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

| Current <br> Ranking | TCTAB Proj. No. | Project Name | Project Type | Scale | Roadway/ Intersection | Status of Project | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1-9 | 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 | 1-3 | MO-76 and Lakeshore Dr | Traffic Safety | Medium | Intersection | Planning and Design | 2018 |
| 6 | 1-1 | 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 |  |
| 8 | 1-2 | US Bus Rte 65 (Hwy 76 to North Birch) | Geometric/Safety | Large | Roadway | Planning and Design |  |
| 9 | I-10 | US 65 Upgrade to Freeway Standards | Capacity | Regional | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 10 | 5-2 | MO-248 and Branson Hills Pkwy Intersection | Geometric/Safety | Medium | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 11 | 2-4 | US-160 and Y Hwy | Traffic Safety | Medium | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 12 | 3-6 | Hwy 76 \& US-160 | Traffic Safety | Medium | Intersection | Construction | 2018 |
| 13 | 4-4 | US-160 and MO-248 Intersection | Traffic Safety | Small | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 14 | 6-1 | MO-165 and Fall Creek Road Intersection | Geometric/Safety | Medium | Intersection | Grant Application Submitted |  |
| 15 | 1-12 | Hwy 86 at Amanda Road | Traffic Safety | Small | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 16 | 7-1 | Coon Creek Rd (Hwy Bb to MO-76) | Connectivity | Medium | Roadway | Construction | 2018 |
| 17 | 1-6 | New Interchange at MO-86 \& US-65 | Capacity | Regional | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 18 | 6-4 | Fall Creek Rd (Wildwood Drive to MO-165) | Geometric/Safety | Large | Roadway | Planning |  |
| 19 | 1-7 | Access Rd (US-65 to Branson Creek Blyd) | Connectivity | Regional | Roadway | Planning |  |
| 20 | 1-11 | Transload Facility | Multimodal | Regional | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 21 | I-13 | 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 | 1-8 | 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 | 1-5 | 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 | Roadway | Planning |  |
| 29 | 6-11 | New Interchange at MO-76 \& MO-376 | Capacity | Regional | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 30 | 6-9 | Improve Skyview Drive (MO-265 to Luster Dr) | Traffic Safety | Medium | Roadway | Planning |  |
| 31 | 6-3 | Safari Rd (Sharp Curve Area to MO-165) | Geometric/Safety | Medium | Roadway | Planning |  |
| 32 | 4-5 | Round Mountain Road Bridge | Quality of Communities | Medium | Roadway | Construction | 2019 |
| 33 | 5-1 | MO-248 and Buchanan Rd Intersection | Traffic Safety | Small | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 34 | 2-6 | Hwy 76 - Kirbyville School Turn Lanes | Traffic Safety | Small | Intersection | Planning |  |
| 35 | 3-8 | Hulls Ford Bridge | 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 Flynn 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 |
|  | I-4 | Acacia Club Rd (Sun Valley Circle to MO-I65/V Hwy) | Connectivity | Medium | Roadway | Completed | 2017 |
|  | 3-3 | Brace Hill Rd (Slough Hollow Rd to M Hwy) | Geometric/Safety | Medium | Roadway | Completed | 2016 |
|  | 7-2 | Iowa Colony Rd (MO-I65 to Diamond Hill Crt) | Traffic Safety | Medium | Roadway | Completed | 2010 |
|  | 2-2 | Slough Hollow Rd (Fishermans Nose to Brace Hill) | Connectivity | Large | Roadway | Completed | 2013 |
|  | 2-3 | M Hwy at Brace Hill and Nazarene Church Rd | Geometric/Safety | Medium | Intersection | Completed |  |
|  | 7-4 | MO-165 and MO-265 Intersection | Traffic Safety | Medium | Intersection | Completed |  |
|  | 7-3 | Lakeshore Drive (End) | Traffic Safety | Small | Roadway | Completed |  |
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| 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 | meet criteria for |  |  |


| Quality 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 |  |  |  | On local plans and subm | as TIGER I | pplica |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | East-West Roadway listed | as need in SMCO | regio | al plan |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | First section of the East-W | st Roadway (Ho | er to | rbyville) |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No major scenic or visual | ements |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Important to the local and | egional communi | 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 m | gated(new stormu | ter dete | ntion facilit |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals |  |  |  | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Unmitigated environmenta | impacts are not | pected |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts |  |  |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impac |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors |  |  |  | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 2.3 | Few small wetlands in area, project includes stormwater BMP |  |  |  |
| Safety |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 5.9 | of 20 |
|  | PDO | 10 | Safety Index | 0.16 | 50 | 5.9 | 1.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 3 | Crash Rate | 92.72 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011, used vol data from Bus 65 at Maple Int. used crashes for Bus 65 at Maple intersection |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Yea | 3 | Severity Index | 1.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2010 AADT | 13768 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Safety mentioned as important issue in TIGER \\|I 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 rer | sidents |  |  |



| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{1 . 7}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Existing portion of Birch Street |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Minor Arterial | $40 \%$ | 10 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 625 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $50 \%$ | 40 | 20.0 | 1.0 | Mainly new roadway, but benefits existing roadways |  |  |  |



| Efficient 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 conne | in T | ey County |


| 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 shown in applicable | plan (though | cal pr | ect exists) |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | important Hollister throug | oute |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | limited scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | important improvement in | e heart of Hollis |  |  |


| Environmental 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 16.0 of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 54 | Safety Index | 0.80 | 50 | 30.1 | 6.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 22 | Crash Rate | 336.09 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 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 Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 7050 | 10 | 3.5 | 0.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 2.0 | improving roadway oper | ons benefits existi | system |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.4 of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | artial 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | MO-76 is an important co | merce route, Lak | hore is not |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan | in Hollister or | son) |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Important connection for | Branson, Hollis | \& Kirb | ville areas |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no major scenic or visual | nefits, except po | ibly la | dscaping |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | this is an important inters | ion in the area |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Modest project, few stormwater issues expected |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Unmitigated environmental impacts are not expected |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $50 \%$ | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | no major mitigation expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 26.7 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 14 | Safety Index | 1.18 | 50 | 44.1 | 13.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 12 | Crash Rate | 145.61 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 2.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 16306 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancement |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | improvements expected to | address safety co | cerns |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no major effect on respon | times |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 10.5 | crash data confirms local | ncerns |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 15.2 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | M0-76 assumed to be good or very good, Lakeshore Fair |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | alignment decreases sight distance east of intersection |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 8350 | 10 | 7.0 | 1.4 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important local intersection |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.3 | Of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | not a major truck route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=10 \% \quad$ Total Points $=$ | 3.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent 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 of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | benefits local residents |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points = | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | environmental mitigation possible |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $50 \%$ | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | unknown environmental issues |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 14.0 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 2 | Safety Index | 0.38 | 50 | 14.1 | 4.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 121.26 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 2539 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local leaders |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | project will result in new road that meets design stds |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | no major impact on response times or service |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | project benefits safety through better design |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 14.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | existing road assumed to | $e$ in fair condition |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | existing road narrower tha | current standard |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 1300 | 10 | 0.2 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | opportunity to upgrade the | existing system |  |  |




| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan | Hollister or | son) |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | US-65 connects to Brans | \& Hollister and p | ints bey |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Interchange, no scenic be |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | interchange could spur gror | vth, could also ca | se more | competitio |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points = | 7.5 | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | large project; environmental mitigation possible |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | no known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $0 \%$ | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | due to size of project, mitigation likely |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 4.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 7 | Safety Index | 0.22 | 50 | 8.3 | 1.7 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 2 | Crash Rate | 47.29 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 17380 | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Interchange will improve safety over the at-grade intersection |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 1.8 | crash rate not significant relative to other projects |  |  |  |


| Taking 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 Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0 |


| Functional Classification2 | Freeway | $100 \%$ | 10 | 10.0 | 0.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 4450 & 10 & 0.9 & 0.0 & \text { (Modifed MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$

| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $0 \%$ | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | system expansion / econ dev project |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.1 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 275 | 30 | 11.1 | 1.1 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Interchange to meet criter | for freight; US-6 | an in | ortant fac |


| Quality 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 |  |  |  | correlated to the airport, w | ich is mentioned in | Branso | plan |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | airports in general are men | tioned in SMCOG | gional |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | US-65 connects to Branso | \& Hollister and p | its bey |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Interchange could serve ne | w development an | airpor | trafic |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points $=1.5$ | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | large project; environmental mitigation possible |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | no known historical impacts |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $0 \%$ | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | due to size of project, mitigation likely |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 6.6 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 6 | Safety Index | 0.52 | 50 | 19.5 | 3.9 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 4 | Crash Rate | 52.54 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 17380 | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Interchange will improve safety over the at-grade intersection |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 1.8 | crash rate not significant re | ative to other pro |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 0.8 | of 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |




