<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Route Number</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Section Breakpoint (beginning - end)</th>
<th>Closest Underlying Route(s)</th>
<th>Total Length</th>
<th>Interstate Mileage Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>U.S. 71</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>(a) 1987 Average ADT</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>33,850</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 2010 Average ADT</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>47,900</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>(a) Average Annual Injuries (1984-1986)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Average Annual Fatalities (1984-1986)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Present 4 Lane</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Freeways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Condition - Miles Critically Deficient</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mileage of Proposed Improvements by Location</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) AASHTO Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Existing Location</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) New Location</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 2000 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Existing Location</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) New Location</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Future Road Type Mileage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) AASHTO Standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) &lt; 4 Lane</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Freeways - 4 Lane</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 or More</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 2000 Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) &lt; 4 Lane</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) 4 or More W/O FAC 1/</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Freeways - 4 Lane</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 or More</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Improvement Costs ($000)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) AASHTO Standards</td>
<td>97,902</td>
<td>101,412</td>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) 2000 Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urbanized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSOURI STUDY SYNOPSIS

The Missouri segment of the proposed route is 185.2 miles in length. Nearly 75% of this mileage is presently a dual lane divided facility of which nearly 44 percent is constructed to Interstate Standards. Average daily traffic on this segment is currently 11,270 with volumes over 90,000 recorded in Kansas City. Truck travel is heavy and constitutes 19 percent of the traffic at the Missouri-Arkansas line.

It is expected that traffic will more than double by the year 2010. Additional lanes will be needed on 27 miles of the facility from I-435 to Route 7. The 47.7 mile segment from I-44 to Arkansas will need to be upgraded from a two-lane facility to a dual divided facility and will probably need to be constructed on new location.

Missouri has plans to upgrade a portion of the segment south of I-44 by the Year 2000. However, it is not anticipated to be constructed to Interstate Standards and may not fit into a future Interstate concept. Hearings are presently being conducted. A decision on the proposed Freeway Route is needed to facilitate this process.

The proposed route is physically feasible. Terrain in Missouri ranges from rolling to rugged and is well suited for road construction. Most of the corridor is rural in nature and there are no obvious environmental or social concerns.
Route Improvement Standards, Costs and Impacts:

Work currently planned by the Year 2000 consists of providing additional capacity from I-435 to Richards-Gebaur, reconstruction of two sections of substandard roadbed near Carthage, and the construction of a dual lane facility from I-44 to Route 59. The total cost of this work, in present dollars, is estimated to be $111 million. The dual portion south of I-44 is not planned to be constructed to Interstate Standards and probably will not follow alignment that would be used for the proposed route.

Work required to upgrade the present facility to freeway standards, by 2010, and accommodate travel at an acceptable level of service, will require additional lanes from I-435 to Route 7, conversion of 61.5 miles of limited access control to full access control on intermittent segments between Route 7 and I-44, and construction of a new facility on probable new alignment from I-44 to Arkansas. The estimated cost in today's dollars is $324 million. With Missouri's Highway Funds already earmarked for the next 15 years, the success of this proposal will hinge on the ability to secure interstate gap type funding.

In Missouri, the travel distance between Kansas City and Arkansas would be reduced by nearly five miles. This reduction in mileage and the increased speed limit on rural portions of Interstate Routes would result in travel time savings of 34 minutes per vehicle trip between the above two mentioned points.
There would also be additional savings resulting from the replacement of 43.7 miles of existing two lane facility with a dual divided roadway that would eliminate problems related to passing opportunity.

Safety would also be enhanced. There are presently 14 fatalities and 460 injuries occurring annually on the existing facility. If the proposed freeway facility were in place today, it would reduce fatalities by an estimated 29 percent and injuries by 37 percent.

ARKANSAS STUDY SYNOPSIS

The Arkansas portion of the proposed freeway-type facility consists of two alternate routes, 01 and 01A. Their alignments are identical except in the vicinity of Texarkana where one alternative loops to the west of the city and the other to the east. The corridor comprises a nine county area that is predominantly rural. There are three urbanized areas and a number of communities that are economically and socially tied to agricultural and forestry operations.

