

The interchange at I-40 and 5.5 miles of grading north of I-40 has been let to contract. The section from Fayetteville north to Rogers, including the Fayetteville Bypass has been completed and is built to Interstate Standards. Grading and structure work is currently underway north of Rogers.

The most significant area of this proposed alignment is the urbanized region of Fayetteville/Springdale, one of the fastest growing employment centers in the state. This area is the home office and major distribution center for the Wal-Mart discount stores, the center of major poultry industry activities, the base for several trucking firms and the focal point of higher education in the state with the location of the University of Arkansas in Fayetteville.

Two national parks and several outstanding state parks are located along the route corridor. Research conducted by the Arkansas Department of Parks and Tourism for 1986 showed that more than 15 million travelers visited the state and its recreational facilities. The counties comprising this portion of the route corridor were ranked as the number one final destination point of the surveyed travelers.

Section Breakpoint Number 06-07

This 16.8 mile segment of the corridor starts at Interstate 40 near Alma, southwesterly through Fort Smith, via I-540 on existing location to south of the city. This route alignment provides the connection to the metropolitan areas of Little Rock,

Arkansas; Memphis, Tennessee; Tulsa and Oklahoma City, Oklahoma through east-west I-40. The alignment would also provide the link to the inland river ports along the Arkansas River and the international port at New Orleans via the Mississippi River. Access to the Little Rock Air Force Base and Camp Chaffee at Fort Smith would also be improved by this route connection. The city of Fort Smith would be a major traffic generator for the proposed highway since it is recognized as the industrial and commercial hub of the Arkansas River Valley.

Section Breakpoint Numbers 07-08 and 08-09

This part of the alignment is on new location and is 140.7 miles in length from south of Fort Smith to the Arkansas-Texas State Line northwest of Texarkana.

Numerous lakes, rivers, hiking trails and camping facilities are located along the entire corridor. Vast amounts of natural resources (timber, slate, sandstone, gypsum, chert and novaculite) are also located within the corridor. The small towns in this area are economically tied to the forestry and mining operations and recreational activities.

There exists four areas to be avoided during construction, all of which are public water supplies of small towns.

Section Breakpoint Numbers 09-10 and 10-12

This section is 48.4 miles beginning at the Arkansas-Texas State Line on existing and new location, circling the city of

Texarkana to the west, and continuing south on new location to the Arkansas-Louisiana State Line. The route alignment would provide the link with east-west I-30 and the principal commercial areas of Dallas and Houston, Texas.

The alignment serves the urbanized areas of Longview/Marshall, Tyler and Texarkana, the principal city in southwestern Arkansas and northeast Texas. Major oil and gas fields are located in this area of the corridor with Texarkana as the collection and distribution center. Several military defense plants are located in the vicinity of Texarkana and Marshall and would benefit from the proposed freeway facility. These defense plants are involved with equipment repairs and the manufacturing of ammunition and rocket fuel. The defense plants along with two public water supplies were identified as areas to be avoided during construction of the proposed multi-state highway.

Section Breakpoint Number 12-13

This segment of the alignment starts at the Arkansas-Louisiana State Line, near Ida, south on new location to the junction of I-220 at Shreveport, Louisiana, a distance of 34.2 miles. At this locale the route would connect with east-west I-20 providing the avenue to the market areas of Jackson, Mississippi and Dallas, Texas. Upon completion of I-49 between Shreveport and Lafayette, a continuous route from Canada and the central states to the Gulf of Mexico would be available.

This route alignment would serve the major industrial

complexes in Shreveport and the Barksdale Air Force Base, a Strategic Air Command unit. Agriculture, oil and gas operations and tourist related activities in the rural area would benefit from the proposed alignment.

SECTION V

ROUTE IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS, COSTS AND BENEFITS

This section describes the general alignment of the proposed multi-state freeway-type facility; examines the cost estimates for developing the route to AASHTO freeway standards and what the states can physically and financially accomplish; and explains the cost-benefits of the preferred route.

General Alignment:

Due to terrain and environmental constraints, only one alignment for the proposed highway route was studied except in the vicinity of Texarkana where two alternatives were identified. One alternative loops to the west of the city through Texas and the other to the east through Arkansas. Because of environmental issues, higher construction costs, and right-of-way acquisition problems, the east alternative was dismissed. The preferred route is Alternative 01 which traverses the western edges of Missouri, Arkansas and Louisiana and circles Texarkana to the west in Texas.

The alignment begins at Kansas City, Missouri at the junction of I-435 and U.S. 71 and continues south on existing and new location to the Missouri-Arkansas State Line near Bella Vista Village. The route proceeds south on existing and new location through the Fayetteville/Springdale area to I-40 near Fort Smith, then southwesterly through Fort Smith via I-40 and I-540 and

continues south on new location to the Arkansas-Texas State Line, northwest of Texarkana. At this locale, the route bypasses the city to the west crossing Texas I-30 then proceeds southeast to the Texas-Arkansas State Line, south of Texarkana. The route remains on a southerly direction to the Arkansas-Louisiana State Line then southeasterly to I-220 at Shreveport, Louisiana, a distance of 503.2 miles.

Cost Estimates:

Table 8 provides two estimates of route improvement costs for each study route alternative. The first estimate is based on the requirements for developing a freeway-type facility to AASHTO standards that conforms to the State's normal practice for determining lane requirements, consistent with the volume of traffic forecasted for the Year 2010. The second reflects what the states believe can be physically and financially accomplished by the Year 2000, assuming no significant change in current improvement program priorities and financing.

