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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Transportation Planning Report (TPR) studied approximately 15.19 miles of State Route (SR) 64 from US 31A (SR 11/SR 271) in the Lewisburg area of Marshall County to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville, Bedford County. The South Central East Rural Planning Organization (RPO) requested this study be performed for the 15.19 mile segment as part of a major eastwest arterial that extends from Interstate 65 in Maury County, along SR 50, US 31A (SR 11), and SR 64 to US 231 (SR 10) in Shelbyville in Bedford County.

## Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed improvements for this study corridor is to provide a transportation facility that enhances mobility within the region, supports economic development, improves safety, better provides for alternative modes of transportation. This section would also provide these counties with an improved highway connection between Interstate 65 and Interstate 24. Information provided in the Preliminary Purpose and Needs Statement identified deficiencies within a twenty five (25) year planning horizon, which is expects the roadway to have a capacity deficiency within the years 2018-2022.

Four (4) options for improvement were developed. These options and their estimated costs are listed below:

Options Studied
Option 1-No-Build
Option 2-Four (4) Lane Divided and Five (5) Lane Section for the entire Study Area with a North Bypass at the Wheel Community Estimated Cost \$ 0
\$97,132,000
$\begin{gathered}\text { Option } 3-\text { Shoulder Widening With Three (3) Lane Section } \\ \text { Through the Wheel Community }\end{gathered} \quad \$ 27,289,000$
Option 4 - Spot Improvements
4.1 - Left Turn Lane at Highway 40 Intersection \$ 578,000
4.2 - Center Turn Lane from Haskins Chapel Road
To Whitaker Road \$ 1,935,000
4.3 - Left Turn Lane at Bethlehem Church Road Intersection
4.4 - Left Turn Lane at SR 130 Intersection
$\$ \quad 753,000$

Total Option 4 \$ 3,887,000

SR 64, From US 31A (SR 11) in Lewisburg, Marshall County To SR 10 in Shelbyville, Bedford County
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### 1.0 PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### 1.1 Project History

This Transportation Planning Report (TPR) will evaluate various options for improving State Route (SR) 64, from US 31A (SR 11/SR 271) in the Lewisburg area of Marshall County to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville, Bedford County. The South Central East Rural Planning Organization (RPO) requested the study of this 15.19 mile segment as part of a major east-west arterial that extends from Interstate 65 in Maury County, along SR 50, US 31A (SR 11), and SR 64 to US 231 (SR 10) in Shelbyville in Bedford County.

This segment of SR 64 under review is designated as the "Tennessee Walking Horse Parkway" and has several horse and agricultural facilities located along the route. In addition, this serves as the major east-west transportation corridor for Marshall and Bedford Counties and is utilized by a large amount of truck traffic as evidenced by the percent of trucks. The design year (2034) overall average annual daily traffic (AADT) is 13,000 and the percentage of trucks is approximately twelve (12) percent on SR 64 within the study area. Improvements to this facility are supported by officials of both Marshall and Bedford Counties.

The Long Range Planning Division conducted a Needs Assessment Study for SR 50/US 31A (SR 11)/SR 64, from I-65 in Maury County to SR 10, Shelbyville in Bedford County, a distance of 28.43 miles. SR 64, from US 31A (SR 11) in Marshall County to SR 130 in Bedford County, a distance of 12.67 miles, is a portion of the extended corridor.

A feasibility study completed in 2005 analyzed the feasibility and the estimated cost of reconstructing SR 50 , SR 11, SR 64 , and SR 10 to provide a four (4) lane highway connection between Columbia and Shelbyville. The study examined the use of both existing and new alignments, including a bypass connecting SR 50 and SR 64 north of Lewisburg.

### 1.2 Description of Study Area

The limits of this TPR cover a distance of approximately 15.19 miles and extends from US 31A (SR 11) in Lewisburg, Marshall County to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville, Bedford County. Exhibit 1.2.1 presents a larger, regional view of the study area, while Exhibit 1.2.2 presents a more localized view of the study area (in red).

