
Collector	(for the major street)	
4,000	(est. 2012, avg. for major street))
400	(est. 2012, avg. for major street))
2	(through lanes on major street)	
	New Intercha Total Scor ew interchange -JJ. Roadw Collector 4,000 400 2	New Interchange at US-65 & connection to JJ Total Score 54.7 out of 100 ew interchange near Ridgedale and a roadway

Project Discussion: This would provide an additional east-west connection and the only east-west connection toUS-65 in MO, south of the airport. There does not appear to be significant background demand for this connector, therefore future development should be a major part of the plan. An assumed 4,000 ADT was selected as the baseline for this two-lane road. If significant development occurs along the corridor, a higher capacity facility could be considered. Also, if this roadway were connected to the airport the project definition and ratings would change.



Efficient Movement of Freight			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.9	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly	Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Wi	dens Road	Yes							
Improves	Geometry	Yes							
Improves L	oad Rating	Yes							
Tru	ick Usage	200	30	9.5	0.9	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freig	nt Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to meet cr	iteria for freight; 65	ō is an im	portant faci
Quality of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10

Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.0 of 10
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Consistent with Local Plans No					no applicable local plan (not in Hollister or Branson)
Consistent with Regional Plans					not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
Connectivity		30	0.0	0.0	Ridgedale (does not meet criteria for activity center) to Highway
Scenic and Visual		20	0.0	0.0	Interchange & roadway, no scenic benefits
Local Quality of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits to Ridgedale area residents

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ed (new stormwate	r detenti	on facilities
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	new road, proximity to airp	ort; environmental	mitigatio	n possible
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	environmental mitigation li	kely		

Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.4 of 20
oad	PDO	2	Safety Index	1.05	50	39.4	7.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R(Injury	7	Crash Rate	123.79				Crash data 2009-2011 (interchange area)
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.71				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.94				
Cras	Avg AADT	3906	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Interchange will provide numerous safety features
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	3.5	crash rate not significant relative to other projects

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.2	of 5	
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions V	/ery Good	20	0.0	0.0	Future project				
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	Future project				
Fu	nctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.2					
		Daily Vehicle Usage	2000	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
	Local Taking Care of	of the System Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	Future project				

Access to Opportur	nity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.5	of 5
Elimin	ate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	100%	25	25.0	1.3				
Proj	ect provides bike connections	Yes				assume bike provisions	are incorporated in	to the pr	oject
Project pro	ovides pedestrian connections	Yes				assume ped provisions a	are incorporated in	to the pro	oject
Project brings existing fa	cilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply				
Project provides	some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply				
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	nuttle or Jefferson L	ines	
Local Ac	cess to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes new bike/ped f	facilities in corridor	(modera	te use)

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 3.8 of 15	
	2	Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.8	design LOS B, street access restricted to maintain flow	
	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	1.1		
		Daily Usage	2000	25	0.4	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.9	moderate to low traffic	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 19.4 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	US-65
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Interchange allows for large scale economic possibilities
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 4.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 3 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	important part of current econ. dev efforts

Proj. #: 1-9 F	Project Name:	Taney County E	Expressway	
Project Type: 0	Connectivity	Total Score	76.9 out of 100	
Project Descript Birch Street in Ho highway. All inters be required.	ion: Construct a ne Illister to Hwy 76 in sections will be at-g	ew approximately Kirbyville. The ro rade and likely si	4.6 mile highway connection badway is proposed as a tw top-controlled. Multiple brid	on from vo-lane Iges will
Status: Grant A	Application Submitte	d	Length: 4.6 miles	
Project Scale: F	Regional	Roadway	or Intersection Roadwa	y
Functior	nal Classification:	Major Arterial	(for the major street)	
Avg. Annual Dai	ly Traffic (AADT):	4,000	(est. 2012, avg. for major	street)
D	aily Truck Traffic:	200	(est. 2012, avg. for major	street)
	Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major st	treet)

Project Discussion: Project would provide a needed connection between the Hwy 65 / Industrial Park Dr interchange and the east side of Taney County. It would reduce traffic volumes on Hwy 76 in the Lakeshore area; provide a more safe travel route (diverting traffic from Hwy 76); and open development opportunities (commercial, industrial, and residential). It would also divert traffic from Hwy Bb and Coon Creek Road, providing an alternative to Coon Creek Road in high water conditions. This project includes project 1-1 and it could address some of the needs identified in project 7-1.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.7	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Widens Road	Yes							
Improves Geometry	Yes							
Improves Load Rating	Yes							
Truck Usage	100	30	6.7	0.7	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to be built to	o meet criteria for	trucks	

Quality	<i>r</i> of Communities	Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.0 o	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans Yes	30	30.0	3.0		
	Consistent with Local Plans Yes				On local plans and submitted as TIGER Application	
	Consistent with Regional Plans Yes				East-West Roadway listed as need in SMCOG regional	plan
	Connectivity Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hollister to Kirbyville	
	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual elements	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 100%	20	20.0	2.0	Important to the local and regional community quality	

Enviro	nmental Protection	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	12.8	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Ye	s 30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	igated(new stormw	ater deter	ntion faciliti
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	s 30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmenta	ll impacts are not e	xpected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Ye	s 20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 25	<mark>%</mark> 20	5.0	0.8	Will require several bridge	crossings and gre	enfield co	nstruction

Safet	^t y				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.3 of 20
oad	PDO	54	Safety Index	0.80	50	30.1	6.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	22	Crash Rate	336.09				Crash data 2009-2011, used crash and volume data for Bus 65
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.92				used length data from BUS 65
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.72				
Cra	, 2010 AADT	13768	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Safety mentioned as important issue in TIGER II application
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Shift traffic from Hwy 76 and BUS 65
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Could improve emergency response times and access/egress
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	Improves safety for area residents

Taking Care of the System		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.0	of 5
Roadway or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	New roadway, but relieves traffic on other roads	
Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	Provides alternate to Coon Creek Road and Hwy 76	
Functional Classification2 Major Arterial	50%	10	5.0	0.3		
Daily Vehicle Usage	2000	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
Local Taking Care of the System Factors	25%	40	10.0	0.5	Mainly new roadway, but benefits existing roadways	

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 2.8	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				Only for a portion of the	entire length (see below)	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				Only for a portion of the	entire length (see below)	
Project bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply			
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	Portion of highway will h	ave sidewalk and bike lar	ies
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	100%	50	50.0	2.5	Directly connects year-ro	ound housing with jobs ar	nd shoppir

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	9.4	of 15
		Level of Service	F	25	25.0	3.8	Indirectly addresses LOS	F condition identif	ied for	1-2 & 1-3
	Functional Classification1	Major Arterial	50%	25	12.5	1.9				
		Daily Usage	2000	25	0.4	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	3.8	Diverts traffic from conge	sted area, new dire	ect conr	nection

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 20.0 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Affects BUS 65 and Eastern Taney County
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Future development area, prior initiatives in corridor
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	4.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	20.0%				2011-2015 ACS block group data - 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	10.0%				2011-2015 ACS tract data - 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	Important future development area, important linkage

Proj. #: 1-10 Project Name: US	S 65 Upgrade to Freeway Standards	Efficient Movement of Freight	N	<mark>Aax A</mark>
Project Type: Capacity	Total Score 66.2 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partia	Yes	30
Project Description: Upgrade Highway	y 65 to meet freeway standards throughout Tane	Widens Road	5	
County. Upgrades would include impro	oving Hwy 65 access points to grade-seprated	North / NTS Improves Geometry Ye	s	
interchanges. This includes four interse to three in the northern part of the coun	ections in the southern part of the county and up ity (though some access consolidation may be	Improves Load Rating	2	
necesary). Some segment improvemen	Its signage upgrades may also be required.	Truck Usage 347	.5	30
Status: Planning	Length: NA miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 50	%	40
Project Scale: Regional	Roadway or Intersection Intersection	st Beach		
Functional Classification: Fr	reeway (for the major street)	Quality of Communities	N	<mark>Aax A</mark>
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 20	,611 2015 MoDOT Vehicle Count Map	Cave Park Local/Regional Land Use Plans Ye	s	30
Daily Truck Traffic: 1,3	2015 MoDOT Vehicle Count Map	Consistent with Local Plans	s	
Through Lanes: 4	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans Ye	s	
Project Discussion: Highway 65 is th	ne primary north-south highway through Taney	Connectivity Ye	s í	30
County. It was upgraded to 4-lanes with	h a median in the 1990's. Several grade-	Table Rock Scenic and Visual No	o (20
separated interchanges have also been	n built; nowever, there are seven at-grade			

intersections that still remain. These intersections must be upgraded to full gradeseprated interchanges or closed to meet Interstate standards. Other design features such as fencing, signage, ramp tapers, and clear-zones must also be examined and possibly improved. The focus of the evaluation is on the southern four intersections.

.



ficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.8	of 10	
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	Yes				Will upgrade intersections	and corridor to Inte	erstate s	tandards	
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	347.5	30	12.5	1.3	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effi	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Will benefit freight primaril	y at access points			
											-	
ualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10	
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0					
	Consistent with Local Plans Yes			Yes				Local priority, intersections	s on plans, now co	ridor be	ing added	
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				Listed as need in SMCOG	regional plan			
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Countywide				
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual	elements			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important to the local and	ant to the local and regional community quality			
nviro	vironmental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	14.3	of 15		
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes			30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mit	igated(new stormw	ater det	ention facili		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes			Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	xpected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts			
	Loca	l Environmo	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	2.3	Few small wetlands in are	a, project includes	stormwa	ater BMP	
										_		
afety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	11.8	of 20	
))	PDO	34	Safety Index	0.60	50	22.7	4.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ction	Injury	24	Crash Rate	40.31				Crash data 2009-2011,				
erse	Fatal	2	Accident Index	0.61				at all non-interchange acc	ess locations (7) a	ong US	65	
or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	2.27				volume multiplied by 7 for	7 intersections			
5	2010 AADT	19418	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0					
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Reduces conflict points				
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	Unlikely to have a major in	npact on emergene	cy respo	nse	
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	Improves safety for area re	esidents			
akinç	<mark>y Care of the</mark>	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5	
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	Existing Hwy 65				
	Subst	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	Does not meet FHWA star	ndards for interstat	es		
Fu	inctional Clas	sification2	Freeway	100%	10	10.0	0.5					
Functional Classification2Freeway100%												
		Daily Vehicle Usage 5152				1.2	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)			

					IVICAX	//0/0/01	worghtou	
		Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5	
			Widens Road	No				
			Improves Geometry	Yes				Will upgrade intersections and corridor to Interstate standards
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	347.5	30	12.5	1.3	MoDOT formula
	Local Eff	icient Move	ement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Will benefit freight primarily at access points
Qualit	ty of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
	Consistent with Local Plans			Yes				Local priority, intersections on plans, now corridor being added
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				Listed as need in SMCOG regional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Countywide
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual elements
	Local Quality of Communities Factors			50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important to the local and regional community quality
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 14.3 of 15
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mitigated(new stormwater detention facil
	Co	onsistent w	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmental impacts are not expected
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts
	Loca	l Environm	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	2.3	Few small wetlands in area, project includes stormwater BMP
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.8 of 20
oad)	PDO	34	Safety Index	0.60	50	22.7	4.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R.	Injury	24	Crash Rate	40.31				Crash data 2009-2011,
(Maj ersec	Fatal	2	Accident Index	0.61				at all non-interchange access locations (7) along US 65
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.27				volume multiplied by 7 for 7 intersections
Crae	2010 AADT	19418	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Reduces conflict points
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	Unlikely to have a major impact on emergency response
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	Improves safety for area residents
			•					
Takin	a Care of the	Svstem			Max	Actual	Weiahted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.8 of 5
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	Existing Hwy 65
	Subst	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	10	Does not meet FHWA standards for interstates
F	unctional Clas	sification?	Freeway	100%	10	10.0	0.5	
			Daily Vehicle Lleage	5152 75	10	1.2	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	المعدا	Taking Ca	o of the System Eastern	50%	40	20.0	1.0	Mainly now interportions, but honofite existing reactively
	Local	Taking Cal	e of the system ractors	JU 70	40	20.0	1.0	wainty new intersections, but benefits existing roadways

		<u> </u>			THOUX	, totala	Wolghtou	5			
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	⊃artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				Will upgrade intersections and corridor to Interstate standards			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	347.5	30	12.5	1.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Will benefit freight primarily at access points			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.0 of 10			
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Local priority, intersections on plans, now corridor being added			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	Yes				Listed as need in SMCOG regional plan			
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Countywide			
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual elements			
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important to the local and regional community quality			
Environmental Protection				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 14.3 of 15				
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mitigated(new stormwater detention facility)			
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmental impacts are not expected			
		A	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts			
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	2.3	Few small wetlands in area, project includes stormwater BMP			
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%			
oad)	PDO	34	Safety Index	0.60	50	22.7	4.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
jor R ction	Injury	24	Crash Rate	40.31				Crash data 2009-2011,			
(Maj erse	Fatal	2	Accident Index	0.61				at all non-interchange access locations (7) along US 65			
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.27				volume multiplied by 7 for 7 intersections			
Crak	2010 AADT	19418	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0				
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Reduces conflict points			
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	Unlikely to have a major impact on emergency response			
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	Improves safety for area residents			
Takin	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.8 of 5			
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	Existing Hwy 65			
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	Does not meet FHWA standards for interstates			
F	unctional Clas	sification2	Freewav	100%	10	10.0	0.5				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5152.75	10	1.2	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	1.0	Mainly new intersections, but benefits existing roadways			
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors					20.0	1.0	, succession of the second of the second sec			

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	1.9 of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0			
	Project provides bike connections	No						
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No						
Project bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply			
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if first two do not apply		o not apply			
	Transit	Yes	25	25.0	1.3	Affects Branson Shuttle	and Jefferson Line	s
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	Will not significantly chai	nge ped/bike/ransit	access

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 5.9 c	of 15
	2	Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.8	Intersections typically operate at LOS B or better	
	Functional Classification	Freeway	100%	25	25.0	3.8		
		Daily Usage	5152.8	25	3.0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestie	on Relief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.9	Not a major congestion relief project	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 17.9 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Affects all of Taney County
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Beneficial for attracting new businesses & development
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	17.0%				2011-2015 ACS block group data - 4 block groups, near ints
Unemployment (tract)	9.0%				2011-2015 ACS tract data - 3 tracts, near ints.
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	4.5	New development often favors Interstate access

Proj. #: 1-11 Project Name: Transload Facility	Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 10.0 of 10
Project Type: Multimodal Total Score 55.8 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Fac	i lities Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
Project Description: Construct a new transload facility near the airport with railroad	Widens	Road Yes				Project effectively improves freight facilities
acces. The site must have easy access to Hwy 65.	Improves Geo	metry <mark>Yes</mark>				Project effectively improves freight facilities
	Improves Load	Rating Yes				Project effectively improves freight facilities
	Truck	sage 125	30	30.0	3.0	Adjusted to provide full points given project type
Status: Planning Length: N/A miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Fa	ctors 100%	40	40.0	4.0	Project is designed to improve freight movements
Project Scale: Regional Roadway or Intersection Intersection	son ort					
Functional Classification: Other (for the major street)	Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.0 of 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 500 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use	Plans Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
Daily Truck Traffic: 250 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Loca	Plans <mark>Yes</mark>				MoDOT Statewide Freight Study recommends strengthening
Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional	Plans <mark>Yes</mark>				Intermodal connectors
Project Discussion: The transload facility could provide economic benefits to the area.	Conne	tivity <mark>No</mark>	30	0.0	0.0	
It could promote manufacturing and industrial development in the County and specifically	Scenic and V	isual <mark>No</mark>	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual elements
distribution services.	Local Quality of Communities Fa	ctors 50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important to the local and regional community quality
Rogeoale	Environmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 13.5 of 15
TMISSOURI	Consistent with Stormwater	Goals Yes	30	30.0	4.5	
	Consistent with Environmental	Goals Yes	30	30.0	4.5	
Access to Opportunity Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 0.	O of 5 Avoids Historical Im	pacts Yes	20	20.0	3.0	
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) 0% 25 0.0 0.0	Local Environmental Protection Fa	ctors 50%	20	10.0	1.5	Project provides an efficient means of transporting freight
Project provides bike connections No						
Project provides pedestrian connections No	Safety		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 5.3 of 20
roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations No use if first two do not apply	ਲੂ PDO Safety	ndex -1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities No use if first two do not apply	က်က် Injury Cras	Rate 0.00				
Transit No 25 0.0 0.0 No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	Fatal Accident	Index 0.00				
Local Access to Opportunity Factors 0% 50 0.0 0.0 This project does not affect bike/ped/transit acc	ess. Years Severity	Index 0.00				
	Safety Co	ncern No	5	0.0	0.0	
Congestion Relief Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 1.	7 of 15	nents No	5	0.0	0.0	
		onse No	5	0.0	0.0	
		otoro 75%	25	26.2	5.0	Project provides a sofe way of maying fraight
			55	20.3	0.0	Project provides a sale way of moving height
Dally Usage 250 25 0.0 0.0 (Modified MoDUT formula)	Tables One of the Oreford					
Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 25 6.3 0.9 Could reduce regional truck traffic, but increase			Max	Actual	Weighted	weight Factor = 5% otal Points = 2.0 of 5
	Roadway or Bridge Cond	tions Fair	20	10.0	0.5	
Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 19.	4 of 20 Substandard Roadway or Bridge Fe	ature No	20	0.0	0.0	

Functional Classification2

Other

Local Taking Care of the System Factors 75%

Daily Vehicle Usage 250

Econo	mic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 19.4 of 20
	Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	
	Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Future development area, prior initiatives in corridor
	Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
	Poverty (Block Group)	18.0%				2011-2015 ACS block group data - countywide
	Unemployment (tract)	9.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - countywide
	Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	This project is focused on local and regional development

10 0.0

10 0.0

40 30.0

0%

Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.0 of 5
0.5	
0.0	
0.0	
0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
1.5	Project provides an efficient multimodal way of moving freight

Proj. #: 1-12 Project Name: Hwy 86 at Ama	anda Road		Efficient Movement of Freight		Max
Project Type: Traffic Safety Total Score	e 58.3 out of 100	117107	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	artial Yes	30
Project Description: Improve safety at the intersec	tion by modifying or upgrading the	North /NTS	Widens Road	No	
traffic control, signage, and geometry.		Nordi / Nordi / Nordi / Nordi / Nordi	Improves Geometry	Yes	
		June //	Improves Load Rating	No	
			Truck Usage	167.5	30
Status: Planning	Length: NA		Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40
Project Scale: Small Roadwa	ay or Intersection Intersection	To Market Contraction			
Functional Classification: Minor Arterial	(for the major street)		Quality of Communities		Max
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 6,700	(2017 counts, avg. for major street,		Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30
Daily Truck Traffic: 335	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Consistent with Local Plans	No	
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)		Consistent with Regional Plans	No	
Project Discussion: Traffic has increased at this in	tersection due to Long Creek Marina		Connectivity	No	30
access by turning south. Sight distances are limited	due to topography. There are no		Scenic and Visual	No	20
does meet the turn lane warrant thresholds. Turn la	nes may be the best option for		Local Quality of Communities Factors	50%	20
improving safety at this location.					
			Environmental Protection		Max
			Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30
			Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30
Access to Opportunity	Max Actual Waighted	Maight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.5 of 5	Avoide Historical Impacts	Vac	20

Access to Opportunity		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	l otal Points =	1.5 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connection	s <mark>No</mark>				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connection	s <mark>No</mark>				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulation	s <mark>No</mark>	use if first two do not apply		o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilitie	s <mark>Yes</mark>	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes widened should	ders at intersection	
Trans	it No	25	0.0	0.0	not on transit route		
Local Access to Opportunity Factor	s 50%	50	25.0	1.3	widened shoulders bene	fit bikes/peds	

C	ongestion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.2	of 10
	Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak hour LOS	
	Functional Classification1 Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0		
	Daily Usage	3350	25	9.3	0.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	moderate localized congestion	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.7 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	US-86
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Big Cedar / Bass Pro Resort Area Development
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	1.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	18%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	2.3	MO-86 is an important arterial and economic link

Efficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.4	of 10	
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection safety improve	ements			
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	167.5	30	8.7	0.9	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Minimal criteria met; Hwy 8	36 is an important	arterial		
ualit	v of Commu	nition			Maria	Asteral	Mainh ta al	Maight Factor = 10%	Total Dointo -	10	of 10	
uant			agianal Land Llas Diana	Ne		Actual	weighted	Weight Factor - 10%	Total Points -	1.0		
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	na appliachla lagal plana				
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan			
		00113	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	Localized project only	regional plan			
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	no scenic henefil	e		
	Loc	eal Ouality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Minimal criteria met: Hwy	R6 is an important	facility in	Tanov (
	200	ar Quanty		0070	20	10.0	1.0		oo io an important	raonity ii	i runoy c	
nviro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5	
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expec	oted		
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected			
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts			
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	expected			
					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Easter = 30%	Total Points =	29.3	of 30	
afetv					Ινίαλ	Actual	44.0	(Modified MoDOT formula		2010		
afety }	PDO	0	Safetv Index	1.27	50	47.6	14.3					
afety (uo	PDO Iniury	0 2	Safety Index Crash Rate	1.27 27.92	50	47.6	14.3	Crash data 2014-2016				
section) section	PDO Injury Fatal	0 2 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	1.27 27.92 0.42	50	47.6	14.3	Crash data 2014-2016				
Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	0 2 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50	50	47.6	14.3	Crash data 2014-2016				
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 2 0 3 6542	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50 Yes	50	47.6 5.0	14.3	Crash data 2014-2016 Concern raised by local le	aders			
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 2 0 3 6542	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50 Yes Yes	50 5 5	47.6 5.0 5.0	14.3 1.5 1.5	Crash data 2014-2016 Concern raised by local leaving will result in intersection in	aders nprovements (traff	ic contro	l and sat	
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 2 0 3 6542	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50 Yes Yes Yes	50 5 5 5 5	47.6 5.0 5.0 5.0	14.3 1.5 1.5 1.5	Crash data 2014-2016 Concern raised by local leavill result in intersection in	aders nprovements (traff	ic contro	l and sa	
Crashes (Major Road Bo or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 2 0 3 6542	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50 Yes Yes Yes	50 5 5 5 5	47.6 5.0 5.0 5.0	14.3 1.5 1.5 1.5	Crash data 2014-2016 Concern raised by local le Will result in intersection in Improves intersection near	aders nprovements (traff · emergency respo	ic contro nder (ar	l ai nbu	
Ortasnes (Major Koad et al or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 2 0 3 6542	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.27 27.92 0.42 3.50 Yes Yes Yes 100%	50 5 5 5 35	47.6 5.0 5.0 5.0 35.0	14.3 1.5 1.5 1.5 10.5	Crash data 2014-2016 Concern raised by local lea Will result in intersection in Improves intersection near All criteria met; crash rate	aders nprovements (traff ⁻ emergency respo is noteworthy	ic contrc nder (ar	l and इ nbulan	

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points = 7.	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature		Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Roadway cracking		
			No	20	0.0	0.0			
F	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8			
		Daily Vehicle Usage	3350	10	3.7	0.7	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	4.0	Important local intersection	; provides access to ma	rina

55.7 out of 100 .5 mile highway connection from δ in Kirbyville via the East-West	
.5 mile highway connection from δ in Kirbyville via the East-West	
vay. All intersections will be at- required. A portion of this	
ength: 7.5 miles	North UNITS Local Efficiency
or Intersection Roadway	
for the major street)	Quality of Commu
estimated, avg. for major street)	A Start And A Start A
estimated, avg. for major street)	TO RESIDENT MOLEN.
through lanes on major street)	A STANDARD
	vay. All intersections will be at- required. A portion of this ength: 7.5 miles or Intersection Roadway for the major street) estimated, avg. for major street) estimated, avg. for major street) through lanes on major street)

Project Discussion: Project would provide a needed connection between the Hwy 65 / Hwy 86 intersection and the east side of Taney County. It would reduce traffic volumes on Hwy 76 in the Lakeshore area; provide a more safe travel route (diverting traffic from Hwy 76); and open development opportunities (commercial, industrial, and residential). If would also divert traffic from Hwy Bb and Coon Creek Road, providing an alternative to Coon Creek Road in high water conditions.



Efficie	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.3	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes							
	Improves Geometry	Yes							
	Improves Load Rating	Yes							
	Truck Usage	400	30	13.4	1.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to be built	to meet criteria for	trucks	
Quality	y of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.0	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	Yes				Not on any plans			
	Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes				Not on any plans			
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hollister/Ridgedale to Kirb	yville		
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual e	elements		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Important to the local and	regional communit	y quality	
<mark>Enviro</mark>	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	igated(new stormw	ater det	ention f
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	xpected	

Efficie	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.3	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes							
	Improves Geometry	Yes							
	Improves Load Rating	Yes							
	Truck Usage	400	30	13.4	1.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	100%	40	40.0	4.0	Road assumed to be built	to meet criteria for	trucks	
Quality	y of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.0	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	Yes				Not on any plans			
	Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes				Not on any plans			
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hollister/Ridgedale to Kirb	yville		
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No major scenic or visual e	elements		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Important to the local and	regional communit	y quality	
<mark>Enviro</mark>	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	igated(new stormw	ater det	ention f
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	xpected	

Enviro	nmental Protection	M	<u>lax</u>	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes 3	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	gated(new stormw	ater deter	ntion facilit
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No 3	30	0.0	0.0	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	xpected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes 2	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0% 2	20	0.0	0.0	Will require several bridge	crossings and gre	enfield co	nstruction

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 3.8 of 20
oad)	PDO	NA	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R tion)	Injury	NA	Crash Rate	0.00				
(Maj ersec	Fatal	NA	Accident Index	0.00				
shes or Inte	Years	NA	Severity Index	0.00				
Cra	Avg AADT	7811	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	No safety concerns currently
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Shift traffic from Hwy 76 and BUS 65
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Could improve emergency response times and access/egress
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	1.8	Improves safety for area residents

Takin g	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.3	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions V	ery Good	20	0.0	0.0	New project			
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	New project			
Fu	unctional Classification2	Major Arterial	50%	10	5.0	0.3				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4000	10	0.7	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	Mainly new roadway, but b	enefits existing roa	idways	

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8 of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) 2	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				Only for a portion of the	entire length (see be	elow)
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				Only for a portion of the	entire length (see be	elow)
Project bri	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fil	rst two do	o not apply			
Pro	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fil	rst two do	o not apply	Portion of highway will h	ave sidewalk and bil	ke lanes
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lir	nes
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors 1	00%	50	50.0	2.5	Directly connects year-ro	ound housing with jo	bs and shoppir

Conge	stion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 7.8 of 15
	Level of Servic	e F	25	25.0	3.8	Indirectly addresses LOS F condition identified for 1-2 & 1-3
	Functional Classification1 Major Arterial	50%	25	12.5	1.9	
	Daily Usag	e 4000	25	1.8	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestion Relief Factor	s 50%	25	12.5	1.9	Diverts traffic from congested area, new direct connection

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 17.3 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Affects BUS 65 and Eastern Taney County
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Future development area, prior initiatives in corridor
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	2.8	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 8.0%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Unemployment (tract)	4.0%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	4.5	Important future development area, important linkage

|--|

Proj. #: 2-1 Project Name:	K Hwy/W	arren Rd at Bull Shoals Lake		Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.2 of	f 10
Project Type: Connectivity	Total :	Score 49.1 out of 100	North / NTS	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Project Description: Raise roadwa	y connectio	on across waterway leading into Bull	a second and the second second second	Widens Road	No							
Shoals Lake to provide an all weath	er connecti	ion from K-Highway to Warren Road. The		Improves Geometry	No							
project would eliminate (or greatly matthis location	inimize) th	he problem of flooding closing the roadway		Improves Load Rating	No							
				Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
Status: Completed	2012	Length: NA	A CALCULATION	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	Assumes no major truck	accommodations in	roadway im	iprove
Project Scale: Medium	Rc	oadway or Intersection Intersection	and the second of the second of the									
Functional Classification	Collector	r (for the major street)	and the second states and	Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0 of	f 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	700	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)		Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Daily Truck Traffic:	14	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	A LAND AND A CONTRACT OF A CONTRACT.	Consistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)		Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOC	G regional plan		
Project Discussion: There are abc	ut a dozen	homes on Warren Road and Parksley		Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather con	nectivity		
Lane that could benefit from this imp	proved con	nection, as well as the K-Dock Marina.		Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Roadway carries recreati	onal traffic; reductio	on of flooding	g imp
This connection has flooded a numb	per of times	s in the last few years. During those events		Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical for local commun	ity (residents/busine	esses)	

from the homes and marina. K-Highway along the lake frontage was recently improved, but this does not eliminate the flooding problem.



	Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Roadway carries recreational traffic; reduction of flooding impact
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical for local community (residents/businesses)
Inviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.8 of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Will address stormwater and flooding issues
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; environmental impacts possible
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Floodplain and/or wetlands impacts possible

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.3 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0	
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalk, bike lanes, or widened shoulders
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Flooding mitigation will be beneficial to bikes/peds as well

Co	ngestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.1	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	LOS is not an issue here			
	Functional Classification	1 Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8				
		Daily Usage	350	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
	Local Congest	ion Relief Factors	75%	25	18.8	1.9	addresses non-recurring d	lelay due to weath	er	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.2 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	20.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	7.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	Important to marina / lake activity

_									
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 15.0 of 3	0
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011	
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00					
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00					
Cras	Avg AADT	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Raising the roadway will reduce impact from flooding	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Emergency access not possible in severe flooding	
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	Emergency response issue is critical	

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 16.6 of 2	0
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	/ery Poor	20	20.0	4.0	crossing in poor condition, new road is by water	
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	floods in high water	
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	350	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all weather access	

			-		
Proj. #: 2-2 Project Typ	<pre>2 Project Name: e: Connectivity</pre>	Total Score	(Fisherman 34.7	s Nose t out of	o Brace Hill) 100
Project Dese nclude a cor oadway as i iour feet	cription: Raise roadwa nbination of fill and/or s t parallels the creek (ap	y to reduce the in tructure. It would prox. 3200 feet)	npact of flo I need to r at an estin	ooding. un the nated e	This could entire length of levation of at le
Status: Co	mpleted	2013	Length:	1.03	miles
Project Scal	e: Large	Roadway	y or Inter	section	Roadway
Fun	ctional Classification:	Local	(for the n	najor st	reet)
Avg. Annua	I Daily Traffic (AADT):	200	(est. 201	2, avg.	for major stree
	Daily Truck Traffic:	4	(est. 201	2, avg.	for major stree
	Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes c	on major street)

Project Discussion: This roadway section floods in high water and becomes impassable. It is necessary to raise about a third of a mile of the roadway to eliminate this problem. This project would require coordination with state and federal agencies and would likelty require some environmental mitigation. It could also be difficult and expensive (but not impossible) to implement.



Efficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.1	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather conne	ectivity		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0				
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
Inviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals				30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	igated(new stormw	ater det	ention fac
	Co	No	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; environn	nental impacts pos	sible			
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	Floodplain and wetlands in	npacts likely		
Safety	,				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.1	of 20
oad)	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.61	50	23.0	4.6	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
ction	Injury	0	Crash Rate	443.32				Crash data 2009-2011			
erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.53							
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
Cras	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Raising the roadway will re	educe impact from	flooding	J
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	3.5	crash rate high given low v	/olume, but only on	ie crash	
			•								
Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.9	of 5
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.8	roadway in poor-fair condi	tion based on field	observa	ations
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature					20.0	10	flooding problem			
Fu	Functional Classification2					2.0	0.1				
		100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
	Least	Taking Car	ro of the System Eastern	1009/	40	40.0	2.0	improvement would be a f	t ovicting readures	auntar	
	Local	raking Car	e of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	improvement would benefi	it existing roadway	system	

		e of fireig			IVIUN	Aotuai	Wolghtou	Holgher dotor 1070			01.10
		Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route			
Quality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOO	Gregional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather conr	nectivity		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0				
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
nviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals				30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mi	tigated(new stormw	ater dete	ention fac
	Consistent with Environmental Goals			No	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; environ	mental impacts pos	sible	
	Avoids Historical Impacts			Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impa	cts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors			0%	20	0.0	0.0	Floodplain and wetlands	impacts likely		
afety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.1	of 20
(PDO	1	Safety Index	0.61	50	23.0	4.6	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
ction	Injury	0	Crash Rate	443.32				Crash data 2009-2011			
erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.53							
	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
5	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local le	eaders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Raising the roadway will	reduce impact from	flooding	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	3.5	crash rate high given low	volume, but only or	ne crash	
aking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.9	of 5
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.8	roadway in poor-fair conc	lition based on field	observa	tions
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature				20	20.0	1.0	flooding problem			
Fu	Functional Classification2				10	2.0	0.1				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)		
	Local	Taking Ca	re of the System Eactors	100%	10	40.0	2.0	improvement would hope	fit existing readway	evetem	
	Local	ranny Uar	e or the system ractors	100 %	40	40.0	2.0	improvement would bene	in existing roadway	System	

		e of fireig			IVIUN	Hotuai	Wolghtou	
		Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0	
			Widens Road	No				
			Improves Geometry	No				
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.0 of 10
		Local/F	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather connectivity
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 7.5 of 15
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mitigated(new stormwater detention fa
	Consistent with Environmental Goals			No	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; environmental impacts possible
	Avoids Historical Impacts			Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts
	Local Environmental Protection Factors			0%	20	0.0	0.0	Floodplain and wetlands impacts likely
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 10.1 of 20
oad)	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.61	50	23.0	4.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	443.32				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.53				
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Raising the roadway will reduce impact from flooding
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	3.5	crash rate high given low volume, but only one crash
Takino	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 3.9 of 5
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.8	roadway in poor-fair condition based on field observations
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	flooding problem
Fu	Inctional Clas	sification2		20%	10	2.0	0.1	01.1.1.1.1
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	المعما	Taking Ca	ro of the System Easters	1009/	40	40.0	2.0	improvement would benefit existing readius visitem
	Local	Local Taking Care of the System Factors				40.0	2.0	improvement would benefit existing roadway system

ality of	Local Effic	Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities Widens Road Improves Geometry Improves Load Rating	No No No	30	0.0	0.0				
ality of	Local Effic		Widens Road Improves Geometry Improves Load Rating	No No							
ality of	Local Effic		Improves Geometry	No							
ality of	Local Effic		Improves I oad Rating								
ality of	Local Effic		improtoo Load raang	No							
ality of	Local Effic		Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
ality of		ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route			
ality of											
,	ⁱ Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather conn	ectivity		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0				
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local residents			
vironm	ental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5	of 15
	(Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mit	igated(new stormw	ater dete	ention fac
	Consistent with Environmental Goals		No	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; environr	mental impacts pos	sible		
	Avoids Historical Impacts		Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts			
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	Floodplain and wetlands in	mpacts likely		
											_
ety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.1	of 20
(PDO	1	Safety Index	0.61	50	23.0	4.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ction	Injury	0	Crash Rate	443.32				Crash data 2009-2011			
erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.53							
r Int	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
Av	/g AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Raising the roadway will re	educe impact from	flooding	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	3.5	crash rate high given low	volume, but only or	ne crash	
king Ca	are of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.9	of 5
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.8	roadway in poor-fair condi	tion based on field	observa	tions
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature				20	20.0	1.0	flooding problem			
	Substa	Europhical Classification?						01			
Functi	Substa ional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.1				
Functi	Substa ional Class	sification2	Local	20% 100	10 10	2.0 0.0	0.1 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
⊑ ∂ Av	Years vg AADT are of the	3 200 System Roadwa	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.00 Yes Yes No 50% Poor	5 5 35 Max 20	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 15.0	1.0 1.0 0.0 3.5 Weighted 0.8	Concern raised by local le Raising the roadway will ra crash rate high given low w Weight Factor = 5% roadway in poor-fair condi	aders educe impact from volume, but only or Total Points = tion based on field	flooding ne crash 3.9 observa	o tior

		e of thong			IVIUN	Rotual	noighteu	freight i deteil i fe			01 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route	e		
0		. 141								4.0	6.40
Juant	of Commun				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10	% Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local pla	an		
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMC	COG regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides all-weather c	connectivity		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0				
	Loca	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	benefits local resident	S		
	numerated Dree	teetien				A (1				7.5	-6.45
nviro	nmental Pro				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15	1 otal Points =	7.5	of 15
	0	Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runon	r mitigated(new stormw	later det	ention faci
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts		NO	30	0.0	0.0	Raising roadway; envi	ironmental impacts pos	sidie		
	Avoids Historical Impacts		Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known nistorical in	npacts			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors			0%	20	0.0	0.0	Floodplain and wetlan	ids impacts likely		
afetv					Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20	% Total Points =	10.1	of 20
ad	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.61	50	23.0	4.6	(Modified MoDOT for	nula)		
ion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	443.32				Crash data 2009-201	1		
sect	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.53							
Inter	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
or		200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	10	Concern raised by loc	al leaders		
			Safety Enhancemente	Yee	5	5.0	1.0	Raising the roadway	vill reduce impact from	flooding	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	i ciong tro roddiidy i		liobarry	
				50%	25	17.5	2.5	orach rate high given l	low volume, but only o	no oroch	
			Local Salely Factors	30 %	- 35	17.5	3.5	ciasi i ale nigri given i	iow volume, but only of		
aking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	6 Total Points =	3.9	of 5
-		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.8	roadway in poor-fair c	ondition based on field	observa	ations
	Substa	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Conditions			20	20.0	1.0	flooding problem			
Fu	nctional Class	ctional Classification 2			10	2.0	0.1	0.			
	Daily Vehicle Usage		100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT for	mula)			
	ا ممدا ۲	Taking Car	o of the System Easters	100%	40	40.0	2.0	improvement would be	onofit ovicting readures	(outom	
	Local	Local Taking Care of the System Factors			40	40.0	2.0	improvement would be	eneni existing roadway	system	

Access to Opportunity		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.6 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (AD	A) 0%	6 25	0.0	0.0			
Project provides bike connection	ons No)			does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connection	ons No)			does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulation	ons No	use if i	first two d	lo not apply	assumes no sidewalks c	or bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilit	ies No	use if i	first two d	lo not apply	assumes no sidewalks, l	bike lanes, or wide	ned shoulders
Tran	sit No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	nuttle or Jefferson L	ines
Local Access to Opportunity Facto	ors 259	% 50	12.5	0.6	road improvements will I	be beneficial to bike	es/peds as well

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 4.5 c	of 15
	Level of Service		Α	25	0.0	0.0	peak hour congestion not a major issue	
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.8		
		Daily Usage	100	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion Relief Factors			25	25.0	3.8	road closure causes non-recurring congestion	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 4.0 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	20	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	30	0.0	0.0	not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	4.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 8.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	10.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	0%	30	0.0	0.0	not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects

Proj. #: 2-3 Project Name: M Hwy at E	Brace Hill and Nazarene Church Rd	Efficient Movement of Freight	Max	Actua
Project Type: Geometric/Safety Total Se	core 34.5 out of 100	North / NTS Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Ye	s 30	15.0
roject Description: Improve intersection to imp	prove safety and address poor lines of	Widens Road No		
sight, especially to from the north on Hwy-M. Im	provements could include signage,	Improves Geometry Yes		
striping, flashing beacons, tree removal, or realig	nment.	Improves Load Rating No		
		Truck Usage 3	30	1.2
Status: Completed 2016	Length: NA	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25%	40	10.0
Project Scale: Medium Roa	dway or Intersection Intersection			
Functional Classification: Collector	(for the major street)	Quality of Communities	Max	Actua
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 300	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0
Daily Truck Traffic: 6	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans No		
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans No		
Project Discussion: All of the roads intersecting	in this area are two-lane roads without	Connectivity No	30	0.0
aurn lanes. Vehicles turning onto M-Hwy have lir	nited sight distance to the north.	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0

Enviro	nvironmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes			Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expect	ed		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigat	ion expected			
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ots			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	s expected			

Max Actual

20 10.0

Local Quality of Communities Factors 50%

Safety					Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 8.3 of 30	,
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011	
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00					
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00					
Cras	Avg AADT	300	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Sight distance improvements	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	no reported crashes from 2007-2011	

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 13.6	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions			20	5.0	1.0	road in good condition based on field observations	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature		Yes	20	20.0	4.0	limited sight distance	
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	150	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100				40.0	8.0	beneficial improvements to existing system	

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.5 of \$	5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3		
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes improved shoulders at intersection	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Assumes improved shoulders at intersection	

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = (<mark>).8</mark> ot	f 10
		Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major issue		
	Functional Classification	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8			
		Daily Usage	150	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Congestion Relief Factors			25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major issue, safety project		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities No		20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	17.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	1 0.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	0%	30	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.6 of 10	
1.5		
	improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles	
0.1	MoDOT formula	
1.0	not a major truck route	

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%
0.0	
	no applicable local plan not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
0.0	
0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits
1.0	important to and beneficial for local residents

Proj. #: 2-4 P	roject Name:	US-160 and Y H	wy				1		-
Project Type: T	raffic Safety	Total Score	64.2	out of	100		de		
Project Descripti Improvements cou									
Status: Planning	g		Length:	NA			2.1		
Project Scale: M	ledium	Roadway	or Inters	section	Interse	ection			
Function	al Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the n	najor str	eet)		1 P. 1		
Avg. Annual Dail	y Traffic (AADT):	10,700	(est. 201	2, avg. t	or majo	or street,)	4 + + P	
Da	aily Truck Traffic:	210	(est. 201	2, avg. f	or majo	or street,)		
	Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes or	n major	street)	7		

Project Discussion: The intersection is an all-way stop control intersection. The volumes are not balanced and some movements therefore have higher delay values. The volumes are also near and possibly above the threshold for signal warrants. A roundabout could also work at this location.



fficie	nt Movement of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
	Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
		Widens Road	No							
		Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved in a	a manner that bei	nefits lar	ge vehicles
		Improves Load Rating	No							
		Truck Usage	105	30	6.9	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	trucks will benefit from the in	nproved geometr	y and/or	traffic contr
ualit	y of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10.0	of 10
	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	C	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvements	mentioned in For	syth Str	ategic Plan
	Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvements	mentioned in SM	ICOG re	gional plan
		Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	160 connects Forsyth to 176	6 (Merriam Wood	s/Rocka	way Beach)
		Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	possible conversion to round	dabout; location c	of county	' seat
	Local Quality	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection; 160 is in	mportant corridor	through	Forsyth
nviro	onmental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwa	ater issues expec	ted	
	Consistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation	n expected		
	A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75			20	15.0	0.8	Assume nearby floodplains &	& wetlands has n	o bearin	g on project
afety				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.2	of 30
-										-
1)	PDO 2	Safety Index	0.26	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ajor Koau ction)	PDO 2 Injury 1	Safety Index Crash Rate	0.26 26.22	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011			•
s (Major Koau tersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	0.26 26.22 0.40	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011			
asnes (major roau or Intersection)	PDO2Injury1Fatal0Years3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011			
Or Intersection)	PDO2Injury1Fatal0Years3Avg AADT10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes	50 5	9.7 5.0	2.9 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead	ders		
Crasnes (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes	50 5 5	9.7 5.0 5.0	2.9 1.5 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control	ters ol improvements		
Urasnes (major road or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes No	50 5 5 5 5	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro	ters ol improvements		
Urasnes (Major road or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes No 50%	50 5 5 5 35	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant rela	ders ol improvements ative to other proj	ects	
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes No 50%	50 5 5 5 35	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant rela	lers ol improvements ative to other proj	ects	
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes No 50%	50 5 5 35 35	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20%	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points =	ects 14.4	of 20
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes No 50%	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 5.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant rela Weight Factor = 20%	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points =	ects 14.4	of 20
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes 50% 50%	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20%	ters ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points =	ects 14.4	of 20
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes No 50% 50% Good Yes 40%	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 10	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic contro crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20%	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points = a during peak time	ects 14.4	of 20
Urasines (major Froad or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 g Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions adway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes No 50% 50% Good Yes 40% 5350	50 5 5 35 35 Max 20 20 10 10	9.7 5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula)	ters ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points = i during peak time	ects 14.4 es	of 20
Vi ashes (major Foad or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa unctional Classification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors dway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes 50% 50% Good Yes 40% 5350	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 20 10 10	9.7 5.0 5.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9 40.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6 8.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula) Important local intersection	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points =	ects 14.4 es	of 20
Videntee (major Foad or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa Inctional Classification2 Local Taking Car	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors dway or Bridge Conditions adway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes 50% 50% Good Yes 40% 5350 100%	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 20 10 10 10 40	9.7 5.0 5.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9 40.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.8 0.6 8.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula) Important local intersection	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points = i during peak time	ects 14.4	of 20
or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 g Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa Inctional Classification2 Local Taking Car	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors dway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes No 50% 50% 40% 5350 100%	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 10 10 10 40	9.7 5.0 5.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9 40.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6 8.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula) Important local intersection	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points = I during peak time	ects 14.4 35	of 20
Lutashes (major Foad built or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 g Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa Inctional Classification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors dway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes 50% 50% 40% 5350 100%	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 10 10 10 40	9.7 5.0 5.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9 40.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6 8.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant related Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula) Important local intersection	ders ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points =	ects 14.4 3S	of 20
Viasines (major Foad or Intersection)	PDO 2 Injury 1 Fatal 0 Years 3 Avg AADT 10448 2 Care of the System Roadw Substandard Roa Inctional Classification2 Local Taking Car	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Minor Arterial Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.26 26.22 0.40 1.83 Yes Yes 50% 50% Good Yes 40% 5350 100%	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 20 10 10 10 40	9.7 5.0 5.0 17.5 Actual 5.0 20.0 4.0 2.9 40.0	2.9 1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.8 0.6 8.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Intersection and traffic control crash rate not significant relation Weight Factor = 20% LOS E and even F condition (Modified MoDOT formula) Important local intersection	lers ol improvements ative to other proj Total Points = a during peak time	ects 14.4	of 20

Efficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved in	a manner that be	nefits lar	ge vehicles
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	105	30	6.9	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	trucks will benefit from the	improved geometr	y and/or	traffic contr
											_
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in Fo	rsyth Str	ategic Plan
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	Yes	00	00.0	0.0	160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in SN	ICOG re	gional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	160 connects Forsyth to 17	6 (Merriam Wood	s/Rocka	way Beach)
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	possible conversion to roui	ndabout; location o	of county	seat
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection; 160 is	important corridor	through	Forsyth
E		4 4!								4.0	
	onmental Pro	Consistent	with Ctorester Oral	Vee	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	i otal Points =	4.8	01.2
	Co	Consistent	the Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.0	Medest project, lew storm	vater issues expected	cied	-
	00		voide Historical Impacts	Vec	20	20.0	1.0	No known bistorical impact			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%				20	15.0	1.0		.S . 9 watlanda haa r	o hoorin	a on proiod
Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%				1370	20	15.0	0.0	Assume nearby noodpiains		o bearin	g on project
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.2	of 30
ad	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.26	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ir Ro	Injury	1	Crash Rate	26.22				Crash data 2009-2011			
Majc	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.40							
Intel	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
Crasl	Avg AADT	10448	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
-			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Intersection and traffic con	trol improvements		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant re	elative to other pro	iects	
Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0				
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	LOS E and even F condition	n during peak time	es	
Fu	Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial 40%				10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5350	10	2.9	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	Important local intersection	1		
		3 - n .									
				Data	Check?	K OK		Data Check1 OK		ata Chook	2 OK
				Dala	I UNECKJ				U		

Efficie	ent Movem	ent of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
		Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved in	a manner that be	nefits lar	ge vehicles
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	105	30	6.9	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local E	fficient Move	ement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	trucks will benefit from the	improved geomet	y and/or	traffic contr
Qualit	y of Comn	nunities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10.0	of 10
		Local/F	Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in Fo	r <mark>syth</mark> Stra	ategic Plan
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in SN	ICOG re	gional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	160 connects Forsyth to 17	⁷ 6 (Merriam Wood	s/Rockav	way Beach)
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	possible conversion to rou	ndabout; location o	of county	seat
	L	ocal Quality	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection; 160 is	important corridor	through	Forsyth
Envir	onmental F	rotection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormy	vater issues expec	ted	
	(Consistent w	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	S		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%				20	15.0	0.8	Assume nearby floodplains	s & wetlands has r	o bearing	g on project
Safety	/				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.2	of 30
Road	PDC	2	Safety Index	0.26	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
dior F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	26.22				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Me	Fata	0	Accident Index	0.40							
ishes or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
Cra	Avg AADT	10448	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Intersection and traffic con	trol improvements		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant re	elative to other pro	jects	
Takin	g Care of t	he System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0				
	Sub	standard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	LOS E and even F condition	on during peak time	es	
F	Functional Classification 2 Minor Arterial 40%				10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5350	10	2.9	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Loc	al Taking Ca	re of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	Important local intersection			
	Lov				10	10.0	0.0		•		
				Data	1 Check3	OK		Data Check1 OK	D	ata Check2	2 OK

Efficie	<mark>nt Moveme</mark> l	<mark>nt of Freig</mark> l	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved ir	າ a manner that be	nefits lar	ge vehicles
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	105	30	6.9	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	trucks will benefit from the	improved geomet	ry and/or	traffic cont
Qualit	y of Commu	Inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Cu	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	ts mentioned in Fo	rsyth Stra	ategic Plan
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	ts mentioned in SN	/ICOG re	gional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	160 connects Forsyth to 13	76 (Merriam Wood	ls/Rocka	way Beach
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	possible conversion to rou	ndabout; location o	of county	' seat
	Loc	cal Quality c	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection; 160 is	important corridor	through	Forsyth
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes				30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormy	water issues expec	oted	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes				30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%				20	15.0	0.8	Assume nearby floodplains	s & wetlands has n	no bearin	g on projec
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.2	of 30
Road	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.26	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
ajor F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	26.22				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Mé	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.40							
ishes or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
Cra	Avg AADT	10448	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Intersection and traffic con	trol improvements		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant re	elative to other pro	jects	
Taking	Care of the	• System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0				
	Subst	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	LOS E and even F condition	on during peak time	es	
Fu	Functional Classification 2 Minor Arterial 40%				10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5350	10	2.9	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)	1		
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%				40	40.0	8.0	Important local intersection	1		
	20001	Jung Sul					2.0				
				Data	ı Check3) OK		Data Check1 OK	D	ata Check	2 OK

Efficie	ent Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved in	n a manner that be	nefits lar	ge vehicles
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	105	30	6.9	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	trucks will benefit from the	improved geometr	y and/or	traffic contr
Qualit	v of Commu	nition			Maria	A . t	Mainh ta al	Maight Faster = 10%	Total Dointo -	10.0	of 10
Quan	ly of Commu		Pegional Land Lise Plans	Vec	Max 30	Actual		Weight Factor - 10%	Total Points -	10.0	
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	Ves	00	00.0	0.0	160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in Fo	revth Str	ategic Plan
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				160 roadway improvement	s mentioned in SM	ICOG re	dional plan
		00110	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	30	160 connects Forsyth to 17	76 (Merriam Wood	s/Rocka	way Beach)
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	nossible conversion to rou	ndahout: location (of county	seat
	Loc	al Quality (of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection: 160 is	important corridor	through	Forsyth
	200	an addity		19070	20	20.0	2.0	Children toroootion, 100 lo	in portant oom dor	anough	, oroyut
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormy	vater issues expec	ted	
	Co	nsistent wi	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75% 20 15.0 0.8 Assume nearby floodplains & wetlands has no bearing					g on project				
Safety	/				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.2	of 30
()	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.26	50	9.7	2.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ijor F ction	Injury	1	Crash Rate	26.22				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.40							
shes or Inf	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
Cra	Avg AADT	10448	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Intersection and traffic con	trol improvements		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant re	elative to other pro	jects	
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0				
	Substa	andard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	LOS E and even F condition	on during peak time	es	
F	Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial 40%				10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5350	10	2.9	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)	1		
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%					40.0	8.0	Important local intersection	1		
			_					_			
				Data	1 Check3	S OK		Data Check1 OK	D	ata Check	2 OK

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0 of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5			
	Project provides bike connections	No				consider adding bike land	e or multi-use facili	y
	Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				assumed ped provisions	are part of project	
Project bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply			
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply			
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Li	nes
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors 1	00%	50	50.0	2.5	project would benefit peo	destrians crossing a	t the intersec

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 6.7 of 10
		Level of Service	F	25	25.0	2.5	westbound movements LOS for stop control (Synchro)
F	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0	conservative assumption
		Daily Usage	5350	25	7.2	0.7	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	moderate to high traffic, key location

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 10.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-160
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	supports continued development and activity in Forsyth
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	13.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	MO-160 is an important arterial and economic link

Proj. #: 2-5 Project Name: J	J-Hwy at Trigge	r Creek	
Project Type: Connectivity	Total Score	41.0	out of 100
Project Description: Improve the roa culverts) at Trigger Creek. This could roadway.	dway to address include using fil	s the secti I and/or a	on that floods (existing structure to raise the
Status: Planning		Length:	0.1 miles
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	or Inters	ection Roadway
Functional Classification:	Collector	(for the m	najor street)
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 7	'00	(est. 2012	2, avg. for major street)
Daily Truck Traffic: 1	4	(est. 2012	2, avg. for major street)
Through Lanes: 2	2	(through	lanes on major street)
Project Discussion: The closure of t	his roadway duri	ng high w	ater events impacts north

south travel and causes traffic to have to re-route. This affects commerce, emergency response times, and general travel. The roadway appears to be in relatively good condition with regards to pavement. The flooding is relatively infrequent.



Efficient Movement of Freight					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.7	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Νο							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ater area)		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	benefits truck traffic, but no	ot major truck focu	sed imp	rovement
										1.5	
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	plicable local plan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Kirbyville, Mincey			
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	links community together,	especially in serior	us weath	er cond.
											_
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stream/floodplain crossing	, but impacts shou	ld be mi	tigated
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	environmental issues may require mitigation			
Safety	/				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	9.8	of 30
לoad 1)	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
ajor F ection	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
ishe: or In	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
Cra	Avg AADT	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	reduced flooding			
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response ti	mes		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project offers a number of	safety benefits to I	the local	community
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway and culvert appea	ar to be in fair cond	dition	
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during high	gh water events		
Fu	Functional Classification2 Collector 30%		10	3.0	0.6						
			Daily Vehicle Usage	350	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%		40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all w	eather access				
	Local	aning our		10070	10	10.0	0.0	inportant to maintain all w			

Efficient Movement of Freight					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.7	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ter area)		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	benefits truck traffic, but no	ot major truck focu	sed impr	ovement
•										4.5	
Qualit	y of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	insistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	plicable local plan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No	00	00.0	0.0	not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan			
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Kirbyville, Mincey			
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loca	al Quality o	f Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	links community together, e	especially in seriou	is weath	er cond.
										4 -	
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should l	be mitigatable		
	Cor	nsistent wit	h Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stream/floodplain crossing,	, but impacts shou	ld be mil	tigated
	Avoids Historical Impacts Ye			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	S		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	environmental issues may require mitigation			
Safat					N 4	A = 1			Total Dainta -	0.0	of 20
Sarety	PDO	0	O-f-tll	1.00	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	9.0	of 30
Roa n)	PDU	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
lajor ectic	irijury Estal	0		0.00							
ss (M nters	Fatai	0		0.00							
ashe or li	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00	-	- 0					
ū	Avg AAD I	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local lea	ders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	reduced flooding			
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response til	mes		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project offers a number of	safety benefits to t	he local	community
											_
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway and culvert appea	ar to be in fair cond	lition	
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during hig	h water events		
Functional Classification2 Collector 30		30%	10	3.0	0.6						
Daily Vehicle Usage 350			350	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%			40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all we	eather access				

Efficie	Efficient Movement of Freight				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.7	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
l			Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	iter area)		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficience	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	benefits truck traffic, but no	ot major truck focu	sed impr	rovement
Ouglit	Lof Comment	aitica			14		10/	Weight Frater - 400/	Total Delate	AE	66.40
Qualit	y of Commu	littes	anianal I contilla Di	N I -	Max	Actual	Weighted	weight Factor = 10%	i otal Points =	4.5	OT 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	NO	30	0.0	0.0	not known to be an arrive	nlicoble level star		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	NO				not mentioned in SMCCC	regional plan		
		COUS	Connectivity	Yee	30	30.0	3.0	Kirbyville Mincey	rogional piali		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefite			
		al Quality	occine and visual	75%	20	15.0	1.5	links community tegether	especially in corio	IS Weath	er cond
	LOC	ai Quality (o communities ractors	1370	20	13.0	1.0	initia community together, a	copecially in seriol	นอ พย่อเก	เษา บบที่นี้.
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should h	pe mitigatable		
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stream/floodplain crossing	but impacts should	ld be mit	tigated
	Avoids Historical Impacts			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	environmental issues may	vironmental issues may require mitigation		
									, in the second s		
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	9.8	of 30
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
jor R stion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
Cra: o	Avg AADT	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local lea	ders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	reduced flooding			
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response til	mes		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project offers a number of	safety benefits to t	he local	community
Taking	I Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway and culvert appea	ar to be in fair conc	lition	
	Substa	Indard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during hig	gh water events		
Fu	nctional Clas	sification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	350	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local 1	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all w	eather access		

Efficient Movement of Freight				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.7	of 10	
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ater area)		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	benefits truck traffic, but n	ot major truck focu	sed impi	rovement
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	plicable local plan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No	~~			not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Kirbyville, Mincey			
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	links community together,	especially in serio	us weath	er cond.
											_
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes		Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stream/floodplain crossing	, but impacts shou	ld be mi	tigated	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	environmental issues may	require mitigation		
Safety	/				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	9.8	of 30
را ۱)	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ajor F ictior	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
shes or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
Cra	Avg AADT	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	reduced flooding			
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response ti	mes		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project offers a number of	safety benefits to	the local	community
Takin	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway and culvert appe	ar to be in fair con	dition	
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during hi	gh water events		
Fi	Functional Classification2 Collector 30%		10	3.0	0.6						
	Daily Vehicle Usage 350		10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%		40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all w	eather access				
	20041						0.0				

Efficient Movement of Freight					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.7	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ater area)		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	7	30	1.8	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	benefits truck traffic, but no	ot major truck focu	sed impi	rovement
										4.5	
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	plicable local plan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No	~~	not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan					
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	links community together,	especially in seriou	us weath	er cond.
_											_
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stream/floodplain crossing	, but impacts shou	ld be mi	tigated
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	environmental issues may require mitigation			
											_
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	9.8	of 30
oad) (ו	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ajor F ection	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
ishes or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
Cra	Avg AADT	700	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	reduced flooding			
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response ti	mes		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	project offers a number of	safety benefits to t	he local	community
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway and culvert appea	ar to be in fair cond	dition	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Yes		20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during hi	gh water events				
Fu	Functional Classification2 Collector 30%		10	3.0	0.6						
			Daily Vehicle Usage	350	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 100%		40	40.0	8.0	important to maintain all w	eather access				
		<u> </u>			-						

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.6	of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0				
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply			
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply			
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if first two do not apply		o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	or bike lanes		
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks, l	bike lanes, or wide	ned sho	ulders
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson L	ines	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	minimal pedestrian/bicyd	cle benefits		

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.9	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	estimated peak hour LOS	
	Functional Classification	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8		
		Daily Usage	350	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congesti	on Relief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.6	addresses an infrequent delay issue	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	22%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block group
Unemployment (tract)	7%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	minimal commerce on roadway

Proj. #:	2-6	Project Name:	Hwy 76 - Kirbyv	ille Schoo	ol Turn Lanes					
Project	Туре:	Traffic Safety	Total Score	46.2	out of 100					
Project I	Descri	ption: Addition of a	urn lane and/or a	cceleration	n/deceleration lanes to					
improve safety for Middle School entrance.										
Status:	Planr	ing		Length:	NA					
Project \$	Scale:	Small	Roadway or Intersection Intersection							
	Functi	onal Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the m	ajor street)					
Avg. An	nual D	aily Traffic (AADT):	6,200	(est. 2016	, avg. for major street)					
		Daily Truck Traffic:	410	(est. 2016	, avg. for major street)					
		Through Lanes:	2	(through l	anes on major street)					
Proiect I	Discus	sion: Highway 76 is	a two-lane roadw	av at the e	entrance to the Kirbyville					

Project Discussion: Highway 76 is a two-lane roadway at the entrance to the Kirbyville Middle School. The posted speed limit is 55 mph with a 45 mph school zone. Flashing lights have recently been installed to alert motorists to the school zone. Concerns have been expressed over the safety of buses and school traffic entering and exiting. Proposed improvements may include some combination of turn lanes and acceleration and deceleration lanes. Previous study by MoDOT has indicated a traffic signal or additional lanes were warranted, but funding was not available.



Efficient I	Movement of Freight	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Po	oints =	6.0	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road Yes				additional turn lanes			
	Improves Geometry Yes				additional lanes			
	Improves Load Rating No							
	Truck Usage 205	30	9.6	1.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 50%	40	20.0	2.0	Hwy 76 is an important arterial			
Quality of	f Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Po	ints =	4.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0	0.0				

Quality	/ of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects western and eas	stern Taney County	/	
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	, no scenic benefit	S	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	Minimal criteria met; Hwy 7	76 is an important f	facility in	Taney

Enviro	Environmental Protection			Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes Avoids Historical Impacts Yes		30	30.0	1.5	Moderate project, few stormwater issues expected				
			30	30.0	1.5	Moderate project, no mitigation expected				
			20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts				
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Moderate project, few issu	les expected			

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 10.9 of 30
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2014-2016
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	6054	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improves intersection (traffic control and safety)
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	crash rate not as high as some other projects

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 8.4 of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	based on field observations and pictures considered good
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature			20	0.0	0.0	
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8	
		Daily Vehicle Usage	3100	10	3.2	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Taking Care	75%	40	30.0	6.0		

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.3	of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no bike/pedest	rian facilities	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes widened shoul	ders at intersection	

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
	Level of Service		Α	25	0.0	0.0	Int. LOS in PM Peak and	School Dismissal	Peak (Synchro)
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0				
	Daily Usage		3100	25	7.9	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)		
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	localized congestion			

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.4 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hwy 76
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	1.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	18.0%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Unemployment (tract)	4.0%				2012-2016 ACS 5-year estimates for countywide
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	MO-76 is an important arterial and economic link

Proj. #: 3-1 Project Name: Forsyth/	Taneyville Rd (Strawberry Rd to MO-76)	Efficient Movement of Freight	
Project Type: Geometric/Safety Tota	Score 42.6 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities P	Partial Ye
Project Description: Widen the lanes and sl	oulders and improve drainage along this	Widens Road	Yes
low density rural roadway. The improvement	s may require additional right-of-way as	Improves Geometry	No
well as utility and stormwater swale relocation	l.	Improves Load Rating	No
		Truck Usage	15
Status: Planning	Length: 3.62 miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%
Project Scale: Medium F	oadway or Intersection Roadway		
Functional Classification: Local	(for the major street)	Quality of Communities	
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 1,500	(estimated, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No
Daily Truck Traffic: 30	(estimated, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans	No
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans	No
Project Discussion: The roadway has mode	rate to low daily traffic volumes; however, if	t Connectivity	Yes
also has narrow lanes (approx 9 feet) no sh	ulders and what annears to be a narrow		

anes (approx. 9 leet), no shoulders and what appears to be a harrow right-of-way. Improvements are appropriate for this roadway, which is essentially a collector roadway (though it is currently classified as a local street). This roadway provides an alternate to MO-76 for travel between Forsyth and Taneyville .



ificie	<mark>nt Movemen</mark>	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.8	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	15	30	2.6	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major freight route			
lalit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Forsyth S	trategic Plan		
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG r	egional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects Forsyth and Tane	eyville		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no	o scenic benefits		
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	provides alt. route btwn For	rsyth & Taneyville		
viro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent with Stormwater Goals			30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage in	mprovements		
	Coi	Consistent with Environmental Goals			30	30.0	1.5	Little mitigation expected du	ue to size of proje	ot	
		Avoids Historical Impacts				20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	S		
	Local	Local Environmental Protection Factors 50%					0.5	Few issues expected; A fev	v small wetlands (ponds) r	near ro
fety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	13.1	of 30
(PDO	1	Safety Index	0.43	50	16.1	4.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ctior	Injury	1	Crash Rate	34.45				Crash data 2009-2011			
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.20							
or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
	Avg AADT	1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	iders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders, in	mprove drainage		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant re	lative to other proj	ects	
king	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions Fair					10.0	2.0	Chip and seal in fair conditi	on		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature No					0.0	0.0				
	unctional Classification2 Local 20%					2.0	0.4				
Fu	Daily Vehicle Usage 750					0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
Fu			Daily venicle Usage	100							

Efficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.8	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulder	S		
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	15	30	2.6	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major freight route			
<u> </u>										4.0	
Jualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 1
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Forsyth	Strategic Plan		
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No	~~~			not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects Forsyth and Tai	neyville		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, i	no scenic benefits		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	provides alt. route btwn Fo	orsyth & Taneyville		
nviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4 5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals				30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage	improvements	7.0	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals				30	30.0	1.5	Little mitigation expected	due to size of projec	t	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ado to oizo oi projoc		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected: A fe	w small wetlands (n	onde)	near n
	Loodi				20	10.0	0.0			ionaoj	noarn
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	13.1	of 3
oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.43	50	16.1	4.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	34.45				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.20							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
Cras	Avg AADT	1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders,	improve drainage		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant r	elative to other proje	ects	
Faking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 2
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Chip and seal in fair condi	tion		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature			No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	750	10	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	l ocal Taking Care of the System Factors										

fficie	nt Movemer	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.8	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulder	S		
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	15	30	2.6	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major freight route			
										4.0	
ualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Forsyth	Strategic Plan		
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects Forsyth and Ta	neyville		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements,	no scenic benefits		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	provides alt. route btwn F	orsyth & Taneyville		
nvirc	nmental Pro	tection			May	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4 5	of 5
TVILC		Consistent with Stormwater Goals Y			30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage	improvements		
	Co	Consistent with Environmental Goals			30	30.0	1.0	Little mitigation expected	due to size of project	ot	
		Consistent with Environmental Goals			20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impar	ate to bize of projet		
	local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected: A fe	ew small wetlands (nonds)	near roa
								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	(, , ,	
afety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	13.1	of 30
)	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.43	50	16.1	4.8	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
ction	Injury	1	Crash Rate	34.45				Crash data 2009-2011			
erse(Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.20							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
5 0	Avg AADT	1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders,	improve drainage		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not significant r	relative to other proj	ects	
aking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Chip and seal in fair cond	ition		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature No				20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	unctional Classification2 Local 20%				10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	750	10	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	100%	10	40.0	8.0	improvements ungrade a	connecting element	of curr	ent evet

Acces	ss to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.5	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project I	brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
F	Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes improved shou	Iders	
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Assumes improved shou	Iders	

Congestio	n Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.9	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	congestion not a major is	sue		
Fun	ctional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5				
		Daily Usage	750	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	75%	25	18.8	1.9	moderate to low volumes	, time spent follow	ing pos	sible issu

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	15.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	minor economic linkages

Proj. #: 3-2 Project Name:	Garrison Cutof	Road (MO-76 to County Line)							
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	36.7 out of 100							
Project Description: Widen the lanes and shoulders and improve drainage along this low density rural roadway. The improvements may require additional right-of-way. The project may also result in moderate realignments. Garrison Cutoff Road connects Hwy 76 in northern Taney County to Hines Lane/Hwy 125 in southern Christian County.									
Status: Planning		Length: 2.18 miles							
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	or Intersection Roadway							
Functional Classification:	Local	(for the major street)							
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	200	(estimated, avg. for major street)							
Daily Truck Traffic:	4	(estimated, avg. for major street)							
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)							

Project Discussion: The lanes and shoulders on this roadway are narrow, with lane widths of approximately 9 feet. Drainage is handled in swales at the roadway edge. The corridor is somewhat forested and a utility line (utility poles) run parallel to the roadway. Expanding the lanes and shoulders would improve safety and driver operations. It could also benefit pedestrians and bicyclists. The improvements may require expanding the right-of-way and/or relocating utilities to accomplish this. However, minor improvements may be possible without a major right-of-way expansion.



fficia	nt Movement	of Freigl	of		Mox	Actual	Maightad	Weight Eactor = 10%	Total Pointe =	2.6	of 10
more			hiolo Eriondly Essilities	Partial Vac		45 0				2.0	
		Large ve	Widona Daad		30	15.0	1.5	widen lance and shoulders			
				No				widen lattes and shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	NO							
				2	20	0.0	0.1	MaDOT formula			
	Local Effic	iont Movo	mont of Eroight Eastors	2	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
	Local Ellic	ient move	ment of Freight Factors	2370	40	10.0	1.0				
ualit	v of Commun	ities			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
dan	y or ooninan	Local/R	agional Land Lise Plans	No	30					0.0	
		Co	unsistent with Local Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Consi	Connectivity	Ves	30	30.0	3.0	Connectivity important to k	negional plan ocal rural residents	•	
			Seenie and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Poodway improvements in		,	
			Scenic and visual	NO 05%	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, in	o scenic benefits		
	Loca	ii Quality c	or communities factors	23%	20	0.C	0.5	Deneticial to residents			
nvir	nmontal Prot	tection			Max	Actual	Waightad	Maight Feater - 5%	Total Painta -	1 8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goale	Vaa			1 5	Project includes drainage i		4.0	01.5
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes				20	20.0	1.5	limited mitigation expected	Inprovements		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes				20	20.0	1.0	Ma known bisteriael impact	ha l		
	Avoids Historical Impacts		Tes 750/	20	20.0	1.0	Four issues supported	.8			
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	13%	20	15.0	0.0	Few issues expected			
afetv	1				Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	7.1	of 30
ą	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
(uo	Iniury	0	Crash Rate	0.00	00	0.0	0.0	Crash data 2009-2011			
secti	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
nter	Vooro	3	Soverity Index	0.00							
or		200		0.00	E	5.0	4 5		- down		
5	AVG AAD I	200	Safety Concern	res	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders, i	mprove drainage		
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve rura	l emergency respo	onse tim	ies
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	no reported crashes from 2	2007-2011		
. 1.1		0								40.4	
akin	g Care of the s	System		0.1	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	road in fair to good condition	on 		
	Substar	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Narrow lane widths; no sho	oulders		
	Inctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
F				400	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
F			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0		1			