Existing highways within the corridor are to a large degree inadequate two-lane facilities with high traffic volumes. Motorists safety is a major issue. Along the closest underlying route to the proposed highway (on a yearly basis) six traffic accidents occur per average mile resulting in 3.2 injuries per mile and one death every 4.7 miles. State funds are insufficient to improve this route to appropriate standards under present
levels of funding and any improvement less than that proposed would not properly serve the area.

No major environmental or social obstructions are apparent along the corridor except public water supplies of several small urban areas are to be avoided. During construction, caution will be exercised in the vicinity of national parks and forests, military reserves and game management areas.

Route Improvement Standards, Costs and Impact:

Two estimates of route improvement costs were prepared. The first estimate is the costs associated with developing an freeway-type facility to AASHTO design standards and the second estimate reflects what the state will be able to accomplish without supplementary fundings.

AASHTO Standards Estimate

The estimates developed in Arkansas for each section were based on AASHTO design standards for constructing a fully-controlled access freeway facility.

The total estimated cost to design, purchase right-of-way and construct Alternative 01 is approximately $1.093 billion. The estimated cost of Alternative 01A is $1.228 billion.

Estimated roadway costs were derived by using the latest available unit cost of construction based on actual contracts awarded. Using this information, $2.5 million per mile was estimated for the construction of a four-lane facility on new location in non-mountainous sections while $4.5 million per mile
was used for mountainous areas. Added to this were structures and interchanges. Right-of-way costs were estimated at $200,000 per mile in non-mountainous sections and $400,000 per mile in the mountainous sections.

Because plans are being developed for the construction of an interstate-type facility from Interstate 40 north to near the Missouri line, estimates for these sections had previously been prepared and used in this report.

In consultation with the Department's Roadway Design Division, the locations of interchanges were generally placed where the new route alignment crosses a state highway or population center. A cost of $1.4 million was used for the construction of a diamond interchange and $3.3 million for a fully-directional interchange. Grade separations were placed where access to local landowners was limited by the new alignment or where it crossed major features such as county roads or railroads.

Major structures were placed on the new route by identifying existing structures 50 feet or over in length on existing Highway 71. A unit cost of $80 per square foot was used in estimating bridge and approaches cost.

The impact of developing this route to freeway standards on the region's existing transportation service, economic and land use development and environmental character will be positive. All existing transportation modes will benefit by improved access resulting in increased usage. The more densely populated areas
will receive economic benefits soon after the project is initiated by money channelling into the local economies and by the expansion and relocation of business and industries adjacent to the facility. Since the proposed route transcends a sparsely developed area, air and noise pollution should not be a serious problem.

Year 2000 Plan Estimate

The second estimate reflects the best evaluation of progress both physically and financially expected on the nearest underlying routes by the Year 2000. This amount, $247 million, is not sufficient to construct the type of facility needed in the corridor. Anticipated Federal funding for accomplishing these improvements is structured around the assumption that trends of recent years in the traditional Federal-Aid Highway Program will continue. If any diversion of highway trust fund revenues for non-highway purposes should occur, the proposed improvement program will have to be re-evaluated and the program revised.

TEXAS STUDY SYNOPSIS

The Texas corridor comprises eighteen counties that are a mixture of small urbanized and rural areas. There are three urbanized areas and numerous small urban and rural communities that are economically and socially tied to forestry, mineral production, defense plants, and manufacturing operations.

Existing highways within the corridor are predominately two-
lane facilities. Motorist safety is a major issue along the closest underlying route (U.S. Highway 59) to the proposed freeway facility near Texarkana. A yearly average of 40.1 accidents occurs per mile, resulting in 7.1 injuries per mile and one death every 3.3 miles on this parallel route in Texarkana.

There are no apparent major environmental or social obstructions along the corridor except public water supplies of several urban areas which will be avoided. Caution will be exercised in the vicinity of cultural and historic facilities, military reserves, parks, and game management areas to maintain their proper functions.

Route Improvement Standards, Costs and Impact:

Estimates developed in Texas for the proposed north-south highway are based on Texas State Department of Highways and Public Transportation design standards for constructing a fully-controlled access freeway facility.

The total estimated cost to design, purchase right-of-way, and construct this project through the Texas corridor is approximately $84 million. This average cost per mile through Texas is approximately $5.2 million. There were no alternate routes considered in Texas.