| Efficient 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 | eria for freight; 65 | an im | ortant facill |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% Total Points = | 10.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | correlated to the airport, which is mentioned in Branson plan airports in general are mentioned in SMCOG regional plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | connects proposed development and airport to US-65 \& beyond |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Landscaping, signage, art, etc. |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Connects US-65 directly to a irport |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Environmental 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 | detentio | on facilities |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | new road, proximity to airport, environmental | mitigation | n 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 2.8 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | N/A | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | N/A | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | N/A | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | N/A | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 tolfrom a | rport if needed |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | $\mathbf{0 . 2}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Good | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Future project |  |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Future project |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Minor Arterial | $40 \%$ | 10 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 4000 | 10 | 0.7 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $0 \%$ | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Future project |  |  |  |



| 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 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 200 | 30 | 9.5 | 0.9 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 4.0 | Road assumed to meet o | eria for freigh; 65 | $s$ an im | ortant fac |


| 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 (n | t in Hollister or Br | nson) |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Ridgedale (does not meet | criteria for activity | enter) | Highway |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 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 |  |  |


| Environmental 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 detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | new road, proximity to airport, environmental mitigation 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 12.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 2 | Safety Index | 1.05 | 50 | 39.4 | 7.9 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 7 | Crash Rate | 123.79 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 (interchange area) |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 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 Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Future project |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 2000 | 10 | 0.2 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 0\% | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Future project |  |  |  |



| 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 buil | o meet criteria for | ucks |  |


| Quality 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 |  |  |  | On local plans and subr | d as TIGER A | ation |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | East-West Roadway liste | as need in SMCO | region | al 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 | lements |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Important to the local and | regional commun | quality |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points $=12.8$ | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | $25 \%$ | 20 | 5.0 | 0.8 | Will require several bridge crossings and greenfield construction |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 14.3 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 54 | Safety Index | 0.80 | 50 | 30.1 | 6.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 22 | Crash Rate | 336.09 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011, used crash and volume data for Bus 65 used length data from BUS 65 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 trafic 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 res | sidents |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 0}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $25 \%$ | 40 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Mainly new roadway, but benefits existing roadways |  |  |  |

[^0]

| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.8 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | Partial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | Will upgrade intersections | and corridor to In | state | andards |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 347.5 | 30 | 12.5 | 1.3 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Will benefit freight primaril | at access points |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | Local priority, intersection | on plans, now | dor be | g added |
| Consistent 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 | egional communit | 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 facilit |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 11.8 of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 34 | Safety Index | 0.60 | 50 | 22.7 | 4.5 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 24 | Crash Rate | 40.31 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011, |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 2 | Accident Index | 0.61 |  |  |  | at all non-interchange access locations (7) along US 65 |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.27 |  |  |  | volume multiplied by 7 for 7 intersections |  |  |
|  | 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 |  |  |


| Taking 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 | Existing Hwy 65 |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | Does not meet FHWA st | dards for intersta |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Freeway | 100\% | 10 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 5152.75 | 10 | 1.2 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 1.0 | Mainly new intersections | ut benefits existin | roadw |  |


| Proj. \#: $1-11$ Project Name: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Multimodal | Total Score\| | 55.8 | out of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct a new transload facility near the airport with railroad acces. The site must have easy access to Hwy 65 . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning Length: N/A miles |  |  |  |  |  | cold | 1 |  |  |
| Project Scale: Regional Roadway or Intersection Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Other (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 500 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 250 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  | (1) 8 |  |  |
| Project Discussion: The transload facility could provide economic benefits to the area. It could promote manufacturing and industrial development in the County and specifically near the new facility. It could promote job growth and make Taney County a hub for distribution services. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 0.0 |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) |  | 0\% | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections No  <br> Project provides pedestrian connections No  <br> roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations No use if first two do not apply  <br> Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities No use if first two do not apply  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Sh | ttle or Jefferson L |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 0\% | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | This project does not aff | ct bike/ped/transi | access |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 15\% | Total Points = | 1.7 | of 15 |
| Level of Service |  |  | 25 | 5.0 | 0.8 | Could reduce regional tr | ck trafic, but incr | ease loc | boal trafic |
| Functional Classification | Other | 0\% | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 250 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors |  | 25\% | 25 | 6.3 | 0.9 | Could reduce regional tr | ck trafic, but incr | ease loc | cal trafio |
| Economic Competitiveness |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points = |  |  |
| Strategic Regional Economic Corridor |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Support Regional Economic Opportunities |  | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Future development are | prior initiatives in | corridor |  |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 85\% | 20 | 17.0 | 3.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) |  | 18.0\% |  |  |  | 2011-2015 ACS block gror | up data - county |  |  |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 9.0\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract da | - countywide |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 100\% | 30 | 30.0 | 6.0 | This project is focused o | local and regiona | al develo | lopment |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 10.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | Yes |  |  |  | Project effectively impro | freight facilities |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | Project effectively improv | freight facilities |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | Yes |  |  |  | Project effectively improv | freight facilities |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 125 | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Adjusted to provide full po | nts given project |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 4.0 | Project is designed to imp | ve freight move |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | MoDOT Statewide Freigh | Study recomme | streng | ening |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | Intermodal connectors |  |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No major scenic or visual | lements |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Important to the local and | regional commun | quality |  |



| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
\text { Avoids Historical Impacts } & \text { Yes } & 20 & 20.0 & 3.0
\end{array}
$$

Local Environmental Protection Factors $\quad 50 \% \quad 20 \quad 10.0 \quad 1.5 \quad$ Project provides an efficient means of transporting freight

| Safety |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 5.3 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Local Safety Factors | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 5.3 | Project provides a safe way | of moving freight |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 2.0 | of 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Other | 0\% | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 250 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Project provides an efficie | t multimodal way | movin | freight |




| 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 plans |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Localized project only |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Minimal criteria met; Hwy | 6 is an important | cility in | Taney Co |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of 5 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 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 | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Modest project, few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 29.3 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 1.27 | 50 | 47.6 | 14.3 | (Modififed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 2 | Crash Rate | 27.92 |  |  |  | Crash data 2014-2016 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 6542 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local lea | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Will result in intersection in | provements (traft | control | and safety |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Improves intersection near | emergency resp | der (amb | bulance) |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 10.5 | All criteria met; crash rate | noteworthy |  |  |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions |  | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | Roadway cracking |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Minor Arterial | $40 \%$ | 10 | 4.0 | 0.8 |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 3350 | 10 | 3.7 | 0.7 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors |  | $50 \%$ | 40 | 20.0 | 4.0 | Important local intersection; provides access to marina |



| Efficient 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 buil | meet criteria fo | ucks |  |


| Quality 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 | ville |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No major scenic or visual | lements |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Important to the local and | egional communit | quality |  |


| Environmental 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 mi | gated(new storm | ter dete | ntion facilit |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals |  |  |  | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Unmitigated environmental | impacts are not e | pected |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts |  |  |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impac |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors |  |  |  | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Will require several bridge crossings and greenfield construction |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 3.8 | of 20 |
|  | PDO | NA | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | NA | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | NA | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | NA | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 7811 | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No safety concerns currently |  |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Shift trafic 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 |  |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 0.3 | of 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Gooc |  | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | New project |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | New project |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Major Arterial | 50\% | 10 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 4000 | 10 | 0.7 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 0\% | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Mainly new roadway, bu | enefits existing ro | ways |  |




| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | provides all-weather conne | ctivity |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Roadway carries recreatio | al traffic; reductio | of floo | ing impact |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Critical for local community | (residents/busine |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{2 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 15.0 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 16.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Poor | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | crossing in poor cond |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | floods in high water | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Collector } & 30 \% & 10 & 3.0 & 0.6\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Local Taking Care of the System Factors } & 100 \% & 40 & 40.0 & 8.0 & \text { important to maintain all weather access }\end{array}$



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 0.1 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 0\% | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not a major truck route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent 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 |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | benefits local residents |  |  |


| Environmental 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 mitigated(new stormwater detention facilit |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 10.1 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.61 | 50 | 23.0 | 4.6 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 443.32 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 2.53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 200 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| 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 | slume, but only on | crash |  |

Taking Care of the System

| Roadway or Bridge Conditions |  | Poor | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Substandard | Roadway or | Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 |
| 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Local | $20 \%$ | 10 | 2.0 | 0.1 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Local } & 20 \% & 10 & 2.0 & 0.1\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 100 & 10 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \text { (Modified MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Local Taking Care of the System Factors } & 100 \% & 40 & 40.0 & 2.0 & \text { improvement would benefit existing roadway system }\end{array}$