Effici	ent Movement	of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
Quali	ty of Commun	ities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connectivity important to lo	ocal rural residents	;	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, n	o scenic benefits		
	Loca	I Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to residents			
Envir	onmental Prot	ection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	C	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage i	mprovements		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes				30	30.0	1.5	limited mitigation expected			
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local I	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Few issues expected			
Safet	y				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	7.1	of 30
()	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ijor F ction	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Ma erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
Se tu											
she	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
Crashe or li	Years Avg AADT	3 200	Severity Index Safety Concern	0.00 Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
Crashe or li	Years Avg AADT	3 200	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.00 Yes Yes	5 5	5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i	aders mprove drainage		
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT	3 200	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.00 Yes Yes Yes	5 5 5	5.0 5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5 1.5	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo	onse tim	es
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT	3 200	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011	onse tim	es
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT	3 200	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2	aders mprove drainage l emergency respo 2007-2011	onse tim	es
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT g Care of the s	3 200 System	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 35 <u>Max</u>	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20%	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points =	onse tim	es of 20
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT g Care of the	3 200 System Roadwa	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good	5 5 35 <u>Max</u> 20	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20%	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points =	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
Crashe or I	Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substat	3 200 System Roadwa	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good Yes	5 5 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no sho	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on pulders	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
or II- Date	Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substan unctional Class	3 200 System Roadwa ndard Roa ification2	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors usy or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good Yes 20%	5 5 35 Max 20 20 10	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.4	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no sho	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on pulders	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
Crashe Or II-	Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substan unctional Class	3 200 System Roadwa Indard Roa	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors us or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good Yes 20%	5 5 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 10	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0 2.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.4 0.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, i Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no sho	aders mprove drainage I emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on oulders	onse tim 13.4	es of 20

ffici	ent Movemen [.]	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders	3		
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
											_
luali	ty of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connectivity important to lo	ocal rural residents	;	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, r	o scenic benefits		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to residents			
											_
nvir	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage i	mprovements		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes				30	30.0	1.5	limited mitigation expected			
		Avoids Historical Impacts Yes				20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Few issues expected			
											_
afet	у				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	7.1	of 30
1) (n	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ajor r	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
ĕ 드	Vaara	3	Severity Index	0.00							
or or	Teals			0.00							
Crasi	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	0.00 Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
Crast	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.00 Yes Yes	5 5	5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders,	aders improve drainage		
orasi	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.00 Yes Yes	5 5 5	5.0 5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5 1.5	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura	aders improve drainage il emergency respo	onse tim	98
OLASI	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2	aders improve drainage Il emergency respo 2007-2011	onse tim	es
Crasi	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2	aders improve drainage Il emergency respo 2007-2011	onse tim	es
akin	Avg AADT	200 System	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25%	5 5 35 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20%	aders improve drainage al emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points =	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
akin	Avg AADT	200 System Roadwa	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good	5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20	5.0 5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0	1.5 1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition	aders improve drainage Il emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
akin	g Care of the Substa	200 System Roadwa ndard Roa	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Ves Yes Yes 25% Good Yes	5 5 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no sho	aders improve drainage al emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on oulders	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
akin	g Care of the Substa	200 System Roadwa ndard Roa sification2	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good Yes 20%	5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 10	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0 2.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.4	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no sho	aders improve drainage al emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on oulders	onse tim 13.4	es of 20
akin	g Care of the Substa	200 System Roadwa ndard Roa sification2	Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local Daily Vehicle Usage	0.00 Yes Yes 25% Good Yes 20% 100	5 5 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 10	5.0 5.0 8.8 Actual 5.0 20.0 2.0	1.5 1.5 2.6 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.4 0.0	Concern raised by local lea Widen lanes & shoulders, Could slightly improve rura no reported crashes from 2 Weight Factor = 20% road in fair to good condition Narrow lane widths; no should be (Modified MoDOT formula)	aders improve drainage il emergency respo 2007-2011 Total Points = on oulders	onse time 13.4	es of 20

Efficie	ent Movemen	it of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders	8		
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
	60									0 E	
lualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	P 11 1 1 1			
			onsistent with Local Plans	NO				no applicable local plan	and a state of a large		
	Consistent with Regional Plans				20	20.0	2.0	not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Scenic and Visual				30	30.0	3.0	Connectivity important to i	ocal rural residents	S	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, r	to scenic benefits		
	Loc	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to residents					
nvir	nmentel Dro	tection			Mox	Actual	Walahtad	Weight Faster - 5%	Total Pointe -	4.8	of 5
IIVII		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Vac			1 5	Project includes drainage i		4.0	01.5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals			Vec	30	30.0	1.5	limited mitigation expected	I		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts			Vee	20	20.0	1.0	No known bistorical impac	te		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Few issues expected	15		
	Loval	LINIOIII		1070	20	10.0	0.0				
afety	у				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	7.1	of 30
ממת	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
tion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
rsec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
ol	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			- Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders,	improve drainage		
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve rura	al emergency resp	onse tim	es
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	no reported crashes from 2	2007-2011		
			•								
aking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	road in fair to good condition	on		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Yes					20.0	4.0	Narrow lane widths; no she	oulders		
Fu	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
							0.0				

Efficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders	3		
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
									Tatal Dainte -	2 5	-6.40
uam	y of Commu	niues	a si su al la su di lla si Diana si	N.L.	Max	Actual	Weighted	weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	NO	30	0.0	0.0	ne emiliachte teast atea			
		Cana	intertwith Designal Plans	NO				no applicable local plan			
	Connectivity				20	20.0	2.0	Connectivity important to k	regional pian		
	Scenic and Visual				00	0.0	0.0			>	
		-1 Ou - 154	Scenic and visual	110	20	0.0	0.0	honoficial to providents, r	io scenic benefits		
	LOC	al Quality	or Communities Factors	23%	20	0.C	0.5	deneticial to residents			
nvire	onmental Pro	tection			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4 8	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Project includes drainage i	mprovements	1.0	
	Co	nsistent wi	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	limited mitigation expected	l		
	Consister		voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Few issues expected			
afety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	7.1	of 30
	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	-		
tion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011			
I NIG	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00							
o g	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders,	improve drainage		
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve rura	l emergency resp	onse tim	es
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	no reported crashes from 2	2007-2011		
akin	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	road in fair to good condition	on		
	Substa	andard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Narrow lane widths; no she	oulders		
F	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
								the sector of the sector sector and the sector sect			

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 0.9 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3		
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks c	r bike lanes
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes improved shou	Iders
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	Very rural; local access	is limited even with improvements

Con	gestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.8 of 10
		Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major issue
	Functional Classification	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5	
		Daily Usage	100	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	moderate to low volumes, time spent following possible is

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	15.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	removed from most economic dev activity

Proj. #:	3-3	Project Name:	Brace Hill Rd (S	lough Hollow Rd to M Hwy)
Project	Type:	Geometric/Safety	Total Score	47.0 out of 100
Project I expand r	Descri ight-of	ption: Widen lanes a ⋅way.	nd/or add should	ers, repave roadway, possibly
Status:	Comp	oleted	2016	Length: 1.38 miles
Project	Scale:	Medium	Roadway	or Intersection Roadway
	Functi	onal Classification:	Local	(for the major street)
Avg. An	nual D	aily Traffic (AADT):	200	(estimated, avg. for major street)
		Daily Truck Traffic:	4	(estimated, avg. for major street)
		Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)

Project Discussion: This roadway has narrow lanes and shoulders. The lanes are approximately 10 feet wide and there are essentially no shoulders. There is also a limited clear zone along most of the length of the roadway. The posted speed limit is 25 mph. Drainage is handled in ditches at the roadway edge. While it has a low estimated volume, it would benefit from a design that better met current standards.



fficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
Jality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG r	egional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Important local connector			
		Scenic and Visual Local Quality of Communities Factors			20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no	o scenic benefits		
	Loca	Local Quality of Communities Factors 25%					0.5	valuable to local residents			
viro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues exp	ected		
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	No mitigation expected due	to size of project		
		Av	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	8		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected; A few	<i>ı</i> small wetlands (ponds) r	near roa
_											
fety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	19.0	of 30
Ē	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.36	50	13.4	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ection	Injury	0	Crash Rate	330.88				Crash data 2009-2011			
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.89							
or In	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	ders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen roadway and possibl	y add shoulders		
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve local	emergency respo	onse time	es; alt ro
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	one reported crash from 20	07-2011		
king	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	11.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	roadway condition poor bas	ed on pictures an	d observ	vations
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Yes			Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow lanes			
	unctional Classification2 Local 20%										
Fu	nctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
Fu	nctional Class	sification2	Local Daily Vehicle Usage	20% 100	10 10	2.0 0.0	0.4 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			

icie	nt Movement	of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.6 of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	⊃artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5	
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders
			Improves Geometry	No				
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route
lity	of Commur	ities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Important local connector
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits
	Loca	ement of Freight Large Vehicle Friendly Facilit Widens Ro Improves Geome Improves Load Rai Truck Usa I Efficient Movement of Freight Factor Inmunities Local/Regional Land Use Pla Consistent with Local Pla Consistent with Regional Pla Consistent with Regional Pla Consistent with Regional Pla Consistent with Stormwater Go Consistent With Consistent With Consistent Go Consistent With Stormwater Go Consistent With Consistent With Consistent With Consistent Go Consistent With Consistent With Consistent Here Consistent With Consistent With Consistent Here Consistent Here Consistent Here Cons	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	valuable to local residents
iro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.5 of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues expected
	Cor	sistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	No mitigation expected due to size of project
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected; A few small wetlands (ponds) near roa
ty					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 19.0 of 30
Ê	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.36	50	13.4	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
cno	Injury	0	Crash Rate	330.88				Crash data 2009-2011
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.89				
orin	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00				
	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen roadway and possibly add shoulders
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve local emergency response times; alt r
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	one reported crash from 2007-2011
ing	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.4 of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	roadway condition poor based on pictures and observations
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow lanes
					4.0	0.0	<u> </u>	
Fu	nctional Class	ification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4	
Fu	nctional Class	ification2	Local Daily Vehicle Usage	20% 100	10 10	2.0 0.0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)

fficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.6 of	f 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5		
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders	
			Improves Geometry	No					
			Improves Load Rating	No					
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula	
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route	
lality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of	f 10
		Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0		
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Important local connector	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits	
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	valuable to local residents	
viro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.5 of	f 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues expected	
	Cor	Scenic and Visual Local Quality of Communities Factors al Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	No mitigation expected due to size of project		
			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected; A few small wetlands (ponds) near	r road
fety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 19.0 of	f 30
Ē	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.36	50	13.4	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
ection	Injury	0	Crash Rate	330.88				Crash data 2009-2011	
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.89					
or In	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00					
	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen roadway and possibly add shoulders	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve local emergency response times;	alt ro
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	one reported crash from 2007-2011	
king	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.4 of	f 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	roadway condition poor based on pictures and observation	ons
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow lanes	
Fu	nctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	

fficie	nt Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5		
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders	
			Improves Geometry	No					
			Improves Load Rating	No					
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula	
	Local Effic	sient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route	
l. i fr									. 6 40
Jant		nues		NL-	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.3	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	NO	30	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan	
		Cana	intertwith Designal Plans	NO				no applicable local plan	
		Consi		Vac	30	30.0	3.0		
			Connectivity	Ne	20	0.0	0.0		
			Scenic and visual	NO	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits	
	LOC	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	23%	20	5.0	0.5	valuable to local residents	
viro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.5	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues expected	
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	No mitigation expected due to size of project	
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected; A few small wetlands (ponds) ne	ar road
fety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 19.0	of 30
(PDO	1	Safety Index	0.36	50	13.4	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
ction	Injury	0	Crash Rate	330.88				Crash data 2009-2011	
erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.89					
or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00					
U	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen roadway and possibly add shoulders	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve local emergency response times	s; alt ro
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	one reported crash from 2007-2011	
<u></u>									
		System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.4	of 20
iking	Care of the					15.0	3.0	roadway condition poor based on pictures and observation	ations
king	Care of the	Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	0.0		aono
ı <mark>kinç</mark>	<mark>Care of the</mark> Substa	Roadw ndard Roa	ay or Bridge Conditions Idway or Bridge Feature	Poor Yes	20 20	20.0	4.0	narrow lanes	
<mark>king</mark> Fu	Care of the Substa	Roadw ndard Roa sification2	ay or Bridge Conditions adway or Bridge Feature	Poor Yes 20%	20 20 10	20.0 2.0	4.0 0.4	narrow lanes	
<mark>ıking</mark> Fu	Care of the Substa	Roadw ndard Roa sification2	ay or Bridge Conditions adway or Bridge Feature Local Daily Vehicle Usage	Poor Yes 20% 100	20 20 10 10	20.0 2.0 0.0	4.0 0.4 0.0	narrow lanes (Modified MoDOT formula)	

Efficie	nt Movemen [.]	t of Freigł	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	2.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
			Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders		
			Improves Geometry	No						
			Improves Load Rating	No						
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula		
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route		
ualit	y of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Important local connector		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	valuable to local residents		
nviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues expected		
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	No mitigation expected due to size of project		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Few issues expected; A few small wetlands (p	ponds) I	near road
										_
afety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points =	19.0	of 30
090X	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.36	50	13.4	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
adu	Injury	0	Crash Rate	330.88				Crash data 2009-2011		
terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.89						
	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00						
5	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen roadway and possibly add shoulders		
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve local emergency respo	nse tim	es; alt rout
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	one reported crash from 2007-2011		
										_
	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points =	11.4	of 20
aking	Roadway or Bridge Conditions Poo		Poor	20	15.0	3.0	roadway condition poor based on pictures an	d obser	vations	
<mark>aking</mark>		Roadwa	, ,							
<mark>aking</mark>	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow lanes		
<mark>aking</mark> Fu	Substa nctional Class	ndard Roa sification2	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes 20%	20 10	20.0 2.0	4.0 0.4	narrow lanes		
<mark>aking</mark> Fu	Substa nctional Class	ndard Roa sification2	dway or Bridge Feature Local Daily Vehicle Usage	Yes 20% 100	20 10 10	20.0 2.0 0.0	4.0 0.4 0.0	narrow lanes (Modified MoDOT formula)		

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1	.5 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two do	not apply	assumes improved shou	Iders	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Line	s
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Assumes improved shou	Ilders for ped/bike use	•

Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.8 o	of 10
	Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major issue	
Functional Classification	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
	Daily Usage	100	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	moderate to low volumes, time spent following poss	ible iss

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	21.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	10.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects

Proj. #: 3-4 Project Name:	Hulls Ford Rd (MO-76 to	End of Road)
Project Type: Traffic Calming	Total Score	54.8	out of 100
Project Description: Traffic control vehicular speeds and promote safe trucks). This could take the form of measures such as chicanes, speed and proper use should be considered	and/or traffic calr use of the roadwa signage or even r humps, or rumble ed before any of th	ning impro ay by all us nore aggr strips. O nese optio	ovements to limit sers (peds, bikes, autos, essive traffic calming f course maintenance ns are implemented.
Status: Planning		Length:	3.81 miles
Project Scale: Small	Roadway	/ or Inters	section Roadway
Functional Classification:	Local	(for the n	najor street)
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	500	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)
Daily Truck Traffic:	10	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)

Project Discussion: This project is intended to improve both the vehicular and pedestrian safety on Hulls Ford Road. For reference, the lanes are 9 feet wide, there is essentially no shoulder and drainage is handled in swales at the roadside edge. While the ADT is estimated at 500 vehicles per day, there have been five crashes on the road in the last 3 years. Additionally, this road is used by residents to reach a popular swimming hole. It is expected that low cost measures should be possible to better restrain traffic speeds on this roadway and promote safe travel for all users.



Efficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.2	of 10	
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	5	30	1.5	0.2	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route				
											-	
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10	
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plan				
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan				
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	promotes safe travel to/fro	m swimming hole			
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	very important to local resi	dents - safety			
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5	
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	vater issues expe	oted		
	Co	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Signage is very unlikely to	cause impacts					
	Avoids Historical Impacts				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts			
	Local	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Road crosses floodplain &	wetland; but impa	cts not e	expected			
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30	
oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.35	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	I			
or R	Injury	4	Crash Rate	239.70				Crash data 2009-2011				
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.37								
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.00								
Crat	Avg AADT	500	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders			
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Speed slowing mechanism	is (i.e. signs)			
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	four reported crashes, inclu	uding 4 iniuries			
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20	
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	chip and seal - fair conditio	on - some gravel			
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	unsafe pedestrian travel co	onditions			
F	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0 4					
			Daily Vehicle Lleage	250	10	0.0	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)				
	1 ! *	Taking O	baily venicle usage	200	10	0.0	0.0					
	1000	50%	4()	- 20.0	4 ()	improvements beneticial to	avioting evetom					

Linolo		c of f folg			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Mergint l'actor	10 /0	Total Total Total		
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	5	30	1.5	0.2	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck ro	oute			
Qualit	y of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local p	plan			
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SM	MCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	promotes safe trave	el to/froi	m swimming hole		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	very important to loo	cal resi	dents - safety		
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few	ı stormv	vater issues expe	oted	
	Cor	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Signage is very unli	ikely to	cause impacts				
		voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical	l impact	ts			
	Local	Environmo	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Road crosses flood	plain &	wetland; but impa	cts not e	expected
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
oad)	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.35	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)			
or R	Injury	4	Crash Rate	239.70				Crash data 2009-20	011			
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.37								
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.00								
Cras	Avg AADT	500	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by l	local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Speed slowing mec	hanism	s (i.e. signs)		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	four reported crashe	es, inclu	uding 4 injuries		
Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	chip and seal - fair o	conditio	n - some gravel		
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	unsafe pedestrian tr	ravel co	onditions		
Fu	nctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4					
			Daily Vehicle Usage	250	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT f	ormula)			
		aking Car	a of the System Easters	50%	40	20.0	4.0	improvemente hene		evicting evictor		
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors				40	200	40	- Infortovententis dene				

		c of f forg			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Mergine Fabior	To a local l	012	
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	5	30	1.5	0.2	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck rou	ute		
Qualit	y of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = <i>′</i>	10% Total Points :	= 4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local p	blan		
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SM	ICOG regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	promotes safe trave	I to/from swimming hol	e	
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	very important to loc	cal residents - safety		
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5% Total Points =	= 4.5	of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few	stormwater issues exp	pected	
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Signage is very unlik	kely to cause impacts		
		A	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical	impacts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Road crosses floodp	olain & wetland; but im	pacts not	expected
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 3	30% Total Points =	= 28.5	of 30
pad	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.35	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)		
or R(Injury	4	Crash Rate	239.70				Crash data 2009-20	11		
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.37							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.00							
Cras	Avg AADT	500	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by lo	ocal leaders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Speed slowing mech	hanisms (i.e. signs)		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	four reported crashe	es. including 4 iniuries		
									,		
Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 2	20% Total Points :	= 10.4	of 20
		Roadw	av or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	chip and seal - fair o	condition - some grave		
	Subeta	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yee	20	20.0	4.0	unsafe nedestrian tr	avel conditions		
	notional Class			2004	10	20.0	ч.0 0.4				
с.	na nonai cuase	sincation2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
Fu				050	40	~ ~	0.0				
Fu	inctional oraci		Daily Vehicle Usage	250	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)		

		it of thong			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Meight Fueter	10 /0		012	
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	5	30	1.5	0.2	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck rou	ute			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local p	plan			
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SM	MCOG re	gional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	promotes safe trave	el to/from	swimming hole		
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	very important to loc	cal reside	ents - safety		
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few	stormwa	ater issues expe	cted	
	Co	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Signage is very unlil	kely to ca	ause impacts				
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical	impacts			
	Local	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Road crosses flood	plain & w	etland; but impa	acts not e	xpected		
Safety	,				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 3	30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
oad)	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.35	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)			
or R	Injury	4	Crash Rate	239.70				Crash data 2009-20)11			
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.37								
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.00								
Cras	Avg AADT	500	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by lo	ocal lead	lers		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Speed slowing mecl	hanisms	(i.e. signs)		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	four reported crashe	es, incluc	ling 4 injuries		
			-									
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 2	20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	chip and seal - fair c	condition	- some gravel		-
		andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	unsafe pedestrian tr	ravel con	ditions		
	Substa				-	2.0	0.4					
Fu	Substa Inctional Clas	sification?	local	20%	10	20	04					
Fu	Substa Inctional Clas	sification2	Local Daily Vehicle Usage	20% 250	10 10	2.0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)			
Fu	Substa	sification2	Local Daily Vehicle Usage	20% 250	10 10	0.0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)	victing system		

		c of f foigi			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Mergint l'autor	10 /0	l'otal l'offito	012	
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	5	30	1.5	0.2	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck re	oute			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local	plan			
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in S	MCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	promotes safe trav	vel to/fro	om swimming hole		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	very important to lo	ocal res	idents - safety		
Inviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, fev	<i>w</i> storm	water issues expe	oted	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Signage is very un	likely to	cause impacts		
		A۱	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historica	al impac	ets		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Road crosses flood	dplain &	wetland; but impa	icts not e	expected
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
(oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.35	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT	formula	l)		
ction	Injury	4	Crash Rate	239.70				Crash data 2009-2	2011			
(Ma	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.37								
shes r Int	Years	3	Severity Index	3.00								
Cra	Avg AADT	500	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by	local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Speed slowing me	chanisn	ns (i.e. signs)		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	four reported crash	nes, incl	luding 4 injuries		
<mark>laking</mark>	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	20%	Total Points =	10.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	chip and seal - fair	conditio	on - some gravel		
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	unsafe pedestrian	travel c	onditions		
Fu	Inctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4					
			Daily Vehicle Usage	250	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT	formula)		
			,							,		
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	40	improvements hen	eficial to	n existing system		

Access 1	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 2.8 o	f 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brir	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two de	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Proj	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	project designed to incre	ase pedestrian safety	
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	100%	50	50.0	2.5	Traffic controls intended	to make facility more ped fr	iendly

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.8 of	10
		Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major issue	
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
		Daily Usage	250	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	moderate to low volumes, time spent following possib	ole iss

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	15.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects

Total Score	
	33.7 out of 100
nd shoulders and	potentially straighten horizontal
	Length: 5.46 miles
Roadway	or Intersection Roadway
Local	(for the major street)
100	(estimated, avg. for major street)
2	(estimated, avg. for major street)
2	(through lanes on major street)
	Roadway Local 100 2 2

Project Discussion: This low volume road has approximately 9 foot lanes (18 foot travelway). There are no pavement markings on the roadway. It also has sharp curves in a number of locations. Improving these curves and providing shoulders would improve safety and benefit the users of this roadway.



Efficie	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.1	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes				widen lanes and shoulders			
	Improves Geometry	Yes				straightening curves			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
Quality	<i>r</i> of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Eoodintegional Eana ose i lans	110	00	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan			
	Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans	No No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan not mentioned in SMCOG r	egional plan		

Quality of Communities		Max	Actua
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0
Consistent with Local Plans	No		
Consistent with Regional Plans	No		
Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0
Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0
Local Quality of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.3	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Few stormwater issues ex	pected		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Proximity to floodplains &	wetlands may be an	issue	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ots		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Roadway travels in/along	floodplain area; sma	all wetlan	ids (ponds)

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 9.8 of 30	
oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	167.26				Crash data 2009-2011	
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.96					
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00					
Cra	Avg AADT	100	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Widen lanes & shoulders, straighten curves	
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could slightly improve rural response times	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	one reported crash from 2007-2011	

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points =	7.4	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	Roadway in worse condition than bridge		
	Substandard Roadv	ay or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0			
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4			
		Daily Vehicle Usage	50	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care o	f the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	4.0	improvements beneficial to existing system		

Access to Opportunity	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.9 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) 20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connections No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations No	use if t	first two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities Yes	use if t	first two d	o not apply	assumes improved shou	Iders	
Transit No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson L	ines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors 25%	50	12.5	0.6	Very rural; local access i	s limited even with	improvements

C	ongestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.1 of 10
	Level	of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	congestion not a major is	sue	
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5			
	D	aily Usage	50	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)	
	Local Congestion Rel	ief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.6	low volumes		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 5.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	10.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects

3.0 Only N-S connector in a large rural area

0.0 Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits

0.5 valuable to local residents

Proj. #: 3-6 Project Name: Hwy 76 & US-160	0					Efficien	n <mark>t Moveme</mark> r	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.7 of 10
Project Type: Traffic Safety Total Score	62.2	out of	f 100					Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
Project Description: Improve intersection to address t	traffic cor	ntrol, d	elay, and	d safety.					Widens Road	No						
Improvements could include signalization, a roundabou	ut, or sign	age/st	triping.						Improves Geometry	Yes				location will be improved	l in a manner that b	enefits large vehicles
									Improves Load Rating	No						
									Truck Usage	320	30	12.0	1.2	MoDOT formula		
Status: Construction 2018 L	Length:	NA					Local Eff	icient Mov	ement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	trucks will benefit from t	ne improved geome	try and/or traffic contr
Project Scale: Medium Roadway	or Inters	ection	n Interse	ection												
Functional Classification: Minor Arterial ((for the m	najor st	treet)			Quality	of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10.0 of 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 8,000 ((est. 2012	2, avg.	for majo	or street)	The state and and and a state of			Local/F	Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0			
Daily Truck Traffic: 640	(est. 2012	2, avg.	for majo	or street)				C	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				160 roadway improveme	ents mentioned in F	orsyth Strategic Plan
Through Lanes: 2	(through l	lanes d	on major	street)				Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				160 roadway improveme	ents mentioned in S	MCOG regional plan
Project Discussion: The intersection is a three-way st	top contro	ol inter	section.	The					Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	160 connects Forsyth to	76 (Kirbyville)	
volumes are not balanced and some movements there The volumes are also near and possibly above the thre	tore have	highe	er delay v Lwarrant	/alues. ·s ∆					Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	possible conversion to r	oundabout; location	of county seat
roundabout could also work at this location.		orgrid	warall	.o. n			Loc	cal Quality	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical intersection; 160	is important corrido	or through Forsyth
					North ATC	Environ	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.0 of 5
								Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small increase in storm	vater - could be mit	igated
					•		Co	onsistent w	ith Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	May have fill in Corps of	Engineer's Floodpl	ain
Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.8 of 5			А	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical imp	acts	
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5			Loca	l Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Corps of Engineer's floo	dplain impacts	
Project provides bike connections	No															
Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				assumed ped provisions are part of project	Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	16.5 of 30
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if f	first two de	o not apply		bad	PDO	10	Safety Index	0.87	50	32.6	9.8	(Modified MoDOT formu	la)	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if f	first two de	o not apply		or Ro tion)	Injury	3	Crash Rate	151.98				Crash data 2009-2011		
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0		Majc	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.31						
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	project could benefit peds crossing at the intersection	hes (Years	3	Severity Index	1.58						
						Crasl	Avg AADT	7811	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0			
Congestion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighter	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.4 of 10				Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	15	Intersection and traffic o	ontrol improvement	S
Level of Service	D	25	15.0	1.5	Lowest movement LOS for stop control (Synchro)				Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0			
Functional Classification 1 Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0	conservative assumption				Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	53	Safety is an issue most	crashes are rear-ei	nd crashes
Daily Leage	4000	25	4 0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)				2004 04/019 1 40/019	0070	00	17.0	0.0			
Local Congrotion Polici Fosters	100%	25	25.0	2.4	moderate to high traffic key location	Taking	Caro of the	Sustan			Mox	Actual	Waightad	Weight Easter - 20%	Total Pointe -	10 1 of 20
	10070	20	25.0	2.0	nousiale to high tranic, key location	Taking		Dead		Coord		Actual		weight Factor = 20%		
			A ()	187 1 1 1			.	Roady	ay or bridge conditions	Good	20	0.0	1.0			
	V	Max	Actual	weighted	$\frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1000}{1000} =$	_	Subst	andard Ro	adway or Bridge Feature	NO	20	0.0	0.0			
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-16U and Hwy /6	Fun	nctional Clas	sification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8			
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	supports continued development and activity in Forsyth				Daily Vehicle Usage	4000	10	1.6	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formu	la)	
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7			Local	Taking Ca	e of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	Important local intersect	ion	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 6.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 4 block groups											

Unemployment (tract) 8.0%

Local Economic Competitiveness Factors 100% 30 30.0 3.0 US-160 and Hwy 76 are important corridors

2006-2010 ACS tract data - Comb. 3 tracts

Proj. #: 3-7 Project Name:	US-160 Widenin	ig throug	h Forsyth
Project Type: Capacity	Total Score	73.4	out of 100
Project Description: Widen US 160 Road. The widening would add a ce Forsyth. It is assumed that the wider improvements. Existing stormwater system) from west of the nter two-way left- ning project will a ditches may have	Hwy 76 I turn lane lso includ to be co	ntersection to Casey through the center of e appropriate pedestrian nverted to an enclosed
Status: Planning		Length:	2.8 miles
Project Scale: Large	Roadway	or Inters	ection Roadway
Functional Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the n	najor street)
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	9,500	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)
Daily Truck Traffic:	475	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)
Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes on major street)
Project Discussion: This portion of	US-160 has daily	v traffic vo	lumes of between 8.500

and 10,500. It is the main street through Forsyth and is important for both local and through traffic. There are safety, access, and capacity issues on this highway. The addition of a center two-way left-turn lane as well as possible access improvements and consolidations would help address these issues.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilitie	s Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Widens Roa	d Yes				roadway widening project			
Improves Geometr	y Yes				adds turn lanes			
Improves Load Ratin	g <mark>No</mark>							
Truck Usag	e 237.5	30	10.3	1.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factor	s 75%	40	30.0	3.0	Should benefit truck traffic	; important connec	ctor in Ta	aney County
								-
Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
Local/Regional Land Use Plan	s Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Consistent with Local Plan	s Yes				mentioned in Forsyth strat	egic plan		
Consistent with Regional Plan	s Yes				mentioned in SMCOG reg	ional plan		
Connectivit	y Yes	30	30.0	3.0	important Forsyth through	route		
Scenic and Visua	l No	20	0.0	0.0	limited scenic benefits			
Local Quality of Communities Factor	s 75%	20	15.0	1.5	important improvement in	the heart of Forsyl	th	
Environmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	13.5	of 15
Consistent with Stormwater Goal	s Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mit	gated		
Consistent with Environmental Goal	s Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	expected	
Avoids Historical Impact	s Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		

Efficient Movement of Freight			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
Large Vehicle	Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes				roadway widening project			
	Improves Geometry	Yes				adds turn lanes			
Im	proves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	237.5	30	10.3	1.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement	of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	Should benefit truck traffic	; important connec	tor in Ta	aney County
Quality of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
Local/Region	al Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Consist	ent with Local Plans	Yes				mentioned in Forsyth strat	egic plan		
Consistent	with Regional Plans	Yes				mentioned in SMCOG reg	ional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	important Forsyth through	route		
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	limited scenic benefits			
Local Quality of Co	nmunities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	important improvement in	the heart of Forsyl	:h	
Environmental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	13.5	of 15
Consistent with	Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	gated		
Consistent with En	vironmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	expected	
Avoids	Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		

Efficient Movement of F	Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
Lar	ge Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Widens Road	Yes				roadway widening project			
	Improves Geometry	Yes				adds turn lanes			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	237.5	30	10.3	1.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient	Movement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	Should benefit truck traffic	important connect	tor in Ta	ney County
Quality of Communities	5		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
Lo	cal/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	Yes				mentioned in Forsyth strat	egic plan		
	Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes				mentioned in SMCOG regi	onal plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	important Forsyth through	route		
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	limited scenic benefits			
Local Qu	ality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	important improvement in	the heart of Forsyth	ı	
	-								
Environmental Protecti	on		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	13.5	of 15
Cons	istent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff miti	gated		
Consiste	ent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Unmitigated environmenta	l impacts are not e	xpected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
Local Envir	ronmental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.5	No known environmental i	mpacts, historical ir	npacts	possible

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 15.4 of 20
oad	PDO	69	Safety Index	0.71	50	26.8	5.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R stion)	Injury	23	Crash Rate	323.48				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.85				
shes ir Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.63				
Cra	Avg AADT	9276	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened road and other improvements
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	will improve response time, fire dept. on north side of project
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	7.0	High number of crashes confirms local safety concern

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.5 of 5	5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	Both the Roadway and Bridges are in good condition	
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0		
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.2		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4750	10	1.6	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	improving roadway operations benefits existing system	

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.4 of	5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5				
	Project provides bike connections	No				assume no bike facility v	vill be included with	the proje	ct
	Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				assumes pedestrian faci	ilities inc. ped signa	ls	
Project bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
Pro	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0				
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	75%	50	37.5	1.9	Improved roadway and i	ntersection could b	enefit ped	acces

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 7.9 of 15
		Level of Service	E	25	20.0	3.0	planning level - based on volume/capacity on roadway
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.5	
		Daily Usage	4750	25	3.9	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	75%	25	18.8	2.8	moderate to high traffic, key location

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 17.2 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	US 160
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	supports continued development and activity in Forsyth
Level of Economic Distress	30%	20	6.0	1.2	
Poverty (Block Group)	11.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	11.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	1 00%	30	30.0	6.0	US 160 is an important economic corridor

Proj. #: 3-8	Project Name:	Hulls Ford Brid	ge	
Project Type	Quality of Commu	Total Score	45.8	out of 100
Project Desci	ription : Construct an a	all-weather river c	rossing (b	ridge) as well as all
weather appro	ach roadways.			
Ctatura: Diam				0.1 miles
Status: Plan	ining		Length:	0.1 miles
Project Scale	: Medium	Roadway	or Inters	ection Roadway
Funct	tional Classification:	Local	(for the n	najor street)
Avg. Annual I	Daily Traffic (AADT):	200	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)
	Daily Truck Traffic:	2	(estimate	d, avg. for major street)
	Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes on major street)
Project Discu	ssion: Currently this i	s a low water cro	ssing only	It also is only one lane

Project Discussion: Currently this is a low water crossing only. It also is only one lane wide. It has very modest traffic. A full bridge with approach ramps would be required to stay clear of the stream and floodwaters. The existing crossing is in poor condition.



Efficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.1	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.5	of 10
		Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Popular swimming and fisl	ning location		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local area res	idents		
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (new stormwate	er deten	tion facilitie
	Co	nsistent wi	ith Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and wetland in	n project area		
		Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts				
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts - bridge	crosses floodplains	and we	tland area
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	19.1	of 30
(oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	11.54	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ction	Injury	1	Crash Rate	4566.21				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Ma	Fatal	0	Accident Index	26.09							
shes r Int	Years	3	Severity Index	3.50							
Cra	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	not main reason for projec	t		
			- Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	New two-lane high-water b	oridge		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	project driven by factors o	ther than safety		
l aking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	concrete deteriorating			
	Substa	undard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow and low water cros	sing		
F	unctional Clas	sification?	Local	20%	10	2.0	04				
			Daily Vehicle Lleage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Lees!	Taking Cor	to of the System Eastern	759/	10	20.0	6.0	improvement heneficial to	ovicting least trans	nortotio	n ovotom
	Local	raking Car	e of the System Factors	15%	40	30.0	0.U	improvement beneficial to	existing local trans	portatio	n system

		•			Max	notau	monginto a	trong.to a cost i tra			
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No							
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck route			
Qualit	v of Commun	nities			Мах	Actual	Waightad	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	25	of 10
zuunt	y or commu	Local/R	egional Land Lise Plans	No	30					2.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plan	s		
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCC	o Gregional plan		
		00110	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0		o rogional plan		
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Popular swimming and	fishing location		
	Loca	al Quality /	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local area r	residents		
	2008	a waany (20/0	20	0.0	0.0		oordonto		
nvirc	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
	(Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff miti	gated (new stormwat	er deten	tion facili
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and wetland	d in project area		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical imp	acts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts - bridg	je crosses floodplains	and we	tland are
							107 1 1 1	DAL 1 1 C C 200/	Tatal Datate -	10.1	of 30
afety					Max	Actual	weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	i otal Points =	19.1	
afety	PDO	0	Safety Index	11.54	Max 50	Actual 50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formu	ula)	19.1	
afety ction)	PDO Injury	0 1	Safety Index Crash Rate	11.54 4566.21	Max 50	Actual 50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011	<i>iotal Points =</i> <i>Ila</i>)	13.1	
ersection)	PDO Injury Fatal	0 1 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	11.54 4566.21 26.09	Max 50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011	<i>iotal Points =</i>	13.1	
shes (Major Koad <mark>by</mark> or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	0 1 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50	Max 50	Actual 50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011	<i>iotal Points =</i>	13.1	
Or Intersection) or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No	<u>Max</u> 50	Actual 50.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011	ject	19.1	
Crasnes (Major Koad or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes	Max 50 5 5	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0	0.0 0.5	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate	ject	19.1	
Crashes (Major Koad or Intersection) Atales	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0	0.0 1.5 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate	ject pridge	13.1	
Crashes (Major Koad solution) (Apple or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate	ject s other than safety	13.1	
Crashes (Major Road Bo or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	Max 50 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	(Modified MoDOT formu Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors	ject er bridge	13.1	
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	Max 50 5 5 5 35 35 Max	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 Actual	Vveighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Vveighted	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formulation Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors Weight Factor = 20%	ject s other than safety	13.4	of 20
Crashes (Major Koad even or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200 System Roadw	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	Max 50 5 5 5 35 Max 20	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 Actual 15.0	Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formulation Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors Weight Factor = 20% concrete deteriorating	ject s other than safety Total Points =	13.4	of 20
Crashes (Major Koad solution) or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200 System Roadw ndard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes 25%	Max 50 5 5 35 Max 20 20 20	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 Actual 15.0 20.0	Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formulation Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for projon New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors Weight Factor = 20% concrete deteriorating narrow and low water or	iect er bridge s other than safety Total Points =	13.4	of 20
Crashes (Major Road Road Road Road Road Road Road Road	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200 System Roadw ndard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes 25% No 25%	Max 50 5 5 35 35 Max 20 20 10	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 0.0 8.8 15.0 20.0 2.0	Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 0.4	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formulation Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for projon New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors Weight Factor = 20% concrete deteriorating narrow and low water or	ject s other than safety Total Points =	13.4	of 20
Crashes (Major Koad estimation) Or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	0 1 0 3 200 System Roadw ndard Roa sification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions adway or Bridge Feature Local Daily Vehicle Usage	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes 25% No 25% 20% 100	Max 50 5 5 35 35 20 20 20 10 10	Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 Actual 15.0 20.0 2.0 0.0	Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 0.4 0.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formulation Crash data 2009-2011 not main reason for proj New two-lane high-wate project driven by factors Weight Factor = 20% concrete deteriorating narrow and low water or (Modified MoDOT formulation)	iect er bridge s other than safety Total Points =	13.4	of 20

		c of f forg			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Meight Factor	10 /0	Total Tollito		
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effic	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck rou	ute			
Qualit	y of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = [·]	10%	Total Points =	2.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local p	olans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SM	//COG r	egional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Popular swimming a	and fish	ing location		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local ar	ea resi	dents		
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff	mitigate	ed (new stormwat	er deten	tion facilit
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and wet	tland in	project area		
		A	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical	impact	S		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts - b	oridge c	rosses floodplains	s and we	tland area
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 3	30%	Total Points =	19.1	of 30
oad)	PDO	0	Safety Index	11.54	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)			
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	4566.21				Crash data 2009-20)11			
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	26.09								
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.50								
Cras	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	not main reason for	project			
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	New two-lane high-w	water bi	ridge		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	project driven by fac	ctors oth	ner than safety		
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 2	20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	concrete deterioratir	ng			
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow and low wate	er cross	sing		
Fu	Inctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4					
			Deily Vehicle Hoose	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT fo	ormula)			
			Dally venicle lisane	/ . /		0.0	0.0		er i i i i i i i i i i i i			
		akina Co-	Daily vehicle Usage	750/	40	20.0	60	improvement henef		victing local trans	nortation	a ovotom

		e of Froig			INICIA	Actual	weighteu	Meight Factor	10 /0	Total Total	011	
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effi	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck ro	oute			
	()								4.0.0/		0.5	
lualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	10%	Total Points =	2.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local	plans			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	not mentioned in S	MCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	NO	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Popular swimming	and fish	ning location		
	Loc	al Quality (of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local a	rea res	idents		
		tootion							50/	Tatal Dainta -	2.0	
.nvirc	onmental Pro		t	Vee	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	Z.0	
	Co	Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	res	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runon	r mitigai	ed (new stormwat	er deten	tion facilit
	CO		un Environmental Goals	NO	30	0.0	0.0	No known bistoriae		r project area		
		Environm	voids historical impacts	165	20	20.0	1.0	Dessible imposte	hridao.	lS		tion di oro
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	23%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts -	billuge (nosses noouplains	s and we	
afety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	30%	Total Points =	19.1	of 30
ad	PDO	0	Safety Index	11.54	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT f	formula			
ion)	Injury	1	Crash Rate	4566.21				Crash data 2009-20	011			
rsect	Fatal	0	Accident Index	26.09								
Intel	Years	3	Severity Index	3.50								
or	Ava AADT	200	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	not main reason for	r projec	t		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	New two-lane high-	water b	ridae		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	0		0		
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	project driven by fa	ctors of	her than safety		
				2070	00	0.0	2.0	project anven by la				
aking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	concrete deteriorati	ing			
	Substa	Indard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow and low wat	ter cros	sing		
Fu	Inctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4					
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT f	formula)		
		Taking Cor	a of the System Easters	75%	40	30.0	6.0	improvement honof	ficial to	evisting local trans	nortatio	n evetor
	Local	aking car	e of the System Factors	1370	40	50.0	0.0	improvement benef		evisiting local rialis	portatio	rsystem

		connoig			IVIAN	Actual	weighteu	Mergine i autor	10 /0			
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Widens Road	No								
			Improves Geometry	No								
			Improves Load Rating	No								
			Truck Usage	1	30	0.7	0.1	MoDOT formula				
	Local Effic	cient Move	ement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck ro	oute			
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	10%	Total Points =	2.5	of 10
		Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0					
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local	plans			
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in S	MCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0					
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Popular swimming	and fish	ning location		
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local a	area res	idents		
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runof	f mitiga	ted (new stormwat	er deten	tion facilit
	Cor	nsistent wi	ith Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and we	etland ir	n project area		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historica	al impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts -	bridge of	crosses floodplains	and we	tland area
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	30%	Total Points =	19.1	of 30
oad)	PDO	0	Safety Index	11.54	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT 1	formula,)		
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	4566.21				Crash data 2009-20	011			
(Maj ersed	Fatal	0	Accident Index	26.09								
shes r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.50								
Cras	Avg AADT	200	Safety Concern	No	5	0.0	0.0	not main reason fo	r projec	t		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	New two-lane high-	-water b	oridge		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0					
			Local Safety Factors	25%	35	8.8	2.6	project driven by fa	actors of	ther than safety		
Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor =	20%	Total Points =	13.4	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	concrete deteriorat	ting			
	Substa	ndard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	narrow and low wa	ter cros	sing		
Fu	nctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4					
			Daily Vehicle Usage	100	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT)	formula)		
			Daily remote 03age	100	10	0.0	0.0		, sinnaia,			
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors				40	20.0	60	improvement here	finial to	ovicting local trans	nortatia	n avetam

Access to O	pportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	1.5	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3				
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply			
Pi	roject provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply			
Project brings e	xisting facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fii	rst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes		
Project p	provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fil	rst two do	not apply	all weather crossing, ass	sumes shoulders		
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Li	nes	
L	ocal Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	No existing connection; a	assumes shoulders		

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.0	of 10
		Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	capacity is not a major issue	
	Functional Classification	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
		Daily Usage	100	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	closure causes non-recurring delay to bridge users	

Economic Competitiveness		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	very little traffic on the bridge
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 5%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	11%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	development in the area not likely

Proj. #: 4-1 Pro	oject Name:	F Hwy and US-1	60 Inters	ection	
Project Type: Tra	affic Safety	Total Score	73.6	out of	100
Project Descriptic hrough movement Convert US-160 sc and relocate drivew reduce speeds, wh	on: Improve inters to connect US-16 puthbound (north le vays as needed. ile limiting vehicle	ection alignment 60 in the southeas eg) to stop contro A roundabout cou stops. It could a	and traffic st with F H ol. Ensure Ild be cons Iso possib	control. ighway adequa sidered. lv reduc	Re-align th in the east. ite sight dista This could e sight dista
Status: Complete	ed	2016	Length:	NA	o olgint diota
Project Scale: Sn	nall	Roadway	or Inters	ection	Intersection
Functiona	al Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the m	ajor stre	eet)
Avg. Annual Daily	/ Traffic (AADT):	10,500	(est. 2012	2, avg. f	or major stre
Dai	ily Truck Traffic:	530	(est. 2012	2, avg. f	or major stre
	Through Lanes:	2	(through l	anes or	n major stree
Project Discussio	n: 2010 ADTs on	US-160 are 10,5	00 to the s	outh an	d 2,700 to th

north. 2010 ADT on Hwy F is 8,500. The locations of the heavy volumes highlight the need to adjust the through movement and/or install a roundabout. Truck traffic was estimated at 5% based on a truck count on Hwy F west of the intersection. The crash data indicted numerous rear-end crashes on Route F. This is the only east-west connection within Taney County between the communities north of the river and US-65. Nearly all east-west traffic between these areas passes through this intersection. The traffic volumes appear to meet signal warrants, but a detailed study is in order.



cie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.6 of
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5	
			Widens Road	No				
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	265	30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor
lit	of Commun	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.0 of
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	Yes				SMCOG regional plan
			Connectivity	res	30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities north of river with Branson area
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical connection location within the County
irc	nmontal Dra	tootion			Max	Astual	Mainhead	Might Factor = 5% Total Dainta = 4.9 of
irc	nmental Pro	Consistent	with Stormwater Goala	Vac		Actual		Weight Factor = 5% Total Points - 4.0 of
	Cor	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals				30.0	1.0	Modest project, new stormwater issues expected
	00	Consistent with Environmental Goals			20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts
		Environme	antal Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project few issues expected
	Local			1370	20	10.0	0.0	modest project, iew issues expected
etv					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 28.5 of
-	PDO	26	Safety Index	1.96	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
luon	Injury	10	Crash Rate	320.67				Crash data 2009-2011
Iseci	Fatal	0	Accident Index	4.87				
Ð	Years	3	Severity Index	1.69				
ō	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shoulders
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	High crash rate confirms local concerns, many rear-end c
								on the west leg
ing	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 10.6 of
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition based on observations
	Substa	Indard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	
	Inctional Classification 2 Minor Arterial				10	4.0	0.8	
Fι	nctional Class	Deily Vehicle Hears					4.0	(Mar different Mar DOT for monthal)
Fı	nctional Class		Daily Vehicle Usage	5250	10	9.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)

ficie	nt Movement o	of Freigh	t		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.6	of 10
		Large Vel	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5		
			Widens Road	No					
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles	
			Improves Load Rating	No					
			Truck Usage	265	30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula	
	Local Efficie	ent Mover	nent of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor	
ality	y of Communit	ties			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.0	of 10
		Local/Re	gional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0		
		Co	nsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans	
		Consis	stent with Regional Plans	Yes				SMCOG regional plan	
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities north of river with Branson area	1
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits	
	Local	Quality o	f Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical connection location within the County	
	umontal Drata						387 1 7 1		
/iro	nmental Prote	ection		V	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Iotal Points = 4.8	C TO
	Come	onsistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, rew stormwater issues expected	
	Cons		n Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation expected	
	=	. AV	olds Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known nistorical impacts	
	Local El	nvironme	ntal Protection Factors	/ 3%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, tew issues expected	
etv					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 28.5	of 30
	PDO	26	Safety Index	1.96	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
(uoi	Injury	10	Crash Rate	320.67				Crash data 2009-2011	
rsect	Fatal	0	Accident Index	4.87					
nte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.69					
ō	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shoulders	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0		
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	High crash rate confirms local concerns many rear-end	d cras
						00.0	10.0	on the west leg	u oroto
ing	Care of the S	ystem			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 10.6	of 20
		Roadwa	y or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition based on observations	
	Substand	dard Road	dway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0		
	nctional Classif	fication2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8		
Fu	fictional classif			5250	10	9.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
Fu			Daily Vehicle Usage	5250					

fficie	ent Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% To	otal Points =	5.6	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks and c	other large veh	icles	
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	265	30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor			
									tal Dainta -	0.0	-6.40
Jant	y or Commu		agional Land Llas Plana	Vaa	Max	Actual	Weighted	weight Factor = 10% IC	tal Points =	0.0	of 10
		Localir	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	30.0	3.0	no applicable local plane			
		Conoi	atent with Regional Plana	Vec							
		Consi	Stent with Regional Plans	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	SMCOG regional plan	f river with Pro	noon or	~~
				Tes NL	30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities north o			ea
			Scenic and visual	NO	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements, no	scenic benefit	S	
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical connection location with	hin the County		
vire	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	tal Points =	4 8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Ves	30	30.0	1 5	Modest project, few stormwate		ted	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.0	Modest project, no mitigation e	expected	liou	
			oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	, poolou		
	Local	Environme	antal Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project few issues evo	ected		
	Loodi			1070	20	10.0	0.0				
afety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% To	tal Points =	28.5	of 30
	PDO	26	Safety Index	1.96	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
tion)	Injury	10	Crash Rate	320.67				Crash data 2009-2011			
rsec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	4.87							
- Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.69							
ō	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leader	s		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shoulder	s		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	High crash rate confirms local	concerns, mar	iy rear-e	end cras
			ļ					on the west leg	,		
king	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% To	tal Points =	10.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition based	d on observatio	ons	
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
		sification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8				
Fu	inctional Clas				40	0.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
Fu	inctional Clas		Daily Vehicle Usage	5250	10	9.1	1.0	Informed model formata			

ficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks a	and other large veh	nicles	
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	265	30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor			
alit		Initiae			Max	Actual	Maightad	Weight Eactor = 10%	Total Pointe =	8.0	of 10
anı		Local/R	egional Land Lise Plans	Vee	30	30.0	3 0			0.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No	50	50.0	0.0	no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	Ves				SMCOG regional plan			
		00131	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities no	rth of river with Bra	anson ar	еа
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	no scenic henefi	ts	
		cal Quality c	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Critical connection location	within the Count		
	200	cal Quality C		10070	20	20.0	2.0		r mann the obtaing		
virc	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expe	cted	
	Co	onsistent wit	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	ion expected		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Loca	l Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	expected		
ety	55.0			1.00	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Iotal Points =	28.5	of 30
(L	PDO	26	Safety Index	1.96	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
ectio	injury	10		320.67				Crash data 2009-2011			
Iters	Fatal	U	Accident Index	4.87							
or	Years	3	Severity Index	1.69	-	F 0		0			
	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shou	Ilders		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	High crash rate confirms lo	ocal concerns, ma	n <mark>y rear-</mark> e	end cra
	0							on the west leg			
king	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.6	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition b	ased on observati	ons	
_	Subst	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	inctional Clas	ssification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5250	10	9.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
	Local	Taking Care	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	important intersection to m	naintain in good op	eration	

ificie	ent Movemen	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.6	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks a	ind other large veh	nicles	
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	265	30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor			
- - :4									Tatal Dainte -	0.0	- 5 40
ant	y or Commu		agional Land Llas Plana	Vee	Max	Actual	Weighted		Total Points =	0.0	01 10
		Local/R	egional Land Ose Plans	No	30	30.0	3.0	no applicable local plane			
		Consi	stont with Pogional Plans	Voc				SMCOC regional plans			
		Cons		Vee	30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities not	th of river with Bra	aneon ar	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
			Secric and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0			to	ca
				4000/	20	0.0	0.0	Critical connection leastion	, no scenic benefit		
	Loc	al Quality o	or Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Chucal connection location	i within the County		
viro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expe	cted	_
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	expected		
fety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
-	PDO	26	Safety Index	1.96	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
ction	Injury	10	Crash Rate	320.67				Crash data 2009-2011			
erse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	4.87							
or Int	Years	3	Severity Index	1.69							
Ű	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shou	Ilders		
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	High crash rate confirms lo	ocal concerns, mai	ny rear-e	end cras
								on the west leg			
king	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.6	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition b	ased on observati	ons	
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	unctional Clas	sification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	5250	10	9.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
			-								

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.5	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
	Project provides pedestrian connections					does not apply		
^p roject bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Pro	Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities		use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes improved shou	Iders at intersection	
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes improved shou	Iders at intersection	

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	<mark>6.7</mark> of	10
		Level of Service	D	25	15.0	1.5	eastbound left turn LOS for stop control		
	Functional Classification	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0			
		Daily Usage	5250	25	22.8	2.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	75 %	25	18.8	1.9	moderate to high traffic, key location		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	8.0	of 10
Strategic Regional Ecor	nomic Corridor Ye	<mark>s</mark> 30	30.0	3.0	US-160			
Support Regional Economic	Opportunities No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned	l econ. dev. projec	ts	
Level of Ecor	nomic Distress 100	% 20	20.0	2.0				
Povert	y (Block Group) 20.0	0%			2006-2010 ACS block gro	oup data - Comb. 3	3 block	groups
Unem	ployment (tract) 13.0	1%			2006-2010 ACS tract data	a - 1 tract		
Local Economic Competitiv	veness Factors 100	% 30	30.0	3.0	MO-160 is an important a	rterial and econor	nic link	

roj. #: 4-2 Project Name: MO-176 and US	S-160 Rockaway Turnoff Int.	Efficient Movement of Freight	Max	Ac
roject Type: Traffic Safety Total Score	54.3 out of 100	North / NTS Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Ye	s 30	1
oject Description: Improve intersection alignment	and traffic control. Could include	Widens Road No		
onstruction of a roundabout or installation of a traffic	signal if warranted. Roundabout	Improves Geometry Yes		
ould potentially reduce speeds without increasing vertices and the provided (especially east an	enicle stops and delay. Adequate	Improves Load Rating No		
e relocated and/or consolidated.		Truck Usage 265	30	1
tatus: Planning	Length: NA	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 50%	40	2
Project Scale: Small Roadwa	y or Intersection Intersection			
Functional Classification: Minor Arterial	(for the major street)	Quality of Communities	Max	Ac
vg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 10,500	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0
Daily Truck Traffic: 530	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans No		
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans No		
ject Discussion: Both roadways are two-lanes.	The northbound approach is stop	Connectivity Yes	30	3
ntrolled; however, it splits with traffic on both sides	of the island as shown on the figure	Scenic and Visual No	20	(
the right. There is also a grade differential, with th	e normbound approach traveling up			

intersection, the speed of traffic approaching the intersection should be taken into account. The posted speed on US-160 is 55 mph and the posted speed on MO-176 is 45 mph. The traffic volumes at this location appear to meet or be near meeting peak hour signal warrants.

to meet the east-west through street (US-160). In planning for improvements to this

Access to Opportunity



Total Points = 1.5 of 5

inviro	nmental Protection	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Ye	s 30	30.0	1.5	Moderate project, few stormwater issues expected	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Ye	s 30	30.0	1.5	Moderate project, no mitigation expected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Ye	s 20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75	<mark>%</mark> 20	15.0	0.8	Moderate project, few issues expected	

Local Quality of Communities Factors 50%

	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3		H	
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		Safe
oject bri	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fil	rst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes	11	oad
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fir	rst two do	not apply	widened shoulders and better ped crossing opportunities	П	or R
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	П	(Maj
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes widened shoulders at intersection	11	hes

Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5%

Cong	jestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 6.0	of 10
	l	_evel of Service	D	25	15.0	1.5	northbound left LOS for stop control (Synchro)	
	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0		
		Daily Usage	5250	25	22.8	2.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	localized congestion	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 8.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-160
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	20.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	13.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	MO-160 is an important arterial and economic link

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 15.8 of 30
oad	PDO	3	Safety Index	0.67	50	25.3	7.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	3	Crash Rate	53.45				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.81				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25				
Cras	Avg AADT	10252	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improves intersection (traffic control and safety)
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash rate not as high as some other projects

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = <mark>9.6</mark> of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	based on field observations and pictures considered good
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	
Fu	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8	
		Daily Vehicle Usage	5250	10	9.1	1.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	important intersection to maintain in good operation

Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.6	of 10
30	15.0	1.5				
			realignment of intersection			
30	10.9	1.1	MoDOT formula			
40	20.0	2.0	US-160 is an important arte	erial		
Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
30	0.0	0.0				
			no applicable local plans			
			not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
30	30.0	3.0	Connects communities nor	th of river with Bra	nson ar	еа
20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements,	, no scenic benefit	S	
20	10.0	1.0	Minimal criteria met; US-16	60 is an important f	acility in	Taney Co

Proj. #: 4-3 Project Name:	Rockaway Bead	ch and US-160 Intersection
Project Type: Traffic Safety	Total Score	69.2 out of 100
Project Description: Improve safety	/ at the intersection	on by modifying or upgrading the
traffic control, signage, and geometry	y .	
Status: Planning and Design		Length: NA
Project Scale: Small	Roadway	or Intersection Intersection
Functional Classification:	Minor Arterial	(for the major street)
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	11,000	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)
Daily Truck Traffic:	550	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)
Project Discussion: Both roadways	are two-lane roa	ds. There are no turn lanes at the

roject Discussion: Both roadways are two-lane roads. There are no turn lanes at ntersection. There was one fatal crash at the location, a head-on crash related to one vehicle passing another vehicle. MoDOT traffic counts indicate that this intersection likely does not meet the signal warrant thresholds. Turn lanes may be the best option for improving safety at this location.



Efficient	t Movement of Freight	:		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.6	of 10
	Large Veh	icle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
		Widens Road	No							
		Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection safety improve	ements		
		Improves Load Rating	No							
		Truck Usage	275	30	11.1	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movem	ent of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important a	arterial	
Juality	of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
	Local/Reg	gional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Con	sistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
	Consist	tent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Rockaway Beach/Merriam	Woods connection	to Fors	yth
		Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefit	S	
	Local Quality of	Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important t	acility in	Taney C
										_
nviron	mental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent v	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expec	ted	
	Consistent with	n Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigat	ion expected		
	Avo	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmen	tal Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	sexpected		
) of a to a								T (10 1 (20.0	
atety				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	30.0	of 30
(oac	PDO 3	PDO 3 Safety Index 1.36			50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
r	Injury 4 Crash Rate 68.02						0 1 1 0000 0011			

Efficier	nt Movement of Freigh	t		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.6	of 10
	Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
		Widens Road	No							
		Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection safety improve	ements		
		Improves Load Rating	No							
		Truck Usage	275	30	11.1	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Mover	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important	arterial	
uality	of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
	Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Co	nsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
	Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Rockaway Beach/Merriam	n Woods connectior	i to Fors	syth
		Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefit	S	
	Local Quality o	f Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important i	iacility in	Taney C
									4.0	
nviro	nmental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few storm	water issues expec	ted	
	Consistent wit	h Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigat	ion expected		
	Av	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes		20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ots		
	Local Environme	ntal Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	s expected		
				Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	30.0	of 30
afety				INIGA	/ (0000					
Safety ਸ਼	PDO 3	Safety Index	1.36	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		

fficien	t Movement	of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.6	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities P	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection safety improve	ements		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	275	30	11.1	1.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	ient Move	nent of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important a	arterial	
uality	of Commun	ities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	nsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Rockaway Beach/Merriam	Woods connection	to Fors	syth
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefit	S	
	Loca	l Quality o	f Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Minimal criteria met; US-1	60 is an important f	acility in	i Taney C
nviron	mental Prot	ection			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project few storm	water issues expec	ted	
	Con	sistent wif	h Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigat	ion expected		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ntal Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	s expected		
									1		_
afety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	30.0	of 30
p	PDO	3	Safety Index	1.36	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
0		PDO 5 Safety Index 1.30									

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 30.0 of 30
oad	PDO	3	Safety Index	1.36	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	4	Crash Rate	68.02				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	1	Accident Index	1.03				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.25				
Cras	Avg AADT	10741	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection improvements (traffic control and safety
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improves intersection near emergency responder (ambulance)
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	All criteria met; crash rate is noteworthy, head-on

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.8	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Roadway cracking			
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.8				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	5500	10	10.0	2.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	Important local intersection			

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.1	of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3				
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply			
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply			
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes		
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two do	o not apply	assumes widened shoul	ders at intersection		
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Li	nes	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	75%	50	37.5	1.9	widened shoulders bene	fit bikes/peds		

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.8	of 10
		Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	eastbound estimated peak hour LOS	
i	Functional Classification1	Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.0		
		Daily Usage	5500	25	25.0	2.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	moderate localized congestion	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.2 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-160
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	60%	20	12.0	1.2	
Poverty (Block Group)	12%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	14%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 3 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	MO-160 is an important arterial and economic link

Proj. #: 4-4 Project Name: US-160	and MO-248 Intersection	Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actua
Project Type: Traffic Safety Tota	I Score 59.1 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Par	artial Yes	30	15.0
Project Description: Improve traffic safety a	t this intersection by either reconfiguring the	Widens Road	No		
intersection to a more standard "T" intersection	on or constructing a roundabout.	Improves Geometry	Yes		
Consideration should be given to which move	ements are the major through movements.	Improves Load Rating	No		
Also sight distance is somewhat limited for ve This sight-distance issue may need to be add	enicies turning left onto MO-248 horthbound. tressed	Truck Usage	110	30	7.0
Status: Planning	Length: NA	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0
Project Scale: Small F	Roadway or Intersection Intersection				
Functional Classification: Collect	or (for the major street)	Quality of Communities		Max	Actua
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 2,700	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0
Daily Truck Traffic: 220	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans	No		
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes		
Project Discussion: There is a fire house ju	st west of the intersection on the north side	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0
of MO-160. 2010 MoDOT traffic counts on a	Il three legs. Truck count on the east leg.	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0
MUTCD intersection meets the peak hour sig	inal warrants.	Local Quality of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0
		Environmental Protection		Max	Actua
		Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0
			Vee	20	20 (

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1	.5 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes widened shoul	ders at intersection	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	S
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes widened shoul	ders at intersection	

C	ngestion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.2	of 10
	Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	estimated peak hour LOS	for left turns		
	Functional Classification1 Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8				
	Daily Usage	1350	25	1.5	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestion Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3				

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.7 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	US-160
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	13%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	7%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	MO-160 is an important arterial and economic link

Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expecte	ed	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ots		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Small project, few issues	expected		
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	20.1	of 30
oad	PDO	3	Safety Index	0.82	50	30.6	9.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	138.56				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.10							
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.63							
Cra	Avg AADT	2636	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection in	mprovements (traff	ic contro	l and safety
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	crash types vary			

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	10.7	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions V	ery Good	20	0.0	0.0	based on pictures and field	d observations, ver	y good	
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Vertical alignment directly	east of intersectior	า	
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	1350	10	0.6	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	Important local intersection	ı		

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.2 of 10
1.5	
	improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles
0.7	MoDOT formula
3.0	fire house nearby, US-160 is an important arterial

Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 7.0 of 10
3.0	
	no applicable local plans
	US 160 mentioned in SEMCOG regional plan
3.0	List communities
0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits
1.0	

Proj. #: 4-5 Project Name: Rou	nd Mountain Road Bridge	Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	A
Project Type: Quality of Commu T	otal Score 48.0 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	
Project Description: Construct and all-w	reather river crossing (bridge) as well as all	Widens Road	No		
weather approach roadways.		Improves Geometry	No		
		Improves Load Rating	No		
		Truck Usage	2	30	
Status: Construction	2019 Length: 0.1 miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway or Intersection Roadway				
Functional Classification: Loc	al (for the major street)	Quality of Communities		Max	P
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 200	(estimated, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	
Daily Truck Traffic: 4	(estimated, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans	No		
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans	No		
Project Discussion: Currently this is a lo	w water crossing only. It also is only one lane	Connectivity	Yes	30	
wide. It has very modest traffic. A full bri	dge with approach ramps would be required to	Scenic and Visual	No	20	
stay oldar of the stream and hood waters.		Local Quality of Communities Factors	25%	20	
				20	
				20	
		North / NTS Environmental Protection		Max	F
		North / NTS Environmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	20 Max 30	F
		Image: North / NTS Environmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes No	20 Max 30 30	ļ
Access to Opportunity	Max Actual Weighted	North / NTS Environmental Protection Environmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.5 of 5 Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes No Yes	Max 30 30 20)

Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply			
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	Safet	у	
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fir	rst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes	oad	PDO	(
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fir	rst two do	not apply	assumes wide shoulders	or R	Injury	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	(Maj ersec	Fatal	(
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	No existing connection; assumes wide shoulders	shes or Inte	Years	:
						o o		

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.0 of 1	10
	Le	vel of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	capacity is not a major issue	
1	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
		Daily Usage	100	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion	Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	closure causes non-recurring delay to bridge users	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.6 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	would support future development east of the bridge
Level of Economic Distress	30%	20	6.0	0.6	
Poverty (Block Group)	11%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	13%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	supports local econ dev efforts

						,	Worgintou				
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No				not a freight facility			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	Assumed to meet criteria for	or freight; not an ii	mportan	t facility
										_	
uali	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides connection to eas	st side of creek		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No scenic benefits			
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local area resi	idents		
nvire	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ed (new stormwat	ter deter	ition facilit
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and wetland in	i project area		
				V.	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
		A	oids Historical Impacts	res	20			· · · · ·			
	Local	Av Environme	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors	res 25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts - bridge c	crosses floodplain:	s and we	etland are
	Local	Av Environme	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors	res 25%	20	5.0	0.3	Possible impacts - bridge c	prosses floodplain	s and we	etland are
<mark>afet</mark> y	Local	A	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors	Yes 25%	20 20 <u>Max</u>	5.0 Actual	0.3 Weighted	Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30%	prosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
afety	Local / PDO	Av Environme	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index	25%	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula)	orosses floodplain Total Points =	s and we	of 30
afety action) action	Local / PDO Injury	Av Environme 0 1	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate	11.54	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	prosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
tersection)	Local / PDO Injury Fatal	Av Environme 0 1 0	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	11.54 25%	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	prosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years	Environme 0 1 0 3	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	trosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No	20 20 Max 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	trosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Ax Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes	20 20 Max 50 5 5	5.0 Actual 50.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-	rosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Ax Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No	20 20 Max 50 50 5 5 5 5	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	trosses floodplain: Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 50 50 5 5 5 5 5 35	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	trosses floodplain: Total Points = water bridge her than safety	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Koad or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 50 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 35	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-weight project driven by factors of	water bridge	s and we	of 30
Orasnes (major Koad or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 3 200	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 50 50 5 5 5 35 35	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 0.0 8.8 Actual	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors of Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30 of 20
or Intersection) (1)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadw	roids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% Poor	20 20 50 50 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 Max 20	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 Actual 15.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 2.6 Weighted 3.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-v project driven by factors of Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30 of 20
or Intersection) (1)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 3 200 System Roadw	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% Poor Yes	20 20 50 51 5 5 5 35 35 35 35 20 20	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 0.0 8.8 4.0 15.0 15.0 20.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors of Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge	water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 3 200 System Roadw andard Roa sification2	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors antal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors av or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% Poor Yes 20%	20 20 50 50 5 5 35 35 35 35 20 20 20 10	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 0.0 8.8 4.0 15.0 20.0 2.0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 0.0 2.6 0.0 2.6 0.0 2.6 0.0 2.6	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-v project driven by factors of Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge	water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Koad urive or Intersection)	Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	Ave Environme 0 1 0 3 200 3 200 System Roadwa andard Roa sification2	voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors dway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local Daily Vehicle Usage	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% Question Yes 20% 100	20 20 50 50 5 5 35 35 35 35 35 20 20 20 10 10	5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 0.0 8.8 4.0 15.0 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0	0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 4.0 4.0 0.4	Possible impacts - bridge of Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors of Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge (Modified MoDOT formula)	water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30

		-						U U			
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	No				not a freight facility			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	2	30	0.9	0.1	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effici	ient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	Assumed to meet criteria for	o <mark>r freight</mark> ; not an ir	mportan	facility
Qualit	y of Commun	ities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG r	regional plan		
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	provides connection to eas	t side of creek		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	No scenic benefits			
	Loca	l Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	beneficial to local area resi	dents		
Enviro	onmental Prot	ection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
	C	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitigate	ed (new stormwat	er deter	tion facili
	Con	sistent wit	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Floodplains and wetland in	project area		
					00	20.0	4.0	No known bistoriaal immost	0		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historicai impact	5		
	Local E	Av Environme	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors	Yes 25%	20 20	20.0 5.0	1.0 0.3	Possible impacts - bridge c	s rosses floodplains	s and we	tland are
	Local E	Av Environme	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors	Yes 25%	20 20	20.0 5.0	1.0 0.3	Possible impacts - bridge c	s rosses floodplains	s and we	etland are
Safety	Local E	Av Environme	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors	Yes 25%	20 20 <u>Max</u>	5.0 Actual	1.0 0.3 Weighted	Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30%	rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Safety	Local E / PDO	Av Environme	oids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index	Yes 25% 11.54	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula)	rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
ijor Road <mark>StajeS</mark> ction)	Local E / PDO Injury	Av Environme 0 1	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 5.0 Actual 50.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
. (Major Road <mark>GajeS</mark> ersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal	Av Environme 0 1 0	roids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	5.0 Actual 50.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
shes (Major Road <mark>Sajes</mark> or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years	Av Environme 0 1 0 3	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	s rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road contension)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No	20 20 <u>Max</u> 50	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project	rosses floodplains	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Crashes or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes	20 20 Max 50 5 5	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-weight	rosses floodplains Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes) or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 3.50 No Yes No	20 20 Max 50 50 5 5 5 5	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0	Wo known historical impact Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w	rosses floodplains Total Points = water bridge	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road PS or Intersection) (1)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	antal Protection Factors antal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 35	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-weight project driven by factors off	rosses floodplains Total Points = water bridge ner than safety	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Cashes (Major Road Cashes) or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	oids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 5 35	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-weight factors off	rosses floodplains Total Points = water bridge ner than safety	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200	roids Historical Impacts Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35 35	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors oth Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Crashes) or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadwa	antal Protection Factors Intal Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 Max 20	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 8.8 Actual 15.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0	No known historical impact Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors off Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadwa	anital Protection Factors Inital Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Conditions	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% 25%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 8.8 Actual 15.0 20.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors oth Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we 19.1 11.4	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road contexpection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the S Substar	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadwa ndard Roa	antal Protection Factors Initial Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Severity Index Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes 25% 20%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 20 20 20 10	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 0.0 8.8 4 ctual 15.0 20.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 0 4	No known historical impact Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors oth Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge	rosses floodplains Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road Safet) or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadwa ification2	anital Protection Factors Inital Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes No 25% 25% Yes 20%	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 35 20 20 20 10	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 0.0 8.8 15.0 20.0 2.0 0.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 0.4	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors off Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge	Total Points = water bridge ner than safety Total Points =	s and we	of 30
Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	Local E PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the S Substar	Av Environme 0 1 0 3 200 System Roadwa ndard Roa ification2	anital Protection Factors Inital Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	Yes 25% 11.54 4566.21 26.09 3.50 No Yes 20% 20% 100	20 20 Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35 35 35 35 20 20 20 10 10	20.0 5.0 Actual 50.0 0.0 5.0 0.0 8.8 0.0 8.8 15.0 20.0 2.0 0.0	1.0 0.3 Weighted 15.0 0.0 1.5 0.0 2.6 Weighted 3.0 4.0 0.4 0.4	No known historical impact Possible impacts - bridge c Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 no main reason for project New two-lane bridge high-w project driven by factors off Weight Factor = 20% gravel road sections one lane low water bridge (Modified MoDOT formula)	Total Points = water bridge her than safety Total Points =	s and we 19.1 11.4	of 30 of 20

Data Check1 OK

Data Check2 OK

Proj. #: 5-1 Project Name: MO-248 an	d Buchanan Rd Intersection		Efficient Movement of Freight
Project Type: Traffic Safety Total S	core 47.1 out of 100	North / NTS	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Part
roject Description: Intersection improvement	including potential northbound right		Widens Road
urn lane, signage and striping modifications, tra	ffic signal, and advance warning signs.		Improves Geometry
Other improvements such as a southbound left t	urn lane could also be considered.		Improves Load Rating
			Truck Usage
Status: Planning	Length: NA		Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors
Project Scale: Small Roa	dway or Intersection Intersection		
Functional Classification: Collector	(for the major street)		Quality of Communities
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 5300	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Local/Regional Land Use Plans
Daily Truck Traffic: 110	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Consistent with Local Plans
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)		Consistent with Regional Plans
Project Discussion: MO-248 and Buchanan an	e two-lane roads without turn lanes.		Connectivity

Buchanan is stop controlled and approaches MO-248 on an upgrade. The posted speed limit on MO-248 is 45 mph, leading to a design sight distance of 500 feet. Initial measurements indicate that there is insufficient sight distance for drivers on Buchanan looking to the south due to vertical and horizontal alignment issues (see photo). The intersection does not meet signal warrants based on the available sample count data. More detailed traffic data will be required to evaluate the need for a signal at this location, and to evaluate the need for left and right turn lanes.



fficie	nt Movemen	t of Freig	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will I	better serve trucks	and sch	ool buses
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though tru	uck vols	appear lo
uality	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefit	S	
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	Important for school traffic			
nviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
afety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	19.2	of 30
080	PDO	7	Safety Index	0.50	50	18.9	5.7	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
ction	Injury	2	Crash Rate	94.16				Crash data 2009-2013			
erse(Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.43							
or Inte	Years	5	Severity Index	1.56							
Cas	Avg AADT	5237	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improvements should add	ress key safety issi	les	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10,5	substantial community con	ncern, not a large n	umber o	of crashe
					•••			oubecandar er inny		dirit di la constante di la consta	1 010.211
akina	Care of the	Svetem			Max	Actual	Weighted	Maight Eactor = 20%	Total Points =	12 1	of 20
aniiiu		System			IVIAX	Actual	weighteu	Weight Factor - 2070	Total Follits -	12.1	01 20