For continuity of design and to ensure that the proposed facility would provide a high quality of service, it was concluded that the entire length of the highway should be fully access controlled. Specific factors considered were motorists' safety, the forecasts of travel demand, the mountainous terrain in sections of the corridor, the need to complement planned highway improvements, protection of National Forest lands, overall travel speeds, and possible legal problems and latent

TABLE 8 - ROUTE SUMMARY DATA

1. Study Route Number	01				01				01			
	ALL				MISSOURI (01)				ARKANSAS (01)			
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total
5. Total Length	418.6	22.3	62.3	503.2	164.6	10.7	9.9	185.2	214.6	11.6	41.4	267.6
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	3.8	--	13.0	16.8	--	--	--	--	3.8	--	13.0	16.8
7. (a) 1987 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	7,200	10,980	27,160	9,400	8,700	10,650	54,690	11,270	5,520	11,280	14,980	6,860
(b) 2010 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	17,360	23,410	53,330	21,280	19,750	25,630	83,240	23,480	15,410	21,360	41,830	18,680
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	389	63	392	844	284	39	137	460	71	24	113	208
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	23	2	9	34	10	1	3	14	11	1	2	14
9. Present Road Type Mileage	266.5	5.4	0.2	272.1	42.4	1.3	--	43.7	190.1	4.1	--	194.2
(a) <4 Lanes	88.1	11.0	7.8	106.9	62.0	3.5	--	65.5	20.7	7.5	3.8	32.0
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	60.2	5.9	41.3	107.4	60.2	5.9	9.9	76.0	--	--	24.6	24.6
(c) Freeways	220.0	7.6	3.0	230.6	25.9	3.5	--	29.4	190.1	4.1	--	194.2
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient	166.1	6.0	40.0	212.1	122.1	6.0	9.9	138.0	44.0	--	26.3	70.3
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location	248.7	16.3	9.3	274.3	42.5	4.7	--	47.2	166.8	11.6	2.1	180.5
(b) 2000 Plan	359.4	15.1	42.7	417.2	144.6	8.5	9.9	163.0	206.5	6.6	28.4	241.5
(1) Existing Location	55.4	7.2	6.6	69.2	20.0	2.2	--	22.2	4.3	5.0	--	9.3
(2) New Location	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
12. Future Road Type Mileage	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(a) AASHTO Standards	400.3	19.7	33.4	453.4	150.1	8.1	--	158.2	210.8	11.6	28.4	250.8
(1) <4 Lane	14.5	2.6	15.9	33.0	14.5	2.6	9.9	27.0	--	--	--	--
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	165.5	4.3	--	169.8	14.9	1.7	--	16.6	150.6	2.6	--	153.2
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	111.8	8.8	2.1	122.7	89.5	3.1	--	92.6	14.0	5.7	2.1	21.8
6 or More	137.5	9.2	35.7	182.4	60.2	5.9	4.4	70.5	46.2	3.3	26.3	75.8
(b) 2000 Plan	--	--	11.5	11.5	--	--	5.5	5.5	--	--	--	--
(1) <4 Lane	1467450	53,323	179,388	1,700,161	305,738	3,640	14,521	323,899	102,510	49,633	19,855	1,093,046
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	333,657	18,479	56,596	408,732	99,601	--	11,301	110,902	219,756	18,479	8,695	246,930
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	4,170	5,620	12,800	5,116	4,740	6,150	19,980	5,640	3,700	5,130	10,040	4,480
6 or More												
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)												
(a) AASHTO Standards												
(b) 2000 Plan												
Weighted Average Truck ADT - 2010												

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

1/ W/O FAC - Without Full Access Control
• Items 3 and 4 intentionally omitted from this form for line number consistency with table 3.

TABLE 8 - ROUTE SUMMARY DATA

1. Study Route Number	01				01			
	TEXAS (01)				LOUISIANA (01)			
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total
5. Total Length	9.4		6.8	16.2	30.0		4.2	34.2
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	--		--	--	--		--	--
7. (a) 1987 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	16,000		33,800	23,470	8,000		33,850	11,170
(b) 2010 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	28,500		61,200	42,230	14,500		47,900	18,600
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	5		7.3	7.8	29		69	98
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	0		3	3	2		1	3
9. Present Road Type Mileage	4.0		--	4.0	30.0		0.2	30.2
(a) <4 Lanes	5.4		--	5.4	--		4.0	4.0
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	--		6.8	6.8	--		--	--
(c) Freeways	4.0		3.0	7.0	--		--	--
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient	--		3.8	3.8	--		--	--
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed	9.4		3.0	12.4	30.0		4.2	34.2
(1) Existing Location	8.3		4.4	12.7	--		--	--
(2) New Location	1.1		2.4	3.5	30.0		4.2	34.2
(b) 2000 Plan	--		--	--	--		--	--
(1) Existing Location	--		--	--	--		--	--
(2) New Location	--		--	--	--		--	--
12. Future Road Type Mileage	9.4		4.5	13.9	30.0		0.5	30.5
(a) AASHTO Standards	--		2.3	2.3	--		3.7	3.7
(1) <4 Lane	--		--	--	--		--	--
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	8.3		--	8.3	--		--	--
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	1.1		4.5	5.6	30.0		0.5	30.5
6 or More	--		2.3	2.3	--		3.7	3.7
(b) 2000 Plan	40,300		43,600	83,900	97,902		101,412	199,314
(1) <4 Lane	14,300		36,600	50,900	0		0	0
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	6,840		14,690	10,760	3,480		11,500	7,490
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane								
6 or More								
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)								
(a) AASHTO Standards								
(b) 2000 Plan								
Weighted Average Truck ADT - 2010								

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

1/ W/O FAC - Without Full Access Control
* Items 3 and 4 intentionally omitted from this form for line number consistency with table 3.