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 2.6 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 3 | 30 | 1.2 | 0.1 | 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 = | 1.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | important to and beneficia | for local residents |  |  |



| Taking 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 | road in good condition based on field observations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | limited sight distance |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 150 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | beneficial improvements to existing system |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.2 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | artial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | location will be improved in | a manner that be | fits la | evehicles |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 105 | 30 | 6.9 | 0.7 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | trucks will benefit from the | mproved geome | and/o | raffic contr |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 10.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 160 roadway improvemen | mentioned in Fors | yth Str | tegic Plan |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 160 roadway improvemen | mentioned in S | OG re | ional plan |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 160 connects Forsyth to | 6 (Merriam Wood | Rockav | ay Beach) |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | possible conversion to rou | dabout; location | county |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Critical intersection; 160 is | important corrido | hrough | Forsyth |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 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 | 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 no bearing 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) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 26.22 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 10448 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Intersection and traffic con | ol improvements |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | crash rate not significant re | ative to other pro |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 14.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | LOS E and even F condition | n during peak tim |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 5350 | 10 | 2.9 | 0.6 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important local intersection |  |  |  |


| oj. \#: 2-5 ${ }^{\text {Project Name: }}$ J-Hwy at Trigger Creek |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Connectivity | Total Score\| | 41.0 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Improve the roadway to address the section that floods (existing culverts) at Trigger Creek. This could include using fill and/or a structure to raise the roadway. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning |  | Length: 0.1 miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Roadwa |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Collector (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 700 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 14 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Discussion: The closure of this roadway during high water 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |
| roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations |  | No | use if first two do not apply |  |  | assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes |  |  |
| Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities |  |  | use if first two do not apply |  |  | assumes no sidewalks, bike lanes, or widened shoulders |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no effect on Branson Sh | uttle or Jefferson L |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 25\% | 50 | 12.5 | 0.6 | minimal pedestrian/bicycle benefits |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  |  | Actual Weighted |  | Weight Factor $=10 \% \quad$ Total Points $=$ |  | 1.9 of 10 |
| Level of Service |  | B | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 | estimated peak hour LOS |  |  |
| Functional Classificatio | Collector | 30\% | 25 | 7.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 350 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formu |  |  |
| Local Congestion 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 groups |  |  |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 7\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract data - 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 25\% | 30 | 7.5 | 0.8 | minimal commerce on ro | adway |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 2.7 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | improve alignment (low water area) |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 7 | 30 | 1.8 | 0.2 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | benefits truck trafic, but | t major truck focu | d impro | vement |


| 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 known to be on any ap | slicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent 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 |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | links community together, | specially in seriou | weath | r cond. |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 4.5 | of 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | stormwater issues sh | mitigatable |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | stream/floodplain crossi | but impacts shou | be miti | gated |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical imp |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | environmental issues m | equire mitigation |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 9.8 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 ti |  |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | project offers a number of | safety benefits to | loca | community |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions |  | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | roadway and culvert appear to be in fair condition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | road impassable during high water events |
| 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 |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 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 a |  |  |  |


| 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 | gional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Connects western and eas | tern Taney County |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | Minimal criteria met; Hwy | 6 is an important | cility in | Taney Co |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Moderate project, few stormwater issues expected |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Moderate project, no mitigation expected |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Moderate project, few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 10.9 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2014-2016 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 6054 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local lea | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Improves intersection (trafic 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 | me other projec |  |  |

## Taking Care of the System

| Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 8.4 | of 20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature } & \text { No } & 20 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Minor Arterial } & 40 \% & 10 & 4.0 & 0.8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 3100 & 10 & 3.2 & 0.6\end{array}$
(Modifed MoDOT formula)

Local Economic Competitiveness Factors $\quad 100 \% \quad 30 \quad 30.0 \quad 3.0 \quad$ MO-76 is an important arterial and economic link


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 2.8 | Of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 | 15 | 30 | 2.6 | 0.3 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | not a major freight route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in Forsyth | rategic Plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Connects Forsyth and Ta | yville |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Roadway improvements, | scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | provides alt. route btwn F | syth \& Taneyville |  |  |


| Environmental Protection | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 4.5 | of 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Consistent with Stormwater Goals } & \text { Yes } & 30 & 30.0 & 1.5 & \text { Project includes drainage improvements }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Consistent with Environmental Goals } & \text { Yes } & 30 & 30.0 & 1.5 & \text { Little mitigation expected due to size of project }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Avoids Historical Impacts } & \text { Yes } & 20 & 20.0 & 1.0 & \text { No known historical impacts }\end{array}$

| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $50 \%$ | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Few issues expected; A few small wetlands (ponds) near road |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 13.1 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.43 | 50 | 16.1 | 4.8 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 34.45 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 1465 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local leaders |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 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 relative to other projects |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 10.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | Chip and seal in fair condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 750 | 10 | 0.1 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | improvements upgrade a | onnecting elemen | of curre | nt system |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 2.6 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 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 = | 3.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Connectivity important to I | cal rural residents |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Roadway improvements, | o scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | beneficial to residents |  |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Project includes drainage improvements |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | limited mitigation expected |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 7.1 of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 lanes \& shoulders, improve drainage |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Could slightly improve rural emergency response times |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 2.6 | no reported crashes from 2007-2011 |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 13.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | road in fair to good condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | Narrow lane widths; no sh | ulders |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 100 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important local connection |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 2.6 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | Prial 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | not a major truck route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=10 \% \quad$ Total Points $=$ | 3.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent 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 |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | valuable to local residents |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | 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 | ected |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | No mitigation expected d | to size of projec |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impa |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Few issues expected; A | small wetlands | onds) | ear road |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% Total Points = | 19.0 of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.36 | 50 | 13.4 | 4.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 330.88 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.89 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 |  | Could slightly improve local emergency response times; alt route |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 10.5 | one reported crash from 2007-2011 |  |




| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 0.2 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 0\% | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not a major truck route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | promotes safe travel toffr | swimming hole |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | very important to local res | dents - safety |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=1.4 .5$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Modest project, few stormwater issues expected |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Signage is very unlikely to cause impacts |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $50 \%$ | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Road crosses floodplain \& wetland; but impacts not expected |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% Total Points = | 28.5 of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 1.35 | 50 | 50.0 | 15.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |
|  | Injury | 4 | Crash Rate | 239.70 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.37 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 500 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local leaders |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Speed slowing mechanisms (i.e. signs) |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 10.5 | four reported crashes, including 4 injuries |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 10.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | chip and seal - fair condition - some gravel |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | unsafe pedestrian travel conditions |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 250 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 4.0 | improvements beneficial to | existing system |  |  |


| Proj. \#: 3-5 Project Name: | Caney Creek Rd (W Hwy to Skyline Dr) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Traffic Safety | Total Score | 33.7 | Out of | 100 |  | T |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Widen lanes and shoulders and potentially straighten horizontal curves. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning |  | Length: 5.46 miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Roadway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Local (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 100 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 2 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points = | 0.9 |  |
| 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 |  |  |  |
| roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations <br> Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities |  | No | use if first two do not apply |  |  | assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes |  |  |  |
|  |  | use if first two do not apply | assumes improved shoulders |  |  |  |
| Transit |  |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Sh | uttle or Jefferson |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 25\% | 50 | 12.5 | 0.6 | Very rural; local access is limited even with improvements |  |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 1.1 | of 10 |
| Level of Service A |  | A | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | congestion not a major issue |  |  |  |
| Functional Classificatio | Local | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 50 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief 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) |  | 15.0\% |  |  |  | 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. proje |  |  |


| Efficient 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 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 |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Only N -S connector in a large rural area |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Roadway improvements, no scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | valuable to local residents |  |  |


| Environmental 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 | ected |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals |  |  |  | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Proximity to floodplains \& | vetlands may be | issue |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts |  |  |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical imp |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors |  |  |  | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.3 | Roadway travels in/along floodplain area; small wetlands (ponds) |  |  |  |
| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points $=$ | 9.8 | of 30 |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 167.26 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.96 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 |  |  |  |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions |  | Poor | 20 | 15.0 | 3.0 | Roadway in worse condition than bridge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Lunctional Classification2 | Local | $20 \%$ | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 50 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors |  | $50 \%$ | 40 | 20.0 | 4.0 | improvements beneficial to existing system |