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.8	of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, ADA	A pedestrian provisions a	ssumed
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, ped	estrians have safe crossi	ng option
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	nuttle or Jefferson Lines	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Signalization would bene	efit bikes/peds as well	

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
	l	_evel of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	estimated LOS from sam	ple count (more a	nalysis	needed)
1	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8				
		Daily Usage	2650	25	5.8	0.6	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)		
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	congestion during peak s	chool traffic hours	an issu	le

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	9%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	not a major economic dev project

<mark>nt Movemen</mark>	<mark>t of Freig</mark> l	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.0	of 10
	Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
		Widens Road	No							
		Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will b	better serve trucks	and sch	ool buses
		Improves Load Rating	No							
		Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
Local Effic	<mark>cient Move</mark> r	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though tru	uck vols	appear low
/ of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.5	of 10
	Local/Re	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Co	insistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
	Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	, no scenic benefits	S	
Loc	al Quality c	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	Important for school traffic			
nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
(Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
Cor	nsistent wit	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
	Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
Local	Environme	Intal Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	19.2	of 30
PDO	7	Safety Index	0.50	50	18.9	5.7	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
Injury	2	Crash Rate	94.16				Crash data 2009-2013			
Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.43							
Years	5	Severity Index	1.56							
Avg AADT	5237	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
		Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improvements should addr	ress key safety issu	Jes	
			No	5	0.0	0.0				
		Emergency Response								
		Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	substantial community con	icern, not a large n	umber o	f crashes
		Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	substantial community con	icern, not a large n	umber c	of crashes
	nt Movemen Local Effic y of Commun Loca Domental Pro Con Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	nt Movement of Freigh Large Ve Local Efficient Mover y of Communities Local/Re Consist Consist Local Quality of Consistent Consistent Consistent will Av Local Environme PDO 7 Injury 2 Fatal 0 Years 5 Avg AADT 5237	nt Movement of Freight Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities P Widens Road Improves Geometry Improves Load Rating Truck Usage Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Stormwater Goals Local Environmental Protection Factors PDO 7 Safety Index Years 5 Avo ADT 5237 Safety Concern	nt Movement of Freight Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes Improves Load Rating No Truck Usage 55 Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% y of Communities No Consistent with Local Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes Avoids Historical Impacts Yes Local Environmental Protection Yes PDO 7 Safety Index 0.50 Injury 2 Crash Rate 94.16 Fatal 0 Accident Index 1.43 Years 5 Severity Index 1.56 Avg AADT 5237 Safety Concern Yes	nt Movement of Freight Max Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes Improves Load Rating No No 7 Improves Load Rating No 7 7 7 Yof Communities Max Max 30 30 Y of Communities Max No 30 30 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 30 Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 30 Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 20 Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 Inmmental Protection Max Max Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 Avoids Historical Impacts Yes 20 Local Environmental Protection Factors 50% 20 Voids Historical Impacts Yes 30 PDO 7 Safety Index 0.50 50 Injury 2 C	Max Actual Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes Improves Load Rating No 10.0 Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 y of Communities Max Actual Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 mmental Protection Max Actual Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 30.0 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 30.0 Local Environmental Protection Factors 50% 20 10.0 Years 5 Actual Actu	nt Movement of Freight Max Actual Weighted Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes Yes Improves Load Rating No Improves Load Rating No Truck Usage 55 30 5.0 0.5 Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 1.5 ormental Protection Max Actual Weighted Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0 1.5 onsistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 30.0 1.5 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 20 10.0 0.5	nt Movement of Freight Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will I Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will I intersection upgrades will I Improves Load Rating No 5.5 30 5.0 0.5 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freig y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 Consistent with Regional Plans No not mentioned in SMCOG not mentioned in SMCOG Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 1.5 Important for school traffic onmental Protection Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5% 20 10.0 No known historical impact onsistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 30.0 <td>It Movement of Freight Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will better serve trucks Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will better serve trucks Improves Coed Rating No Truck Usage 55 30 5.0 0.5 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck Usage y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no applicable local plans Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefit Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 1.5 Important for school traffic nmental Protection Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0<!--</td--><td>It Movement of Freight Max Actual Weight Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.0 Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Load Rating No 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck vols y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no applicable local plans not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits</td></td>	It Movement of Freight Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will better serve trucks Widens Road No Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will better serve trucks Improves Coed Rating No Truck Usage 55 30 5.0 0.5 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck Usage y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no applicable local plans Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefit Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 1.5 Important for school traffic nmental Protection Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0 </td <td>It Movement of Freight Max Actual Weight Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.0 Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Load Rating No 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck vols y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no applicable local plans not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits</td>	It Movement of Freight Max Actual Weight Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.0 Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes 30 15.0 1.5 intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Geometry Yes intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and sch Improves Load Rating No 10.0 1.0 MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck vols y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 y of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no applicable local plans not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits Local Quality of Communities Factors 75% 20 15.0 Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.1	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	roadway assumed to be in	good condition		
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sight distance issue			
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	2.3	0.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	Important local intersection	n to have function	well	

Proj. #:	5-2	Project Name:	MO-248 and Bra	anson Hil	ls Pkwy Int	ersection
Project	Туре:	Geometric/Safety	Total Score	64.8	out of 100)
Project I	Descrij	otion: Intersection in	nprovements inclu	iding a po	tential traffic	o signal,
southbou	und left	turn lane, and advar	nce warning signs			
Status:	Plann	ing		Length:	NA	
Status: Project \$	Plann Scale:	ing Medium	Roadway	Length: or Inters	NA section Inte	ersection
Status: Project \$	Plann Scale: Functio	ing Medium onal Classification:	Roadway Collector	Length: or Inters (for the r	NA section Intentionality (NA)	ersection
Status: Project \$ Avg. An	Plann Scale: Functionnual D	ing Medium onal Classification: aily Traffic (AADT):	Roadway Collector 6600	Length: or Inters (for the r (estimate	NA section Inte major street) ed, avg. for i	ersection major street)
Status: Project S Avg. An	Plann Scale: Functio nual D	ing Medium onal Classification: aily Traffic (AADT): Daily Truck Traffic:	Roadway Collector 6600 130	Length: or Inters (for the r (estimate (estimate	NA section Internajor street) ed, avg. for n ed, avg. for n	ersection major street) major street)

Project Discussion: MO-248 is a two-lane, 45 mph highway without turn lanes. Branson Hills Parkway is a four lane divided roadway with stop control at MO-248. Based on the sample counts it appears that the intersection may meet the peak hour traffic signal warrants. The relatively high side-street volume contributes to this. The number and type of crashes, posted speed, and line of sight issues (to the north especially) support at least a turn lane if not signal installation. A roundabout could also be considered in the location.



fficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will be	etter serve trucks		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	65	30	5.4	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Branson Hills Parkway is a j	potential commer	cial route	•
ualit	y of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				Branson Rec-plex is mentio	ned in Branson C	ommuni	ty Plan 203
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG re	egional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Opportunity for building on I	Branson Hills Parl	kway lan	dscaping
	Loc	cal Quality c	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	proximity to Branson Rec-pl	lex, high school tr	affic use	s intersectio
nviro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues expe	ected		
	Co	onsistent wit	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	mitigation possible, mines c	ould be an issue		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	3		
	Loca	l Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	few issues expected, but mi	ines and topograp	hy are is	ssues
										00 F	
atety				4 70	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
n)	PDO	11	Safety Index	1.79	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ectio	Injury	5	Crash Rate	240.91				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (m	Fatal	1	Accident Index	3.66							
or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.21							
5	Avg AADT	6444	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lead	ders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Improvements should addre	ess key safety issu	les	
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0				
			Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	No 100%	5 35	0.0 35.0	0.0 10.5	17 crashes in 3 years, main	ly angle and rear-	end	

Efficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will I	better serve trucks		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	65	30	5.4	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Branson Hills Parkway is a	a potential commer	cial route	e
										0.5	
Quality	/ of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				Branson Rec-plex is menti	oned in Branson C	ommuni	ity Plan 203(
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No	~ ~			not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Opportunity for building on	Branson Hills Par	kway lan	ndscaping
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	proximity to Branson Rec-	plex, high school tr	affic use	es intersectio
										0.0	_
		the shi s is									
<mark>Enviro</mark>	nmental Pro	tection		M	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
<mark>Enviro</mark>	nmental Pro	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	Max 30	Actual 30.0	Weighted 1.5	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection Consistent nsistent wit	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals	Yes No	Max 30 30	Actual 30.0 0.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
Enviro	nmental Pro Cor	ntection Consistent nsistent wir Av	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts	Yes No Yes	Max 30 30 20	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact	Total Points = pected could be an issue ts	3.3	of 5
E <mark>nviro</mark>	nmental Pro Cor Local	otection Consistent nsistent wir Av Environme	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors	Yes No Yes 75%	Max 30 30 20 20	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but n	Total Points = pected could be an issue ts nines and topograp	3.3 bhy are i	of 5
Enviro Safety	nmental Pro Cor Local	tection Consistent nsistent wi Saturn Environme	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors	Yes No Yes 75%	Max 30 30 20 20 Max	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points = pected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =	3.3 ohy are i: 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Enviro Safety ਨੂ	nmental Pro Cor Local	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index	Yes No Yes 75%	Max 30 30 20 20 20 50	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but n Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula)	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =	3.3 bhy are is 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Enviro Safety (uoj	nmental Pro Cor Local PDO Injury	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme 11 5	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91	Max 30 20 20 20 50	Actual 30.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =	3.3 bhy are is 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Major Road Section)	nmental Pro Cor Local PDO Injury Fatal	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme 11 5 1	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66	Max 30 20 20 50	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =	3.3 hy are i 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
nes (Major Road Safety Intersection) Safety	nmental Pro Cor Local PDO Injury Fatal Years	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme 11 5 1 3	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66 2.21	Max 30 20 20 Max 50	Actual 30.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but n Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =	3.3 bhy are i: 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Crashes (Major Road <mark>ouived solution) outvoid solution (Major Road solution) or Intersection) of the solution </mark>	nmental Pro Cor Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	tection Consistent Insistent with Environme 11 5 1 3 6444	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66 2.21 Yes	Max 30 20 20 Max 50	Actual 30.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0 1.5	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =)	3.3 bhy are ia 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Crashes (Major Road Section) or Intersection)	nmental Pro Cor Local PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme 11 5 1 3 6444	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66 2.21 Yes Yes	Max 30 20 20 Max 50 50	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0 5.0 5.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0 1.5 1.5	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =) aders ress key safety issue	3.3 ohy are in 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Crashes (Major Road BS or Intersection) Apple	nmental Pro	tection Consistent nsistent wi Av Environme 11 5 1 3 6444	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66 2.21 Yes Yes	Max 30 20 20 Max 50 50 5 5	Actual 30.0 0.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0 5.0 5.0 0.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0 1.5 1.5 0.0	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =) aders ress key safety issue	3.3 ohy are is 28.5	of 5 ssues of 30
Crashes (Major Road crashe	nmental Pro	tection Consistent Insistent wir Av Environme 11 5 1 3 6444	with Stormwater Goals th Environmental Goals voids Historical Impacts ental Protection Factors Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes No Yes 75% 1.79 240.91 3.66 2.21 Yes Yes No 100%	Max 30 20 20 Max 50 50 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 30.0 20.0 15.0 Actual 50.0 5.0 5.0 0.0 35.0	Weighted 1.5 0.0 1.0 0.8 Weighted 15.0 1.5 1.5 0.0 10 5	Weight Factor = 5% few stormwater issues exp mitigation possible, mines No known historical impact few issues expected, but m Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lead Improvements should addr 17 crashes in 3 years mail	Total Points = bected could be an issue ts nines and topograp Total Points =) aders ress key safety issu	3.3 ohy are i 28.5 ues	of 5 ssues of 30

Efficie	n <mark>t Movemen</mark>	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will b	petter serve trucks		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	65	30	5.4	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Branson Hills Parkway is a	potential commer	cial route	•
Quality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				Branson Rec-plex is mention	oned in Branson C	ommuni	ty Plan 203(∎
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Opportunity for building on	Branson Hills Par	kway lan	dscaping
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	proximity to Branson Rec-p	olex, high school tr	affic use	s intersectio
										0.0	
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
	1	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues exp	ected		
	Coi	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	mitigation possible, mines	could be an issue		
		A\	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	few issues expected, but m	nines and topograp	hy are is	ssues
Safety					Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
pe	PDO	11	Safety Index	1 79	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			••••
- Roi	Iniury	5	Crash Rate	240.91		00.0	10.0	Crash data 2009-2011			
Major	Fatal	1	Accident Index	3 66							
ies (1	Years	3	Severity Index	2 21							
krash or		6444	Safety Concern	Ves	5	50	15	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
0	ANG ADT	VTTT	Safety Enhancemente	Vec	5	5.0	1.5	Improvements should addr	ace kay safaty ion	100	
				Ne	F	0.0	0.0	improvements should addi	000 100 001019 1881	100	
				1000/	5	0.0	0.0	17 encelhos in Oursers	nhu analaluc	a va d	
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	Tr crasnes in 3 years, mail	nly angle and rear-	ena	

Efficie	<mark>nt Movemer</mark>	nt of Freig	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection upgrades will b	better serve trucks		
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	65	30	5.4	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Branson Hills Parkway is a	potential commer	cial route	Э
Quality	e of Commu								Tatal Dainta -	2 5	- 5 40
Qualit	y of Commu	niues		N	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	NO	30	0.0	0.0				1 DL 000
		Consi	onsistent with Local Plans	NO				Branson Rec-plex is mentio	oned in Branson C	ommuni	ty Plan 203
		Consi	Stent with Regional Plans	No	20	0.0	0.0	not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	NO	30	0.0	0.0	One entropit of an booth dia a sec	Desease Lills Dev		de e en la e
			Scenic and visual	res	20	20.0	2.0	Opportunity for building on	Branson Hills Par	kway lan	ascaping
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	proximity to Branson Rec-p	olex, high school tr	affic use	s intersection
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues exp	ected		-
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	mitigation possible, mines	could be an issue		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	S		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	few issues expected, but m	nines and topograp	hy are is	ssues
											_
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	28.5	of 30
()	PDO	11	Safety Index	1.79	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ijor F	Injury	5	Crash Rate	240.91				Crash data 2009-2011			
(M	Fatal	1	Accident Index	3.66							
shes (M	Fatal Years	1 3	Accident Index Severity Index	3.66 2.21							
Crashes (M. or Interse	Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 6444	Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	3.66 2.21 Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
Crashes (M. or Interse	Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 6444	Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	3.66 2.21 Yes Yes	5 5	5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5	Concern raised by local lea Improvements should addr	aders ess key safety issi	Jes	
Crashes (M. or Interse	Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 6444	Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	3.66 2.21 Yes Yes No	5 5 5	5.0 5.0 0.0	1.5 1.5 0.0	Concern raised by local lea Improvements should addr	aders ess key safety issi	Jes	
Crashes (M. or Interse	Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 6444	Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	3.66 2.21 Yes Yes No 100%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 0.0 35.0	1.5 1.5 0.0 10.5	Concern raised by local lea Improvements should addr 17 crashes in 3 years, main	aders ess key safety issi nly angle and rear	ues ∙end	

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	14.8	of 20
	Roadway	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Roadway in fair condition				
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature		Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sight distance issues			
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	3300	10	1.1	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	Important roadway and inte	rsection to maintain	high fun	octionality

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	1.8 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations Yes		use if fi	irst two de	o not apply	if signal is installed, ADA	v pedestrian provisio	ns assumed
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, pede	estrians have safe c	rossing option
Transit		25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Li	nes
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Signalization would bene	efit bikes/peds as we	ell

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.9	of 10
		Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak hour LOS for westbound left turn	
	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8		
		Daily Usage	3300	25	2.7	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestio	75%	25	18.8	1.9	peak hour congestion is an issue		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Branson Hills Parkway provides key development access
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	9%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	beneficial to make Branson Hills Parkway function better

Proj. #: 5-3 Project Name:	MO-248 and Fly	nn Road	Intersection	
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	43.4	out of 100	-
Project Description: Intersection s acceleration lane and a northbound are also proposed.	afety improvemen right turn lane. S	ts includii ignage ar	ng a northbound nd striping improvements	- COSAL
Status: Planning		Length:	NA	
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	/ or Inters	ection Intersection	
Functional Classification	Collector	(for the n	najor street)	
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	13000	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)	
Daily Truck Traffic	260	(estimate	ed, avg. for major street)	Lea là
Through Lanes	2	(through	lanes on major street)	- An a
Project Discussion: Both roads ar on MO-248 is 45 mph. There is a c sight distance to the north for both I design value is 500 ft. Grade adjus distance. Southbound advance wa	e 2-lane roads wit riveway across fro Flynn Road and th tments may be ne ching signage may	hout turn om Flynn e drivewa cessary to y be warra	lanes. The posted speed Road. There is limited y. The sight distance p improve the sight nted. Sample counts	North

indicate that the intersection may be near or even meet the peak hour traffic signal warrants. The volume of traffic as well as the number of rear-end crashes on MO-165

indicates that turn lanes may be warranted.

fficient Movement of F	reight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.3	of 10
Larg	ge Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	130	30	7.6	0.8	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient I	Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
ality of Communities							Total Dainta a	15	
laity of Communities			Max	Actual	Weighted	weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.9	of 10
Lo	cal/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Consistent with Local Plans No						not mentioned in Branson		030	
(Consistent with Regional Plans No					not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	NO	30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefit	S	
Local Qua	ality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	important to residents that	t use this for access	and cir	culatior
vironmental Protectio	on		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
Consi	stent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expecte	d	-
Consiste	nt with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts			
Local Environmental Protection Factors 50%				10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues	expected		
fety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	10.9	of 30
PDO 7	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		-

Efficien	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.3	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	130	30	7.6	0.8	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
Quality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans No					not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 20	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans No					not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	S	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	important to residents that	use this for access	and cir	culatio
Enviror	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 50%		20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
Safety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	10.9	of 30
ad	PDO 7 Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		

Efficien	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.3	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	130	30	7.6	0.8	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route			
Quality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans No					not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 20	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans No					not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	3	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	important to residents that	use this for access	and cir	culation
nviror	mental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts		20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ets		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 50%		20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
Safety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	10.9	of 30
ad	PDO 7 Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 10.9 of 30
oad	PDO	7	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	50.36				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.76				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	12694	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	intersection improvements could address safety issues
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	most crashes are rear-ends on MO-165

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points =	15.4	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions		Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway assumed to be in fair condition		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature unctional Classification2 Collector		Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sight distance and turn lane issues		
F			30%	10	3.0	0.6			
	Daily Vehicle Usage		6500	10	4.2	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	important design / safety improvements		

Access to Opportunity			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.1 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (A	ADA) 20)%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connect	tions N	lo				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections		lo				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regula	tions N	lo	use if fiı	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian faci	ilities Y	es	use if fiı	rst two do	o not apply	assumes widened shoul	ders at intersection	
Tra	ansit N	lo	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lin	es
Local Access to Opportunity Fac	tors 7	5%	50	37.5	1.9	Proximity to existing bus	inesses & residents I	oikes/peds

15

Congestion	Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.7	of 10
	Level of Service			25	20.0	2.0	estimated peak hour LOS for westbound left turns	
Functi	onal Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8		
	Daily Usage Local Congestion Relief Factors			25	10.6	1.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
				25	18.8	1.9	congestion appears to be a peak period issue	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	9%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	0%	30	0.0	0.0	not an economic dev related project

Proj. #: 5-4 Project Name:	MO-248 and Bu	iena Vista Intersection				
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	38.9 out of 100				
Project Description: Proposed inter other safety measures. A main cond Road. Also a right-turn lane into Bue advance signage/striping would be r lane may be warranted in accordance	rsection improven pern is sight distar ena Vista Road h eviewed. Sample pe with the MoDO	ments include signage, striping, an nce for turns from Buena Vista as been proposed. Intersection ar counts indicate that a right-turn T Access Management Guideline				
Status: Planning		Length: NA				
Project Scale: Small	Roadway	y or Intersection Intersection				
Functional Classification:	Collector	(for the major street)				
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	10100	(estimated, avg. for major street)				
Daily Truck Traffic:	200	(estimated, avg. for major street)				
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)				

Project Discussion: MO-248 is a 2-iane road without turn lanes. Buena Vista Rd is a 3lane road with left and right turn lanes at MO-248. Traffic on MO-248 appears to be approx. 10,000 ADT; Buena Vista traffic varies seasonally (serves a campground). One observation had very low volumes, another an est. ADT of 2,000. The 45 mph posted speed on MO-248 relates to a 500 ft sight distance. From Buena Vista looking south this should be available if the foliage is trimmed. To the north, the upgrade on Buena Vista and the sag vertical curve on MO-248 make the lines of sight more difficult. More precise measurements are needed. Grade work could improve the sight lines to the north.



Efficient N	lovement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points = 5.2	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities P	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
	Widens Road	No						
	Improves Geometry	Yes				right turn lane could improv	ve truck turns from MO-248	
	Improves Load Rating	No						
	Truck Usage	100	30	6.7	0.7	MoDOT formula		
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	Quarry, Mountain Complex	< & campground	

Quality	<i>r</i> of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10	
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0	0.0					
	Consistent with Local Plans No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 2	030		
	Consistent with Regional Plans No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan			
	Connectivity No	30	0.0	0.0					
	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0	0.0	intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	3		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 25%	20	5.0	0.5	not a major community ori	ented project			

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwater issues expected	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation expected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues expected	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 10.6 of 30
oad	PDO	6	Safety Index	0.21	50	7.8	2.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	64.82				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.98				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.36				
Cras	Avg AADT	9862	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	intersection improvements will improve safety
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	crash types vary, not clear that project can address them directly
0	AVg AAD I	9862	Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes Yes No 50%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements will improve safety crash types vary, not clear that project can address them direct

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Tota	l Points =	8.3	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway considered to be in fair of	condition		
	Substandard Roady	vay or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	nctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	5050	10	8.4	1.7	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	4.0	prudent safety improvements			

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.0 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson L	ines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	0%	50	0.0	0.0	no pedestrian/bike eleme	ents to project	

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.6 of 10	1
		Level of Service	D	25	15.0	1.5	estimated peak hour LOS for left turn out of Buena Vista	1
	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8		
		Daily Usage	5050	25	21.1	2.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	project will improve safe & efficient traffic flow	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.3 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Quarry, campground & potential developments to west
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	9%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	2.3	MO-248 is an important roadway, quarry adjacent

Proj. #: 5-5 Project Name: Bee C	eek Road and Rinehart Road		Efficient Movement of Freight
Project Type: Capacity Tot	al Score 35.2 out of 100	North / NTS	Large Vehicle Friend
Project Description: Improve intersection b	y adding at least a northbound right-turn	possible sight	v v
ane and appropriate traffic control (signing	and striping).	distance	Improve
		Issues	Improves
			Т
Status: Planning	Length: NA		Local Efficient Movement of Frei
Project Scale: Small	Roadway or Intersection Intersection	Proposed	
Functional Classification: Local	(for the major street)	right turn	Quality of Communities
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 4900	(estimated, avg. for major street)	lane.	Local/Regional Lan
Daily Truck Traffic: 50	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Consistent with
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)		Consistent with Re
Project Discussion: Roads are two-lane ro	ads with no turn lanes. Rinehart Road is		

oject discussion: Roads are tw stop controlled. A church driveway is nearly aligned with Rinehart. The intersection angle makes turns between the south and east legs more difficult. Major traffic flows appear to be between these legs. Posted speed on Bee Creek Road is 35 mph. There are possible sight distance issues to/from the north. At 35 mph the sight distance requirement is 390 ft (from a point 14.5 ft back from the travelway), which may not be met. County Health Dept is located on the SE corner. Traffic volumes are predicted to increase due to development. Right turn lane would promote safe turns onto Rinehart Rd.



fficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.8	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Part	ial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
Widens Road	No							
Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lane to be added			
Improves Load Rating	No							
Truck Usage	25	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 75%			30.0	3.0	will benefit trucks turning of	onto Rinehart Road		
uality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Consistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 20)30	
Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	does not connect any maj	or communities		
Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	\$	
Local Quality of Communities Factors 2	25%	20	5.0	0.5	benefits local residents an	d businesses		
nvironmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expecte	d	
Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ets		
Local Environmental Protection Factors 5	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		

fficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.8	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
Widens Road	No							
Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lane to be added			
Improves Load Rating	No							
Truck Usage	25	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	will benefit trucks turning of	onto Rinehart Road		
uality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Consistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 20	030	
Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	does not connect any maj	or communities		
Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	3	
Local Quality of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	benefits local residents an	d businesses		
-								
nvironmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expecte	d	
Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ets		
Local Environmental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project few issues	expected		

								4.0	
Efficie	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.8	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partia	l Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road No	0							
	Improves Geometry Ye	S				turn lane to be added			
	Improves Load Rating	0							
	Truck Usage 25	5	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 75	%	40	30.0	3.0	will benefit trucks turning of	onto Rinehart Road		
Qualit	y of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	0	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	0				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 20	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	0				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity No	0	30	0.0	0.0	does not connect any maj	or communities		
	Scenic and Visual	0	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	s, no scenic benefits	6	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 25	%	20	5.0	0.5	benefits local residents an	d businesses		
Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Ye	s	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expecte	d	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Ye	S	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
	Avoids Historical Impacts Ye	S	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 50	%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
						1, 2, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1,			

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 8.3 of 30
oad	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	38.18				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.58				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	4784	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	will promote safety for turning vehicles
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	no substantial effect on emergency response
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	relatively few crashes, not a high ranking safety problem

Takin	g Care of the System		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 6.8 of 20)
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions	Very Good	20	0.0	0.0	roadway appears to be in very good condition.	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	project as scoped will not address sight distance issue	
F	unctional Classification2	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
	Daily Vehicle Usage	2450	10	2.0	0.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	important local intersection / route to business park	

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 0.0 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0	
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks, bike lanes, or widened shoulders
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	0%	50	0.0	0.0	turn lane will not affect ped/bike activity

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Pe	oints = 3.9	of 10
		Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak hour LOS for west	oound left turns	5
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5			
		Daily Usage	2450	25	5.0	0.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	75%	25	18.8	1.9	turn lane will promote smooth traffi	c flow	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 6.4 o	of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0		
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	will benefit nearby industrial development	
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	1.4		
Poverty (Block Group)	18%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group	
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract	
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	important route for businesses on Rinehart Road	

Proj. #: 5-6 Project Name:	MO-248 and Em	ory Creek Blvd			A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OF THE		CHILDREN I
Project Type: Traffic Safety	Total Score	39.2 out of 1	00	5	No. Contraction	North /	NTS
Project Description: Intersection in modifications, traffic control modifica and/or other modifications to improve	nprovements inclu tions, roadway re e sight distance.	iding potential sign -grading, advance	age and striping warning signs,				
Status: Planning		Length: NA		M. Ste			100
Project Scale: Small	Roadway	or Intersection	ntersection	- 945	10 0000	~ >	
Functional Classification:	Collector	(for the major stre	et)	Constant of the	Star and	12 122 -	
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	2400	(estimated, avg. fo	or major street)	the set of	The Contraction	IN States	
Daily Truck Traffic:	230	(estimated, avg. fo	or major street)	1 Liter		L	Carlos and
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on	major street)				2. A.
Project Discussion: MO-248 and E is stop controlled. There is a northb have complained about safety at the	mory Creek Blvd ound right-turn la intersection. On	are two-lane roads ne at the intersection e potential issue is	s. Emory Creek on. Residents the sight				

istance for drivers on Emory Creek looking to the south, due to vertical and horizontal alignment issues (see photo). More detailed traffic analysis may be required to evaluate the safety concerns, possible signage/traffic control changes, roadway re-grading needs, and the need for a southbound left-turn lane. 2009 to 2011 crash data showed two single vehicle crashes (no multi-vehicle crashes) on MO-248 near intersection.

.



											-
fficie	<mark>nt Moveme</mark> r	<mark>nt of Freig</mark> l	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.2	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improvements would bette	r serve trucks and	school ł	ouses
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	115	30	7.2	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though tru	uck vols	appear lo
Quality	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Scenic and Visual		No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	, no scenic benefit	S	
	Loc	al Quality c	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important for local users			
nviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
		Av	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	l Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.7	of 30
(PDO	2	Safety Index	0.07	50	2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
or Ho	Injury	0	Crash Rate	77.94				Crash data 2009-2011			
Majo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.18							
r Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
Cras	Avg AADT	2343	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local re	sidents and leaders	S	
-			,		_						

Efficie [®]	<mark>nt Movemen</mark>	i <mark>t of Freig</mark> r	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.2	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities P	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	Νο							1
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improvements would better	r serve trucks and ϵ	school ł	buses
			Improves Load Rating	Νο							
			Truck Usage	115	30	7.2	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though tru	uck vols	appear low)
Quality	<mark>y of Commu</mark> r	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Cc	onsistent with Local Plans	Νο				no applicable local plans			1
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	Νο				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	, no scenic benefits	5	
	Loc	al Quality (of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important for local users			
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	(Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	xpected		
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.7	of 30
pad	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.07	50	2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
or Ro	Injury	0	Crash Rate	77.94				Crash data 2009-2011			
Majo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.18							
nes (Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
Crast	Ava AADT	2343	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local re	sidents and leader	s	
			1								

Efficie	<mark>nt Movemen</mark>	<mark>t of Freig</mark> ł	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.2	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities Pa	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improvements would better	r serve trucks and ؛	school	suses
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	115	30	7.2	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though tru	ick vols	appear low
Quality	<mark>y of Commu</mark> r	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Cc	onsistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Connectivity Scenic and Visual			20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	, no scenic benefits	3	
	Loc	al Quality (of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important for local users			
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwa	ater issues expecte	d	
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation	n expected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	xpected		
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	11.7	of 30
pad	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.07	50	2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
or Rc tion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	77.94				Crash data 2009-2011			
Majo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.18							
nes (Years	3	Severity Index	1.00							
Crast	Ava AADT	2343	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local re	sidents and leaders	8	
<u> </u>	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		1								

ficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.2	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				improvements would bette	r serve trucks an	d school	buses
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	115	30	7.2	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	MO-248 is a potential freig	ht route (though	truck vols	appear
ality		nities			Max	Actual	Woightod	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	10	of 10
uni		Local/R	egional Land Lise Plans	No	30					1.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No	00	0.0	0.0	no applicable local plans			
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Conor	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements	no scenic hene	fite			
	Loc	•al Ωuality c	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	Important for local users		into	
	200	al Quanty C		0070	20	10.0	1.0	Important for local doors			
viro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormw	ater issues expec	ted	
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigatio	n expected		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	Small project, few issues e	expected		
								Mainht Factor - 20%	Total Points =	11 7	of 30
iotv					Mov	Actual	Wolahtod				01.00
ety	PDO	2	Safety Index	0.07	Max 50	Actual	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)		-
ety (uo	PDO Iniury	2	Safety Index Crash Rate	0.07	Max 50	Actual 2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)		
section) section	PDO Injury Fatal	2 0 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	0.07 77.94 1.18	Max 50	Actual 2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)		
Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal	2 0 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	0.07 77.94 1.18 1.00	Max 50	Actual 2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)		
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	2 0 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	0.07 77.94 1.18 1.00	50 50	Actual 2.7	0.8	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)	are	
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	2 0 0 3 2343	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	0.07 77.94 1.18 1.00 Yes	Max 50 5	Actual 2.7 5.0	0.8 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011) sidents and lead	ers	
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	2 0 0 3 2343	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.07 77.94 1.18 1.00 Yes Yes	Max 50 5	Actual 2.7 5.0 5.0	0.8 1.5 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local re Improvements should add) sidents and leada	ers sues	
or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	2 0 0 3 2343	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.07 77.94 1.18 1.00 Yes Yes No	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5	Actual 2.7 5.0 5.0 0.0	Weighted 0.8 1.5 1.5 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local re Improvements should add) sidents and leade	ers sues	

Taking	J Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.7 o	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	roadway assumed to be in good condition	
	Substandard Roady	way or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sight distance issue	
Fu	nctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	1200	10	0.5	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care of the System Factors 75%				30.0	6.0	Important local intersection, future growth area	

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	1.5 of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brir	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, ADA	pedestrian provisio	ns assumed
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, pede	estrians have safe cr	rossing option
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lir	nes
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Signalization could bene	fit bikes/peds as we	I

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.1	of 10
		_evel of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	estimated LOS from sam	ple count (more a	nalysis	needed)
	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8				
		Daily Usage	1200	25	1.2	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)		
	Local Congestion Relief Factors			25	12.5	1.3	improvements could bene	efit traffic flow, sig	nal may	/ add dela

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	100%	20	20.0	2.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	22%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	12%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	not a major economic dev project, local growth area

Proj. #: 5-7	Project Name:	Buchanan Rd and Sunrise	Dr Intersection	
Project Type:	Traffic Safety	Total Score 37.8	out of 100	135
Project Descri through movem convert Sunrise roundabout. Th	ption: Improve inter ent to connect Sunr Dr. northbound (so iis may address the	section alignment and traffic c ise Dr in the north with Bucha uth leg) to stop control. Alterr same issues more cost effect	control. Re-align the nan Rd in the west and nativey, install a ively.	
Status: Plann	ing	Length:	NA	

•		-				
Project Scale: Small	Roadway	Roadway or Intersection Intersection				
Functional Classification:	Local	(for the major street)				
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	2,800	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)				
Daily Truck Traffic:	140	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)				
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)				

Project Discussion: Buchanan Rd is the location of the Branson High School, Intermediate School, and Elementary School as well as the Taney County Transfer Station. Traffic is heavy at peak times when school is in session. The south leg of Sunrise Dr has only a handful of residences. The locations of the heavy volumes highlight the need to adjust the through movement and/or install a roundabout. A roundabout offers the benefit of reducing speeds, while limiting vehicle stops. It also could limit the amount of new right-of-way. The final design should ensure adequate sight distance and relocate driveways as needed.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	3.1	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
Widens Road	No							
Improves Geometry	Yes				improves turns for trucks a	and other large vehic	les	
Improves Load Rating	No							
Truck Usage	70	30	5.6	0.6	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	limited truck traffic other th	an buses and trash	trucks	
Quality of Communities		Mox	Actual	Woighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	20	of 10

Quality of Co	ommunities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.0 of	f 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0		
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				no applicable local plans	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
	Connectivity		30	0.0	0.0	No significant improved connectivity	
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	Reduces driver frustration for school traffic	

Environmental Protection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals		30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwater issues expected			
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation expected			
	Avoids Historical Impacts		20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	sexpected		

Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 13.5 of 30
oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	-0.20	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	33.40				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.51				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	2734	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in widened shoulders & improved intersection design
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	Concern raised by local leaders

Taking Care of the System				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 8.5	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions			20	10.0	2.0	roadway in fair condition based on observations	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature		No	20	0.0	0.0		
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
	Daily Vehicle Usage		1400	10	0.6	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care o	f the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	important intersection to maintain in good operation	

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	1.5 of	f 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3				
	Project provides bike connections Project provides pedestrian connections					does not apply			
						does not apply			
Project br	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes		
Pro	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply	assumes improved shoul	Iders at intersection		
	Transit		25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Shu	uttle or Jefferson Lin	ies	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	assumes improved shoul	Iders at intersection		

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	3.7	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	eastbound left turn LOS for stop control		
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5			
		Daily Usage	1400	25	1.6	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	moderate to high traffic, key location		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	Not a strategic corridor
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	7.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	3.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	Minimal economic impact outside of the school