TABLE 8 - ROUTE SUMMARY DATA

1. Study Route Number	01A						01A						01A					
	ALL						MISSOURI (01)						ARKANSAS (01A)					
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total		
5. Total Length	422.3	22.0	61.4	505.7									227.7	11.3	47.3	286.3		
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	3.8	--	13.0	16.8									3.8	--	13.0	16.8		
7. (a) 1987 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	7,030	10,990	22,590	8,700									5,670	11,310	15,100	7,100		
(b) 2010 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)	27,220	23,450	50,580	20,800									15,720	21,390	41,480	19,230		
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	384	63	399	846									66	24	120	210		
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	22	2	9	33									10	1	2	13		
9. Present Road Type Mileage	275.6	5.4	0.2	281.2									203.2	4.1	--	207.3		
(a) <4 Lanes	82.7	10.7	13.7	107.1									20.7	7.2	9.7	37.6		
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	60.2	5.9	34.5	100.6									--	--	24.6	24.6		
(c) Freeways	229.2	7.6	--	236.8									203.2	4.1	--	207.3		
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient																		
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location	166.1	6.0	36.2	208.3									44.0	--	26.3	70.3		
(1) Existing Location	232.4	16.0	12.2	280.6									179.9	11.3	8.0	199.2		
(2) New Location																		
(b) 2000 Plan																		
(1) Existing Location	364.2	14.8	44.2	423.2									219.6	6.3	34.3	260.2		
(2) New Location	54.3	7.2	4.2	65.7									4.3	5.0	--	9.3		
12. Future Road Type Mileage	--	--	--	--									--	--	--	--		
(a) AASHTO Standards	--	--	--	--									--	--	--	--		
(1) <4 Lane	--	--	--	--									--	--	--	--		
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	404.0	19.4	34.8	458.2									223.9	11.3	34.3	269.5		
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	14.5	2.6	13.6	30.7									--	--	--	--		
6 or More																		
(b) 2000 Plan																		
(1) <4 Lane	178.6	4.3	--	182.9									163.7	2.6	--	166.3		
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	103.5	8.5	8.0	120.0									14.0	5.4	8.0	27.4		
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	136.4	9.2	31.2	176.8									46.2	3.3	26.3	75.8		
6 or More	--	--	9.2	9.2									--	--	--	--		
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)	1,525,593	58,230	168,238	1,752,061									1,121,953	54,590	52,305	1,228,848		
(a) AASHTO Standards	319,357	18,479	19,996	357,832									219,756	18,479	8,695	246,930		
(b) 2000 Plan																		
Weighted Average Truck ADT-2010	4,130	5,630	12,140	4,930									3,770	5,130	9,950	4,610		

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

1/ W/O FAC - Without Full Access Control
* Items 3 and 4 intentionally omitted from this form for line number consistency with table 3.

TABLE 8 - ROUTE SUMMARY DATA

1. Study Route Number	01A				01A			
	TEXAS (01)				LOUISIANA (01)			
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Total
2. State								
5. Total Length								
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)								
7. (a) 1987 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile) (b) 2010 Weighted ADT (DVMT/Mile)		N.A.					"Same as Alternative 01"	
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986) (b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)								
9. Present Road Type Mileage (a) <4 Lanes (b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (c) Freeways								
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient								
11. Mileage of Proposed Improvements by Location (a) AASHTO Standards (1) Existing Location (2) New Location (b) 2000 Plan (1) Existing Location (2) New Location								
12. Future Road Type Mileage (a) AASHTO Standards (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 lane 6 or More (b) 2000 Plan (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 Lane 6 or More								
13. Improvement Costs (\$000) (a) AASHTO Standards (b) 2000 Plan Truck ADT								

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

1/ W/O FAC - Without Full Access Control
 • Items 3 and 4 intentionally omitted from this form for line number consistency with table 3.

construction costs in upgrading from partial access control to fully controlled access. Consideration was also given to the necessity for a high speed north-south freeway facility which would augment the existing east-west Interstate system in the study area. Currently, a 500 mile gap exists between the north-south Interstates now serving the region, I-35 in Central Oklahoma and I-55 along the Mississippi River. The proposed multi-state highway through full access control, would provide the region with a rapid and efficient transportation system that would likewise complement the east-west Interstate system already in place. In Appendix A, a detail description of the need and advantages of providing full access control for the total length of the proposed highway is provided by section breakpoint numbers.

Estimate For Route Built to AASHTO Design Standards

This estimate is based upon AASHTO design standards for constructing a fully-controlled access freeway facility. The estimated cost of \$1.7 billion, for the preferred route of Alternative 01, includes the cost for design, right-of-way acquisition and construction. The estimated cost for Alternative 01A is 1.75 billion. The roadway costs were derived by applying the latest available unit cost of construction based on actual contracts awarded. Right-of-way costs are based upon state's experience for like facilities.

The location of interchanges were generally placed where the

new route alignment crosses state highways and/or in the vicinity of population centers. Grade separations were located where access to local landowners was limited by the new alignment or where it crossed major features such as county roads and railroads. The location of major structures (50-foot or over) was identified by examining the closest underlying route.

Traffic forecasts were used in determining lane requirements with emphasis on truck useage. It was projected that a freeway facility through the study corridor would average 21,280 (weighted) vehicles per day by the Year 2010, of which 24 percent would be truck traffic. Traffic projections were based upon historical trends, computer aided traffic assignments, origin and destination surveys, special traffic counts and comparison of traffic volumes for like facilities. In Arkansas, yearly historical traffic growth trends for a 20-year period for I-30 was used in determining projected traffic for the proposed highway facility through the state. Segments of Interstate 30 in the vicinity of the urbanized area of Texarkana and along rural sections of the Interstate were analyzed. This highway at these locations presently averages over 12,100 (unweighted) vehicles per day and exhibits an average annual traffic growth rate of nearly 3 percent.

Year 2000 Plan Estimate

Existing north-south highways within the study corridor are primarily two-lane facilities with high traffic volumes,

insufficient passing sight distance and undesirable alignment. Travel time is greatly reduced along these routes by the presence of many small towns, where a speed reduction is required. Because of limited funding, many of the Year 2000 improvements will be on existing alignment consisting of either widening to four lanes, reconstruction and/or resurfacing existing two-lane roadways. The widening projects will primarily be built within existing right-of-way but some projects will require additional easements. The access control for existing routes in the 2000 Plan will remain mostly unchanged. The 2000 Improvement Plan by the states, amounting to \$408.7 million, is not sufficient to construct the safe, efficient facility required to satisfy the corridor travel demands.

Benefits vs. Costs:

A benefit/cost analysis was used in accessing the advisability of the preferred route for the proposed highway, Alternative 01, to the existing route from Kansas City to Shreveport. The cost-effectiveness analysis shows that the preferred route would provide nearly \$154 million dollars annually in road user benefits resulting from decreased travel time and accident rate reduction (refer to Table 9). A benefit/cost ratio of 1.29 is derived when the road user benefit is compared to construction costs.