| Proj. \#: 3-6 Project Name: Hwy 76 \& US-160 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Traffic Safety | Total Score\| | 62.2 | out of |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Improve intersection to address traffic control, delay, and safety. Improvements could include signalization, a roundabout, or signage/striping. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Construction 2018 Length: NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Minor Arterial (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 8,000 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 640 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Discussion: The intersection is a three-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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 <br> Project provides pedestrian connections Yes <br> Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations No use if first two do not apply <br> Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities No use if first two do not apply |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | assumed ped provisions | are part of project |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | project could benefit peds crossing at the intersection |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 5.4 of 10 |
| Level of Service |  | D | 25 | 15.0 | 1.5 | Lowest movement LOS | or stop control (Sy | nchro) |
| Functional Classificatio | Minor Arterial | 40\% | 25 | 10.0 | 1.0 | conservative assumption |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 4000 | 25 | 4.0 | 0.4 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors |  | 100\% | 25 | 25.0 | 2.5 | moderate to high traffic, key location |  |  |
| Economic Competitiveness |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=10 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 9.7 of 10 |
| Strategic Regional Economic Corridor |  | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | US-160 and Hwy 76 |  |  |
| Support Regional Economic Opportunities |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | supports continued deve | pment and activit | ty in Forsyth |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 85\% | 20 | 17.0 | 1.7 |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) |  | 16.0\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block gror | up data - Comb. 4 | 4 block groups |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 8.0\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract dat | - Comb. 3 tracts |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 100\% | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | US-160 and Hwy 76 are | mportant corridors |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 5.7 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | arrial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | location will be improved in | a manner that be | fits la | e vehicles |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 320 | 30 | 12.0 | 1.2 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 3.0 | trucks will benefit from the | mproved geometry | and/or | trafic contr |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 10.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 160 roadway improvemen | $s$ mentioned in Fo | St | tegic Plan |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 160 roadway improvemen | $s$ mentioned in SI | G r | ional plan |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 160 connects Forsyth to 7 | (Kirbyville) |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | possible conversion to rou | dabout; location | count |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Critical intersection; 160 is | important corrido | hrough | Forsyth |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{3 . 0}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Small increase in stormwater - could be mitigated |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | May have fill in Corps of Engineer's Floodplain |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $50 \%$ | 20 | 10.0 | 0.5 | Corps of Engineer's floodplain impacts |  |  |  |



| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ | Total Points = | $\mathbf{1 0 . 1}$ | of $\mathbf{2 0}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Minor Arterial | $40 \%$ | 10 | 4.0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 4000 | 10 | 1.6 | 0.3 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $100 \%$ | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important local intersection |  |  |  |



| 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 |  |  |  |
| 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 connec | in Ta | ey County |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | mentioned in Forsyth strat | gic plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | mentioned in SMCOG reg | nal plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | important Forsyth through | oute |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | limited scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | important improvement in | he heart of Forss |  |  |


| 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 |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Unmitigated environment | impacts are not | pected |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impa |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.5 | No known environmental | pacts, historical | mpacts possible |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 15.4 of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 69 | Safety Index | 0.71 | 50 | 26.8 | 5.4 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 23 | Crash Rate | 323.48 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 9276 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Concern raised by local | ders |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Will result in widened road | and other improv | nents |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | will improve response tim | fire dept. on nor | side of project |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 7.0 | High number of crashes | nfirms local safet | concern |


| Taking 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 | Both the Roadway and Bridges are in good condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 4750 | 10 | 1.6 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 2.0 | improving roadway oper | ons benefits existi | system |  |


| Proj. \#: $3-8$ Project Name: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Quality of Commul Total Score\| | 45.8 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct an all-weather river crossing (bridge) as well as all weather approach roadways. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning | Length: | 0.1 | miles |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Roadway <br> Functional Classification: Local (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 200 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 2 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = |  |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections Project provides pedestrian connections Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  | No | use if firs | sist two do | not apply | assumes no sidewalks or | bike lanes |  |  |
|  | Yes | use if fir | st two do | not apply | all weather crossing, ass | mes shoulders |  |  |
| Transit | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Sh | ttle or Jefferson L | ines |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | No existing connection; | ssumes shoulders |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.0 | of 10 |
| Level of Service | A | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | capacity is not a major is |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification1 Local | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Usage | 100 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed 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 = |  |  |
| 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 bri |  |  |  |
| Level of Economic Distress | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) | 15\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block gr | up data - 1 block | group |  |
| Unemployment (tract) | 11\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract dat | - 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors | 50\% | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 | development in the area | ot likely |  |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 0.1 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 0\% | 40 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not a major truck route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% Total Points = | 2.5 | 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 | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Popular swimming and fishing location |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | beneficial to local area residents |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | 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 mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Floodplains and wetland in project area |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.3 | Possible impacts - bridge crosses floodplains and wetland area |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% Total Points = | 19.1 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 11.54 | 50 | 50.0 | 15.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 4566.21 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 26.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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-water bridge |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 2.6 | project driven by factors other than safety |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 13.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Poor | 20 | 15.0 | 3.0 | concrete deteriorating |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | narrow and low water crossing |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 100 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | improvement beneficial to existing local transportation system |  |  |  |




| Quality 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 | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plans |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | SMCOG regional plan |  |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | Connects communities no | th of river with Bra | son area |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvement | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Critical connection locatio | within the County |  |  |
| Environmental 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 |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Modest project, no mitiga | on expected |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impa |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Modest project, few issue | expected |  |  |




| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.6 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | artial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | realignment of intersection |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 265 | 30 | 10.9 | 1.1 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | US-160 is an important ar |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | 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 communities no | th of river with Bra | son area |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Minimal criteria met; US-1 | 0 is an important | cility in | Taney Co |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Moderate project, few stormwater issues expected |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Moderate project, no mitigation expected |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Moderate project, few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 15.8 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 3 | Safety Index | 0.67 | 50 | 25.3 | 7.6 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 3 | Crash Rate | 53.45 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 10252 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Improves intersection (trafi | ic control and saf |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | crash rate not as high as | me other project |  |  |

## Taking Care of the System

Max Actual Weighted Weight Factor $=20 \% \quad$ Total Points $=$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature } & \text { No } & 20 & 0.0 & 0.0\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Minor Arterial } & & 40 \% & 10 & 4.0 & 0.8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 5250 & 10 & 9.1 & 1.8 & \text { (Modifed MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$
Local Taking Care of the System Factors $\quad 75 \% \quad 40 \quad 30.0 \quad 6.0 \quad$ important intersection to maintain in good operation



| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | 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 | Rockaway Beach/Merriam | Woods connectio | to Fors |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Minimal criteria met; US-1 | 0 is an important | cility in | Taney Co |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of 5 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 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 | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Modest project, few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 30.0 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 3 | Safety Index | 1.36 | 50 | 50.0 | 15.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 4 | Crash Rate | 68.02 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 1 | Accident Index | 1.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 safely) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 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 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 Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 5500 | 10 | 10.0 | 2.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Important local intersection |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 5.2 | Of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 110 | 30 | 7.0 | 0.7 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 3.0 | fire house nearby, US-160 | is an important ar |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | no applicable local plans |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | US 160 mentioned in SEM | COG regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | List communities |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |



| Taking Care of the System | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 10.7 | of 20 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Gooc |  | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | based on pictures and field observations, very good |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | Vertical alignment directly east of intersection |
| unctional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 1350 | 10 | 0.6 | 0.1 | (Modififed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Important local intersection |


| Proj. \#: $4-5$ Project Name: Round Mountain Road Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48.0 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Construct and all-weather river crossing (bridge) as well as all weather approach roadways. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Construction 2019 Length: 0.1 miles |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Roadway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Local (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 200 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 4 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points $=$ | 1.5 |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections Project provides pedestrian connections roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  | No | use iffir | rst two do | not apply | assumes no sidewalks or | bike lanes |  |  |
|  | Yes | use iffir | rist two do | not apply | assumes wide shoulders |  |  |  |
| Transit | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Shu | title or Jefferson |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | No existing connection; | sumes wide sho | Iders |  |
| Congestion Relief |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.0 | of 10 |
| Level of Service | A | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | capacity is not a major iss |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification1 Local | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 100 | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors | 100\% | 25 | 25.0 | 2.5 | closure causes non-recuri | ing delay to brid | 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 deve | lopment east of | e bridge |  |
| Level of Economic Distress | 30\% | 20 | 6.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) | 11\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block gro | up data - 1 block | group |  |
| Unemployment (tract) | 13\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract data |  |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors | 100\% | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | supports local econ dev e | forts |  |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 1.1 of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Assumed to meet criteria | or freight; not an in | portant facility |


| Quality of Communities | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=10 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 3.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Consistent with Local Plans
Consistent win Local Plans
$\begin{array}{lllllll} & & & & \text { not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan } \\ \text { Connectivity } & \text { Yes } & 30 & 30.0 & 3.0 & \text { provides connection to east side of creek }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Scenic and Visual } & \text { No } & 20 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \text { No scenic benefits }\end{array}$
Local Quality of Communities Factors $\quad 25 \% \quad 20 \quad 5.0 \quad 0.5 \quad$ beneficial to local area residents