During the study, it was determined that a portion of the proposed Shelbyville By-Pass (SR 437) could potentially connect to SR 64 on the eastern end of this study area. The connection potentially exists to the north of the existing connection with SR 130. Funding for a SR 437 project is not proposed in the 2008-2011 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Included in the Appendix are maps and layouts that depict the proposed location of the Shelbyville By-Pass (SR 437). This information was provided by TDOT Project Planning Division personnel and is being provided as a part of this report to ensure that users are aware of this potential improvement that would have a direct impact to the proposed corridor improvements that are included in this study. Currently, SR 64 from US 31A (SR 11) in Lewisburg, Marshall County to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville, Bedford County is not scheduled for any improvements.
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Regional Map


Marshall and Bedford Counties (shaded)


### 1.3 Traffic

The original traffic counts and forecasts were conducted at two (2) locations on Wednesday, July 22 and Thursday, July 23, 2009 between 6:00-9:00 AM, 11:00AM - 1:00 PM, and 3:00 6:00 PM. Location 1 was the intersection of SR 64 and US 31A in Marshall County. Location 2 was the intersection of SR 64 and SR 130 in Bedford County. As a result of comments received at the stakeholders meeting and field review, an additional count was requested and performed on Wednesday, February 10 and Thursday, February 18, 2010 between 6:00-9:00 AM, 11:00AM - 1:00 PM, and 3:00 - 6:00 PM for the following intersections:

- SR 64 and Highway 40
- SR 64 and Haskins Chapel Road
- SR 64 and Whitaker Road
- SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road

After these counts were performed, the limits of the study corridor were extended to include a logical eastern termini of SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville. No additional counts were conducted in this approximate 2.52 mile section.

The annual average daily traffic (AADT) volumes are expressed in vehicles per day (VPD) and were forecast for the years 2014 and 2034. A summary of the traffic forecast for this study area is shown in Exhibit 1.3.1.

Exhibit 1.3.1 Traffic Forecasts


Level of Service (LOS) was used as the measure of effectiveness for each roadway segment. According to the Highway Capacity Manual, the level of service is defined in terms of delay. Delay results in driver discomfort, frustration, fuel consumption, and lost travel time. Delay is caused by a number of factors including traffic signal timing, geometrics, traffic congestion, and crashes at an intersection. Level of Service is based on a grade scale from $A$ to $F$ with $A$ being excellent and $F$ being failure. A Level of Service $C$ is desirable, and $D$ is acceptable in an urban setting. Table 1.3.1 describes the conditions at each level of service per the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM).

Table 1.3.1 Level of Service Descriptions

| LOS A | Free flow conditions. Vehicle operations are virtually unaffected by other <br> vehicles. Easy to maneuver through traffic stream. Minor disruptions do <br> not create a change in travel speed. |
| :--- | :--- |
| LOS B | Free flow conditions but other vehicles become noticeable. Travel speeds <br> are similar to LOS A but driver has less maneuverability. Minor disruptions <br> are easily absorbed. |
| LOS C | Driver maneuverability through traffic stream is affected by other vehicles. <br> Minor disruptions can result in serious service deterioration and queues. |
| LOS D | Traffic congestion severely restricts driver maneuverability. Increasing <br> volume results in a reduced travel speed. |
| LOS E | Operations at or near capacity. Disruptions often create queues and cause <br> service to deteriorate to LOS F. |
|  | Traffic flow becomes forced or breaks down. Vehicles arrive at a greater <br> rate than which they are discharged or the demand exceeds the capacity. <br> Queues form from the breakdowns, with vehicles experiencing brief periods <br> of movement followed by stoppages. |

Traffic volumes from the approved SR 64 Traffic Forecast Report were used to analyze each roadway segment. Analysis was completed using HCS+, a standard analysis tool, which uses HCM methodologies to evaluate roadway corridors. Table 1.3.2 summarizes the LOS results for the No Build conditions, the improvements to the existing two (2) lane corridor, and for the four (4) lane highway conditions. The analysis files can be found in the appendix of this report.