Estimated roadway costs were derived by using the latest available unit cost of construction based on actual awarded contracts. Using this information, $2.5 million per mile was estimated for the construction of a four-lane rural facility on new location without continuous frontage roads, while $4.5
million per mile was used for urban sections with one-way frontage roads. Added to this cost were structures, interchanges, grade separations, and preliminary engineering.

Right-of-way costs were estimated at $200,000 per mile in rural locations and various costs in the urban areas, depending on the location.

Because work is being developed for construction of an interstate-type facility from U.S. Highway 59 to South State Line on proposed Loop 151, estimates for this section had previously been prepared and were used in this report.

Locations of interchanges had already been established on the Loop 151 portion of the project. Other locations were chosen where the new route alignment crossed an existing state highway. A cost of $1.4 million was used for the construction of a diamond interchange, and $20.0 million was estimated to redesign the existing trumpet interchange at Interstate Highway 30 with an interstate-to-interstate direct connecting interchange. Grade separations were placed where the new alignment crossed major features such as county roads or railroads. The unit cost of construction of these grade separations were from $.7 million to $.8 million each. The cost of structures was estimated at $35 per square foot.

The impact of developing this route to freeway standards on the region's existing transportation modes, economic and land use development, effect on unemployment rates of the region, added mobility for the three major defense plants in northeast Texas,
and environmental character will be positive. All existing transportation modes—air, pipelines, rail, and highways—will benefit by improved access and reduced travel time. The proposed facility will help local economies and encourage existing businesses and industries to expand their markets. Air and noise pollution should not be a serious problem in this region of the state.

**Year 2000 Plan Estimate:**

The second estimate reflects the best evaluation of what is to be constructed on the nearest underlying routes (U.S. Highway 59, Loop 151, and Interstate Highway 30) by the Year 2000. Anticipated federal funding for accomplishing these improvements is based on the assumption that trends of recent years in the Federal-Aid Highway Programs and state programs will continue. If any diversion of federal highway trust funds or state highway funds for non-highway purposes should occur, the proposed improvement program will have to be re-evaluated and the program revised.

**LOUISIANA STUDY SYNOPSIS**

Louisiana's portion of the proposed freeway route linking Shreveport and Kansas City occupies the corridor paralleling U.S. 71 in Caddo Parish. This 34.2 mile segment extends from the junction of I-220 north to the Arkansas State Line and traverses an area that is predominately rural except for some 4.2 miles in
the urbanized area of Shreveport.

In Louisiana, the route will connect with routes I-20 and I-220 and will serve as an extension of I-49 south of Shreveport. This Interstate Highway was added to the original Interstate System as a substitute for I-410 in the New Orleans area. Upon completion in 1990, it will connect I-20 in Shreveport with I-10 some 207 miles to the south of Lafayette, Louisiana.

Overall movement of people and goods within the corridor will be greatly improved by the proposed highway with considerable benefits to motorists safety. In Louisiana, controlled access Interstates in rural areas exhibit much lower accident rates than rural two-lane highways. Accident data for the calendar year 1986 reveals rates of 1.39 and 0.44 accidents per million vehicle miles for U.S. 71 and rural Interstates in Louisiana, respectively.

There are no major environmental concerns in the Louisiana corridor. Efforts will be made to mitigate impacts in the areas affected, especially in the city of Shreveport where several relocations and displacements will be required.

Route Improvement Standards, Cost and Impact:

Estimates developed for the proposed north-south multi-state highway route in Louisiana are based on actual costs to design, purchase right-of-way and construct similar sections of I-49 now under construction. The total estimated cost for the Louisiana segment is $200 million. This estimate was derived from costs to
construct rural four-lane sections of freeway type highways at $2.3 million per mile and rural diamond interchanges at $3.5 million each. Other estimates were developed from actual costs to construct similar highway segments in the Shreveport area.

As stated previously, constructing this route to full access-control freeway standards will positively impact transportation service and economic development. Existing transportation modes - air, rail, waterways and highways will benefit from improved access, safety and reduced travel time. Environmental impacts will be minimal as will air and noise pollution.