$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { Consistent with Stormwater Goals } & \text { Yes } & 30 & 30.0 & 1.5 & \text { Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Consistent with Environmental Goals } & \text { No } & 30 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \text { Floodplains and wetland in project area }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { Avoids Historical Impacts } & \text { Yes } & 20 & 20.0 & 1.0 & \text { No known historical impacts }\end{array}$

| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $25 \%$ | 20 | 5.0 | 0.3 | Possible impacts - bridge crosses floodplains and welland area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% Total Points = | 19.1 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 11.54 | 50 | 50.0 | 15.0 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 4566.21 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 26.09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 200 | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no main reason for project |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | New two-lane bridge high-water bridge |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 2.6 | project driven by factors other than safety |  |  |

 | Roadway or |  | Sridge Conditions | Poor | 20 | 15.0 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | 3.0

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 100 & 10 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \text { (Modified MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Local Taking Care of the System Factors } & 50 \% & 40 & 20.0 & 4.0 & \text { improvement beneficial to existing local transportation system }\end{array}$

| Proj. \#: 5-1 Project Name: | O-248 and Buc | chanan R | Rd Inter | rsection |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Trafic Safety | Total Score | 47.1 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Intersection improvements including potential northbound right turn lane, signage and striping modifications, traffic signal, and advance warning signs. Other improvements such as a southbound left turn lane could also be considered. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning |  | Length: | NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Small | Roadway | or Inters | section | Intersec | ection |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AA <br> Daily Truck Tra <br> Through La | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ollector } \\ & 300 \\ & 10 \end{aligned}$ | (for the $m$ (estimated (estimated (through | major st <br> d, avg. <br> d, avg. <br> lanes o | reet) <br> for majo <br> for majo <br> on major | or street) <br> or street) street) |  |  |  |  |
| Project Discussion: MO-248 <br> Buchanan is stop controlled and limit on MO-248 is 45 mph , lead measurements indicate that ther looking to the south due to vertic intersection does not meet signa More detailed traffic data will be location, and to evaluate the nee | hanan are twoaches MO-248 a design sight d sufficient sight d horizontal align ants based on th ed to evaluate eft and right turn | lane road on an up distance of distance nment iss he availa the need n lanes. | ds witho grade. <br> f 500 fe or drive ues (se ble sam for a sig | out turn la The pos eet. Initial ars on Bu ee photo) ple coun gnal at th | anes <br> sted speed al <br> uchanan <br> ). The <br> nt data <br> his |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 1.8 |  |
| Eliminate Bike | Barriers (ADA) | 40\% | 25 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provid | e connections | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
| Project provides pe | n connections | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
| roject brings existing facilites up | A Regulations | Yes | use if fir | irst two do | o not apply | if signal is installed, ADA | pedestrian prov | ons ass | sumed |
| Project provides some bik | strian facilities | Yes | use if fir | irst two do | not apply | if signal is installed, pede | strians have safe | crossing | option |
|  | Transit | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Shu | utle or Jefferson L |  |  |
| Local Access to | unity Factors | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | Signalization would bene | fit bikes/peds as |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.3 | of 10 |
|  | vel of Service | B | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 | estimated LOS from sam | ple count (more | alysis | needed |
| Functional Classificatio | Collector | 30\% | 25 | 7.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 2650 | 25 | 5.8 | 0.6 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Conge | Relief Factors | 100\% | 25 | 25.0 | 2.5 | congestion during peak s | chool trafic hour | an issu |  |
| Economic Competitiveness |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = |  | of 10 |
| Strategic Regional | mic Corridor | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Support Regional Econ | Opportunities | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Not linked to any planned | econ. dev. project |  |  |
| Level of | mic Distress | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | (Block Group) | 9\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block g | pup data - Comb | block | oups |
|  | loyment (tract) | 4\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract dat | - 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Comp | ness Factors | 25\% | 30 | 7.5 | 0.8 | not a major economic dev | project |  |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | intersection upgrades will better serve trucks and school buses |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load 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 vols appear low) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 |  |  |  | no applicable local plans |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG r | regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements, | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | Important for school traffic |  |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 |  |  |  |




| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | roadway assumed to b |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sight distance issue | $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Collector } & 30 \% & 10 & 3.0 & 0.6\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{lllll}2650 & 10 & 2.3 & 0.5 & \text { (Modifed MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Local Taking Care of the System Factors } & 75 \% & 40 & 30.0 & 6.0 & \text { Important local intersection to have function well }\end{array}$


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | artial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | intersection upgrades will | etter serve trucks |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 65 | 30 | 5.4 | 0.5 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Branson Hills Parkway is | potential comme | al route |  |


| Quality 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 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | Branson Rec-plex is mentioned in Branson Community Plan 203 not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Opportunity for building on Branson Hills Parkway landscaping |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | proximity to Branson Rec-plex, high school traffic uses intersectio |  |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | 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 expected |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | mitigation possible, mines could be an issue |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | few issues expected, but mines and topography are issues |  |  |


| 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) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 5 | Crash Rate | 240.91 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 1 | Accident Index | 3.66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 6444 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Improvements should add | ess key safety iss |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 10.5 | 17 crashes in 3 years, mai | ly angle and rear |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 14.8 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | Roadway in fair condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sight distance issues |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 3300 | 10 | 1.1 | 0.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important roadway and inte | rsection to maint | high fu | nctionality |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Geometric/Safety | Total Score\| | 43.4 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Intersection safety improvements including a northbound acceleration lane and a northbound right turn lane. Signage and striping improvements are also proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning |  | Length: NA |  |  |  |  | \% |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Intersection <br> Functional Classification: Collector (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 13000 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 260 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Discussion: Both roads are 2-lane roads without turn lanes. The posted speed on MO-248 is 45 mph . There is a driveway across from Flynn Road. There is limited sight distance to the north for both Flynn Road and the driveway. The sight distance design value is 500 ft . Grade adjustments may be necessary to improve the sight distance. Southbound advance warning signage may be warranted. Sample counts 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted |  | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = |  |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) |  | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections Project provides pedestrian connections roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  |  | No | use if first two do not apply |  |  | assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | use if ifirst two do not apply |  |  | assumes widened shoulders at intersection |  |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson St | uttle or Jefferson |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 75\% | 50 | 37.5 | 1.9 | Proximity to existing businesses \& residents bikes/peds |  |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 5.7 | of 10 |
| Level of Service |  | E | 25 | 20.0 | 2.0 | estimated peak hour LOS for westbound left turns |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification | Collector | 30\% | 25 | 7.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 6500 | 25 | 10.6 | 1.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors |  | 75\% | 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 planne | econ. dev. proje |  |  |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) |  | 9\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block g | oup data - Comb. | bloc | groups |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 4\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract da | - 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 0\% | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not an economic dev re | ted project |  |  |


| Efficient 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 2 |  |  |
| 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 | no scenic benefit |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | important to residents that | use this for access | and cir | culation |


| Environmental 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 mititation 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 10.9 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 7 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 50.36 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 12694 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | intersection improvements | could address saf | ty issues |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 7.9 | most crashes are rear-end | s on MO-165 |  |  |


| Taking 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 | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sight distance and turn lane issues |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 6500 | 10 | 4.2 | 0.8 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | important design / safety improvements |  |  |  |





| Quality 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 |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | regional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | does not connect any maj | communities |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefi |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | benefits local residents an | d businesses |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 8.3 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 2 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 38.18 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 4784 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | aders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | will promote safety for turn | ing vehicles |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no substantial effect on er | ergency response |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | relatively few crashes, not | a high ranking safe | problem |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 6.8 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Gooc |  | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | roadway appears to be in | very good conditio |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | project as scoped will not | address sight dista | ce issue |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 2450 | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | important local intersection | / route to busines | park |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.2 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | improvements would better serve trucks and school buses |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 115 | 30 | 7.2 | 0.7 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | MO-248 is a potential freight route (though truck vols appear low) |  |  |  |


| 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 plans |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG r | gional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements, | no scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | Important for local users |  |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 11.7 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 2 | Safety Index | 0.07 | 50 | 2.7 | 0.8 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 77.94 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 2343 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local res | sidents and leaders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Improvements should address key safety issues |  |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | substantial community concern, not a large number of crashes |  |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 7.9 |  |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 11.7 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | roadway assumed to be in good condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sight distance issue |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 1200 | 10 | 0.5 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Important local intersection, future growth area |  |  |  |