State Route 64 From US 31A (SR 11/271) near Lewisburg to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville
Table 1.3.2 LOS Analysis

| Segment | Level of Service (LOS) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No Build |  | 2 Lane |  | 4 Lane |  |
|  | 2014 | 2034 | 2014 | 2034 | 2014 | 2034 |
| US 31 to Hwy 40 | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| Hwy 40 to Bedford County Line | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| Bedford County Line to Haskins <br> Chapel Road | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| Haskins Chapel Road to Whitaker <br> Road | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| Whitaker Road to Bethlehem Church <br> Road | B | B | B | B | A | A |
| Bethlehem Church Road to SR 130 | B | C | B | C | A | A |

Based on the LOS analyses for SR 64, all roadway segments between US 31 and SR 130 are currently operating at an acceptable LOS with no capacity deficiencies, as well as into the design year (2034).

### 1.4 Existing Roadway Conditions

The State Route 64 study corridor begins in Marshall County at the intersection with US 31A (SR 11) which has a corresponding county log mile (LM) of 0.00 and continues to the Bedford County line at LM 3.03. From the Bedford County line at LM 0.00 , the study corridor continues to the intersection with SR 10 (US 2331) at LM 12.16. The total length of the two (2) segments of the study corridor is 15.19 miles. Existing SR 64, within the study corridor, is a two (2) lane, two (2) way, non-access controlled roadway and is classified as a rural minor arterial. The posted speed limit throughout the corridor is 55 MPH .

The entire study corridor is classified as a two (2) lane rural minor arterial road with rolling terrain. Within Marshall County there are two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes with eight (8) foot paved shoulders and one hundred (100) foot of right of way. The segment of the corridor within Bedford County consists of two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes with five (5) foot or less paved shoulders and sixty (60) foot of right of way. The surrounding land use along the entire study corridor is primarily rural.

The following discussion includes the approximate LM location as well as a general description of the area. By including the LM, it provides a quick reference to TDOT information, such as the Tennessee Roadway Information System (TRIMS), to review additional information such as roadway features or crash data.

## SR 64/US 31A (SR 11) Intersection Area (LM 0.00 to LM 0.03 )

State Route 64 terminates at the junction with US 31A (SR 11) with a "T" intersection at approximate ninety ( 90 ) degree angles. During the discussion with county officials concerning this location, they indicated there have been numerous vehicles, including trucks, traveling west
on SR 64 which have failed to stop. These vehicles leave the roadway and end up in the field adjacent to US 31A (SR 11). Based on crash data for 2005 through 2007, there were only four (4) crashes reported within a half mile radius of this intersection. These are only the reported crashes and do not reflect other crashes that may not have been serious enough to report. At the minimum, advanced warning and intersection termination signing needs improvement at this intersection. There was agreement between those in attendance during the stakeholders field review that lane and shoulder width was sufficient.

## Exhibit 1.4.1 - SR 64 at the Intersection with US 31A (SR 11)



View is westbound at the US 31A (SR 11) intersection.
Exhibit 1.4.2-SR 64 at the Intersection with US 31A (SR 11)


View is eastbound from the US 31A (SR 11) intersection.

## Highway 40 Intersection Area (LM 0.93)

Highway 40 intersects State Route 64 at a severe skew (angle). According to local officials, this is a popular shortcut to reach SR 247 traveling to Belfast. There is a sight distance issue for SR 64 westbound traffic approaching this intersection area. Due to the sight distance and the horizontal and vertical curves, there is potential for vehicles turning west from Highway 40 and entering SR 64 westbound traffic to not have sufficient room to merge.

Exhibit 1.4.3 - Highway 40 Intersection with SR 64


View from Highway 40 looking east on SR 64.