The State of Louisiana does not have plans to upgrade any of existing U.S. 71 in the foreseeable future and any approval to proceed with construction of a controlled access highway would entirely depend upon supplementary funding.
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Support Letters
STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENTS SUPPORT LETTERS
Mr. Ray Barnhardt, Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration  
Room 4218 - HOA-1  
Washington, D.C. 20590  

Dear Mr. Barnhardt:

The Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development wishes to go on record as supporting the above referenced project. We urge adoption of the recommendations contained in the study report prepared in response to Section 166 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987 and in particular, the immediate designation and funding of this route as an interstate highway.

The benefits of such a project to the Shreveport-Caddo Parish area and the State in general are innumerable. It would greatly enhance the economic growth potential of the area and provide a needed freeway link between Interstates 20, 220 and 49 in Shreveport with the State of Arkansas and points north. With the completion of I-49, a north-south interstate highway would connect the north central region of our Country with the gulf south and beyond.

Through copies of this correspondence, we are urging members of our Congressional Delegation to work with your Agency and other members of the United States Congress to appropriate the needed funds to enable the project to proceed at an early date. We are further requesting Governor Edwin Edwards and Governor Elect Buddy Roemer to add their support to this much needed project.

With kindest regards, I remain

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. GRAVES

LAG/lrp

cc: On next page
Mr. Ray Barnhardt
October 29, 1987
Page 2...

cc: Governor Edwin W. Edwards
    Governor Elect Buddy Roemer
    Louisiana Congressional Delegation
    Mr. Henry C. Gray - Arkansas
    Mr. Wayne Muri - Missouri
    Mr. R. E. Stotzer, Jr. - Texas
    Mr. J. N. McDonald
    Mr. Roy Mitchell
    Mr. Charles M. Higgins
    Mr. Lacey A. Glascock
    Mr. J. L. Wax
    Mr. Henry Barousse
November 16, 1987

The Honorable James H. Burnley, IV
Deputy Secretary
Department of Transportation
400 Seventh St., SW
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Mr. Burnley:

In response to Section 166 of the 1987 Federal-Aid Highway Act, the states of Arkansas, Missouri, Texas, and Louisiana are jointly preparing a study to demonstrate the feasibility of constructing an Interstate Highway from Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana.

The Texas Department of Highways and Public Transportation fully supports this project, and requests that this route be designated and funded as an Interstate Highway. Although only a small portion of this proposed highway will be in Texas, loopin just west of Texarkana, it will greatly benefit this northeast Texas region. It will enhance the economic growth potential of the area, and improve travel time and traffic safety. The highway will also improve tourism, as there are numerous recreational facilities in the surrounding area.

The route through Texas provides another important benefit: the major defense plants in the study corridor are located near Texarkana, Texas. The Lone Star Ammunition Plant is a manufacturer of explosives. The Red River Army Depot repairs equipment, such as the Bradley troop transport and Hawk Missiles, and supplies equipment to the Army. The Longhorn Army Ammunitions Plant produces solid rocket fuel, flares, button bombs, and ammunition rounds.

Through other correspondence, we are urging members of our Congressional delegation to work with your Department and other members of the United States Congress to appropriate the needed funds to enable the project to proceed at an early date.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

R. E. Stotzer, Jr.
Engineer-Director

cc: The Honorable William P. Clements, Jr.
Mr. Robert H. Dedman
Mr. John R. Butler, Jr.
Mr. Ray Stoker, Jr.
Mr. Ray Barnhart, FHWA
February 26, 1988

Mr. James H. Burnley  
Secretary of Transportation  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
400 Seventh Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Burnley:

Pursuant to Section 166 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1987, the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department in cooperation with the state highway agencies of Missouri, Texas and Louisiana, prepared a report on the feasibility of constructing a freeway facility from Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana. Our Department strongly supports this highway project. The proposed facility would greatly improve traffic flow and safety which is a major issue within the study area.

If we may provide any additional information on this project, please contact me. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Maurice Smith  
Director of Highways and Transportation

cc: Senator Dale Bumpers  
Senator David Pryor  
Representative John Paul Hammerschmidt  
Representative Tommy Robinson  
Representative Bill Alexander  
Representative Beryl Anthony
November 13, 1987

Mr. Ray Barnhardt
Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Room 4218, HOA-1
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Barnhardt:

I wish to express my full support for approval of the Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana Interstate Highway project. I am advised by our Secretary of Transportation and Development, Mr. Robert G. Graves, that a recent feasibility study by the state highway agencies of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas and the Federal Highway Administration indicates that the route is highly needed and recommends that it be designated and funded as an interstate highway.