Proj. #: 6-1 Project Name: N	/IO-165 and Fall Creek Road Intersection		Efficient Movement of Freight		Ма
roject Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score 58.3 out of 100		Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities F	Partial Yes	3 30
roject Description: Improve intersed	ction grade, alignment, geometry, and traffic		Widens Road	No	
trol. This could include adding turn	lanes and/or installing a signal. Actual alignment		Improves Geometry	Yes	
anges may be cost prohibitive, but c	could be considered.		Improves Load Rating	No	
			Truck Usage	230	30
tatus: Grant Application Submitted	Length: NA		Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40
roject Scale: Medium	Roadway or Intersection Intersection				
Functional Classification: C	collector (for the major street)		Quality of Communities		Ma
vg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 9	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Local/Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30
Daily Truck Traffic: 4	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Consistent with Local Plans	Yes	
Through Lanes: 2	2 (through lanes on major street)		Consistent with Regional Plans	Yes	
roject Discussion: The westbound a	approach to the intersection (Fall Creek Road) is		Connectivity	Yes	30
n a very steep downgrade. It termina	ates at a stop control. There are no turn lanes at		Scenic and Visual	No	20
een 12 crashes at this location in the	last 3 years (including 3 injury crashes). Three of		Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20
e 12 crashes were angle crashes. T	here were also a number of rear-end crashes,	I NTS			
ainly on MO-165. Buses are prohibit	ted from making northbound right turns at this		Environmental Protection		Ma
cation.			Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30
		·J	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30
ccess to Opportunity	Max Actual Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.8 of 5	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20

Access			wax	Actual	vveignted	Weight Factor = 5%	
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5		
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
^p roject bri	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	Yes	use if fi	rst two de	o not apply	if signal is installed, ADA	pedestrian provisions assumed
Pro	oject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two de	o not apply	if signal is installed, pede	strians have safe crossing option
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shi	uttle or Jefferson Lines
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Signalization would bene	fit bikes/peds as well

Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.3	of 10
	Level of Service	F	25	25.0	2.5	estimated peak hour LOS	(lefts out), more	analysis	s needed
Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8				
	Daily Usage	4550	25	5.2	0.5	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	peak period congestion is	an issue		

nomic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	MO-165
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	10%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block group
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	important intersection in the transportation system

Efficie	ent Movemer	nt of Freigl	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5 of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
			Widens Road	No						
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of intersection	, turn lanes to be a	added
			Improves Load Rating	No						
			Truck Usage	230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula		
	Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Possible benefits to buses	and trucks if all m	ovements allowed
										7.5
Qualit	y of Commu	Inities	·	14	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5 of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	le ste de stitute et se suite es el tre	D	
			onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				both facilities mentioned in	n Branson Commu	hity Plan 2030
1		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	165 (from 76 to 265) menti	oned in SMCOG r	egional plan
			Connectivity	res	30	30.0	3.0			onnectors
			Scenic and visual	NO	20	0.0	0.0		, no scenic benetit	S
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 75%					15.0	1.5	Important connection locat	ion in system	
Enviro	onmental Pr	otection			Mox	Actual	Woighted	Weight Easter = 5%	Total Points =	28 of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Ves	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues exp		2.0
	Consistent with Environmental Goals No				30	0.0	0.0	Possible stream and/or floo	odolain issues	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impact	ts	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes					5.0	0.3	Project has potential to rec	uire mitigation, ne	ed to avoid bridge
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 25%							· · · , · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Safety	/ PDO	9	Safety Index	0.72	Max 50	Actual 27.1	Weighted 8.1	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula)	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
or Road Stion)	PDO Injury	9 3	Safety Index Crash Rate	0.72 123.34	Max 50	Actual 27.1	Weighted 8.1	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
(Major Road srsection)	/ PDO Injury Fatal	9 3 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	0.72 123.34 1.87	Max 50	Actual 27.1	Weighted 8.1	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
shes (Major Road Satery r Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	9 3 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63	Max 50	Actual 27.1	Weighted 8.1	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road <mark>SS</mark> or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes	Max 50	Actual 27.1 5.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road <mark>Sabes)</mark> or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes	Max 50 5	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road States) or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road Apple Or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local conc	Total Points =	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road Apple Or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	Max 50 5 5 5 35	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local conc	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response terns	19.0 of 30
Crashes (Major Road States (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	Max 50 5 5 5 35 35	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 Actual	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concerners	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response terns Total Points =	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20
Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	/ PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 <u>Мах</u> 20	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 26.3 Actual	Weighted 8.1 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response erns Total Points = good condition	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 35 <u>Мах</u> 20	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 20.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g steep grade, bus prohibition	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response erns Total Points = good condition n	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road Lashes Crashes Cra	/ PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Subst	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa andard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors us or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Collector	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30%	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 <u>Мах</u> 20 20 10	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 26.3 5.0 5.0 20.0 3.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g steep grade, bus prohibition	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response terns Total Points = good condition in	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20 12.0
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	/ PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Subst	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa andard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors usor Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Localitions	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30%	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 <u>Мах</u> 20 20 10	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 20.0 3.0 2.1	Weighted 8.1 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula)	Total Points = aders designed to impro ency response erns Total Points = good condition in	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20 0
Crashes (Major Road States (Major Road Laking)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Subst unctional Class	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa andard Roa ssification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors Collector Daily Vehicle Usage	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30% 4550	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 20 20 20 10 10 10	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 20.0 20.0 3.0 2.1 30.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4 6.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula) important local intersection	Total Points =	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20
Crashes (Major Road Lashes (Major Road Lashes (Major Road Lashes to a contraction)	/ PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Subst unctional Class	9 3 0 3 8885 e System Roadwa andard Roa asification2 Taking Card	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors Collector Daily Vehicle Usage e of the System Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30% 4550	<u>Мах</u> 50 5 5 35 35 20 20 20 10 10 10	Actual 27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 26.3 5.0 20.0 2.0 3.0 2.1 30.0	Weighted 8.1 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 0.0 7.9 0.0	Weight Factor = 30% (Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea intersection improvements no major impact on emerge crashes confirm local concern Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in g steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula) important local intersection	Total Points =	19.0 of 30 ove safety 12.0 of 20

Efficie	ent Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.5 of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5	
			Widens Road	No				
			Improves Geometry	Yes				realignment of intersection, turn lanes to be added
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Possible benefits to buses and trucks if all movements allowed
Qualit	v of Commu	nitioo				A ()		Weight Faster = 40% Tatal Dainta = 7.5 at 40
Qualit	y or Commu		enienel Lend Llee Diene	Vee	Max	Actual	Weighted	
		Local/R	ansistant with Local Plans	Ves	30	30.0	3.0	both facilities' montioned in Proneon Community Plan 2030
		Const	istont with Pogional Plans	Vec				165 /from 76 to 265) montioned in SMCOC regional plan
		Cons		Vee	30	30.0	3.0	MO-165 and Fall Creek are both important connectors
			Security Security	No	20	0.0	0.0	
			Scenic and visual	NO 750/	20	15.0	0.0	Intersection improvements, no scenic benefits
	LOC	al Quality	or Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	6.1	Important connection location in system
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.8 of 5
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	15	few stormwater issues expected
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Possible stream and/or floodplain issues
	Avoids Historical Impacts				20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 25%					5.0	0.3	Project has potential to require mitigation, need to avoid bridge
								5 1 1 5 7 5
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 19.0 of 30
be								
õ –	PDO 9 Safety Index			0.72	50	27.1	8.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or Ro: ction)	PDO Injury	9 3	Safety Index Crash Rate	0.72 123.34	50	27.1	8.1	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011
(Major Ro	PDO Injury Fatal	9 3 0	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	0.72 123.34 1.87	50	27.1	8.1	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011
shes (Major Ros r Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	9 3 0 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63	50	27.1	8.1	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011
Crashes (Major Ro or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes	50	27.1	8.1 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders
Crashes (Major Ro or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes	50 5 5	27.1 5.0 5.0	8.1 1.5 1.5	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety
Crashes (Major Ro or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No	50 5 5 5 5	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response
Crashes (Major Ro or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	50 5 5 5 35	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	50 5 5 5 35	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75%	50 5 5 35 Max	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 Actual	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 Actual 5.0	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw andard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 Actual 5.0 20.0	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition steep grade, bus prohibition
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw andard Roa	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors udway or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Collector	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes No 75% Good Yes 30%	50 5 5 35 35 <u>Max</u> 20 20 10	27.1 5.0 5.0 26.3 Actual 5.0 20.0 3.0	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition steep grade, bus prohibition
Crashes (Major Ro. built or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw andard Roa sification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors Collector Daily Vehicle Usage	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30% 4550	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 10 10	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 20.0 3.0 2.1	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula)
Crashes (Major Ro. or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa unctional Clas	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw andard Roa sification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors Collector Daily Vehicle Usage	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes Yes No 75% Good Yes 30% 4550 75%	50 5 5 35 35 20 20 10 10 10 40	27.1 5.0 5.0 0.0 26.3 20.0 3.0 2.1 30.0	8.1 1.5 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4 0.4 6.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula) important local intersection
Crashes (Major Ro. Drawner Ro. Drakes (Major Ro.	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa unctional Clas	9 3 0 3 8885 System Roadw andard Roa sification2	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors Local Safety Factors Collector Daily Vehicle Usage of the System Factors	0.72 123.34 1.87 1.63 Yes No 75% Good Yes 30% 4550 75%	50 5 5 35 20 20 10 10 10 40	27.1 5.0 5.0 26.3 26.3 20.0 3.0 2.1 30.0	8.1 1.5 0.0 7.9 Weighted 1.0 4.0 0.6 0.4 6.0	(Modified MoDOT formula) Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local leaders intersection improvements designed to improve safety no major impact on emergency response crashes confirm local concerns Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.0 of 20 roadway appears to be in good condition steep grade, bus prohibition (Modified MoDOT formula) important local intersection

Proj. #: 6-2 Project Name: Fa	all Creek Rd ar	nd Summe	er Ln							
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	53.7	out of 100							
Project Description: Improve intersection alignment and traffic control. Could include provision of turn lanes as well as realignment of intersection (vertical and horizontal). Possible improvement options include re-grading and/or relocating the intersection. A flashing beacon could be considered as an interim measure.										
Status: Planning Length: NA										
Status: Planning		Length:	NA							
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	Length: or Interse	NA ection Intersection							
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium Functional Classification: La	Roadway	Length: or Interse	NA ection Intersection ajor street)							
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium Functional Classification: Lo Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 53	Roadway ocal 300	Length: or Interse (for the ma (estimated	NA ection Intersection ajor street) I, avg. for major street)							
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium Functional Classification: Lo Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 53 Daily Truck Traffic: 1	Roadway ocal 300 10	Length: or Interse (for the ma (estimated (estimated	NA ection Intersection ajor street) I, avg. for major street) I, avg. for major street)							

Project Discussion: The intersection has stop controls for traffic turning from Summer Lane. There is a grade differential between Fall Creek Road and Summer Lane. Posted speed on Fall Creek Road is 35 mph. Two vehicle out-of-control crashes occurred at this intersection from 2009 to 2011. It does not appear that the intersection meets the peak hour signal warrants. Possible improvement options include re-grading and/or relocating the intersection.



Efficie	ent Movemer	nt of Freigl	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0 of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities F	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
			Widens Road	No						
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection improvements	would benefit truck	(s/trailers
			Improves Load Rating	No						
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula		
	Local Effi	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck/freight ro	ute, but it is a boat	hauling route
<mark>Qualit</mark>	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.0 of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0			
		Cc	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned in	n Branson Commu	nity Plan 2030
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan	
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0			
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Existing recreational signa	ge can be updated	and improved
	Loc	al Quality c	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	would improve a recreation	nal access point	
Enviro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5 of 5
		Yes	30	30.0	1.5	focused project, few storm	water issues expec	ted		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	no substantial mitigation ex	xpected	
		Av	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impact	S	
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no known unmitigatable iss	sues, floodplain pro	oximity
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	17.2 of 30
Road	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.56	50	21.2	6.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
aior F actio	Injury	1	Crash Rate	35.29				Crash data 2009-2011		
s (Me	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.54						
sches or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25						
Cra	Avg AADT	5175	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection in	nprovements and re	oad re-alignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little effect on emergency r	response	
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	two veh. out of control cras	shes	
Taking	<mark>g Care of th</mark> e	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.5 of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	road appears to be in fair o	condition	
	Subst	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not meet	t design standards	
Fu	Inctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4			
			Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	0.7	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula))	
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but u	ingrade is importar	ht

Efficie	ent Moveme	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities P	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection improvements	would benefit truck	<s th="" trailers<=""><th></th></s>	
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Ef	licient Move	ement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck/freight ro	ute, but it is a boat	hauling ro	oute
Qualit	y of Comm	unities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.0	of 10
		Local/R	Regional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned in	n Branson Commu	nity Plan 2	2030
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Existing recreational signa	ge can be updated	and impr	oved
	Lo	cal Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	would improve a recreation	nal access point		
Enviro	Environmental Protection						Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
		Yes	30	30.0	1.5	focused project, few storm	water issues expec	ted			
	Co	onsistent wi	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	no substantial mitigation ex	xpected		
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impact	S		
	Loca	I Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no known unmitigatable iss	sues, floodplain pro	oximity	
										17.0	
Safety	/				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	17.2	of 30
Road	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.56	50	21.2	6.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ajor lectio	Injury	1		35.29				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Minuters	Fatai	0		0.54							
ashe or Ir	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
ö	Avg AADT	5175	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection in	nprovements and r	oad re-ali	gnment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little effect on emergency r	response		
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	two veh. out of control cras	shes		
Taking	g Care of th	e System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.5	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	road appears to be in fair o	condition		
	Subs	tandard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not meet	t design standards		
Fu	unctional Cla	ssification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	0.7	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but u	ingrade is importar	ht	

Efficie	ent Movemer	nt of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities P	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection improvements	would benefit truc	ks/trailer	S
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck/freight ro	oute, but it is a boat	hauling	route
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned i	n Branson Commu	nity Plan	2030
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Scenic and Visual Yes					2.0	Existing recreational signa	ige can be updated	l and imp	proved
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	would improve a recreatio	nal access point		
Enviro	onmental Pro			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes				30	30.0	1.5	focused project, few storm	water issues expe	cted	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	no substantial mitigation e	xpected		
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no known unmitigatable is	sues, floodplain pro	oximity	
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	17.2	of 30
Road	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.56	50	21.2	6.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ajor F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	35.29				Crash data 2009-2011			
(Me terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.54							
ishes or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
Cra	Avg AADT	5175	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local le	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection in	mprovements and r	oad re-a	lignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little effect on emergency	response		
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	two veh. out of control cra	shes		
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.5	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	road appears to be in fair	condition		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Yes					20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not mee	t design standards		
Fu	unctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	0.7	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but	unarade is importa	nt	

Efficie	ent Movemer	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
			Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection improvements	would benefit truck	<s th="" trailers<=""><th></th></s>	
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Eff	icient Move	ement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck/freight ro	ute, but it is a boat	hauling r	oute
Qualit	y of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		С	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned in	n Branson Commu	nity Plan	2030
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Existing recreational signa	ge can be updated	and impr	roved
	Loc	cal Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	would improve a recreation	nal access point		
	nvironmental Protection										
Enviro	Environmental Protection				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	focused project, few storm	water issues expec	ted	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals		Yes	30	30.0	1.5	no substantial mitigation ex	xpected			
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impact	S		
	Loca	I Environm	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no known unmitigatable iss	sues, floodplain pro	oximity	
Safety	1		1		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	17.2	of 30
Road	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.56	50	21.2	6.3	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
ajor F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	35.29				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.54							
shex or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
Cra	Avg AADT	5175	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection in	nprovements and r	oad re-ali	ignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little effect on emergency r	response		
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	two veh. out of control cras	shes		
Taking	g Care of the	e System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.5	of 20
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions Fair				20	10.0	2.0	road appears to be in fair of	condition		
	Subst	andard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not meet	t design standards		
Fu	Inctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	0.7	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
	Daily Vehicle Usage			750/	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but u	ingrado is importa	at	

Efficie	nt Moveme	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
		-	Widens Road	No							
			Improves Geometry	Yes				intersection improvements v	would benefit truc	ks/trailer	s
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	55	30	5.0	0.5	MoDOT formula			
	Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck/freight rou	ite, but it is a boat	hauling	route
Qualit	y of Commı	unities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.0	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned in	Branson Commu	nity Plar	n 2030
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG re	egional plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Existing recreational signag	e can be updated	and imp	proved
	Lo	cal Quality	of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	would improve a recreationa	al access point		
	nvironmental Drotection										
Enviro	Environmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals			Yes	30	30.0	1.5	focused project, few stormw	vater issues expe	cted	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals		Yes	30	30.0	1.5	no substantial mitigation exp	pected			
	Avoids Historical Impacts			Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impacts			
	Loca	l Environmo	ental Protection Factors	50%	20	10.0	0.5	no known unmitigatable issu	ues, floodplain pro	oximity	
Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	17.2	of 30
Road	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.56	50	21.2	6.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
ajor F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	35.29				Crash data 2009-2011			
s (Ma terse	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.54							
sche: or In	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25							
Cra	Avg AADT	5175	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local lead	ders		
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection im	provements and r	oad re-a	lignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little effect on emergency re	esponse		
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	two veh. out of control crash	nes		
Taking	g Care of the	e System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	12.5	of 20
		Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	road appears to be in fair co	ondition		
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Yes			Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not meet	design standards		
Fu	Inctional Cla	ssification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				
			Daily Vehicle Usage	2650	10	0.7	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but u	pgrade is importa	nt	

Access to Opp	ortunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 0.9 of 5
E	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3		
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
Proje	ect provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
Project brings exis	ting facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes
Project prov	vides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes widened should	ders and improved grades
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines
Loc	al Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	unlikely to provide signifi	cant bike/ped improvements

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.9 of *	10
		Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak hour LOS for Summer Lane lefts out	
	Functional Classification?	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
		Daily Usage	2650	25	1.8	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	congestion is not a major issue	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points =	5.7 o	of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	supports recreational econ dev		
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	1.4			
Poverty (Block Group)	18%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2	block g	roups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract		
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	2.3	supports local/regional rec development		

Proj. #: 6-3 Project Name:	Safari Rd (Shar	p Curve A	Area to MO-165)
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score	48.4	out of 100
Project Description: Improve aligr in the middle of the roadway segme proposed.	iment to eliminate ent). A signal insta	sharp cur llation at l	ves (especially the curve MO-165 was also
Status: Planning		Length:	0.88 miles
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	Length: or Inters	0.88 miles ection Roadway
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium Functional Classification	Roadway	Length: or Inters (for the m	0.88 miles ection Roadway najor street)
Status: Planning Project Scale: <mark>Medium</mark> Functional Classification Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)	Roadway : Local : 2600	Length: or Inters (for the m (est. 2012	0.88 miles ection Roadway major street) 2, avg. for major street)
Status: Planning Project Scale: Medium Functional Classification Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) Daily Truck Traffic	Roadway : Local : 2600 : 50	Length: or Inters (for the m (est. 2012 (est. 2012	0.88 miles ection Roadway major street) 2, avg. for major street) 2, avg. for major street)

Project Discussion: Safari Road is a two-lane road with few access points. It is particularly winding where it crosses the valley in the middle of the segment. There are no posted speed limits, so it was assumed that a 25 mph limit applied. The traffic volume at the intersection of Safari Road and MO-165 was examined in a very preliminary manner with respect to traffic signal warrants. Based on the estimated ADTs, it appears it is near the peak hour warrant threshold. Traffic counts will be required to determine if the intersection fully meets one or more warrants. It may be good to split these two projects unless the entire eastern portion of the road is to be upgraded.



Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.8 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5		
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	Yes	use if fi	irst two de	o not apply	signal installation would	meet ADA requirements
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two de	o not apply	signal would benefit ped	s/bikes
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	nuttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Assumes no new sidewa	alks or bike lanes on Safari

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.8	of 10
		Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak LOS on S	Safari (likely differe	nt at in	tersection
	Functional Classification	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5				
		Daily Usage	1300	25	0.4	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)		
	Local Congestio	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.3	congestion not a major is	sue, but seasonali	ty could	d affect it

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	no known regional economic opportunities
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	10%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	1.5	benefits local businesses, could be direct route to MO-265

ficier	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.8	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5		-		
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				eliminates sharp curves			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	25	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck/freight ro	pute		
								4 5	
uality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 2	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	connects MO-165 in Brans	son with MO-265 ir	n west	
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, r	no scenic benefits		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	not major community issue	e, could give reside	ents a ne	w direct
nvirou	mental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	25	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Vas	30	30.0	1 5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (stormwater de		facilities)
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Roadway crosses stream	floodolain: small w	otlande	aonniooj
		Vas	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	te	Guarius	
	Avoids Instantian Eastern	00/	20	20.0	0.0	Respire impacts due to st	room orossing		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	U 70	20	0.0	0.0	i ussible impauts due to si	ream crossing		
afety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.1	of 30

Efficien	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.8	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				-
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				eliminates sharp curves			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	25	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck/freight ro	oute		
-									
Quality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 2	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	connects MO-165 in Bran	son with MO-265 in	west	
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, i	no scenic benefits		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	not major community issue	e, could give reside	nts a ne	w direct
Environ	montal Protoction		Max	Astual	Maightad	$M_{\rm circlet} = 50/$	Total Dainta -	2.5	of 5
		N/s s		Actual	weighted	vveight Factor = 5%	Total Points -	Z.J	
		res	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runom mitiga	ited (stormwater de		acilities)
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	NO	30	0.0	0.0	Roadway crosses stream/	iloodplain; small we	etiands	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	sts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	Possible impacts due to st	tream crossing		
Safety			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.1	of 30
p	PDO 10 Safety Index	0.76	50	28.7	8.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ö		0.10	00	20.7	0.0	In callou mob of formula	/		

Efficier	t Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.8	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				eliminates sharp curves			
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	25	30	3.4	0.3	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a major truck/freight ro	oute		
0 114								4.5	
Juality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.3	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 2	030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	connects MO-165 in Brans	son with MO-265 in	west	
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Roadway improvements, r	no scenic benefits		
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	not major community issue	e, could give reside	nts a ne	w direct
Enviro	nmental Protection		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (stormwater de	tention	facilities)
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	Roadway crosses stream/	floodplain: small we	etlands	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	Possible impacts due to st	tream crossing		
Safety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.1	of 30
ad	PDO 10 Safety Index	0.76	50	28.7	8.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)		

Safety	r				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 22.1 of 30
oad	PDO	10	Safety Index	0.76	50	28.7	8.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	449.66				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj ersec	Fatal	0	Accident Index	2.57				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.23				
Cras	Avg AADT	2539	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in signal at MO-165 and roadway re-alignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	10.5	crashes on Safari were veh. out of control with 3 of 4 in curve

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.4 of	20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	road appears to be in good condition in general	
	Substandard Road	vay or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	sharp curve does not meet design standards	
F	unctional Classification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	1300	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	roadway is not major, but upgrade is important	

Proj. #: 6-4 Project Name:	Fall Creek Ro	l (Wildwood	Drive to MO-165)	ENT
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Sco	re <mark>56.8</mark>	out of 100	
Project Description: Widen lanes a	and shoulders a	and improve	alignment (lower hills).	North / N
This could require right-of-way acqu	iisition as well a	s utility relo	cation. There are	
potential environmental issues to be	e addressed as	well (stream	is, etc.).	1 - all
Status: Planning		Length:	2.69 miles	
Project Scale: Large	Roadw	ay or Inter	section Roadway	Contraction of the second
Functional Classification:	Collector	Modified	from MoDOT (major st)	DANGE
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	5200	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)	LAIGHT
Daily Truck Traffic:	100	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)	
Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes on major street)	

Project Discussion: The road is a two-lane highway with narrow shoulders. It has a posted speed of 35 mph. One of the main challenges is the vertical alignment in the central part of the corridor. Signs are posted that read "Danger Keep Right", due to the poor sight distance over these vertical crests. There are horizontal alignment issues that could be addressed as well. There are some homes with direct access to the road, though much of the road does not have direct residential access. This presents a good opportunity for maintaining restricted direct access.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.5	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
Widens Road	Yes				widening of shoulders			
Improves Geometry	Yes				improved alignment (lower	hills)		
Improves Load Rating	Yes				assume roadway would be	upgraded if recon	structed	
Truck Usage	50	30	4.7	0.5	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	not a major truck route, bu	t benefits those tha	at do use	it
								_

Qualit	/ of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = <mark>7.5</mark> of 10	
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans Yes	30	30.0	3.0		
	Consistent with Local Plans Yes				Fall Creek Rd mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030	
	Consistent with Regional Plans No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
	Connectivity Yes	30	30.0	3.0	improved roadway could connect southern Branson to US-65	
	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits	
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 75%	20	15.0	1.5	benefits community, esp residential dev along corridor	

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	14.3	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (new stormwater	⁻ detentio	on facilities
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Proximity to stream, flood	plain and small wetla	inds	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	2.3	Large project; potential for	impacts; mitigation	likely	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 12.5 of 20
oad	PDO	15	Safety Index	0.47	50	17.7	3.5	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	8	Crash Rate	153.79				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.88				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.87				
Cra	Avg AADT	5077	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened shoulders and vertical re-alignment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	no major effect on response times expected
			Local Safety Factors	100%	35	35.0	7.0	Crashes confirm local concerns, also possible bus activity on roa

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.7	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	0.5	Fair based on field observ	ations		
	Substandard Roady	vay or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	Vertical and horizontal alig	gnment		
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.2				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	2600	10	0.5	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	Important local roadway			

Access to	Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 2.1 of	f 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections	No				consider adding bike lan	e or multi-use facility	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				consider multi-use facility	y (near residential communit	ies)
Project brings	existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two d	o not apply			
Project	provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two de	o not apply	assumes widened should	ders available for bikes/peds	\$
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	75%	50	37.5	1.9	Widened shoulders bene	efit bike/peds	

Conges	tion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 5.4 of 15
		Level of Service	D	25	15.0	2.3	est. peak hour LOS based on percent time spent following
F	unctional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	1.1	Consider upgrading to at least collector status
		Daily Usage	2600	25	1.2	0.2	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.9	congestion is limited issue, but there are no passing options

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 5.8 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	20	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	30	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	70%	20	14.0	2.8	
Poverty (Block Group)	18%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	3.0	not a known major economic development area

Proj. #: 6-5 Project Name:	MO-165 and	Pointe Royale Dr Intersection		Efficient Movement of Freight
Project Type: Operations	Total Sco	ore 53.0 out of 100	North / NTS	Large Vehicle Frie
Project Description: Improve inter	section traffic o	control and/or geometric design.		
Consider traffic signal and/or a roun	dabout.		Al Chan	Impr
				Improv
Status: Planning		Length: NA		Local Efficient Movement of F
Project Scale: Small	Road	way or Intersection Intersection	4	
Functional Classification:	Collector	(for the major street)		Quality of Communities
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	9100	(estimated, avg. for major street)		Local/Regional La
Daily Truck Traffic	460	(estimated, avg. for major street)	Contraction of the second	Consistent w
Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)	Forther	Consistent with
Proiect Discussion: The intersection	on is stop cont	rolled on the side-streets. The posted		

speed limit is 40 mph. There are left-turn lanes in both directions on MO-165. There are also turn lanes for the north-south direction. The intersection appears to function acceptably during most hours of the day; however during peak periods some side-street drivers have to wait longer than desired. A sample count indicated that the location may be close to meeting signal warrants. This is especially true if the high-speed (> 40 mph) thresholds are employed. A speed study and traffic counts could be conducted to determine if the warrants are met. A roundabout could also be considered.



ficier	t Movement of Freight	Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.5 of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Ye	s 30	15.0	1.5	
	Widens Road No				
	Improves Geometry Yes				signal/roundabout could better facilitate truck movements
	Improves Load Rating No				
	Truck Usage 230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25%	40	10.0	1.0	New traffic signal could benefit truck access/egress
uality	of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 6.5 of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans Yes	30	30.0	3.0	
	Consistent with Local Plans Yes				165 mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030
	Consistent with Regional Plans Yes				165 (from 76 to 265) mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
	Connectivity No	30	0.0	0.0	not a major connectivity project
	Scenic and Visual Yes	20	20.0	2.0	Roundabout could enhance aesthetics
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 75%	20	15.0	1.5	benefits to residential dev. to south and businesses to north
viror	nmental Protection	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.5 of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwater issues expected
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation expected

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.8 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	40%	25	10.0	0.5		
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply	
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply	
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	Yes	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, ADA	pedestrian provisions assume
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	if signal is installed, pede	estrians have safe crossing opt
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Signalization/roundabout	would benefit bikes/peds as w

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0 of 10
	L	_evel of Service	E	25	20.0	2.0	estimated peak hour LOS	(southbound thro	ughs and lefts)
	Functional Classification1	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8			
		Daily Usage	4550	25	17.1	1.7	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)	
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	peak period congestion is	an issue	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 5.3 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	MO-165 is an important arterial and economic link
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	not a regional economic dev. Project
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	4%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	2.3	could promote additional dev. north of intersection

Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 13.6 of 30
oad	PDO	1	Safety Index	0.47	50	17.8	5.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R stion)	Injury	1	Crash Rate	20.56				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.31				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.25				
Cras	Avg AADT	8885	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in intersection improvements (i.e. signal)
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	no major change to emergency response times
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	number of crashes not large relative to other projects

20 20.0

20 10.0

50%

Avoids Historical Impacts Yes

Local Environmental Protection Factors

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	11.0	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	intersection conditions app	ear good		
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4550	10	6.8	1.4	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	important local intersection			

1.0 No known historical impacts

0.5 Small project, f	few issues expected
----------------------	---------------------

Proj. #: 6-6 Project Name: MO-165 (MO-	76 to MO-265)
Project Type: Capacity Total Sco	re 74.0 out of 100
Project Description: Widen road. Add turn lanes a require additional right-of-way as well as utility reloc also have to be addressed. Also, different portion o treatments.	and widen shoulders. This could cation work. Stormwater issues will of the roadway would require different
Otatasa Dianaian	
Status: Planning	Length: 4.36 miles
Status: Planning Project Scale: Large Roadw	Length: 4.36 miles ay or Intersection Roadway
Project Scale: Large Roadw Functional Classification: Minor Arteria	Length: 4.36 miles ay or Intersection Roadway Modified from MoDOT (major st)
Project Scale: Large Roadw Functional Classification: Minor Arterial Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 9100	Length: 4.36 miles ay or Intersection Roadway Modified from MoDOT (major st) (est. 2012, avg. for major street)
Project Scale: Large Roadw Functional Classification: Minor Arterial Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 9100 Daily Truck Traffic: 460	Length: 4.36 miles ay or Intersection Roadway Modified from MoDOT (major st) (est. 2012, avg. for major street) (est. 2012, avg. for major street)

Project Discussion: MO-165 has varying typical sections and posted speeds. 1) MO-76 south to Van Buren Road: 2-lanes with left turn lanes at some locations (inc. several major intersections); 2) Van Buren Road to Pointe Royale Drive: 3-lanes (center left-turn lane); 3) Pointe Royale Dr. to Auston Ave: 2-lanes without turn lanes; 4) Auston Ave to MO-265 4-lane undivided. The posted speed ranges from 35 mph near MO-76 (in Branson) to 45 in the southwest. MoDOT ADTs range from 11,000 near MO-76 to 7000 near MO-265 in the southwest (an avg. value was used in the analysis). However, Google ADTs are as high as approx. 13,000 and sample counts showed over 15,000.