## SR 64 at the Marshall/Bedford County Line (LM 3.03/LM 0.00)

The entire corridor has twelve (12) foot lane widths. The roadway in Marshall County has eight (8) foot shoulders with approximately one hundred (100) feet of right of way. The roadway in Bedford County has five (5) foot shoulders with approximately sixty (60) feet of right of way. The shoulder width transition begins at the county line and there a few areas where the narrower shoulders do present some safety issues, such as not providing for disabled vehicles to clear the travel lanes. These areas will be identified in section 3.0, Options Analyzed.

## Exhibit 1.4.4 - SR 64 at Marshall/Bedford County Line



View of shoulder transition at county line

## Wheel Cemetery Area (LM 1.9)

At this location, the roadway is constrained with the Wheel Cemetery on the north and residences on the south. Grave markers indicate that graves are extremely close to the existing slopes and the residences are close to the travel lanes as well. This is another area where roadside safety is reduced due to the shoulder widths not providing sufficient clear zones for disabled vehicles to clear the travel lanes.

Exhibit 1.4.5 - Wheel Cemetery


View of Wheel Cemetery proximity to SR 64.

According to local officials, these two (2) roads in the Wheel Community provide access from neighboring communities to SR 64. In this area, SR 64 is comprised of two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes and three (3) to five (5) foot shoulders. Traffic entering SR 64 from either of these roads does not have an area to accelerate and enter the traffic flow on SR 64. In addition, the narrower roadway width through the Wheel Community indicates that consideration should be given to looking at improvements on new location.

Exhibit 1.4.6 - SR 64 at Whitaker Road


View from Whitaker Road to Haskins Chapel Road.

### 1.5 Crash History

The Tennessee Roadway Information Management System (TRIMS) provides data for locations of crashes, for geometric deficiencies such as narrow lanes (less than eleven (11) feet) and shoulder width (less than six (6) feet for arterials), and for excessive curves and grades, as defined by current design standards. The segment of SR 64 located in Marshall County has sufficient lane width, shoulder width and right of way of one hundred (100) feet. The segment of SR 64 in Bedford County has twelve (12) foot travel lanes, shoulder width of approximately five (5) feet, as well as sixty (60) feet of right of way in a rural land use environment. The narrow shoulders do not provide sufficient clear zones.

Records of vehicle crashes for the three (3) year period 2006 through 2008, were reviewed. The following data is for the entire corridor and is not broken down by county. There were a total of eighty one (81) crashes reported in the three (3) year period. Of these crashes, thirty one (31) involved more than one (1) vehicle. In addition, it is noted that thirty six (36) of these crashes were from vehicles departing the roadway and twenty eight (28) were reported at various intersections along the study area. The actual crash rate for the entire study area in Marshall and Bedford Counties is 1.739 in comparison with the state wide average of 0.190. There was two (2) incapacitating crashes and one (1) fatal crash during the same period.

The review of the crash data and frequency of certain types of crashes enforces some of the observations that have been noted. The number of lane departure crashes suggests that
shoulder width does not provide adequate recovery room for correcting lane departure errors. In addition, edge of pavement indicators, such as rumble striping, provide improvements to these types of roadways. The frequency of crashes that occurred at intersections indicates that spot improvements are a consideration, such as the addition of a third (center) turn lane at various locations along the study area.

### 1.6 Environmental Considerations

This section of the report discusses various items that should be considered if further planning and development of the study area moves forward in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) planning process. The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) has introduced an Early Environmental Screening (EES) process for the report study area. By screening the latest available Geographic Information Systems (GIS) environmental data during the early stages of planning, TDOT resource and permitting agencies will be better prepared to anticipate potential environmental issues and mitigation requirements. Additional study and in depth review will be necessary in subsequent phases of the project's development to determine the significance of the impacts to the environment. The EES and Project Scoring for this corridor are shown in the Appendix.