Construction of a north-south freeway from the City of Shreveport north to Kansas City, Missouri will greatly benefit transportation needs in this area of our state and country and serve to stimulate the economic well-being of our citizens which is so badly needed at this time. It will further provide a basis for improved commerce between the rich agricultural, industrial and shipping interests of our States.

We trust that you are fully aware of our transportation needs and will work with the United States Congress in the forthcoming approval of this route. Please let us know of any action on our part that may assist in the early approval and funding of this most needed project.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

EDWIN W. EDWARDS

[Signature]

EWE/STM

C: Louisiana Congressional Delegation
   Governor Bill Clinton
   Governor John Ashcroft
   Governor William P. Clements
   Mr. J. N. McDonald
   Mr. Robert G. Graves
November 4, 1987

Secretary of Transportation
U. S. Department of Transportation
400 Seventh Street SW
Washington, D.C. 20590

To the Secretary:

I am writing to solicit your support for the construction of an Interstate Highway from Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana.

The states of Arkansas, Missouri, Texas and Louisiana have jointly worked on this project that would provide a critical link in the Interstate Highway System through the central portion of the United States. This route would greatly aid north-south travel with resulting benefits for economic development, shipping and tourism. Presently there is a 500 mile gap in the link from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico ports which would be remedied by this proposal.

I urge your assistance in our efforts to see this proposal become a reality. If you need more information or any further assistance from this office, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

BC/cts/vm
Mr. R. A. Barnhart
Federal Highway Administrator
Department of Transportation
400 7th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Barnhart:

The 1987 Surface Transportation Act required that a feasibility study be made for an interstate route from Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana. The proposed route would close a 500 mile gap between north-south interstate highways in central United States. In Missouri, this route would incorporate some sections of Route 71 and parallel Route 71 in other areas. This study is in its final stages of completion and will show the proposed route to be of considerable benefit in all the affected states. The study will be completed and in your office in the very near future.

I want to lend my strong personal support for the establishment of this interstate route as it will mean that western Missouri could realize a substantial increase in economic development by providing a good shipping route to the gulf ports.

I have advised Missouri's congressional delegation that this proposal will be presented to Congress before April 1, 1988 and have urged them to give this proposal their support.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
GOVERNOR

cc: Secretary of Transportation
November 12, 1987

Mr. Ray Barnhardt, Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Room 4218-HOA-1
Washington, D.C. 20590

RE: Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana Interstate Highway

Dear Mr. Barnhardt:

As the elected official responsible for pursuing industrial and tourism development in Louisiana, this is to express my support for an interstate type highway connecting Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana. The recent feasibility study by the State Highway Agencies of Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas and the Federal Highway Administration indicates that the route is highly needed and recommends that it be designated and funded as an interstate highway. I urge your support in this matter.

Construction of a north-south freeway from the City of Shreveport north to Kansas City, Missouri will be responsive to transportation needs in this area of our State and Country and serve to stimulate economic activity which is badly needed at this time. It will also provide for improved commerce between the rich agricultural, industrial and shipping interests of our States.

I know that you stay abreast of our transportation needs and will work with the United States Congress for approval of this route. Please let me know of any action on our part that may assist in the early approval and funding of this most needed project.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. "BOBBY" FREEMAN
Lieutenant Governor

RLF:as
UNITED STATES SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES SUPPORT LETTERS
The Honorable James Burnley, IV  
Secretary of Transportation  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Washington, D.C. 20590

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The enclosed correspondence for the Chairman of the Arkansas Industrial Development Commission calls attention to the continuing need for a major north-south interstate highway from Kansas City, Missouri to Shreveport, Louisiana.

This highway would pass through a region, including sections of my home state of Arkansas, which urgently require a major transportation artery to facilitate economic development. I want you to know of my support for such a project. Additionally, it would be appreciated if you could provide me with your thoughts on this proposal. I look forward with interest to receiving your reply.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

BILL ALEXANDER  
Member of Congress
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