The methodology used in calculating the benefits/costs is based upon "A Manual on User Benefits Analysis of Highway and

Table 9
Cost-Effectiveness Analysis

ROAD SEGMENT (M)	PERCENT ADT TRUCKS (X)	SPEED (MPH)	LENGTH (MILES)	RUN COSTS AUTO (\$/1000 VM)	RUN COSTS TRUCKS (\$/1000 VM)	SPEED CHNG. COSTS (\$/1000 CYC)			ACCIDENT COSTS (\$/1000 VM)			UPDATED TRAVEL TIME COSTS (\$)	UPDATED OP. COSTS AUTOS (\$)	UPDATED OP. COSTS TRUCKS (\$)	UPDATED ACCIDENT COSTS (\$)	UPDATED USER COSTS (\$)
						AUTO	TRUCKS	TRUCKS	RATES	RATES	TRAVEL TIME (H/1000 VM)					
SEGMENT 2...2	1855	55	151.00	76.23	204.19	269.25	2884.50	16.14	16.14	18.18	423,444.53	381,535.47	4256,152.79	495,912.27	1,152,054.29	42.61
SEGMENT 2...3	10574	50	48.00	74.41	189.91	52.92	544.59	16.14	16.14	20.00	87,943.32	86,751.30	945,931.21	17,655.84	1217,532.37	42.18
SEGMENT 3...4	17906	47	11.90	73.68	173.07	59.08	502.52	16.14	16.14	21.28	356,365.84	332,287.23	413,575.75	47,496.27	489,745.09	42.18
SEGMENT 4...5	24456	55	24.60	76.23	204.19	71.60	769.20	16.14	16.14	18.18	83,138.39	89,962.64	628,234.07	81,165.10	423,505.20	42.18
SEGMENT 5...6	15524	48	45.20	73.92	182.68	181.92	1766.52	16.14	16.14	20.83	121,305.50	101,743.08	555,137.40	124,685.49	430,551.42	42.18
SEGMENT 6...7	15524	55	16.80	76.23	204.19	21.93	653.82	3.73	3.73	16.18	43,563.33	136,746.54	133,466.14	42,154.21	178,936.91	42.18
SEGMENT 7...8	7688	45	146.20	73.20	171.85	603.80	4656.56	16.14	16.14	22.22	203,117.52	165,628.05	871,010.64	33,542.17	449,439.37	42.18
SEGMENT 8...9	9452	50	18.80	75.13	195.63	636.00	5605.25	16.14	16.14	20.00	28,900.96	436,767.90	827,216.24	46,251.46	434,136.40	42.18
SEGMENT 9...10	31481	45	10.70	73.20	171.85	42.57	425.92	16.14	16.14	22.22	864,055.05	447,210.54	628,420.46	111,850.37	451,536.42	42.18
SEGMENT 10...11	7022	53	30.10	75.51	198.49	64.24	704.22	16.14	16.14	18.87	435,821.67	428,348.33	822,849.48	47,435.79	494,455.28	42.18
SEGMENT 10...12	43353	47	37.00	73.68	179.07	92.05	924.30	16.14	16.14	21.28	356,359.15	473,560.56	443,317.26	18,734.96	632,671.92	42.18
TOTALS			540.30								\$1,227,251.65	\$1,070,631.62	\$611,361.34	\$253,084.23	\$2,166,135.04	

AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME = 20.12 (H/1000 VM) AVERAGE SPEED = 49.70 (MPH) ACTUAL TIME OF TRAVEL = 10.87 HOURS = 10 HOURS AND 52 MINS.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

ROAD SEGMENT (M)	PERCENT ADT TRUCKS (X)	SPEED (MPH)	LENGTH (MILES)	RUN COSTS AUTO (\$/1000 VM)	RUN COSTS TRUCKS (\$/1000 VM)	SPEED CHNG. COSTS (\$/1000 CYC)			ACCIDENT COSTS (\$/1000 VM)			UPDATED TRAVEL TIME COSTS (\$)	UPDATED OP. COSTS AUTOS (\$)	UPDATED OP. COSTS TRUCKS (\$)	UPDATED ACCIDENT COSTS (\$)	UPDATED USER COSTS (\$)
						AUTO	TRUCKS	TRUCKS	RATES	RATES	TRAVEL TIME (H/1000 VM)					
SEGMENT 2...2	1855	65	137.50	81.37	246.61	120.36	642.94	5.45	5.45	15.38	331,656.87	326,262.97	656,493.43	69,431.22	496,734.20	42.18
SEGMENT 2...3	10574	65	47.70	81.37	246.61	66.06	528.36	5.45	5.45	15.38	467,226.37	475,252.55	954,688.98	45,331.79	1303,123.60	42.18
SEGMENT 3...4	17906	65	9.70	81.37	246.61	16.06	94.41	4.07	4.07	15.38	821,445.77	827,784.23	912,818.33	91,540.85	924,369.19	42.18
SEGMENT 4...5	24456	65	24.60	76.23	204.19	71.60	769.20	3.73	3.73	18.18	883,138.39	895,962.64	628,234.07	44,969.99	821,305.69	42.18
SEGMENT 5...6	15524	65	43.60	81.37	246.61	60.56	490.68	5.45	5.45	15.38	466,892.67	4104,780.78	461,843.99	48,940.50	461,843.99	42.18
SEGMENT 6...7	15524	65	16.80	76.23	204.19	23.85	576.90	3.73	3.73	19.18	179,569.23	438,539.19	822,943.02	43,154.51	1102,308.94	42.18
SEGMENT 7...8	7688	65	120.60	81.37	246.61	115.00	1330.30	5.45	5.45	15.38	415,936.92	4146,435.90	474,940.31	41,430.41	1387,376.28	42.18
SEGMENT 8...9	9452	65	20.10	74.51	245.81	24.24	113.46	3.45	3.45	15.22	923,763.71	823,825.15	114,858.69	42,225.30	474,703.56	42.18
SEGMENT 9...10	31481	65	16.20	76.23	204.19	39.49	423.06	3.79	3.79	16.18	475,347.72	473,856.80	446,820.44	44,213.07	420,338.93	42.18
SEGMENT 10...11	7022	65	32.20	81.37	246.61	28.32	151.28	5.45	5.45	15.38	431,246.24	432,154.85	827,684.86	42,686.02	433,741.37	42.18
SEGMENT 10...12	43353	65	34.20	81.37	246.61	38.44	226.85	5.45	5.45	15.38	464,603.38	473,741.17	449,631.71	45,677.59	434,064.25	42.18
TOTALS			540.20								\$944,224.46	\$1,062,966.22	\$656,217.95	\$78,201.49	\$2,141,765.11	

AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME = 15.70 (H/1000 VM) AVERAGE SPEED = 63.67 (MPH) ACTUAL TIME OF TRAVEL = 7.90 HOURS = 7 HOURS AND 54 MINS.

Table 9-Cont.