LINOIC	nt Movemen	t of Freial	nt		Mox	Actual	Woightod	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7 0	of 10
			hicle Friendly Facilities	Vec	30	30.0	3 0		Total Tolints -	/.0	
		Large ve	Widens Road	Vec	30	30.0	5.0	widen shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	Vee				turn lanes to be added			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
				230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor for com	merce and trucks i	n this ar	ea
			-								
Qualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				165 mentioned in Bransor	Community Plan 2	2030	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	Yes				165 (from 76 to 265) ment	tioned in SMCOG r	egional	plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	165 connects south Brans	on to north Branso	n	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	benefits residents and bus	iness community		
Enviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	12.8	of 15
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (new stormwat	er deten	tion facilitie
	Cor	n <mark>sistent wi</mark>	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Impacts likely can be mitig	jated, potential floo	dplain is	sues
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ets		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.8	Large project; possible imp	pacts		
											·
	,								Total Dainta -	12 2	of 20
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points -	10.0	
Safety	PDO	136	Safety Index	1.17	Max 50	Actual 44.0	Weighted 8.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)	10.0	
ajor Road ection)	PDO Injury	136 63	Safety Index Crash Rate	1.17 471.46	Max 50	Actual 44.0	Weighted 8.8	(Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)	10.0	
s (Major Road <mark>Ajago</mark> tersection)	PDO Injury Fatal	136 63 1	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index	1.17 471.46 2.69	Max 50	Actual 44.0	Weighted 8.8	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)	10.0	
ashes (Major Road <mark>Sajes</mark> or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years	136 63 1 3	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83	Max 50	Actual 44.0	Weighted 8.8	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011)	10.0	
Crashes (Major Road <mark>Ag</mark> or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	136 63 1 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83 Yes	<u>Мах</u> 50 5	Actual 44.0 5.0	Weighted 8.8 1.0	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local le) aders	10.0	
Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	136 63 1 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83 Yes Yes	Max 50 5 5	Actual 44.0 5.0 5.0	Weighted 8.8 1.0 1.0	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road	aders	rn lanes)
Crashes (Major Road Apjes or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	136 63 1 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83 Yes Yes Yes	Max 50 5 5 5 5	Actual 44.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	Weighted 8.8 1.0 1.0 1.0	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and w	aders I (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes) ponse time
Crashes (Major Road (Jajer or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	136 63 1 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Max 50 5 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 44.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 35.0	Weighted 8.8 1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and w High number of crashes	aders I (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes) ponse time
Crashes (Major Road Crashes (Major Road or Intersection)	PDO Injury Fatal Years Avg AADT	136 63 1 3 8885	Safety Index Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.17 471.46 2.69 1.83 Yes Yes Yes 100%	Max 50 5 5 5 5 35	Actual 44.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 35.0	Weighted 8.8 1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	Weight Factor = 20% (Modified MoDOT formula Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and w High number of crashes	aders I (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes) ponse time

Efficie	nt Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		-	Widens Road	Yes				widen shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor for com	merce and trucks i	n this ar	ea
Jualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	-			
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				165 mentioned in Bransor	Community Plan	2030	
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				165 (from 76 to 265) ment	tioned in SMCOG r	egional	plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	165 connects south Brans	on to north Branso	n	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	benefits residents and bus	iness community		
nviro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	12.8	of 15
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ted (new stormwat	er deten	tion facilit
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Impacts likely can be mitig	ated, potential floo	dplain is	sues
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.8	Large project; possible im	pacts		
afatu					Max	Astual	Mainhfad	Mainht Frater - 20%	Total Dointo -	19.9	of 20
	PDO	136	Safety Index	1 17	50		8 8	(Modified MoDOT formula		10.0	01 20
an (uo	Iniury	63	Crash Rate	471.46	50	44.0	0.0	Crash data 2009-2011)		
section	Fatal	1	Accident Index	2 69							
es (n Inter	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
or		8885	Safety Concern	Vac	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local le	aders		
ر 	AVGAADT	0000	Safety Enhancements	Vae	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened road	(choulders and tu	n lance	
			Emergency Deenerge	Vee	5	5.0	1.0	Additional turn lance and			nonco tim
				100%	25	35.0	7.0		muening could imp	loveres	ponse un
			LOCAL NATATV FACTORS	100%	30	30.0	7.0	rign number of crashes			
			Local Galety Factors								
aking	1 Care of the	System			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.5	of 5

Efficie	nt Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	-			
		-	Widens Road	Yes				widen shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor for com	merce and trucks i	n this ar	ea
Quality	v of Commu	nitios			Мох	Actual	Waightad	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	75	of 10
guant	y or commu	Local/R	agional Land Lise Plans	Vec	30	30.0	3 0			1.0	
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes	50	50.0	5.0	165 mentioned in Bransor	n Community Plan (2030	
		Consi	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				165 (from 76 to 265) ment	tioned in SMCOG r	edional	nlan
		o o nio	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	165 connects south Brans	son to north Branso	n	prom
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality d	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	15	benefits residents and bus	siness community		
					20	10.0	1.0		sino community		
Enviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	12.8	of 15
		Consistent	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ited (new stormwat	er deten	tion faciliti
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Impacts likely can be mitig	gated, potential floo	dplain is	ssues
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ots		
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.8	Large project; possible im	pacts		
											_
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	18.8	of 20
(oad	PDO	136	Safety Index	1.17	50	44.0	8.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
ijor H ction	Injury	63	Crash Rate	471.46				Crash data 2009-2011			
Se As	Fatal	1	Accident Index	2.69							
tshes (N or Intera	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
Crashes (N or Inters	Years Avg AADT	3 8885	Severity Index Safety Concern	1.83 Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local le	aders		
Crashes (N or Inters	Years Avg AADT	3 8885	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	1.83 Yes Yes	5 5	5.0 5.0	1.0 1.0	Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road	aders (shoulders and tu	rn lanes)
Crashes (N or Intere	Years Avg AADT	3 8885	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	1.83 Yes Yes Yes	5 5 5	5.0 5.0 5.0	1.0 1.0 1.0	Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and	aders d (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes rove res) sponse tim
Crashes (N or Inters	Years Avg AADT	3 8885	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.83 Yes Yes Yes 100%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 35.0	1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and High number of crashes	aders d (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes rove res) sponse tim
Crashes (N or Inters	Years Avg AADT	3 8885	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.83 Yes Yes Yes 100%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 5.0 35.0	1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0	Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and w High number of crashes	aders d (shoulders and tu widening could imp	rn lanes rove res) sponse tim
Crashes (A or Inters	Years Avg AADT	3 8885 System	Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	1.83 Yes Yes 100%	5 5 35 35	5.0 5.0 35.0 Actual	1.0 1.0 1.0 7.0 Weighted	Concern raised by local le Will result in widened road Additional turn lanes and High number of crashes Weight Factor = 5%	aders d (shoulders and tu widening could imp Total Points =	rn lanes rove res 2.5) sponse tim of 5

ficie	nt Movemen	it of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.0	of 10
		Large Ve	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
			Widens Road	Yes				widen shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	Yes				turn lanes to be added			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	230	30	10.2	1.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	75%	40	30.0	3.0	important corridor for com	merce and trucks i	n this ar	ea
ualit	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	7.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	Yes	30	30.0	3.0				
		C	onsistent with Local Plans	Yes				165 mentioned in Branson	Community Plan	2030	
		Cons	istent with Regional Plans	Yes				165 (from 76 to 265) ment	ioned in SMCOG r	egional	plan
			Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	165 connects south Brans	on to north Branso	n	
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	75%	20	15.0	1.5	benefits residents and bus	iness community		
viro	onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	12.8	of 15
		Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitigat	ted (new stormwat	er deten	tion facili
	Co	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Impacts likely can be mitig	ated, potential floc	dplain is	sues
		A	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.8	Large project; possible imp	pacts		
fetv	,				Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	18.8	of 20
,	PDO	136	Safety Index	1.17	50	44.0	8.8	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
ion)	Injury	63	Crash Rate	471.46				Crash data 2009-2011			
sect	Fatal	1	Accident Index	2.69							
tet `	Years	3	Severity Index	1.83							
<u> </u>		8885	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local lea	aders		
ar In	Ava AADT			V	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened road	(shoulders and tu	rn lanes)
or In	Avg AADT		Safety Enhancements	Yes	-						
ar In	Avg AADT		Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	10	Additional turn lanes and v	videning could imp	rove res	ponse fir
or In	Avg AADT		Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	Yes Yes	5	5.0 35.0	1.0 7.0	Additional turn lanes and v	videning could imp	rove res	ponse tir
ar In	Avg AADT		Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes Yes 100%	5 35	5.0 35.0	1.0 7.0	Additional turn lanes and v High number of crashes	videning could imp	rove res	ponse tir
u lo kinc	Avg AADT	System	Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	Yes Yes 100%	5 35 Max	5.0 35.0 Actual	1.0 7.0 Weighted	Additional turn lanes and v High number of crashes Weight Factor = 5%	videning could imp Total Points =	rove res	ponse tir of 5

Takin g	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.5	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	bridge and roadway appea	ar to be in good con	dition	
	Substandard Roadv	vay or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0	none known			
Fu	unctional Classification2	Minor Arterial	40%	10	4.0	0.2				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	4550	10	1.4	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
	Local Taking Care o	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	important to maintain funct	tionality of corridor		

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.5	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
	Project provides bike connections No					consider adding bike lane	e or multi-use facility	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				consider multi-use facility	1	
Project bri	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply			
Pro	Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities Yes		use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes widened should	lers available for bikes/p	∋ds
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sho	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Widened shoulders bene	fit businesses & resident	s bikes/pe

Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.3	of 15
	Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.5	est. 2-lane LOS s/o of Fa	ll Creek Rd, more	analysi	s needed
Functional Classification	1 Minor Arterial	40%	25	10.0	1.5	consider request to upgra	ade roadway class	ification	
	Daily Usage		25	3.6	0.5	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
Local Congest	Local Congestion Relief Factors 1			25.0	3.8	capacity and turn lane iss	sues likely, more d	oc neec	ded

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 16.6 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	MO-165
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	important business and access / travel corridor
Level of Economic Distress	15%	20	3.0	0.6	
Poverty (Block Group)	10%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 5 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	5%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	6.0	Important arterial and economic link

Proj. #: 6-7 Project Name:	Spring Creek Road at Branson	City Limits	Efficient Movement of Freight
Project Type: Geometric/Safety	Total Score 27.6 out of	100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facil
Project Description: Improve vertion	al alignment, lower hill to improve s	sight distance and North	NTS Widens F
decrease steep grade.			Improves Geon
		and a second and a second and a second	Improves Load R
			Truck Us
Status: Planning	Length: 0.1	miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Fac
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway or Intersection	Roadway	
Functional Classification:	Local (for the major str	reet)	Quality of Communities
ملاع Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT):	1200 (est. 2012, avg. 1	for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use P
Daily Truck Traffic:	20 (est. 2012, avg.)	for major street)	Consistent with Local F
Through Lanes:	2 (through lanes of	n major street)	Consistent with Regional F
Project Discussion: The alignment	issue occurs at the transition from	the Branson city	Connec

street to the county roadway. The cross section decreases from 3 lanes to 2 lanes. There are driveways in the vicinity. Sight distances are limited due to the vertical alignment (i.e. drivers cannot see over the crest of the hill until they are very close to the crest). Lowering the hill would likely require additional right-of-way as well as utility , relocation.



ficient Movement of Freight		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin	ts = 1.2	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Widens Road	No						
Improves Geometry	No				not a freight oriented improvement		
Improves Load Rating	No						
Truck Usage	10	30	2.1	0.2	MoDOT formula		
-							
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma	rginal benefits	
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40 Max	10.0 Actual	1.0 Weighted	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin	rginal benefits ts = <mark>1.0</mark>	of 1
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors nality of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans	25% No	40 <u>Max</u> 30	10.0 Actual 0.0	1.0 Weighted 0.0	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin	rginal benefits ts = 1.0	of 1
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors ality of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans	25% No No	40 Max 30	10.0 Actual 0.0	1.0 Weighted 0.0	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin not mentioned in Branson Community F	rginal benefits ts = 1.0 Plan 2030	of 1
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors ality of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans	25% No No No	40 Max 30	10.0 Actual 0.0	1.0 Weighted 0.0	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin not mentioned in Branson Community F not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	rginal benefits ts = 1.0 Plan 2030	of 1
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors adity of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity	25% No No No	40 Max 30	10.0 Actual 0.0	1.0 Weighted 0.0	Not freight-oriented, but would have ma Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin not mentioned in Branson Community F not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	rginal benefits ts = 1.0 Plan 2030	of 1
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors ality of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity Scenic and Visual	25% No No No No	40 Max 30 30 20	10.0 Actual 0.0 0.0 0.0	1.0 Weighted 0.0 0.0 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% Total Poin Mote mentioned in Branson Community For mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Roadway improvements, no scenic beneficient	rginal benefits ts = 1.0 Plan 2030 efits	of 1

Efficie	ent Movement of Freight		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.2	of 10	
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0					
	Widens Road	No								
	Improves Geometry	No				not a freight oriented improvement				
	Improves Load Rating	No								
	Truck Usage	10	30	2.1	0.2	MoDOT formula				
		250/	40	10.0	1.0	Not freight-oriented, but wo	ould have marginal	benefit	s	
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	2370	10			· · · ·	U U			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	2370	10				Ŭ			
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	2370	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10	
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans	23% No	Max 30	Actual 0.0	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10	
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors ty of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans	23% No No	Max 30	Actual 0.0	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not mentioned in Branson	Total Points =	1.0	of 10	
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans	23% No No No	Max 30	Actual 0.0	Weighted 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not mentioned in Branson not mentioned in SMCOG	Total Points = Community Plan 2 regional plan	1.0	of 10	
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity	No No No No	Max 30 30	Actual 0.0	Weighted 0.0 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not mentioned in Branson not mentioned in SMCOG	Total Points = Community Plan 2 regional plan	1.0	of 10	
Qualit	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors y of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity Scenic and Visual	No No No No	Max 30 30 20	Actual 0.0 0.0	Weighted 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	Weight Factor = 10% not mentioned in Branson not mentioned in SMCOG Roadway improvements, n	Total Points = Community Plan 2 regional plan to scenic benefits	1.0	of 10	

Enviro	nmental Protection	М	lax	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	「otal Points =	4.5	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Y	(es 3	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues expec	ted		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Y	(es 3	30	30.0	1.5	no mitigation expected			
	Avoids Historical Impacts Y	les 2	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impacts			
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 5	i0% 2	20	10.0	0.5	few issues expected			

Safet	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 8.3 of 30
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	-1.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	1172	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	would result in improved sight distances
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	marginal response-time improvements
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	no recorded crashes from 2007 to 2011

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 10.4 of 20
	Roadway	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	Fair based on observations of the county roadway section	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Functional Classification2		Yes	20	20.0	4.0	limited sight distance
Fi			20%	10	2.0	0.4	
		Daily Vehicle Usage	600	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Taking Care o	f the System Factors	50%	40	20.0	4.0	sight distance issue, but no recorded crashes in 5 years

Access to O	pportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.6	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0				
	Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply			
Р	roject provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply			
Project brings e	xisting facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes		
Project p	provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks, b	oike lanes, or wider	ned shou	ulders
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson L	ines	
L	ocal Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	Lowering the hill would li	kely benefit bikes/p	eds as	well

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.6	of 10
	5	Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	congestion is not a main is	sue		
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5				
		Daily Usage	600	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula))		
	Local Congestion	n Relief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.6	congestion is not a main is	sue		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.0 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any known planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	0%	30	0.0	0.0	not an economic development related project

Type: Type: <th< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></th<>																	
Project Decempor Table Score 0 202	Proj. #: 6-8 Project Name: Tablerock Ad	cres Su	ubdivisi	ion			North / NTS		Efficien	t Movemen	t of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.3 of 10
Week Board Note: Section with a set of production with a	Project Type: Facility Upgrade Total Sco	re 5	2.6	out of	100				1	-	Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Provide construction Provide c	Project Description: Install curbs, gutters, and sic	iewalks	s throug	hout th	ne neigl	hborhood.	The El	A CLARENCE	-			Widens Road	No				
Import last is with provide the stand last interaction Readers of human last is with reaction Readers of human last is with reader	This could require utility relocation work and possic	лупем	v nym-o	i-way.				↑ 0 · · · ·		1		Improves Geometry	No				
The characterize of the second seco							the second					Improves Load Rating	No				
Batter: Reading of the second se							The second					Truck Usage	15	30	2.6	0.3	MoDOT formula
Topole See : Media Review of intervent into solutions Review of intervent	Status: Planning	Ler	ngth:	4	miles			1 - 14	- //-	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	Not a truck travel related project; residential roads
Encland Loganization Test Reset <	Project Scale: Medium Roadw	vay or	Interse	ction	Roadw	/ay	A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	A CONTRACTOR	11-								
No. A mod Dally Taffit: 2407: 3000 (extended, arg, for major alerg) (extended, arg, formajor alerg) (extended, arg, forma)	Functional Classification: Local	(for	r the ma	ijor stre	eet)		A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL		Quality	of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.0 of 10
Daily Track Traffic 30 (windwick zwig is explorable) (windwick zwig is zwi	Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 3000	(es	timated.	, avg. i	for majo	or street)	TO NOT THE WILL	Sekter .	Cord		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Through Late: 2 (Arrow	Daily Truck Traffic: 30	(es	timated	, avg. i	for majo	or street)		E Martin	POL F		С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030
Trade description Connectivity No 30 0.0 0.0 Exception Connectivity No 30 0.0 0.0 2.0 will impose the austribute of the registromeded equality of the dates entrumeded	Through Lanes: 2	(thi	rough la	nes or	n major	street)	1 Carton			NS/L	Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
Number of the solution of the s	Project Discussion: This neighborhood has storm	nwater	issues.	Storm	water i	is handled	A Manager		10			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0	
	in roadside swales. It does not have sidewalks.						文書を行う		The second			Scenic and Visual	Yes	20	20.0	2.0	will improve the aesthetics of the neighborhood
								ALL STORE	N.		al Quality	of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	will benefit residents' quality of life address stormwater & per
Image: Note: Image: Note: Image: Note: Image: Note:														23	20.0	2.0	and the second quarky of the, address stormation a pot
Access to Opportunity Max Actual Weight Factor = % Total Points = 1 S of 3 S									Environ	mental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Moightod	Weight Eactor = 5% Total Points = 50 of 5
Access to Opportunity Max Accuss for											Consiston	t with Stormwater Goals	Vac	30	30.0	1.5	directly addresses starmyater issues
Consistent value (Vergeheed Arriver, Vergeheed Vergehe Kasten = 9%, Total Points = 3.8 of 5 Consistent value (Vergeheed Vergeheed Vergeheeed Vergeh										Co		the Environmental Cools	Vec	20	20.0	1.0	
Cuckes of opportunity Note	Access to Opportunity				Astual	101-1-1-1-				CO		ui Environmental Goals	Vec	20	20.0	1.0	no miligation expected
Eliminate tendered barriers (LW) U/W 2.5 2.00 1.0 2.00 1.0 2.00 1.0 1.00 2.00 1.0 1.00 2.00 1.0 1.00 2.00 1.0 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00 1.00 2.00 1.00	Access to Opportunity	A) 47	0.00/		Actual	veignteo	vveight Factor = 5% Total P			1 1	A		tes	20	20.0	1.0	
Project provides podestrian connections Yes Cub improvements Set is deviated to deviate t	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (AD	(A) 10	00%	25	25.0	1.3				Local	Environm	ental Protection Factors	100%	20	20.0	1.0	tew issues expected; addresses stormwater
Project provides podestrian connectors Yes stadewalks to be installed Max Actual Weight Mactor State Total Points Z 33 G 30 Project provides some backpidedstrian Connectory No see first two do not apply see first two do not ap	Project provides bike connectio	ns 1	Yes				curb improvements										
Project provides some bikapie desition to all the xt two do not apply	Project provides pedestrian connectio	ons)	Yes				sidewalks to be installed		Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 23.3 of 30
Project provides some bike/peckes/rian facilities No use if first into do not apply Code not complex power in the peckes/rian facilities Crash Rate 23.38 Crash Rate 23.38 Crash data 2009-2011 Local Access to Opportunity Factors 100 0.0 No effect on Branoon Shuttle or deffersion Lines Accident Index 0.13 Severity Index 4.50 Consection Relief Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points 2.2 of 10 Safety Concent Yes 5 5.0 1.5 Concent raised by local leaders Functional Classification Local 2.06 0.0 1.0 estimated peak hour LOS Emergency Response No 5.0 0.0 0.0 Vill result in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters Local Congestion Relief Factors 2.5 0.6 0.1 (Modified MoDOT formula) Emergency Response No 5.0 0.0 0.0 Viel result in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters 13.4 of 2.0 Local Congestion Relief Factors 2.5 0.6 0.0 Viel result in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters 13.4 of 2.0 Substandard Roadway or Bridge Conditions No 0.0 0.0 Interve	Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulation	ons	No u	se if firs	st two do	o not apply	does not apply		()	PDO	1	Safety Index	1.75	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
Transit No 25 0.0 0.0 No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines Local Access to Opportunity Factors 100% 50 0.0 2.5 New sidewalks and cub improvements benefit bikes/eeds Congestion Relief Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.2 0 ft Level of Service C 2.5 0.0 0.0 1.0 Safety Enhancements Years 3.3 Safety Enhancements Years 5.0 1.5 One mraised by local leaders Level of Service C 2.5 0.0	Project provides some bike/pedestrian faciliti	ies	No u	se if firs	st two de	o not apply	does not apply		ction F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	23.38				Crash data 2009-2011
Local Access to Opportunity Factors 100% 50 50.0 2.5 New sidewalks and cub improvements benefit bikes/points 3 Severity Index 4.50 Severity Index 4.50 Safety Concern Years 3 3 3 5 5.0 1.5 Concern raised by local leaders Safety Enhancements Years 3 Aug AADT 2929 Safety Concern Years 5 5.0 1.5 Concern raised by local leaders Level of Service C 2.5 10.0 1.0 estimated peak hour LOS Emergency Response No 5 0.0 0.0 <	Tran	sit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Je	efferson Lines	(Ma erse	Fatal	1	Accident Index	0.13				
Congestion Relief Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points 2.2 of 10 Safety Concern Yes 5 5.0 1.5 Concern raised by local leaders Level of Service C 2.5 1.0 1.0 estimated peak hour LOS Emergency Response No 5 0.0 0.0 Vill result in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters Local Congestion Relief Factors 2.5% 0.5 0.5 0.5 1.5 Concern raised by local leaders Local Congestion Relief Factors 2.5% 0.6 0.1 (Modified MoDOT formula) Local Congestion Relief Factors 2.5% 0.8 0.0 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 3.0 0.0	Local Access to Opportunity Factor	ors 10	00%	50	50.0	2.5	New sidewalks and curb improven	nents benefit bikes/peds	r Int	Years	3	Severity Index	4.50				
Congestion Relief Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.2 of 10 Level of Service C 25 10.0 1.0 estimated peak hour LOS Functional Classification1 Local 20% 25 5.0 0.5 Local Safety Factors 50% 35 17.5 5.3 project will not likely address observed vehicle crashes Daily Usage 1500 2.5 6.3 0.6 0.1 (Modified MoDOT formula) Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 25 6.3 0.6 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Strategic Regional Economic Opportunities No 30 0.0 0.0 Isocal Safety Factors 75% 40 30.0 6.0 residential streets Poretry (Block Group) 11% 2006 00.0 ACS 2006 00.0 ACS 2006 00.0 ACS 2006 00.0 ACS 15.0 30.0 stormwater issues Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weighte Factor = 10% Total Points = 0									Cras	Avg AADT	2929	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
Level of Service C 25 10.0 1.0 estimated peak hour LOS Functional Classification 1 Local 20% 25 5.0 0.5 Local Safety Factors 50% 35 17.5 5.3 project will not likely address observed vehicle crashes Daily Usage 1500 25 0.0 0.1 (Modified MoDOT formula) Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 0.3 0.6 Project will not significantly benefit congestion 0.8 of 20 Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0 0.0 Total Points 0.8 of 10 Support Regional Economic Distress 0% 20 0.0 0.0 Control Correl No 5 0.0 0.0 0.0 13.4 of 20 Poverty (Block Group) No 30 0.0	Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total P	oints = 2.2 of 10				Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will result in sidewalks, curbs, and gutters
Functional Classification Local 20% 25 5.0 0.5 Construction Co	Level of Servi	се	С	25	10.0	1.0	estimated peak hour LOS					Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 0.6 0.1 (Modified MoDOT formula) Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 25 6.3 0.6 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Support Regional Economic Opportunities No 20 0.0 0.0 Control Competitiveness Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Support Regional Economic Opportunities No 20 0.0 0.0 Control Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Support Regional Economic Opportunities No 20 0.0 0.0 Control Competitivenes 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Poverty (Block Group) 11% 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Control Competitivenes 75% 40 30.0 6.0 residential streets Deverty (Block Group) 11% 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group	Eunctional Classification1	22	20%	25	5.0	0.5						Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	53	project will not likely address observed vehicle crashes
Local Congestion Relief Factors 25 0.0 0.0 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Local Congestion Relief Factors 25% 25 6.3 0.6 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0 0.0 Control Competitiveness Veight Gactor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Support Regional Economic Corridor No 20 0.0 0.0 Control Competitivenes Veight Gactor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Poverty (Block Group) No 20 0.0 0.0 Control Competitivenes No 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Unsample waret (were) 11% Zoode-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Zoode-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Zoode-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Unsample waret (were) 4% 4% 30.0 6.0 residential streets		do 4	500	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified Manot formula)					Loour dately raciols	00 /0	00	11.0	0.0	Project with the timely address observed vehicle of astres
Local Congestion Relier Factors 25% 25 6.3 0.6 Project will not significantly benefit congestion Iaking Care of the System Max Actual Weight Eactor = 20% Total Points = 13.4 of 20 Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weight Medit Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0	Daily Usa	ge i	500	20	0.0	0.1		(Talain	0 ana - 6 41	Curation				A . (101-1-1-1-1	
Roadway or Bridge Conditions Poor 20 15.0 3.0 stormwater issues Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0 0	Local Congestion Relief Facto	ors 2	20%	25	6.3	0.6	Project will not significantly benefit	t congestion	Taking	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	vveighted	weight Factor = 20% lotal Points = 13.4 of 20
Economic Competitiveness Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10 Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0 <td></td> <td>Roadw</td> <td>ay or Bridge Conditions</td> <td>Poor</td> <td>20</td> <td>15.0</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>stormwater issues</td>											Roadw	ay or Bridge Conditions	Poor	20	15.0	3.0	stormwater issues
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor No 30 0.0 0.0 Functional Classification2 Local 20% 10 2.0 0.4 Support Regional Economic Opportunities No 20 0.0 0.0 0.0 Daily Vehicle Usage 1500 10 0.2 0.0 (Modified MoDOT formula) Level of Economic Distress 0% 20 0.0 0.0 0.0 Cocal 20% 10 0.2 0.0 (Modified MoDOT formula) Poverty (Block Group) 11% 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group 40 30.0 6.0 residential streets	Economic Competitiveness			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total P	Points = 0.8 of 10		Substa	indard Roa	adway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	lacks appropriate stormwater control
Support Regional Economic Opportunities No 20 0.0 0.0 0.0 Level of Economic Distress 0% 20 0.0	Strategic Regional Economic Corrid	lor	No	30	0.0	0.0			Fun	nctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4	
Level of Economic Distress 0% 20 0.0 0.0 Local Taking Care of the System Factors 75% 40 30.0 6.0 residential streets Poverty (Block Group) 11% 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group 40 30.0 6.0 residential streets	Support Regional Economic Opportuniti	es	No	20	0.0	0.0						Daily Vehicle Usage	1500	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
Poverty (Block Group) 11% 2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group Unemployment (tract) 4% 2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 block group	Level of Economic Distre	SS (0%	20	0.0	0.0				Local	Taking Car	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	residential streets
Linemplerment (treet) 49/	Poverty (Black Gra	1 (מו	1%				2006-2010 ACS block group data	- 1 block group			-	-					
		nt)	A0/.				2006 2010 ACS treat data 1 treat	+ biook group									

Local Economic Competitiveness Factors 25% 30 7.5 0.8 not an economic dev. project, benefits existing dev.

Improve Skyvie	ew Drive (MO-265 to Luster Dr)
Total Score	48.4 out of 100
ay. Trees, lands	d improve alignment. This could caping, utilities, and drainage could
	Length: 1.49 miles
Roadwa	v or Interportion Poodway
	y of intersection Roadway
Local	(for the major street)
Local 1500	(for the major street) (estimated, avg. for major street)
Local 1500 0	(for the major street) (estimated, avg. for major street) (estimated, avg. for major street)
	Improve Skyvie Total Score Ind shoulders and ay. Trees, landso

Project Discussion: The travelway on Skyview Drive appears to be less than 18 feet in many places. The posted speed limit is 25mph and there are all-way stops located on Skyview Drive. It is a residential street with many driveways accessing the street. The daily traffic volume was estimated based on a sample count and an estimate of dwelling units in the corridor.



fficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% To	otal Points =	1.0	of 10
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Widens Road	No				widen lanes and shoulders			
			Improves Geometry	No				improve alignment			
			Improves Load Rating	No							
			Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula			
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, but do	es provide for c	leliverie	S
											_
ality	of Commur	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% To	otal Points =	0.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson Con	nmunity Plan 20)30	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regi	onal plan		
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits, could impa	ct scenery		
	Loca	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	could benefit local residents ar	nd could benefit	t peds/b	ikes
											_
nviro	nmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% To	otal Points =	4.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwate	er issues expect	ed	
	Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation e	expected		
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts			
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues exp	pected, some a	re possi	ble thou
afoty					Mox	Actual	Maightad	Maight Easter = 30% To	tal Pointe -	22.2	of 30
	PDO	2	Safoty Index	1.56	50	FO 0		(Modified MoDOT formula)		23.5	01 30
) (in	Iniury	1	Crash Rate	167 39	50	50.0	10.0	Crash data 2009-2011			
section	Eatal	1		0 96 0							
nters	Vooro	2	Covority Index	3 63							
or		1465	Safety Concorn	Vee	5	50	15	Concern raised by local loader	-e		
2		1405	Safety Enhancomente	Voc	5	5.0	1.5	would result in widened lance	o obouldore: ro.c	lianmo	at
				Ne	5	0.0	1.0	would result in widened idnes,	SHOULDELS, TE-2	ingrittiel	it.
				NO	5	17.5	0.0		han ta sa dalifa sa sa 1.1	Increase	
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	roadway width is very harrow,	but wiath could	Increas	se spee
akino	Care of the	Svstem			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% To	otal Points =	14.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway appears to be in fair of	condition, little r	oadway	r cracki
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Lane widths do not meet desig	n standards.		
Fu	nctional Class	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4				

ficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.0 o	of 10
		Large Ve	chicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0		
			Widens Road	No				widen lanes and shoulders	
			Improves Geometry	No				improve alignment	
			Improves Load Rating	No					
			Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula	
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, but does provide for deliveries	
ality	/ of Commu	nities			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.5 o	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0		
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits, could impact scenery	
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	could benefit local residents and could benefit peds/bike	es
viro	nmental Pro	tection			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8 o	of 5
	1	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwater issues expected	
	Сог	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation expected	
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues expected, some are possible	e thou
foty					Mox	Actual	Maightad	Weight Easter = 20% Total Points = 23.3	vf 20
Cly	PDO	2	Safety Index	1 56	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
(uo	Iniury	1	Crash Rate	167.39	00	00.0	10.0	Crash data 2009-2011	
secti	Fatal	1	Accident Index	0.96					
nter	Voare	2	Severity Index	3.63					
or		1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	50	15	Concern raised by local leaders	
	/ lig/ lib1	1400	Safety Enhancements	Ves	5	5.0	1.5	would result in widened lanes, shoulders: re-alignment	
			Emergency Posponso	No	5	0.0	0.0		
				50%	25	17.5	5.2	roodway width is your parrow, but width could increase a	0000
			Local Salety Factors	30%	30	17.5	0.5	Toadway width's very harrow, but width could increase s	speed
king	Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.4 o	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway appears to be in fair condition, little roadway cr	rackir
	Substa	Indard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Lane widths do not meet design standards.	
	nctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
Fu	notional oldo								

Efficie	nt Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.0	of 10
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0		
			Widens Road	No				widen lanes and shoulders	
			Improves Geometry	No				improve alignment	
			Improves Load Rating	No					
			Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula	
	Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, but does provide for deliverie	es
Quality	y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.5	of 10
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0		
		Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030	
		Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
			Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0		
			Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits, could impact scenery	
	Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	could benefit local residents and could benefit peds/	oikes
Inviro	onmental Pro	tection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8	of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwater issues expected	
	Сог	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation expected	
		A۱	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues expected, some are poss	ible thou
Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 23.3	of 30
Road	PDO	2	Safety Index	1.56	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
ajor F	Injury	1	Crash Rate	167.39				Crash data 2009-2011	
s (Ma terse	Fatal	1	Accident Index	0.96					
or In	Years	3	Severity Index	3.63					
ö	Avg AADT	1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders	
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	would result in widened lanes, shoulders; re-alignme	nt
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0		
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	roadway width is very narrow, but width could increa	se speed
									-
Taking	g Care of the	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.4	of 20
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway appears to be in fair condition, little roadwa	y crackir
	Substa	ndard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Lane widths do not meet design standards.	
Fu	Inctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		

ficie	nt Movemer	nt of Freigh	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.0 of 1
		Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0	
			Widens Road	No				widen lanes and shoulders
			Improves Geometry	No				improve alignment
			Improves Load Rating	No				
			Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula
	Local Effi	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, but does provide for deliveries
alit	v of Commu	nitioe			Mary	Astual		Weight Easter = 10% Total Dainta = 0.5 laf 1
anı	y or commu		a nianal I and I las Diana	Ma	Max	Actual		
		Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	INO	30	0.0	0.0	net mentioned in Present Community Plan 2020
		Consi	atent with Degional Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2050
		Consi		No	30	0.0	0.0	not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
			Sconic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scopio honofite, could impact scopony
				250/	20	0.0 E 0	0.0	no scenic benefit, could impact scenery
	LOC	al Quality C	or communities ractors	2370	20	5.0	0.5	could benefit local residents and could benefit pedsiblikes
virc	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8 of 5
		Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormwater issues expected
	Co	nsistent wit	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigation expected
		Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts
	Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues expected, some are possible th
afetv					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 23.3 of 3
,	PDO	2	Safety Index	1.56	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
ion)	Injury	1	Crash Rate	167.39				Crash data 2009-2011
rsect	Fatal	1	Accident Index	0.96				
Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.63				
o	Avg AADT	1465	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	would result in widened lanes, shoulders; re-alianment
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	,,
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	roadway width is very narrow, but width could increase spe
						1110	0.0	
aking	<mark>g Care of the</mark>	System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.4 of 2
		Roadwa	ay or Bridge Conditions	Fair	20	10.0	2.0	roadway appears to be in fair condition, little roadway cract
	Substa	andard Roa	dway or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Lane widths do not meet design standards.
F	nctional Clas	sification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4	

ent Movemen	t of Freigl	nt		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10
	Large Ve	hicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Widens Road	No				widen lanes and shoulders	6		
		Improves Geometry	No				improve alignment			
		Improves Load Rating	No							
		Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Effic	cient Move	ment of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, bu	t does provide for	deliverie	S
y of Commu	nities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10
	Local/R	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Co	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not mentioned in Branson	Community Plan 2	2030	
	Consi	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
		Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
		Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits, could in	mpact scenery		
Loc	al Quality o	of Communities Factors	25%	20	5.0	0.5	could benefit local residen	ts and could bene	fit peds/b	oikes
onmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	4.8	of 5
	Consistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, few stormy	water issues expe	cted	
Cor	nsistent wi	th Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Modest project, no mitigati	on expected		
	Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
Local	Environme	ental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	Modest project, few issues	s expected, some	are poss	ible thou
								T (10 1 (<u> </u>	1.00
		Ostata kalen	4.50	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	23.3	of 30
PDU	2	Safety Index	1.00	50	50.0	15.0	(Modified MoDOT formula,)		
		Croch Doto	167 20				Creek date 2000-2011			
E atal		Crash Rate	167.39				Crash data 2009-2011			
Fatal	1	Crash Rate Accident Index	167.39 0.96				Crash data 2009-2011			
Fatal Years	1	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index	167.39 0.96 3.63	F	5.0	4.5	Crash data 2009-2011			
Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 1465	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea	aders	p	
Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 1465	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes	5 5	5.0 5.0	1.5 1.5	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lan	aders nes, shoulders; re	-alignme	nt
Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 1465	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No	5 5 5	5.0 5.0 0.0	1.5 1.5 0.0	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lar	aders nes, shoulders; re	-alignme	nt
Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 1465	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No 50%	5 5 5 35	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lan roadway width is very narr	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul	-alignme	nt se speec
Fatal Years Avg AADT	1 3 1465	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No 50%	5 5 35	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lar roadway width is very narr	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul	-alignme Id increa:	nt se speec
Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the	1 3 1465 System	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No 50%	5 5 35 35 Max 20	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lan roadway width is very narr Weight Factor = 20%	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul Total Points = fair condition_little	-alignme Id increas 14.4	nt se speec of 20
Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the	1 3 1465 System Roadwa	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No 50% Fair	5 5 35 Max 20	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 10.0	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 2.0	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lar roadway width is very narr Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in f	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul Total Points = fair condition, little	-alignme Id increas 14.4 roadway	nt se speec of 20 r crackin
Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	1 3 1465 System Roadwa	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes Yes No 50% Fair Yes	5 5 35 Max 20 20	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 10.0 20.0	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 2.0 4.0	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lar roadway width is very narr Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in f Lane widths do not meet d	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul Total Points = fair condition, little lesign standards.	-alignme Id increas 14.4 roadway	nt se speec of 20 / crackin
r Jary Fatal Years Avg AADT g Care of the Substa	1 3 1465 System Roadwa andard Roa sification2	Crash Rate Accident Index Severity Index Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Emergency Response Local Safety Factors ay or Bridge Conditions dway or Bridge Feature Local	167.39 0.96 3.63 Yes No 50% 50% Fair Yes 20%	5 5 35 Max 20 20 10	5.0 5.0 0.0 17.5 Actual 10.0 20.0 2.0	1.5 1.5 0.0 5.3 Weighted 2.0 4.0 0.4	Crash data 2009-2011 Concern raised by local lea would result in widened lar roadway width is very narr Weight Factor = 20% roadway appears to be in f Lane widths do not meet d	aders nes, shoulders; re ow, but width coul Total Points = fair condition, little lesign standards.	-alignme Id increas 14.4 roadway	nt se speec of 20 / crackin
	Local Effi ty of Commu Loc onmental Pro Co Local	Local Efficient Move ty of Communities Local/Re Consist Local Quality of Consistent Consistent with Consistent with Av Local Environme	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Widens Road Improves Geometry Improves Load Rating Truck Usage Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors ty of Communities Local/Regional Land Use Plans Consistent with Local Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Consistent with Regional Plans Connectivity Scenic and Visual Local Quality of Communities Factors onmental Protection Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts Local Environmental Protection Factors	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities No Widens Road No Improves Geometry No Improves Load Rating No Truck Usage 0 Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% ty of Communities No Local/Regional Land Use Plans No Consistent with Local Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Consistent with Regional Plans No Local Quality of Communities Factors 25% conmental Protection 25% Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes Avoids Historical Impacts Yes Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities No 30 Widens Road No Improves Geometry No Improves Load Rating No Truck Usage 0 30 Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 ty of Communities Max Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 Local Quality of Communities Factors 25% 20 Onmental Protection Max 20 Local Stent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30 Avoids Historical Impacts Yes 20 Local Environmental Protection Factors 75% 20 Max PDO 2 Safety Index 1.56 50	Large Vehicle Friendly FacilitiesNo300.0Widens RoadNoNoImproves GeometryNoImproves Load RatingNoTruck Usage0300.0Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors25%4010.0ty of CommunitiesMaxActualLocal/Regional Land Use PlansNo300.0Consistent with Local PlansNo300.0Consistent with Regional PlansNo300.0Consistent with Regional PlansNo200.0Local Quality of Communities Factors25%205.0consistent with Stormwater GoalsYes3030.0Consistent with Environmental GoalsYes3030.0Avoids Historical ImpactsYes202.0Local Environmental Protection Factors75%2015.0MaxActualActualActualPDO2Safety Index1.565050.0	Large Vehicle Friendly FacilitiesNo300.00.0Widens RoadNoNoNoImproves GeometryNoImproves Load RatingNoNo10.00.0Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors25%4010.01.0ty of CommunitiesMaxActualWeightedLocal/Regional Land Use PlansNo300.00.0Consistent with Local PlansNo300.00.0Consistent with Regional PlansNo300.00.0Consistent with Regional PlansNo300.00.0Local Quality of Communities Factors25%205.00.5conmental ProtectionMaxActualWeightedConsistent with Stormwater GoalsYes3030.01.5Avoids Historical ImpactsYes2020.01.0Local Environmental Protection Factors75%2015.00.8YMaxActualWeightedPDO2Safety Index1.565050.015.0	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities No 30 0.0 0.0 Widens Road No widen lanes and shoulders improves Load Rating No widen lanes and shoulders Improves Load Rating No No 30 0.0 0.0 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 not a major truck route, but ty of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in Branson not mentioned in SMCOG Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not scenic benefits, could it Local Quality of Communities Factors 25% 20 5.0 0.5 could benefit local residen onmental Protection Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 5% Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0 1.5 Modest project, few storm Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes 30 30.0 1.5 Modest project, few storm Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes<	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities No 30 0.0 0.0 Widens Road No widen lanes and shoulders improve alignment Improves Load Rating No improve alignment Improves Load Rating No 0 0.0 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 not a major truck route, but does provide for ty of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 no not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 20 0.0 0.0 no true mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Consistent with Regional Plans No 30 0.0 0.0	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities No 30 0.0 0.0 Widens Road No widen lanes and shoulders improve alignment Improves Geometry No improve alignment improve alignment Improves Load Rating No 0 0.0 MoDOT formula Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 25% 40 10.0 1.0 not a major truck route, but does provide for deliverie ty of Communities Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.5 Local/Regional Land Use Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030 Consistent with Local Plans No 30 0.0 0.0 not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan Connectivity No 30 0.0 0.0 no scenic benefits, could impact scenery Local Quality of Communities Factors 25% 20 5.0 0.5 could benefit local residents and could benefit peds/t onmental Protection Max Actual Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8 Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes 30