| Proj. \#: 5-7 Project Name: | Buchanan Rd and Sunrise Dr Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Trafic Safety | Total Score\| | 37.8 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Improve intersection alignment and traffic control. Re-align the through movement to connect Sunrise Dr in the north with Buchanan Rd in the west and convert Sunrise Dr. northbound (south leg) to stop control. Alternativey, install a roundabout. This may address the same issues more cost effectively. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Planning Length: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Small $\quad$ Roadway or Intersection Inter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Local (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 2,800 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 140 (est. 2012, avg. for major street) <br> 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. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = |  |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) 20 |  | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
| Project provides pedestrian connections |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
| roject brings existing facilities up to ADA RegulationsProject provides some bike/pedestrian facilities |  | No | use if first two do not apply use if first two do not apply |  |  | assumes no sidewalks or bike lanes |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | assumes improved shou | ders at intersectio |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no effect on Branson Sh | ttle or Jefferson L |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | assumes improved shoulders at intersection |  |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points $=$ | 3.7 |  |
| Level of Service |  |  | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 | eastbound left turn LOS | for stop control |  |  |
| Functional Classificatio | Local | 20\% | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 1400 | 25 | 1.6 | 0.2 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion 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 planne | econ. dev. project |  |  |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) |  | 7.0\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block gror | up data - 1 block | group |  |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 3.0\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract dat | a-1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 25\% | 30 | 7.5 | 0.8 | Minimal economic impac | outside of the scl |  |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.1 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | improves turns for trucks and other large vehicles |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 trafic other than buses and trash trucks |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 2.0 | 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 | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No significant improved co | nectivity |  |  |
| 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 $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 8}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 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 | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Modest project, few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points $=$ | 13.5 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | -0.20 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 33.40 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 2734 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| 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 le | ders |  |  |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | roadway in fair condition based on observations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 1400 | 10 | 0.6 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | important intersection to maintain in good operation |


| .j. \#: 6-1 $\quad$ Project Name: $\quad$ M0-165 and Fall Creek Road Intersection |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type: Geometric/Safety | Total Score | 58.3 | out of |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description: Improve intersection grade, alignment, geometry, and traffic control. This could include adding turn lanes and/or installing a signal. Actual alignment changes may be cost prohibitive, but could be considered. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status: Grant Application Submitted |  | Length: NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Scale: Medium Roadway or Intersection Intersectio |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification: Collector (for the major street) <br> Avg. Annual Daily Traffic (AADT): 9100 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Daily Truck Traffic: 460 (estimated, avg. for major street) <br> Through Lanes: 2 (through lanes on major street) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Discussion: The westbound approach to the intersection (Fall Creek Road) is on a very steep downgrade. It terminates at a stop control. There are no turn lanes at the intersection. The posted speed on MO-165 at this location is 35 mph . There have been 12 crashes at this location in the last 3 years (including 3 injury crashes). Three of the 12 crashes were angle crashes. There were also a number of rear-end crashes, mainly on MO-165. Buses are prohibited from making northbound right turns at this location. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to Opportunity |  |  | Max Actual Weighted |  |  | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points $=$ |  |  |
| Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) |  | 40\% | 25 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections Project provides pedestrian connections roject brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations Project provides some bike/pedestrian facilities |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | use if first two do not apply |  |  | if signal is installed, ADA pedestrian provisions assumed |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | use iffirst two do not apply |  |  | if signal is installed, pedestrians have safe crossing option |  |  |  |
| Transit |  | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson Sh | ttle or Jefferson L |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 50\% | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | Signalization would benefit 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 needed |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification | Collector | 30\% | 25 | 7.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 4550 | 25 | 5.2 | 0.5 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors |  | 100\% | 25 | 25.0 | 2.5 | peak period congestion is an issue |  |  |  |
| Economic Competitiveness |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = |  |  |
| 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. project |  |  |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty (Block Group) |  | 10\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS block | up data - Comb. 2 | block | groups |
| Unemployment (tract) |  | 4\% |  |  |  | 2006-2010 ACS tract dat | - 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 50\% | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 | important intersection in | he transportation | system |  |


| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Possible benefits to buses and trucks if all movements allowed |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | both facilities' mentione | Branson Com | Pla |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 165 (from 76 to 265) ment | ned in SMCOG | ional p |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | MO-165 and Fall Creek ar | both important | nectors |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Intersection improvements | no scenic benefi |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | Important connection loca | on in system |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points = | 2.8 | of 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | few stormwater issues expected |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Possible stream and/or floodplain issues |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.3 | Project has potential to require mitigation, need to avoid bridge |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 19.0 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 9 | Safety Index | 0.72 | 50 | 27.1 | 8.1 | (Modified MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 3 | Crash Rate | 123.34 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 8885 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancement |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | intersection improvemen | designed to impro | safety |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no major impact on eme | ncy response |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 7.9 | crashes confirm local co |  |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 12.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


|  | Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | roadway appears to be in go |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | steep grade, bus prohibition |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Collector | $30 \%$ | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 4550 | 10 | 2.1 | 0.4 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $75 \%$ | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | important local intersection |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  | intersection improvements would benefit trucks/trailers |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 55 | 30 | 5.0 | 0.5 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | not a major truck/freight route, but it is a boat hauling route |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 6.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | Fall Creek Rd mentioned | Branson Comr | ty Plan | 2030 |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Existing recreational sign | e can be updated | and imp | oved |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | would improve a recreatio | a access point |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=14.5$ | of 5 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | focused project, few stormwater issues expected |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | no substantial 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 | no known unmitigatable issues, floodplain proximity |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% Total Points = | 17.2 of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.56 | 50 | 21.2 | 6.3 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 35.29 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.54 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg Aadt | 5175 | 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 and road re-alignment |  |
|  |  |  | 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 crashes |  |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Fair | 20 | 10.0 | 2.0 | road appears to be in fair condition |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sharp curve does not meet design standards |  |
| Functional Classification2 | Local | $20 \%$ | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 2650 | 10 | 0.7 | 0.1 | (Modified MODOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | $75 \%$ | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | roadway is not major, but upgrade is important |  |


| \＃：6－3 $\quad$ Project Name：${ }^{\text {Safari Rd（Sharp Curve Area to MO－165）}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Type：Geometric／Safety | Total Score | 48.4 | out of | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Description：Improve alignment to eliminate sharp curves（especially the curve in the middle of the roadway segment）．A signal installation at MO－ 165 was also proposed． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status：Planning |  | Length： 0.88 miles |  |  |  | $\text { Y } 2 \times 1$ |  |  |  |
| Project Scale：Medium Roadway or Intersection Roadway <br> Functional Classification：Local （for the major street） <br> Avg．Annual Daily Traffic（AADT）： 2600 （est．2012，avg．for major street） <br> Daily Truck Traffic： 50 （est．2012，avg．for major street） <br> Through Lanes： 2 （through lanes on 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 |  |
| Eliminate Bike／Ped Barriers（ADA） |  | 40\％ | 25 | 10.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Project provides bike connections |  |  |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
| Project provides pedestrian connectionsroject rrings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations |  | No |  |  |  | does not apply |  |  |  |
|  |  | Yes | use iffirst two do not apply |  |  | signal installation would meet ADA requirements |  |  |  |
| Project brings existing facilities up to ADA Regulations <br> Project provides some bike／pedestrian facilities |  | Yes | use iff first two do not apply |  |  | signal would benefit peds／bikes |  |  |  |
|  | Transit | No | 25 | 0.0 | 0.0 | No effect on Branson St | Ittle or Jefferson L |  |  |
| Local Access to Opportunity Factors |  | 50\％ | 50 | 25.0 | 1.3 | Assumes no new sidewalks or bike lanes on Safari |  |  |  |
| Congestion Relief |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor＝10\％ | Total Points＝ | 2.8 | f 10 |
| Level of Service |  |  | 25 | 10.0 | 1.0 | estimated peak LOS on Safari（likely different at intersection） |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification | Local | 20\％ | 25 | 5.0 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Daily Usage | 1300 | 25 | 0.4 | 0.0 | （Modified MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Congestion Relief Factors |  | 50\％ | 25 | 12.5 | 1.3 | congestion not a major issue，but seasonality could affect it |  |  |  |
| Economic Competitiveness |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor＝10\％ | Total Points＝ |  | f 10 |
| Strategic Regional Economic Corridor |  | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Support Regional Economic Opportunities |  | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no known regional econ | mic opportunities |  |  |
| Level of Economic Distress |  | 0\％ | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty（Block Group） |  | 10\％ |  |  |  | 2006－2010 ACS block g | p data－Comb． | 2 block | groups |
| Unemployment（tract） |  | 4\％ |  |  |  | 2006－2010 ACS tract da | － 1 tract |  |  |
| Local Economic Competitiveness Factors |  | 50\％ | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 | benefits local businesse | could be direct ro | oute to 1 | MO－265 |