UNIMPROVED ANNUAL ROAD SEG USER COSTS (\$)	AUTOS (1000'S)	AUTOS (1000' VN)	TRUCKS (1000'S)	TRUCKS (1000' VN)	TIME (H/1000VN)
464,507,766	14.62	2208.30795	3.43	517.99795	2745.45
473,393,289	8.56	411.11712	2.01	96.43488	960.00
432,756,957	15.58	185.300818	2.33	27.700582	253.19
423,402,571	22.25	547.472016	2.20	54.145584	447.27
410,776,283	13.04	589.412232	2.48	112.269558	941.67
437,571,789	13.04	219.074688	2.48	41.789512	305.45
4174,543,905	6.61	366.637636	1.08	157.357994	3248.89
436,164,803	8.13	152.819936	1.32	24.877664	376.00
455,310,794	25.61	276.214294	5.67	60.632406	237.78
434,476,177	5.48	164.862516	1.54	46.499684	567.92
444,925,251	11.89	436.68322	2.59	95.65738	787.23
41,154,275,578	4144.94	45,157.97	427.14	41,235.50	10870.87

1) ADT, TRUCK PERCENTAGES AND SEGMENT LENGTH PROVIDED BY INDIVIDUAL STATES
 2) SPEEDS: EXISTING - ALL SPEEDS CALCULATED AS A FUNCTION OF PCFM PER FIGURE B-1 ON PAGE B-29 OF THE 1985 HCM; EXCEPT
 1...2 - PER RED BOOK, ASSUME POSTED SPEED LIMITS
 6...7 - PER RED BOOK, ASSUME POSTED SPEED LIMITS
 7...8 - FIELD INSPECTION -- JCM
 8...9 - FIELD INSPECTION -- JCM
 9...11 - FIELD INSPECTION -- JCM, MMH
 PROPOSED - SEGMENTS 1...2, 2...3, 3...4, 5...6, 7...8, 8...9,
 10...12, 12...13 - DEFAULT TO POSTED RURAL SPEED LIMITS

SEGMENTS 4...5, 5...7, 9...10 - DEFAULT TO POSTED URBAN SPEED LIMITS
 3) RUN COSTS - INTERPOLATED FOR SPEEDS SHOWN FROM TABLES B-1 AND B-3.
 4) SPEED CHANGE COSTS - CALCULATED BY COST PER CHANGE CYCLE MULTIPLIED BY THE FREQUENCY. COSTS REFERENCED TO TABLE B-10 AND B-12. SEE ATTACHMENT FOR SPREADSHEETS.

5) ACCIDENT COSTS - DEFAULT TO FACILITY TYPE.
 6) AVERAGE TRAVEL TIME IS WEIGHTED BY SEGMENT LENGTH.
 7) ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS CALCULATED ON ATTACHMENT 3. (\$119,000,000)

COST EFFECTIVENESS RATIO CALCULATION

COST EFFECTIVENESS RATIO = ANNUAL R.U.C. EXISTING - ANNUAL R.U.C. PROPOSED

ANNUAL ROAD SEG USER COSTS	ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS
464,507,766	
473,393,289	
432,756,957	
423,402,571	
410,776,283	
437,571,789	
4174,543,905	
436,164,803	
455,310,794	
434,476,177	
444,925,251	
41,154,275,578	119,000,000
	= 1,154,275,578 - 1,000,756,019
	= 1.29

ANNUAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS = 119,000,000

COST EFFECTIVENESS RATIO = 1.29

Bus-Transit Improvements", 1977 published by AASHTO.

A current CPI-Consumer Price Index was used in updating road user cost factors. Percent trucks, traffic volumes and segment lengths were provided by the individual states. All autos were grouped together as 4-Kip passenger cars and all trucks were considered as 54-Kip diesel trucks.

The speeds on the existing route used in the cost-effectiveness analysis were obtained from the individual states and their highway inventories. For the proposed construction, a speed was estimated based on the type of facility, its location relative to urbanized areas, and the terrain through which it passes. The travel time was calculated by segment and presented as hours per 1000 vehicle miles. The average travel time for the existing route is 20.12 h/1000 vm. This results in an average speed of 49.70 mph on the existing route. The average travel time for the preferred alternative is 15.70 h/1000vm. The average speed for the preferred alternative is 63.67 mph. The travel time savings or the difference in the travel time for the two alternatives is 2 hours and 58 minutes (10 hours 52 minutes for existing vs. 7 hours 54 minutes for the preferred route). The dollar value annually for these savings is \$103,293,000, the difference in the travel time costs (\$447,972,000 - 344,679,000).

In addition to travel time costs, the length and speed of each segment have a direct bearing on the operating costs. The unit costs are referenced in the 1977 AASHTO publication, "A Manual on User Benefit Analysis of Highway and Bus-Transit

Improvements". The difference of annual auto operating costs between the two alternatives is \$2,433,000 (\$390,781,000 - \$388,348,000). The difference in annual truck operating costs is \$16,008,000. The actual costs of operation are \$223,147,000 for the existing and \$239,155,000 for the preferred route. This reflects an increase in auto and truck operating costs due to higher speeds on the preferred route than on the existing route. The total operating costs, autos and trucks, reflects a difference of \$13,575,000 (613,928,000 - 627,503,000). The increase is due to higher speeds and therefore higher unit operating costs. The operating costs also include the speed change costs.

The final component included in the road segment costs is the accident cost. The unit costs of accidents found in the 1977 AASHTO publication "A Manual on User Benefits Analysis of Highways and Bus-Transit Improvements" is based on the type of facility. Where access control is provided the accident cost rate is much lower than where it is not provided. The actual dollar value of the accidents is calculated by applying the accident rate cost to the vehicle miles travelled. The existing route provides an annual accident cost of \$92,376,000. The preferred route provides an annual accident cost of \$28,545,000 and an annual savings of \$63,831,000.

The combination of the road user, accident and travel time costs gave a total road segment user cost. The annual road segment user costs for the existing route are \$1,154,276,000

(447,972,000 + 390,781,000 + 223,147,000 + 92,376,000). The annual road segment user costs for the preferred route are \$1,000,726,000 (344,678,000 + 388,348,000 + 239,155,000 + 28,545,000). This results in a net road user cost annual savings of \$153,550,000.