The screening process involves using GIS to assess data as it relates geographically to the study area. There are several layers of data that is screened and these individual layers are reviewed below:

- Archeological/Historical Architecture - A preliminary review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) indicated there were three (3) listed properties within the study area. One (1) of these properties is the Confederate Cemetery Monument in the Farmington Community and is located at approximate county LM 0.95 in Marshall County. Exhibit 1.6.1 is a photograph of the monument. In addition to the monument there is a small building with a covered area and a parking lot in front that connects to SR 64.

Exhibit 1.6.1 - Confederate Cemetery Monument Property


The Thomas Montgomery House (Exhibit 1.6.2) is located just east of the Marshall/Bedford county line. This home and surrounding property is commonly known as Palmetto Farms. This home and property is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as well as the Brame-Reed House. The Brame-Reed House is found in Bedford County at approximate county LM 7.43. In addition to these homes, there are other structures along the study area that could be eligible for listing on the NRHP. A more detailed investigation will need to be conducted later in the project development process to determine eligibility for the register.

Exhibit 1.6.2 - Thomas Montgomery House


View of Thomas Montgomery House located at the county line.
In addition, there are seven (7) cemeteries noted within the study area. It should be possible to avoid most if not all potential impacts through improvements to the existing roadway. An environmental impact may result and necessitate further review as part of the NEPA process.

Ecology - No impacts are expected to any Scenic Waterway or Conservation Site as designated by the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC). There are several wetland areas identified within Marshall and Bedford Counties. Those within the study area will need further study as the work progresses. Avoidance and mitigation will be factors to consider.

Hazardous Substance/Geology - Throughout the 15.19 mile study corridor, there are several active petroleum operations, such as convenience stores. In addition, there are locations that may have abandoned underground gasoline storage tanks. It should be noted that any proposed widening of the corridor would need to assess these locations and determine any potential removal of underground storage tanks (UST's).

## Exhibit 1.6.3 - Abandoned Market (LM 2.3)



View of potential abandoned UST's
During the stakeholders site visits and other field reviews, there were other potential areas of impact noted that should be considered. At approximate LM 5.00, the WBTS Volunteer Fire Department operates a garage to house their firefighting equipment. Closer to the highway there are several picnic tables. These are very reminiscent of the roadside parks that were popular in past years. The drive that is currently being used to access this property could possibly be a portion of an older highway. Should these be tables that remain from an old roadside park, the area could be protected by Section 4(f) and encroachment would need to be avoided in future road widening. Further study will need to be performed as this project moves forward.

Exhibit 1.6.4 - WBTS Volunteer Fire Department and Picnic Area (LM 5.00)


View of the fire department garage and adjoining area with picnic tables


In addition to the above mentioned issues, there are other potential environmental impacts along the study corridor. During the field reconnaissance, several churches were noted. At approximate LM 3.7, there is a predominately Hispanic church, which could indicate a linguistically isolated population. These will need to be identified and studied further to determine the potential impacts and any mitigation factors.

### 2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the proposed improvements for this study corridor is to provide a transportation facility that enhances mobility within the region, supports economic development, improves safety, better provides for alternative modes of transportation. The Preliminary Purpose and Needs Statement recommended a TPR performed for the section of SR 64 from US 31A to SR 130. This section would also provide these counties with an improved highway connection between Interstate 65 and Interstate 24. Information provided in the Preliminary Purpose and Needs Statement identified deficiencies within a twenty five (25) year planning horizon, which expects the roadway to have a capacity deficiency within the years 2018-2022. To include a logical eastern termini, the study corridor was lengthened to SR 10 (US 231) in Shelbyville.

Bedford County has a primary focus on the movement of trucks and material along this highway section, due to the large industrial/manufacturing base. In addition, the corridor provides access to industrial, manufacturing and commercial property that is a source of growth for Bedford and Marshall Counties. Bedford County is home to manufacturing and distribution businesses such as Sanford (pencils and markers), Josten's (graduation announcements and diplomas and Walmart (food distribution). Marshall County is home to industrial and manufacturing businesses such as Teledyne, Incorporated (electronics), Calsonic-Kansei (auto parts) NichirinLewisburg (rubber products, auto belts and hoses). The projected volume percentage of truck traffic along SR 64 will be approximately $12 \%$ of the total volume of traffic. In the area is the Tennessee Technology Center at Shelbyville which provides education resources for numerous individuals within the region.