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.1 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connections	No				no bike facilities assume	d to be included	
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				no pedestrian facilities a	ssumed to be includ	ed
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	does not apply		
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes widened should	ders available to bike	e/peds
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lir	nes
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	75%	50	37.5	1.9	Widened shoulders bene	efit bikes/peds	

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.6	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5				
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5				
		Daily Usage	750	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestic	on Relief Factors	25%	25	6.3	0.6	capacity is not a major iss	ue		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.8 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	not linked to any known planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	0%	20	0.0	0.0	
Poverty (Block Group)	9%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	not a major economic development corridor

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
Project Type: Facility U	pgrade Total Sco	re 74.4 out of 100
Project Description: Stree	et improvement project	o improve pedestrian safety and
tourist attraction to the 76 \$	Strip. Project is in the p	anning and preliminary design phase
Status: Planning and De	sign	Length: 3.9 miles
Project Scale: Regional	Roady	vay or Intersection Roadway
Project Scale: Regional Functional Class	Road ification: Major Arteria	way or Intersection Roadway I (for the major street)
Project Scale: Regional Functional Class Avg. Annual Daily Traffic	Road ification: Major Arteria (AADT): 23700	vay or Intersection Roadway I (for the major street) (est. 2012, avg. for major street)
Project Scale: Regional Functional Class Avg. Annual Daily Traffic Daily Truc	Roady ification: Major Arteria (AADT): 23700 k Traffic: 710	 (for the major street) (est. 2012, avg. for major street) (est. 2012, avg. for major street)

Project Discussion: This project has been a priority for the City of Branson. The City has committed \$18 million to the project. Project will include relocation (likely underground) of existing electric utilities. The goals of the project include increasing visitor trips, managing traffic congestion, increasing safety, improving access and mobility, improving visual appearance, preserving and celebrating heritage, encouraging investment and development, and strengthening existing destinations and businesses.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points = 2.3 of 1	0
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Widens Road	No				no change		
Improves Geometry	No				no change		
Improves Load Rating	No				no change		
Truck Usage	355	30	12.6	1.3	MoDOT formula		
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck route, bu	t does provide for deliveries	

Quality	of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	6.5	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans Y	'es 30	30.0	3.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans Y	′es			part of Branson's Compre	hensive and Strate	gic plan	
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No			not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan			
	Connectivity	No 30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual Y	'es 20	20.0	2.0	plan would enhance lands	caping, aesthetics,	and view	NS
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 7	5% 20	15.0	1.5	project will revive strip and	d increase tax rever	lues	

Enviro	nmental Protection	Ma	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 14.3	of 15
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Y	'es 30	30.0	4.5	Branson MS4 requirements will be followed	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals Y	'es 30	30.0	4.5	Rain gardens are planned	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Y	'es 20	20.0	3.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 7	5% 20	15.0	2.3	Environment to be showcased where possible	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%
oad	PDO	388	Safety Index	1.19	50	44.5	8.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R stion)	Injury	133	Crash Rate	527.20				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj erseo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	3.01				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	1.64				
Cras	Avg AADT	23141	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	pedestrian safety will be greatly enhanced
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	will address pedestrian safety which is a major concern

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	2.8	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3	roadway appears to be in	good condition, li	ttle roadwa	y cracking
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
Fu	Inctional Classification2	Major Arterial	50%	10	5.0	0.3				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	11850	10	6.2	0.3	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Taking Care of	of the System Factors	100%	40	40.0	2.0	improvements are needed	l for capacity		

Access	to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	5.0 o	of 5
	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	100%	25	25.0	1.3				
	Project provides bike connections	Yes				bike/pedestrian barriers	will be eliminated		
	Project provides pedestrian connections	Yes				pedestrian access is key	/ part of project		
Project bri	ings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
Pro	pject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply				
	Transit	Yes	25	25.0	1.3	Transit stops are to be c	onstructed		
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	100%	50	50.0	2.5	Pedestrian/Bike/Transit	considerations very	, promine	ent

Conge	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points = 11	.7 of 15
	2	Level of Service	F	25	25.0	3.8	extended delays and long	g queues common	
	Functional Classification1	Major Arterial	50%	25	12.5	1.9			
		Daily Usage	11850	25	15.6	2.3	(Modified MoDOT formul	a)	
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	3.8	project increases capacit	y - a major issue, wors	st in County

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 15.7 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	project is center of highest economic area
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	project is center of highest economic area
Level of Economic Distress	30%	20	6.0	1.2	
Poverty (Block Group)	1 2%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	75%	30	22.5	4.5	needed to keep Branson economically competitive

Proj # 6-11 Project Name	New Interchange at MO-76 & MO-376		Efficient Mo	vement o	f Freiah	t		Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.8 of 10
Project Type: Capacity	Total Score 49.5 out of 100				arge Vel	hicle Friendly Facilities	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Holght Pactor 1070		
Project Description: Construct n	ew interchange to replace existing at-grade			_		Widens Road	Yes	00	00.0	0.0			
intersection.						Improves Geometry	Yes						
						Improves Load Rating	Ves						
							125	30	75	0.8	MoDOT formula		
Status: Planning	Lenath: NA		Lo	ocal Efficier	nt Moven	nent of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	Interchange to meet criter	ia for freight	
Project Scale: Regional	Roadway or Intersection Intersection					·					, and the second s	Ŭ	
Functional Classificatio	n: Major Arterial (for the major street)		Quality of C	ommuniti	es			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.0 of 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT	12,800 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	atoma and the second			Local/Re	gional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Daily Truck Traffi	c: 250 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	animine and a second			Co	nsistent with Local Plans	No				not found in Branson plan		
Through Lane	s: 2 (through lanes on major street)	· Reality and Reality of the			Consis	stent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in regional	plan	
Project Discussion: Project woul	d be designed to increase roadway capacity, facilitate					Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	76 and 376 connect to po	ints beyond	
local circulation, and promote dev	elopment in the project vicinity. Due to the					Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits		
downgrades on Route 376 on botr be constructed as a bridge over R	i sides of Route 76, it is expected that Route 76 could oute 376 There are a number of options for handling	North / NTS		Local G	Quality of	f Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	interchange would benefit	traffic flow, but may	/ impact ROW
the turning movements and the th	ough movements on Route 376. Some concepts that				-								
could be considered include: tight	diamond with signals, single-point type design, ramps		Environmer	ntal Protec	tion			Мах	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	7.5 of 15
with roundabouts, or two-lane roui	ndabout under Route /6. Access to nearby properties			Cor	nsistent	with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	4.5	Assume new runoff mitiga	ited (new stormwate	r detention facil
as wer as right of way are imported				Consis	stent wit	h Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	large project; environmen	tal mitigation possib	e
Access to Opportunity	Max Actual Weighte	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 1.9 of 5			Av	oids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	3.0	no known historical impac	ts	
Eliminate Bike/P	ed Barriers (ADA) 100% 25 25.0 1.3			Local En	vironme	ntal Protection Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	due to size of project, miti	aation likelv	
Proiect provide	s bike connections Yes	assumes bike facilities will be part of project									, , ,		
Project provides ped	estrian connections Yes	assumes sidewalks will be part of proiect	Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	6.7 of 20
Project brings existing facilities up f	o ADA Regulations No use if first two do not apply		ad	PDO	15	Safetv Index	0.53	50	19.9	4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula		
Project provides some bike/	nedestrian facilities No use if first two do not apply		- Roi	lniury	2	Crash Rate	12/1 22				Crash data 2009-2011	/	

Fatal

Years Avg AADT 12498

0

3

Crashes (Ma or Interse

· · ·) · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					······································
brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fil	rst two do	not apply	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fir	rst two do	not apply	
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	could increase speeds; project not pedestrian/bike scale

Cong	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	8.4	of 15
	Level	of Service	E	25	20.0	3.0	congestion is an issue at t	his location		
	Functional Classification1 Ma	jor Arterial	50%	25	12.5	1.9				
	D	aily Usage	6400	25	4.6	0.7	(Modified MoDOT formula)		
	Local Congestion Rel	ief Factors	75%	25	18.8	2.8	moderate to high traffic, w	ith congestion		

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.2 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Hwy 76
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	Yes	30	30.0	6.0	Interchange allows for large scale economic possibilities
Level of Economic Distress	30%	20	6.0	1.2	
Poverty (Block Group)	12.0%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	4.0%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	3.0	benefit to existing economic conditions

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% To	tal Points =	1.1	of 5
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	0.3				
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	No	20	0.0	0.0				
F	unctional Classification2	Major Arterial	50%	10	5.0	0.3				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	6400	10	1.8	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	25%	40	10.0	0.5	improvement over existing inter	rsection		

5 0.0

5 0.0

35 8.8

5

5.0

Accident Index 1.88

Severity Index 1.29

Safety Concern No

Safety Enhancements Yes

Emergency Response No

Local Safety Factors 25%

Weighted	Weight Factor = 20%	Total Points =	6.7	of 20
4.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Crash data 2009-2011			
0.0				
1.0	Interchange could improve	safety over the at	-grade int	ersection
0.0				
1.8	crash rate not significant re	lative to other pro	jects	

Proj. #:	7-1	Project Name:	Coon Creek Rd	(Hwy Bb	to MO-76)	
Project	Type:	Connectivity	Total Score	57.3	out of 100	-
Project culvert). improve	Descri This c the sha	ption: Improve the ro ould include using fill arp curve at the west	adway to addres and/or a structur end of the corrido	s the sect e to raise or.	ion that floods (existing the roadway. Also	Nort
Status:	Cons	truction	2018	Length:	1.52 miles	
Project	Scale:	Medium	Roadway	or Inter	section Roadway	and an and a
	Functi	onal Classification:	Collector	Modified	from MoDOT (major st)	and the second
Avg. An	nual D	aily Traffic (AADT):	3000	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)	
		Daily Truck Traffic:	240	(est. 201	2, avg. for major street)	
		Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes on major street)	2.50
Project	Discus	sion: The closure of	this roadway dur	ing high v	ater events impacts east-	14

west travel and causes traffic to have to re-route MO-76. This affects commerce, emergency response times, and general travel. The roadway appears to be in relatively good condition with regards to pavement. There are guardrails and various advance warning signs. The sharp curve is posted with a 15mph warning sign.



Efficier	t Movement of Freight	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial	Yes 30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road No							
	Improves Geometry Yes	S			improve alignment (low wa	ater area, sharp cu	rve)	
	Improves Load Rating No)						
	Truck Usage 120	30	7.3	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 509	6 40	20.0	2.0	benefits truck traffic, but n	ot major truck focu	sed impr	ovement
Quality	of Communities	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.0	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans No				not known to be on any ap	plicable local plan		
	Consistent with Regional Plans No)			not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity Yes	s 30	30.0	3.0	Hollister, Kirbyville			
	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 100	<mark>%</mark> 20	20.0	2.0	links community together,	especially in seriou	is weath	er cond.
	•							
Enviro	nmental Protection	Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes	s 30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals No	30	0.0	0.0	stream/floodplain crossing	, potential for impa	cts	
	Avoids Historical Impacts Yes	s 20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 759	6 20	15.0	0.8	environmental issues may	require mitigation		
Safety		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.0	of 30

Efficier	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	rtial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ater area, sharp cu	rve)	
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	120	30	7.3	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	benefits truck traffic, but n	ot major truck focu	sed impr	ovement
Quality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.0	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	oplicable local plan		
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hollister, Kirbyville			
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	links community together,	especially in seriou	is weath	er cond.
Enviro:	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	stream/floodplain crossing	, potential for impa	cts	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ots		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	environmental issues may	require mitigation		
Safety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.0	of 30
_									

Efficier	nt Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2	of 10
	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Pa	rtial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
	Widens Road	No							
	Improves Geometry	Yes				improve alignment (low wa	ater area, sharp cu	rve)	
	Improves Load Rating	No							
	Truck Usage	120	30	7.3	0.7	MoDOT formula			
	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	benefits truck traffic, but n	ot major truck focu	sed impr	ovement
Quality	of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	5.0	of 10
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	oplicable local plan		
	Consistent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	Yes	30	30.0	3.0	Hollister, Kirbyville			
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits			
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	100%	20	20.0	2.0	links community together,	especially in seriou	is weath	er cond.
Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	3.3	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	stormwater issues should	be mitigatable		
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	No	30	0.0	0.0	stream/floodplain crossing	, potential for impa	cts	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impac	ts		
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	75%	20	15.0	0.8	environmental issues may	require mitigation		
Safety			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	22.0	of 30
-									

Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 22.0 of 30
oad	PDO	4	Safety Index	0.86	50	32.1	9.6	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	5	Crash Rate	184.60				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	1.05				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.39				
Cra	Avg AADT	2929	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	roadway re-alignment
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Could improve response times, Fire station 1 mile west
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	7.9	project offers a number of safety benefits to the local community

Taking	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 13.6	of 20
	Roadway or	Bridge Conditions	Good	20	5.0	1.0	roadway and culvert appear to be in good condition	
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature			20	20.0	4.0	road impassable during high water events	
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6		
	D	aily Vehicle Usage	1500	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care of the	ne System Factors	100%	40	40.0	8.0	Important to address this connection issue	

Access to Opportunity			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.6 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers	(ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0			
Project provides bike conne	ections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian conne	ections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regu	ations	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian fa	cilities	No	use if fi	rst two do	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks, I	bike lanes, or widen	ed shoulders
т	ransit	No	25	0.0	0.0	no effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lir	ies
Local Access to Opportunity Fa	actors	25%	50	12.5	0.6	minimal pedestrian/bicyd	cle benefits	

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 3.8	of 10
		Level of Service	В	25	5.0	0.5	estimated peak hour LOS (near LOS C)	
	Functional Classification	Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8		
		Daily Usage	1500	25	0.6	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congesti	on Relief Factors	100%	25	25.0	2.5	addresses a major non-recurring congestion/dela	y issue

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.7 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	19%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 3 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	7%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 3 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	100%	30	30.0	3.0	all weather connection/commerce, links communities

Proj. #:	7-2	Project Name:	lowa Colony Rd	(MO-16	to Dia	amond Hill Crt)) a let
Project ⁻	Туре:	Traffic Safety	Total Score	46.4	out of	100	Carry 1
Project D affect dra assumed)escri iinage to be	ption: Add shoulders and right-of-way. La part of the project.	to this relatively in the sould be wide	narrow re ened as w	sidenti ell, but	al road. This could t that is not	
Status: Proiect S	Com Scale:	bleted Medium	2010 Roadway	Length: or Inters	1.33 ectior	miles Roadway	
, F	uncti	onal Classification:	Local	(for the n	najor st	treet)	A lost
Avg. Anr	nual D	aily Traffic (AADT):	1200	(est. 201	2, avg.	for major street)	Server
		Daily Truck Traffic:	0	(est. 201	2, avg.	for major street)	15-
		Through Lanes:	2	(through	lanes d	on major street)	- Contraction

Project Discussion: The travelway width is approximately 20 feet, depending on the location, with another foot of pavement outside the edge lines. Shoulders and the clear zone are minimal in many locations. The pavement condition is good based on field observations. Posted speed limit is 35mph. Sample traffic count was conducted near the south end of the roadway on a weekday in late May. The volume may be higher further to the north and/or during a different season.



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	2.5	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	artial Yes	30	15.0	1.5				
Widens Road	Yes				shoulders to be added			
Improves Geometry	No							
Improves Load Rating	Νο							
Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	25%	40	10.0	1.0	not a major truck / freight in	nprovement projec	et	
Quality of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	of 10
Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				

Quality	<i>r</i> of Communities		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	1.0	0
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Consistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any ap	oplicable local plan		
Consistent with Regional Plans No						not mentioned in SMCOG	regional plan		
	Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits to shou	Ilder widening on this	roadw	ay
	Local Quality of Communities Factors	50%	20	10.0	1.0	potential benefits to reside	ents - esp. for walking	g	

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 4.8 of 5	
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues expected	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	little or no mitigation expected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors 7	75%	20	15.0	0.8	few issues expected, though stormwater could be an issue	

Safety	1				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	1.23	50	46.3	13.9	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	1	Crash Rate	58.60				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.33				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	3.50				
Cras	Avg AADT	1172	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	shoulders could improve auto and ped safety
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	nominal benefits for emergency responders
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	local concern, does not meet design stds; only one crash in 3 yr

Takin _s	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 10.4 of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions V	ery Good	20	0.0	0.0	based on field observations
	Substandard Roadw	vay or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	lanes, shoulders, and clear zones do not meet standards
F	unctional Classification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4	
		Daily Vehicle Usage	600	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
	Local Taking Care o	f the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	upgrades offer benefits to users and potential users

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points = 1.5 of 5	
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if first two do not apply			assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if first two do not apply		o not apply	shoulders to be installed		
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Lines	
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	50%	50	25.0	1.3	Shoulders to be installed	will benefit bikes/peds	

Conges	stion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.6 of 10	
	Level of Service B		В	25	5.0	0.5	est. peak hour LOS for 2-lane roadway (HCM Class III)	
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5		
		Daily Usage	600	25	0.1	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion Relief Factors		25%	25	6.3	0.6	congestion is not a major issue	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 2.5 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7	
Poverty (Block Group)	13%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - Comb. 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	25%	30	7.5	0.8	Not a major economic dev. issue, supports current dev.

	not known to be on any applicable local plan	
	not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan	
0.0		

Proj. #:	7-3	Project Name:	Lakeshore Drive	e (End)
Project	Туре:	Traffic Safety	Total Score	31.0 out of 100
Project I	Descrij	otion: Construct turn	around (cul-de-sa	ac) in accordance with Taney
County d	lesign s	standards.		
Status:	Comp	oleted	2016	Length: NA
Project	Scale:	Small	Roadway	or Intersection Roadway
	Functio	onal Classification:	Local	(for the major street)
Avg. An	nual D	aily Traffic (AADT):	10	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)
		Daily Truck Traffic:	0	(est. 2012, avg. for major street)
		Through Lanes:	2	(through lanes on major street)

Project Discussion: This improvement would provide emergency responders as well as other traffic with a safe and efficient means for turning around at the end of Lakeshore Drive. Currently, the end of the street is relatively narrow and the pavement is in poor condition. The current roadway end does not meet Taney County's design standards (minimum diameters: 100 ft ROW and 80 ft paved).



Efficient Movement of Freight		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.0	of 10
Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	No	30	0.0	0.0				
Widens Road	No							
Improves Geometry	No				turnaround or cul-de-sac			
Improves Load Rating	No							
Truck Usage	0	30	0.0	0.0	MoDOT formula			
Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors	0%	40	0.0	0.0	not a truck/freight route			

Quality	Quality of Communities			Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 1.0	of 10		
	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0	0.0				
Consistent with Local Plans No					not known to be on any applicable local plan			
	Consistent with Regional Plans No				not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan			
	Connectivity No	30	0.0	0.0				
	Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0	0.0				
	Local Quality of Communities Factors 50%	20	10.0	1.0	issue to local residents and for emergency response			

Enviro	nmental Protection		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 5.0	of 5
	Consistent with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, few stormwater issues expected	
	Consistent with Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	Small project, no mitigation expected	
	Avoids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	No known historical impacts	
	Local Environmental Protection Factors	100%	20	20.0	1.0	Small project, few issues expected; floodplain & wetland	d to north

Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30% Total Points = 9.8 of 30
oad	PDO	0	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	0	Crash Rate	0.00				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.00				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	0.00				
Cras	Avg AADT	NA	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Turnaround or cul-de-sac
			Emergency Response	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Will allow emergency responders to turn around
			Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	5.3	Localized issue, no known crashes from 2007 to 2011

Takin	g Care of the System			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 14.4	of 20
	Roadway	or Bridge Conditions	Very Poor	20	20.0	4.0	Gravel Roadway	
	Substandard Road	way or Bridge Feature	Yes	20	20.0	4.0	Dead end, does not meet typical design standards	
F	unctional Classification2	Local	20%	10	2.0	0.4		
		Daily Vehicle Usage	5	10	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Taking Care	of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	Important local improvement	

Access to Opportunity		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.0 of 5
Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0			
Project provides bike connections	No				does not apply		
Project provides pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		
Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two de	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks o	r bike lanes	
Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks, l	bike lanes, or widen	ed shoulders
Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Sh	uttle or Jefferson Li	nes
Local Access to Opportunity Factors	0%	50	0.0	0.0	Cul-de-sac or turnaround	d does not substanti	ally benefit ped

Conge	estion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.5	of 10
	<u> </u>	Level of Service	Α	25	0.0	0.0	no congestion issues			
	Functional Classification1	Local	20%	25	5.0	0.5				
		Daily Usage	5	25	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula	a)		
	Local Congestio	n Relief Factors	0%	25	0.0	0.0	no congestion issues			

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 0.3 of 10
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	no significant direct benefits
Level of Economic Distress	15%	20	3.0	0.3	
Poverty (Block Group)	4%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 1 block group
Unemployment (tract)	6%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	0%	30	0.0	0.0	no significant direct benefits

Proj. #: 7-4 Project Nam	e: MO-165 and MO)-265 Int	ersectio	on		and the second second		Efficie	<mark>nt Moveme</mark> r	nt of Freig	ht		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	4.2 of 10
Project Type: Traffic Safet	y Total Score	34.2	out of	f 100		North / NTS	Contraction of the			Large V	ehicle Friendly Facilities	Partial Yes	30	15.0	1.5			
Project Description: Improv	e intersection to address	sight di	stance a	nd possi	ible safety						Widens Road	No						
issues. Improvements could	include modified traffic o	ontrol, tu	rn lanes	s, or road	dway		and the Mary				Improves Geometry	Yes				improve sight distance, (geometry, and/or tra	ffic control
realignment.											Improves Load Rating	No						
							Sector Providence				Truck Usage	120	30	7.3	0.7	MoDOT formula		
Status: Completed	2015	Length	: NA				Bugger		Local Eff	icient Move	ment of Freight Factors	50%	40	20.0	2.0	will benefit truck traffic (v	which requires longe	r stopping distance
Project Scale: Medium	Roadway	or Inte	section	Interse	ection		10000											
Functional Classific	ation: Collector	(for the	major st	treet)			- Carter	Quality	y of Commu	inities			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%	Total Points =	0.0 of 10
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (A	ADT): 4300	(est. 20	12, avg.	for majo	or street)					Local/F	egional Land Use Plans	No	30	0.0	0.0			
Daily Truck 1	raffic: 240	(est. 20	12, avg.	for majo	or street)		Ten Pan			С	onsistent with Local Plans	No				not known to be on any	applicable local plan	
Through	anes: 2	(throug	n lanes c	on major	street)	nossihl	le sight distance			Cons	istent with Regional Plans	No				not mentioned in SMCO	G regional plan	
Project Discussion: Main is	sue is sight distance for o	drivers tu	Irning let	ft from th	ne MO-265	issues	s, especially for				Connectivity	No	30	0.0	0.0			
leg onto MO-165 westbound.	The MO-265 side street	is stop o		d. Most	traffic raffic	left-tur	ns onto MO-165				Scenic and Visual	No	20	0.0	0.0	Intersection improvement	nts, no scenic benefi	ts
travels between the northeas	t and east legs of the inte	ersection	. Poste	d speed	limit on	A ALASKA			Loc	al Quality	of Communities Factors	0%	20	0.0	0.0	not a major community o	quality issue	
MO-165 is 45 mph. The emb	ankment has been cut s	uch that	there is	addition	al sight													
distance to the northeast. At 4	15 mph the design inters	ection si	ght dista	nce is 5	00 ft	ALS THE CARE	all and the	Enviro	nmental Pro	otection			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	5.0 of 5
(AASHTO Green book). It ap	bears the available sight The intersection does not	distance	to meet	or both o signal w	arrants					Consisten	t with Stormwater Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	few stormwater issues e	xpected	
may be lees than the value.		uppour	to moot	orginal w	arranto.				Co	onsistent w	ith Environmental Goals	Yes	30	30.0	1.5	little or no mitigation exp	ected	
Access to Opportunity			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Tota	I Points = 0.0 of 5			А	voids Historical Impacts	Yes	20	20.0	1.0	no known historical impa	acts	
Eliminate B	ke/Ped Barriers (ADA)	0%	25	0.0	0.0				Loca	l Environm	ental Protection Factors	100%	20	20.0	1.0	few issues expected (un	less major earthworl	k is undertaken)
Project pr	ovides bike connections	No				does not apply												
Project provides	pedestrian connections	No				does not apply		Safety					Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 30%	Total Points =	8.3 of 30
Project brings existing facilities	up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike la	anes	ad	PDO	3	Safety Index	0.00	50	0.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formu	la)	
Project provides some	bike/pedestrian facilities	No	use if fi	irst two d	o not apply	assumes no sidewalks or bike la	anes	or Ro tion)	Injury	0	Crash Rate	65.25				Crash data 2009-2011		
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or	r Jefferson Lines	Majo	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.99						
Local Access t	o Opportunity Factors	0%	50	0.0	0.0	Assumes no new bike or ped fa	acilities	Inte (Years	3	Severity Index	1.00						
								Cras	Avg AADT	4199	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	concern raised by local l	eaders	
Congestion Relief			Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Tota	I Points = 1.9 of 10				Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.5	Intersection improvemen	nts (sight distance)	
	Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.0	side-street left estimated peak h	hour LOS				Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	little impact on emergen	cy responders	
Functional Classific	ation1 Collector	30%	25	7.5	0.8						Local Safety Factors	50%	35	17.5	53	crash rate not significant	t relative to other pro	piects
	Daily Lleage	2150	25	1.0	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)					2004 04.009 1 40.010			11.0	0.0	and the not organitour	creative to other pro	Jeeko
	aastion Poliof Easters	00/	25	0.0	0.0	Congrestion does not appear to	ha a major issue	Taking	Caro of the	Svetom			Mox	Actual	Woightad	Maight Easter - 209/	Total Pointe -	11 7 of 20
	Searion Vener Lacrols	U 70	20	0.0	0.0	oungestion does not appeal to	be a major issue	Taking		Bead	av ar Bridge Conditions	Good		FO	4 O	minor reaching with a		
Feenemie Commetitie				A _ (_)	M(-: 1.1	Weight Frankright 400/ The			0		ay or bridge conditions	Good	20	00.0	1.0	minor roadway rutung		
		N	Max	Actual	weighted	weight Factor = 10% lota		_	Subst		ioway or bridge reature	Tes	20	20.0	4.0	possible signt distance is	ssue	
Strategic Region	ai Economic Corridor	No	30	0.0	0.0			Fu	inctional Clas	sification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.6			
Support Regional Ec	onomic Opportunities	No	20	0.0	0.0	Not linked to any planned econ.	. dev. projects				Daily Vehicle Usage	2150	10	0.5	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formu	la)	
Level	of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	1.7				Local	Taking Ca	e of the System Factors	75%	40	30.0	6.0	Important local intersect	ion	
	Poverty (Block Group)	14%				2006-2010 ACS block group da	ata - Comb. 3 block groups											

2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts

30 15.0 1.5 Important intersection for the area

Unemployment (tract) 8%

Local Economic Competitiveness Factors 50%

Proj. #: 7-5 Project Name: Hw	<i>r</i> y Bb (Hill Billy Lane to Gobbler's Knob)	Efficient Movement of Freight	Max	Actual
Project Type: Traffic Safety	Total Score 45.0 out of 100	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes	30	15.0
Project Description: Involves 2.3 miles	of roadway improvements that could include:	Widens Road Yes		
shoulder and/or lane widening and the a	addition of turn lanes. Roadway has limited	Improves Geometry No		
shoulders (if any at all). Some locations	s would benefit from a turn lane or center two-	Improves Load Rating No		
right-of-way may have to be expanded,	especially in the south.	Truck Usage 133	30	7.7
Status: Planning	Length: 2.3 miles	Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors 50%	40	20.0
Project Scale: Large	Roadway or Intersection Roadway			
Functional Classification: Co	llector (for the major street)	Quality of Communities	Max	Actual
Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 350	00 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Local/Regional Land Use Plans No	30	0.0
Daily Truck Traffic: 266	6 (est. 2012, avg. for major street)	Consistent with Local Plans No		
Through Lanes: 2	(through lanes on major street)	Consistent with Regional Plans No		
Project Discussion: Roadway is classi	fied as a Major Collector. Traffic count is based	Connectivity No	30	0.0
on an inflated 2007 County count for a k	ocation directly north of the high school. A 2012 be higher. This roadway serves the Hollister	Example of narrow shoulders on Scenic and Visual No	20	0.0
High School. Some intersections have t	turn lanes, while other do not. No truck traffic	Local Quality of Communities Factors 50%	20	10.0
estimates available - assumed 3%. Drai	inage is handled in swales at the roadway edge.			
Project might score better if pedestrian a	and bicycle provisions were incorporated. This	Environmental Protection	Max	Actual
could include the addition of a bike lane connect to the school. It could also incre	ease the cost of the project.	Consistent with Stormwater Goals Yes	30	30.0
		Consistent with Environmental Goals Yes	30	30.0
Access to Opportunity	Max Actual Weighted	Weight Factor = 5% Total Points = 2.8 of 5 Avoids Historical Impacts Yes	20	20.0
Eliminate Bike/Ped Ba	arriers (ADA) 20% 25 50 0.3	Local Environmental Protection Factors 75%	20	15.0

	Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	20%	25	5.0	0.3		
	Project provides bike connections	No				consider adding bike lane or multi-use facility	
	Project provides pedestrian connections	No				consider multi-use facility	Sa
roject brii	ngs existing facilities up to ADA Regulations	No	use if fil	rst two do	not apply		peo
Pro	ject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities	Yes	use if fil	rst two do	not apply	assumes widened shoulders available for bikes/peds	or R
	Transit	No	25	0.0	0.0	No effect on Branson Shuttle or Jefferson Lines	(Mai
	Local Access to Opportunity Factors	100%	50	50.0	2.5	Widened shoulders will benefit high school bikes/peds	Seu

(ongestion Relief		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15% Total Points = 4.6	of 15
	Level of Service	С	25	10.0	1.5	estimated peak hour LOS based on v/c ~0.33	
	Functional Classification1 Collector	30%	25	7.5	1.1		
	Daily Usage	1750	25	0.5	0.1	(Modified MoDOT formula)	
	Local Congestion Relief Factors	50%	25	12.5	1.9	benefits congestion around school	

Economic Competitiveness		Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 6.4 of 20
Strategic Regional Economic Corridor	No	20	0.0	0.0	
Support Regional Economic Opportunities	No	30	0.0	0.0	not linked to known planned econ. dev. projects
Level of Economic Distress	85%	20	17.0	3.4	
Poverty (Block Group)	21%				2006-2010 ACS block group data - 2 block groups
Unemployment (tract)	8%				2006-2010 ACS tract data - Combining 2 tracts
Local Economic Competitiveness Factors	50%	30	15.0	3.0	benefits general continued development in the area

Safety	,				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 20% Total Points = 11.0 of 20
oad	PDO	5	Safety Index	0.51	50	19.0	3.8	(Modified MoDOT formula)
or R	Injury	4	Crash Rate	104.57				Crash data 2009-2011
(Maj	Fatal	0	Accident Index	0.60				
shes or Inte	Years	3	Severity Index	2.11				
Cra	Avg AADT	3417	Safety Concern	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	concern raised by local leaders
			Safety Enhancements	Yes	5	5.0	1.0	Will result in widened shoulders
			Emergency Response	No	5	0.0	0.0	Nominal benefits to emergency response
			Local Safety Factors	75%	35	26.3	5.3	Improves a road with possible safety and design issues

Local Environmental Protection Factors 75% 20 15.0

Taking Care of the System				Max	Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 5%	Total Points =	0.7	of 5
	Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Good				0.0	0.0	no known issues			
	Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature No			20	0.0	0.0	none known			
F	unctional Classification2	Collector	30%	10	3.0	0.2				
		Daily Vehicle Usage	1750	10	0.2	0.0	(Modified MoDOT formula)			
	Local Taking Care of	of the System Factors	25%	40	10.0	0.5	Not a major maintenance is	sue		

Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10% Total Points = 4.3 of 10
15.0	1.5	
		widen shoulders and/or lanes uncertain uncertain
7.7	0.8	MoDOT formula
20.0	2.0	minimal criteria met, but road would be widened

Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 10%
0.0	0.0	
		not known to be on any applicable local plan
		not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan
0.0	0.0	
0.0	0.0	no scenic benefits
10.0	1.0	minimal criteria met, but benefits schools and therefore communi

Actual	Weighted	Weight Factor = 15%	Total Points =	14.3 of 15
30.0	4.5	Assume excess runoff mit	gated (new storm	water facilities)
30.0	4.5	Large project; possible imp	pacts likely to be n	nitigated
20.0	3.0	No known historical impac	ts	
15.0	2.3	Large project; potential for	impacts, though I	ikely to be mitigated

Taney County Transportation Prioritization

Revised Weighting Factors

August 28, 2012

	Category Weights			nts		Subcategory Weights			
	Small	Medium	Large	Regional		Small	Medium	Large	Regional
					Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA)	25	25	25	25
Access to	5%	5%	5%	5%	Transit	25	25	25	25
Opportunity	370	370	270	3,0	Local Factors	50	50	50	50
						100	100	100	100
					Level of Service	25	25	25	25
	1.00/	1.00/	150/	1.50/	Functional Classification I	25	25	25	25
Congestion Relief	10%	10%	15%	15%	Daily Usage	25	25	25	25
					Local Factors	25	25	25	25
					Structorio Rogianal Economia Couvidar	20	20	100	100
					Support Regional Economic Corridor	20	20	20	20
Economic	10%	10%	20%	20%	Level of Economic Distress	20	20	20	20
Competitiveness	10/0	10%				20	20	30	20
					Local Factors	100	100	100	100
			10%	10%	Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities	30	30	30	30
Efficient Movement					Truck Usage	30	30	30	30
of Freight	10%	10%			Local Factors	40	40	40	40
0						100	100	100	100
					Local/Regional Land Use Plans	30	30	30	30
Quality of	10%	10%	١0%	10%	Connectivity	30	30	30	30
Quality of					Scenic and Visual	20	20	20	20
Communities					Local Factors	20	20	20	20
						100	100	100	100
					Consistent with Stormwater Goals	30	30	30	30
Environmental			15%	15%	Consistent with Environmental Goals	30	30	30	30
Protection	5%	5%			Avoids Historical Impacts	20	20	20	20
Trotection					Local Factors	20	20	20	20
						100	100	100	100
		30% 30%		20%	Safety Index	50	50	50	50
			20%		Emergency Response	5	5	5	5
Safety	30%				Safety Concern	5	5	5	5
					Salety Ennancements	25	25	25	25
					Local Factors	100	100	100	100
				5%	Roadway or Bridge Conditions	20	20	20	20
			5%		Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature	20	20	20	20
Taking Care of the					Functional Classification2	10	10	10	10
System	20%	20%			Daily Vehicle Usage	10	10	10	10
-,					Local factors	40	40	40	40
						100	100	100	100
	100%	100%	100%	100%					