To complete the cost-effectiveness ratio, the savings in the Road User Costs were divided by the construction costs. The annual costs are used for this analysis. The total construction cost is \$1,700,000,000. This computes to an annual cost of \$119,000,000. Table 10 provides a detailed explanation of the annualized construction costs. The final comparison provides a cost-effectiveness ratio of 1.29.

APPENDIX A

Full Access Control

The following details the requirements for providing full access control, by section breakpoint numbers, for the total length of the proposed freeway facility (refer to Figure 2, Red Route).

MISSOURI:

Section Breakpoint Numbers 01-02 and 02-03

These segments comprise the Missouri portion of the total route which is 185.2 miles in length, consisting of approximately 160 miles of existing U.S. 71 and the remainder on new location. Nearly seventy-five percent of the existing U.S. 71 mileage is dual lanes that are divided, with forty-four percent built to Interstate standards. U.S. 71 is functionally classified as a Principal Arterial.

A study completed by the Missouri Highway Department prior to the subject study, provided that U.S. 71 when improved by state funding sources, would be designated as an Expressway-type facility with full access control. This limitation of access was determined necessary to enhance the highway primary future function of providing mobility. This policy impacted the decision to recommend full access control for the proposed highway in Missouri.

The recommended highway route would directly serve the Metropolitan Statistical Areas of Kansas City and Joplin and by interfacing with Interstate 44, the cities of St. Louis and Springfield, Missouri. Five military installations, three

national guard camps and significant manufacturing plants would be served by the proposed Freeway alignment. These traffic generators will produce a mixture of traffic ranging from passenger cars to tractor trailer trucks. Unless interstate-type design features are applied to the proposed highway, extreme traffic congestion will occur from the improper mixing of vehicles of different sizes and weights. The projected 2010 average daily traffic for the proposed highway is over 23,400 (weighted) vehicles.

For Missouri, the position that the proposed highway should be fully access controlled is consistent with prior policy decisions, in alignment with forecasted travel demands and existing high percent of freeway type mileage, and AASHTO design recommendations for high type arterial highways.

ARKANSAS:

The Arkansas part of the total proposed highway mileage is 267.6 miles consisting of seven sections as defined below. The proposed route parallels U.S. 71, a Principal Arterial, on existing and new location.

Section Breakpoint Numbers 03-04, 04-05 and 05-06

This segment is 77.9 miles in length and would serve the urbanized region of Fayetteville/Springdale, one of the fastest growing employment centers in the state, and traverse over 48 miles of rural area. Traffic volumes on the proposed highway are

expected to exceed 40,000 (weighted) vpd in the urbanized area and 15,670 (weighted) ADT in the rural sections. A significant part of the rural projected traffic volume is through traffic of which 24 percent would be truck traffic. In the rural mountainous sections truck traffic now affects normal traffic flow and motorists' safety by reducing overall travelling speeds and sight distance for faster vehicles trying to pass. For example, there exists a 17 mile rural section through a mountain ridge where sixteen fatalities have occurred within the past three years. Motorist safety would be improved by the placement of a freeway-type facility in the rural sections as determined by studies reported by AASHTO. Interstate-type freeway facilities accidents, injury and fatality rates are between 30 and 76 percent of comparable rates of conventional highways.

The need and justification for full access control of the proposed multi-state highway is also demonstrated by planned highway improvements for the region, potentially latent higher construction costs and possible legal problems.

As authorized by the Arkansas Highway Commission, a freeway type facility with full access control is under construction from I-40 near Alma north to Fayetteville, a distance of approximately 50 miles. This commitment signifies the need that the proposed Freeway should be a high type fully access controlled facility.

Research by the Legal Division of the Arkansas Highway and Transportation Department revealed that if full access control is not provided for initially, commercial and other development will

occur haphazardly. This situation often leads to higher costs and legal cases when full control of access is imposed. Arkansas Statutes entitles affected landowners for compensation for the loss of access, which has historically proven to be extremely costly.

Section Breakpoint Number 06-07

This 16.8 mile part of the proposed route is currently fully access controlled consisting of segments of I-40 and I-540. The present weighted average daily traffic is 20,110 vehicles and is projected to reach 39,700 (weighted) vpd by the year 2010.

Section Breakpoint Numbers 07-08, 08-09 and 10-12

This portion of the alignment is on new location and traverses National Forest land, mountainous terrain and sparsely developed rural areas. The total length of these sections is 172.9 miles of which approximately 30 miles are through the National Forest. This area will require special highway design consideration. Vast amounts of natural resources and recreational sites are located along the corridor. The rough terrain aggravates traffic flow on the existing two-lane highways due to steep inclines and 90-degree turns.

The necessity for full access control is manifested by poor travelling speeds through the mountain regions, the presence of environmental sensitivity areas which lend themselves to total access control, and legal considerations for highways to be built

on new location.

The proposed freeway-type facility through this segment of the corridor is intended to serve mainly through traffic at relatively high speeds. This objective can only be achieved by full control of access which gives preference to through traffic. The proposed highway would be immensely dangerous if entering traffic was not controlled. At-grade intersections would cause points of conflicts and encourage unorthodox maneuvers such as U-turns. The projected weighted ADT by the year 2010 is 13,900 vehicles.

Research has shown that freeway type facilities will decrease travel times, fuel consumption and pollution emissions. According to AASHTO design standards, a highway like the proposed multi-state freeway can and should be located and designed to complement its environment and serve as a catalyst to environmental improvement. Through full access control, the proposed highway will provide the necessary protection entitled to the National Forests, game management areas and other environmental sensitivity areas.

The primary cost/legal consideration in planning for the proposed highway in this region, which will be built on new location, is to eliminate future costs of upgrading from partial access control to fully controlled access. Under Arkansas Statutes, if a fully controlled access highway is placed where no such road existed before, abutting landowners cannot recover damages by reason of lack of access to the road, because no such

right existed before its construction.

In Arkansas, highway capacity analysis, anticipated future traffic needs, corridor development plans and standard planning practices was applied to AASHTO design standards resulting in the recommendation that the multi-state highway through the state would be four lanes with full access control. The necessity for full access control was demonstrated by the need to avoid potentially latent construction costs and possible legal problems, the obligation to preserve environmental sensitivity areas and the exigency of providing for improved motorists' safety.