| Efficient 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 truckfrieight |  |  |  |


| 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 Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in Branson Community Plan 2030 not mentioned in SMCOG regional plan |  |  |  |
|  | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | connects MO－165 in Branson with MO－265 in west |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Roadway improvements，no scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\％ | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | not major community issue，could give residents a new direct rou |  |  |  |
| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor＝5\％ | Total Points＝ | 2.5 | of 5 |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Assume new runoff mitigated（stormwater detention facilities） |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Roadway crosses stream／floodplain；small wetlands |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 0\％ | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Possible impacts due to stream crossing |  |  |  |
| Safety |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor＝30\％ | Total Points＝ | 22.1 | of 30 |
| प्0 PDO 10 Safety Index | 0.76 | 50 | 28.7 | 8.6 | （Modified MoDOT formula） |  |  |  |
| （llar 10 Crash Rate | 449.66 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009－2011 |  |  |  |
| 家苞 | 2.57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 晨 | 1.23 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }_{0}^{\circ}$ 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 |  |  |  |
| Taking 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 Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | sharp curve does not meet design standards |  |  |  |
| Functional 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 |  |  |  |



| 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 | ructed |  |
| 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 | benefits those th | do use it |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans |  |  |  |  | Fall Creek Rd mentioned in | Branson Commu | ty Plan |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | improved roadway could c | onnect southern B | nson 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 re | sidential dev alon | corridor |  |


| 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 new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Proximity to stream, floodplain and small wetlands |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 2.3 | Large project, potential for impacts; mitigation likely |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 12.5 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 15 | Safety Index | 0.47 | 50 | 17.7 | 3.5 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 8 | Crash Rate | 153.79 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.87 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 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 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 obser | tions |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | Vertical and horizontal ali | ment |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 2600 | 10 | 0.5 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 2.0 | Important local roadway |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 3.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | artial Yes | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  | signal/roundabout could be | tter facilitate truck | noveme |  |
| 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 be | eefit truck access/ | gress |  |


| Quality 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 Branso | Community Plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 165 (from 76 to 265) men | ned in SMCOG | yional p |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not a major connectivity |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Roundabout could enhan | aesthetics |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | benefits to residential dev | bouth and busi | sses to |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 13.6 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 1 | Safety Index | 0.47 | 50 | 17.8 | 5.3 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 20.56 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 8885 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Will result in intersection in | provements (i.e. | gnal) |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no major change to emerg | ency response tim |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | number of crashes not larg | e relative to other | projects |  |


\section*{Taking Care of the System <br> | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=20 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 11.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| of 20 |  |  |  |  |  |} $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Collector } & 30 \% & 10 & 3.0 & 0.6\end{array}$

$\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Daily Vehicle Usage } & 4550 & 10 & 6.8 & 1.4 & \text { (Modified MoDOT formula) }\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Local Taking Care of the System Factors } & 100 \% & 40 & 40.0 & 8.0 & \text { important local intersection }\end{array}$


| 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 |  |  |  | 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 3.0 | important corridor for com | nerce and trucks i | this area |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 7.5 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 165 mentioned in Branson | Community Plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | Yes |  |  |  | 165 (from 76 to 265) ment | oned in SMCOG r | ional pla |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 165 connects south Brans | on to north Branso |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | benefits residents and bus | ness community |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | 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 mitig | d (new stormwa | dot | on facilitie |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Impacts likely can be mitio | ted, potential flo | plain is |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impa |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.8 | Large project, possible in |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 18.8 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 136 | Safety Index | 1.17 | 50 | 44.0 | 8.8 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 63 | Crash Rate | 471.46 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 1 | Accident Index | 2.69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.83 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 8885 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Will result in widened road | (shoulders and tu | lanes) |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Additional turn lanes and | dening could imp | ve resp | onse tit |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 100\% | 35 | 35.0 | 7.0 | High number of crashes |  |  |  |


| Taking 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 appear to be in good condition |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | none known |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Minor Arterial | 40\% | 10 | 4.0 | 0.2 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 4550 | 10 | 1.4 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 2.0 | important to maintain functionality of corridor |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | 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 impror | vement |  |  |
| 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 w | uld have margina | enefits |  |


| 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 |  |  |  | not mentioned in Branson | Community 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 | Roadway improvements, | scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | benefits local residents, in | uding bike/ped |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{5 \%}$ | Total Points $=1$ | $\mathbf{4 . 5}$ | of $\mathbf{5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | few stormwater issues expected |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | 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 | few issues expected |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 8.3 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | -1.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 1172 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Concern raised by local lea | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | would result in improved | ght distances |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | marginal response-time in | provements |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | no recorded crashes from | 2007 to 2011 |  |  |


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




| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 1.0 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle 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 Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 25\% | 40 | 10.0 | 1.0 | not a major truck route, bu | does provide for | eliveries |  |


| Quality 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 2030 |  |  |  |
| 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, could impact scenery |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 25\% | 20 | 5.0 | 0.5 | could benefit local residents and could benefit peds/bikes |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Modest project, few storm | vater issues expe |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 1.5 | Modest project, no mitigat | on expected |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical impac |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | Modest project, few issue | expected, some | poss | le though |





| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 2.3 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | does provide for | eliveries |  |


| Quality 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 |  |  |  | part of Branson's Compr | ensive and Strate | plan |  |
| Consistent 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 | plan would enhance lands | aping, aesthetics | and views |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 1.5 | project will revive strip and | increase tax reve |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points = | $\mathbf{1 4 . 3}$ | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Branson MS4 requirements will be followed |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Rain gardens are planned |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 2.3 | Environment to be showcased where possible |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 16.2 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 388 | Safety Index | 1.19 | 50 | 44.5 | 8.9 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 133 | Crash Rate | 527.20 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 3.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 23141 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Concern raised by local lea | aders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | pedestrian safety will be | eatly enhanced |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 5.3 | will address pedestrian sa | ety which is a maj | concern |  |


| Taking 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, little roadway cracking |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Major Arterial | 50\% | 10 | 5.0 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 11850 | 10 | 6.2 | 0.3 | (Modifed MoDOT form |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 2.0 | improvements are need | for capacity |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 5.8 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 125 | 30 | 7.5 | 0.8 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | Interchange to meet criter | for freight |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% Total Points = | 4.0 of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local/Regional Land Use Plans | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |
| Consistent with Local Plans | No |  |  |  | not found in Branson plan |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in regional plan |  |
| Connectivity | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 3.0 | 76 and 376 connect to points beyond |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no scenic benefits |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | interchange would benefit traffic flow, but ma | impact ROW |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points = | 7.5 | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Assume new runoff mitigated (new stormwater detention facilities |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | large project; environmental mitigation possible |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | no known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $0 \%$ | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | due to size of project, mitigation likely |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 6.7 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 15 | Safety Index | 0.53 | 50 | 19.9 | 4.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 2 | Crash Rate | 124.22 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 1.88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 12498 | Safety Concern | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Interchange could improve safety over the at-grade intersection |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 25\% | 35 | 8.8 | 1.8 | crash rate not significant re | lative to other pro |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=5 \%$ | Total Points $=$ | 1.1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\left.\begin{array}{|cccccl|}\hline \text { Roadway or Bridge Conditions } & \text { Good } & 20 & 5.0 & 0.3 & \\ \hline \text { Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature } & \text { No } & 20 & 0.0 & 0.0 & \\ \text { Functional Classification2 } & \text { Major Arterial } & 50 \% & 10 & 5.0 & 0.3\end{array}\right)$


| Efficient 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 |  |  |  | improve alignment (low water area, sharp curve) |  |  |  |
| 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 no | major truck focu | d imp | vement |


| 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 | slicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional 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, | specially in serious | weath | r cond. |


| Environmental 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 sh | mitigatable |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 | stream/floodplain crossi | potential for impa |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | No known historical imp |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | 75\% | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | environmental issues m | equire mitigation |  |  |



| Taking 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 | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | road impassable during high water events |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 1500 | 10 | 0.2 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formu |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 100\% | 40 | 40.0 | 8.0 | Important to address this | onnection issue |  |  |



| 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 | No |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | provement projec |  |  |