TEXAS:

Section Breakpoint Number 09-10

This segment is 16.2 miles consisting of the Texas' portion of the proposed route which is primarily within the Texarkana urbanized area. Over twelve miles are on new location and 4.0 miles on existing alignment of U.S. 59, a four-lane divided full access control facility with frontage roads. This route alignment would provide the link with east-west I-30 and the principal commercial areas of Dallas and Houston, Texas. Several military defense plants are located in the area of the corridor and would benefit from the proposed freeway facility through a reduction in response time. The projected traffic volume is 42,230 (weighted) vehicles per day by the year 2010, 28,500 ADT in the rural area and 61,200 ADT in the urban area. This

APPENDIX B
States Synopsis

forecasted traffic prompted the recommendation that full access control should be employed to ensure that the proposed highway will accommodate the expected traffic requirements and to encourage consistency and uniformity in planned highway improvements. Plans are now being developed for the construction of an interstate-type facility with full access control, from U.S. Highway 59 to South State Line, a distance of 6.3 miles.

LOUISIANA:

Section Breakpoint Numbers 12-13

This segment of the alignment is 34.2 miles of new location beginning at the Arkansas-Louisiana State Line south to I-220 at Shreveport. The proposed highway would connect with I-49 at this locale and become the final link in providing the continuous route from Canada and the central states to the Gulf of Mexico. Traffic volumes of near 18,600 (weighted) vehicles per day is predicted by the year 2010, 14,500 ADT rural and 47,900 ADT urban.

Full access control of the proposed highway is needed to ensure continuity of design and suitable traffic circulation between existing I-49 and the proposed highway at Shreveport. In the rural area, full control of access is necessary for protecting vehicles from entering the roadway from abutting roadside development which causes higher accident rates. In Louisiana, controlled access highways in rural areas exhibit much lower accident rates than partial access controlled facilities.

KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI TO SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
HIGHWAY FEASIBILITY STUDY

HIGHWAY ROUTE STUDY - SECTION 166 OF
THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1987

Overview:

The proposed freeway-type facility would traverse the states of Missouri, Arkansas, Texas and Louisiana starting at the junction of I-435 in Kansas City, Missouri and terminating at I-220 in Shreveport, Louisiana. The route would provide a continuous highway from Canada and the mid-western states to New Orleans and other Gulf of Mexico ports.

The facility would complement existing east-west Interstates and other modes of transportation such as rail and waterways, improve access between rural areas and employment centers and open up new market areas for raw and processed products. It would also attract new commercial and industrial activities to the region and increase tourism by improving access to the numerous recreational sites within the four state area. The facility would greatly enhance motorists' safety which is a major issue along the existing north-south routes. Several major military installations and defense facilities would benefit from improved access provided by the proposed facility. The Department of Defense supports the improvement of the Kansas City to Lake Charles highway corridor because it is included in the Strategic Highway Corridor Network.

The following tables provide route section data per state.

A summary of the improvement standards, costs and impact of the proposed highway for each state is also included.

MISSOURI
TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

1. Study Route Number	01			01		
	Missouri			Missouri		
2. State	Missouri			Missouri		
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	01-02			02-03		
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	I.L.S. 71 & A71			A71, I.L.S. 60 & I.L.S. 71		
5. Total Length	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized
	121.7	5.9	9.9	42.9	4.8	
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized
	9,620	12,100	54,690	6,090	8,870	
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT						
(b) 2010 Average ADT						
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)						
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)						
9. Present (a) <4 Lane Road Type Mileage						
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/						
(c) Freeways						
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient						
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location						
(1) Existing Location						
(2) New Location						
(b) 2000 Plan						
(1) Existing Location						
(2) New Location						
12. Future Road Type Mileage						
(1) <4 Lane						
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/						
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane						
6 or More						
(b) 2000 Plan						
(1) <4 Lane						
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/						
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane						
6 or More						
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)						
(a) AASHTO Standards						
(b) 2000 Plan						
	121.7	5.9	9.9	42.9	4.8	
	--	--	--	--	--	
	9,620	12,100	54,690	6,090	8,870	
	20,540	25,630	83,240	17,500	--	
	157	13	137	127	26	
	5	1	3	5	--	
	--	--	--	42.4	1.3	
	61.5	--	--	0.5	3.5	
	60.2	5.9	9.9	--	--	
	7.8	--	--	18.1	3.5	
	121.7	5.9	9.9	0.4	0.1	
	--	--	--	42.5	4.7	
	121.7	5.9	9.9	22.9	2.6	
	--	--	--	20.0	2.2	
	--	--	--	--	--	
	--	--	--	--	--	
	107.2	3.3	--	42.9	4.8	
	14.5	2.6	9.9	--	--	
	--	--	--	14.9	1.7	
	61.5	--	--	28.0	3.1	
	60.2	5.9	4.4	--	--	
	--	--	5.5	--	--	
	92,738	3,640	14,521	213,000	--	
	11,438	--	11,301	88,163	--	

ARKANSAS

TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

1. Study Route Number	01				01				01							
	ARKANSAS				ARKANSAS				ARKANSAS							
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Urbanized				
2. State	03-04				04-05				05-06				06-07			
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	U.S. 71				U.S. 71				U.S. 71				I-40 & I-540			
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	U.S. 71				U.S. 71				U.S. 71				I-40 & I-540			
5. Total Length	6.4	3.3		24.6			41.9			1.7			3.8			1.3.0
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)																
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT	11,400	16,720		14,240			11,640			14,240						
(b) 2010 Average ADT	21,500	29,660		42,000			19,750			42,000						
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	31	1		313			74			13						
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	33	1		5			7			0						
9. Present (a) <4 Lane	--	1.6		--			36.3			--						
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	6.4	1.7		--			5.6			1.7						
(c) Freeways	--	--		24.6			--			--						
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient	--	1.6		--			36.3			--						
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed	2.1	--		24.6			41.9			1.7						
(1) Existing Location	4.3	3.3		--			--			--						
(2) New Location	2.1	--		24.6			41.9			1.7						
(b) 2000 Plan	4.3	3.3		--			--			--						
(1) Existing Location	2.1	--		24.6			41.9			1.7						
(2) New Location	4.3	3.3		--			--			--						
(a) AASHTO Standards	--	--		--			--			--						
(1) <4 Lane	--	--		--			--			--						
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	--	--		--			--			--						
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	6.4	3.3		24.6			41.9			1.7						
6 or More	--	--		--			--			--						
(b) 2000 Plan	--	--		--			--			--						
(1) <4 Lane	--	--		--			--			--						
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	2.1	--		--			--			--						
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	4.3	3.3		24.6			41.9			1.7						
6 or More	--	--		--			--			--						
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)	13,758	10,590		0			204,695			8,305						
(a) AASHTO Standards	5,335	13,759		0			204,695			8,305						
(b) 2000 Plan																

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

ARKANSAS
TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

1. Study Route Number	01				01			
	ARKANSAS				ARKANSAS			
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Urbanized
2. State	ARKANSAS							
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	07-08				08-09			
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	U.S. 71				U.S. 71			
5. Total Length	114.2	4.3	2.1	2.1	16.1	4.0	32.2	32.2
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT	3,720	8,230	24,250	4,200	10,070	3,400	14,500	27
(b) 2010 Average ADT	13,600	16,250	39,700	16,300	20,000	2	32.2	32.2
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	193	52	14	28	19	2	32.2	32.2
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	10	0	0	2	1	2	32.2	32.2
9. Present (a) <4 Lane Road Type	114.2	2.5	--	7.4	--	32.2	32.2	32.2
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	--	1.8	2.1	8.7	4.0	--	--	--
(c) Freeways	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient	114.2	2.5	--	7.4	--	32.2	32.2	32.2
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(1) Existing Location	114.2	4.3	2.1	16.1	4.0	32.2	32.2	32.2
(2) New Location	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(b) 2000 Plan	114.2	2.6	2.1	16.1	4.0	32.2	32.2	32.2
(1) Existing Location	--	1.7	--	--	--	--	--	--
(2) New Location	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
12. Future Road Type Mileage	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(a) AASHTO Standards	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(1) <4 Lane	111.0	2.6	--	7.4	--	32.2	32.2	32.2
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	3.2	1.7	2.1	8.7	4.0	--	--	--
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6 or More	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(b) 2000 Plan	111.0	2.6	--	7.4	--	32.2	32.2	32.2
(1) <4 Lane	3.2	1.7	2.1	8.7	4.0	--	--	--
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
6 or More	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)	628,400	23,650	11,550	62,157	15,443	114,800	0	0
(a) AASHTO Standards	9,466	4,720	390	260	0	0	0	0
(b) 2000 Plan	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

ARKANSAS

TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

OMB No. 04-S-74006
SHEET 1 OF 2 SHEETS

1. Study Route Number	01A			01A			01A		
	ARKANSAS	Small Urban	Urbanized	ARKANSAS	Small Urban	Urbanized	ARKANSAS	Small Urban	Urbanized
2. State	ARKANSAS								
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	03-04								
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	U.S. 71								
5. Total Length	Same as Alternative 01			Same as Alternative 01			Same as Alternative 01		
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	Same as Alternative 01								
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT (b) 2010 Average ADT									
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986) (b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)									
9. Present (a) <4 Lane Road Type (b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (c) Freeways									
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient									
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed (1) Existing Location (2) New Location (b) 2000 Plan (1) Existing Location (2) New Location									
12. Future Road Type Mileage (a) AASHTO Standards (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 Lane 6 or More (b) 2000 Plan (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 Lane 6 or More									
13. Improvement Costs (\$000) (a) AASHTO Standards (b) 2000 Plan									

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

OMB No. 04-S-74006
SHEET 2 OF 2 SHEETS

1. Study Route Number	01A			01A			01A		
	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized
2. State	ARKANSAS			ARKANSAS			ARKANSAS		
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	07-08			08-11			11-12		
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	U.S. 71			U.S. 71			U.S. 71		
5. Total Length									
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	Same as Alternative 01			Same as Alternative 01			Same as Alternative 01		
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT (b) 2010 Average ADT				5,990	10,070	15,700			
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986) (b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)				18,300	20,000	32,800			
9. Present (a) <4 Lane Road (b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ Mileage (c) Freeways				3	18	141			
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient				0	1	1			
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location (1) Existing Location (2) New Location (b) 2000 Plan (1) Existing Location (2) New Location				20.5	--	--			
12. Future Road Type Mileage (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 Lane 6 or More (b) 2000 Plan (1) <4 Lane (2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/ (3) Freeways - 4 Lane 6 or More				8.7	3.7	5.9			
13. Improvement Costs (\$000) (a) AASHTO Standards (b) 2000 Plan				29.2	3.7	5.9			
				29.2	3.7	5.9			
				--	--	--			
				20.5	--	--			
				8.7	3.7	5.9			
				--	--	--			
				--	--	--			
				160,600	20,350	32,450			
				260	0	0			

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only

TABLE 11 - ROUTE SECTION DATA

OMB No. 04-S-74006
SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS

1. Study Route Number	01					
	Texas					
2. State	09-10					
3. Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)	U.S. Highway 59					
4. Closest Underlying Route(s)	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized	Rural	Small Urban	Urbanized
5. Total Length	9.4		6.8			
6. Interstate Mileage Included (Note: Exclude data on this mileage for all subsequent lines)	--		--			
7. (a) 1987 Average ADT	16,000		33,800			
(b) 2010 Average ADT	28,500		61,200			
8. (a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)	5		73			
(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)	0		3			
9. Present Road Type Mileage	4.0		--			
(a) <4 Lane	5.4		--			
(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	--		6.8			
(c) Freeways	4.0		3.0			
10. Condition - Miles Critically Deficient						
11. Mileage of (a) AASHTO Standards Proposed Improvements by Location	--		3.8			
(1) Existing Location	9.4		3.0			
(2) New Location						
(b) 2000 Plan						
(1) Existing Location	8.3		4.4			
(2) New Location	1.1		2.4			
12. Future Road Type Mileage	--		--			
(a) AASHTO Standards	--		--			
(1) <4 Lane	--		--			
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	9.4		4.5			
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	--		2.3			
6 or More						
(b) 2000 Plan						
(1) <4 Lane	--		--			
(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/	8.3		--			
(3) Freeways - 4 Lane	1.1		4.5			
6 or More	--		2.3			
13. Improvement Costs (\$000)	40,300		43,600			
(a) AASHTO Standards	14,300		36,600			
(b) 2000 Plan						

For Non-Interstate Section Mileage Only