| 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 |  |  |  | not known to be on any ap | plicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no scenic benefits to shoul | der widening on | s roadway |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | potential benefits to reside | ts - esp. for wall |  |  |


| Environmental 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 | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 0.8 | few issues expected, though stormwater could be an issue |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 22.1 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 1.23 | 50 | 46.3 | 13.9 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 1 | Crash Rate | 58.60 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 3.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 1172 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | shoulders could improve | uto and ped safety |  |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | nominal benefits for emer | ency responders |  |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | local concern, does not m | et design stds; on | one cra | ash in 3 yrs |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points $=$ | 10.4 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Good |  | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | based on field observatio |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | lanes, shoulders, and clear zones do not meet standards |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Local | 20\% | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 600 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | upgrades offer benefits to | users and potenti | users |  |



| 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 truckfreight route |  |  |  |


| 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 |  |  |  | not known to be on any a | olicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | gional 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 an | for emergency re | ponse |  |


| Environmental 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 to north |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points = | 9.8 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 0 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 0.00 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | NA | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Turnaround or cul-de-sac |  |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Will allow emergency res | onders to turn arou |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | Localized issue, no know | crashes from 200 | to 2011 |  |



| Roadway or Bridge Conditions Very Poor |  | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | Gravel Roadway |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature |  | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | Dead end, does not meet typical design standards |
| Functional Classification2 | Local | $20 \%$ | 10 | 2.0 | 0.4 |  |
|  | Daily Vehicle Usage | 5 | 10 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors |  | $75 \%$ | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Important local improvement |



| Efficient 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 |  |  |  | improve sight distance, geometry, and/or traffic control |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | will benefit truck traffic (which requires longer stopping distances) |  |  |  |


| Quality of Communities |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 0.0 | 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 | licable 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 | Intersection improvements, | no scenic benefits |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 0\% | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | not a major community qua | lity issue |  |  |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 5\% | Total Points $=$ | 5.0 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 | 100\% | 20 | 20.0 | 1.0 | few issues expected (unless major earthwork is undertaken) |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 30\% | Total Points $=$ | 8.3 | of 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 3 | Safety Index | 0.00 | 50 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (Modifed MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
|  | Injury | 0 | Crash Rate | 65.25 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 4199 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | concern raised by local le | ders |  |  |
| Safety Enhancements |  |  |  | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.5 | Intersection improvements | (sight distance) |  |  |
| Emergency Response |  |  |  | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | little impact on emergenc | esponders |  |  |
| Local Safety Factors |  |  |  | 50\% | 35 | 17.5 | 5.3 | crash rate not significant | ative to other pro |  |  |


| Taking Care of the System |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 11.7 | of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Roadway or Bridge Conditions | Good | 20 | 5.0 | 1.0 | minor roadway rutting |  |  |  |
| Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 4.0 | possible sight distance issue |  |  |  |
| Functional Classification2 Collector | 30\% | 10 | 3.0 | 0.6 |  |  |  |  |
| Daily Vehicle Usage | 2150 | 10 | 0.5 | 0.1 | (Modifed MoDOT formula) |  |  |  |
| Local Taking Care of the System Factors | 75\% | 40 | 30.0 | 6.0 | Important local intersection |  |  |  |



| Efficient Movement of Freight |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 10\% | Total Points = | 4.3 | of 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities Partial Yes |  | 30 | 15.0 | 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| Widens Road | Yes |  |  |  | widen shoulders and/or lan |  |  |  |
| Improves Geometry | No |  |  |  | uncertain |  |  |  |
| Improves Load Rating | No |  |  |  | uncertain |  |  |  |
| Truck Usage | 133 | 30 | 7.7 | 0.8 | MoDOT formula |  |  |  |
| Local Efficient Movement of Freight Factors | 50\% | 40 | 20.0 | 2.0 | minimal criteria met, but ro | ad would be wide |  |  |


| 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 |  |  |  | not known to be on any ap | plicable local plan |  |  |
| Consistent with Regional Plans | No |  |  |  | not mentioned in SMCOG | egional plan |  |  |
| Connectivity | No | 30 | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| Scenic and Visual | No | 20 | 0.0 | 0.0 | no scenic benefits |  |  |  |
| Local Quality of Communities Factors | 50\% | 20 | 10.0 | 1.0 | minimal criteria met, but be | nefits schools and | heref | e commun |


| Environmental Protection |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor $=\mathbf{1 5 \%}$ | Total Points $=$ | 14.3 | of $\mathbf{1 5}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Consistent with Stormwater Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Assume excess runoff mitigated (new stormwater facilities) |  |  |  |
| Consistent with Environmental Goals | Yes | 30 | 30.0 | 4.5 | Large project; possible impacts likely to be mitigated |  |  |  |
| Avoids Historical Impacts | Yes | 20 | 20.0 | 3.0 | No known historical impacts |  |  |  |
| Local Environmental Protection Factors | $75 \%$ | 20 | 15.0 | 2.3 | Large project; potential for impacts, though likely to be mitigated |  |  |  |


| Safety |  |  |  |  | Max | Actual | Weighted | Weight Factor = 20\% | Total Points = | 11.0 of 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | PDO | 5 | Safety Index | 0.51 | 50 | 19.0 | 3.8 | (Modified MoDOT formula) |  |  |
|  | Injury | 4 | Crash Rate | 104.57 |  |  |  | Crash data 2009-2011 |  |  |
|  | Fatal | 0 | Accident Index | 0.60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Years | 3 | Severity Index | 2.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Avg AADT | 3417 | Safety Concern | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | concern raised by local lea | ders |  |
|  |  |  | Safety Enhancements | Yes | 5 | 5.0 | 1.0 | Will result in widened shou | Iders |  |
|  |  |  | Emergency Response | No | 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | Nominal benefits to emerg | ency response |  |
|  |  |  | Local Safety Factors | 75\% | 35 | 26.3 | 5.3 | Improves a road with possi | ble safety and de | gn issues |


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

Taney County Transportation Prioritization
Revised Weighting Factors
August 28, 2012

|  | Category Weights |  |  |  |  | Subcategory Weights |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Small | Medium | Large | Regional |  | Small | Medium | Large | Regional |
| Access to Opportunity | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Eliminate Bike/Ped Barriers (ADA) } \\ \text { Transit } \\ \text { Local Factors } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 25 \\ 50 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 25 \\ 50 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \\ 25 \\ 50 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 25 25 50 100 |
| Congestion Relief | 10\% | 10\% | 15\% | 15\% | Level of Service <br> Functional Classification I <br> Daily Usage <br> Local Factors | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 25 \\ 25 \\ 25 \\ 25 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \\ & 25 \\ & 25 \\ & 25 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 25 \\ 25 \\ 25 \\ 25 \\ 100 \end{gathered}$ | 25 25 25 25 100 |
| Economic Competitiveness | 10\% | 10\% | 20\% | 20\% | Strategic Regional Economic Corridor Support Regional Economic Opportunities Level of Economic Distress Local Factors | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 30 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 20 \\ 20 \\ 30 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 20 \\ & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 30 \\ & 100 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 30 \\ 20 \\ 30 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Efficient Movement of Freight | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | Large Vehicle Friendly Facilities <br> Truck Usage Local Factors | $\begin{array}{r} 30 \\ 30 \\ 40 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 30 \\ 40 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 40 \\ & 100 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30 \\ 30 \\ 40 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Quality of Communities | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | Local/Regional Land Use Plans <br> Connectivity <br> Scenic and Visual Local Factors | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 20 20 100 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 20 20 100 |
| Environmental Protection | 5\% | 5\% | 15\% | 15\% | Consistent with Stormwater Goals Consistent with Environmental Goals Avoids Historical Impacts Local Factors | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 20 20 100 | $\begin{aligned} & 30 \\ & 30 \\ & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 20 20 100 |
| Safety | 30\% | 30\% | 20\% | 20\% | Safety Index Emergency Response <br> Safety Concern Safety Enhancements Local Factors | $\begin{gathered} \hline 50 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 35 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50 5 5 5 35 100 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 50 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 5 \\ 35 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 50 5 5 5 35 100 |
| Taking Care of the System | 20\% | 20\% | 5\% | 5\% | Roadway or Bridge Conditions <br> Substandard Roadway or Bridge Feature Functional Classification2 Daily Vehicle Usage Local factors | $\begin{gathered} \hline 20 \\ 20 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 40 \\ 100 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 20 20 10 10 40 100 | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 20 \\ & 10 \\ & 10 \\ & 40 \\ & 100 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 20 20 10 10 40 100 |
|  | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    $\begin{array}{llll}30 & 30.0 & 6.0 & \text { Important future development area, important linkage }\end{array}$