This study was requested by the South Central East Rural Planning Organization (RPO). Marshall and Bedford Counties are in support of the development of this regional east-west
corridor and recognize the positive impacts such an improvement would have on all the counties within the region. Based on the needs of the study area as outlined by the South Central East RPO and TDOT, the major factors for improving SR 64 within the study area are:

- Correct geometric deficiencies and excessive grades to improve safety and ensure the roadway is in compliance with accepted design standards.
- Enhance economic development within the region by providing better access to employment and business opportunities in the Marshall and Bedford County area.
- Improve the efficiency and traffic flow along the study area by minimizing traffic delays for the motoring public and ensuring that capacity is sufficient for future traffic demands.


### 3.0 OPTIONS STUDIED

On Tuesday, December 22, 2009, a field review was performed with concerned stakeholders for this corridor. The review began with a brief overview of the project and related information. The purpose for roadway improvements was discussed and input was solicited from all participants. Local officials were given the opportunity to provide input on any known growth or developments in the area that could have an impact on any future roadway improvements. There was very little discussion among the group concerning any particular proposed development for the area. There was several comments concerning the need for this corridor to be improved for safety as well as enhancing the potential growth for the counties within the South Central East RPO.

During the drive through of the study area, participants were asked for their input to assist in identifying and discussing potential improvement options. In addition, they were able to provide input as to areas where safety is of concern along the roadway. The section under review is considered to be a portion of a corridor improvement from I-65 near Lewisburg to I-24 near Shelbyville. The typical sections under review were supported by attendees of the stakeholder meeting and by the factors listed in the purpose and need.

Shown below is a listing of all attendees at the stakeholders meeting:

| Joe Boyd Liggett | Marshall County Mayor |
| :--- | :--- |
| Don Nelson | Marshall County Zoning |
| Mike Wiles | Marshall County Highways |
| Eugene Ray | Bedford County Mayor |
| Stanley Smotherman | Bedford County Road Superintendent |
| Wallace Cartwright | City of Shelbyville Mayor |
| Mark Clanton | City of Shelbyville Public Works |
| Lisa Cross | SCTDD - Rural Planning Organization |
| Gary Fotrell | FHWA |
| Bob Allen | TDOT - Environmental |
| Paul Lane | TDOT - Planning |
| Gena Gilliam | TDOT - Planning |
| Terrance Hill | TDOT - Long Range Planning |
| Todd Kemp | Palmer Engineering |
| Terry York | Palmer Engineering |

This report examines operational and safety improvement options along the corridor. These options evaluate opportunities for meeting the transportation and economic development needs
of Marshall and Bedford Counties, as well as the RPO. The options examined are summarized in the following sections of this report.

### 3.1 Option 1 - No Build

The No Build option assumes no modifications or improvements will be made over the planning horizon to add capacity. Analysis of projected traffic volumes supports this assumption. Routine maintenance related activities as well as scheduled resurfacing, signing, and possible safety projects may occur. This option, however, does not support the project's stated Purpose and Need for providing a transportation facility to enhance mobility, support economic development and improve safety.

### 3.2 Option 2 - Four (4) Lane Divided and Five (5) Lane Section for the entire Study Area with a North Bypass at the Wheel Community

This option involves widening the existing SR 64 corridor to provide four (4) twelve (12) foot wide travel lanes with ten (10) foot paved shoulders that will also serve as bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. This option includes fifty two (52) feet wide grass median and requires approximately two hundred (250) feet minimum of right of way. The four (4) lane section will begin at US 31A and extend to approximate LM 11.14, near Redbud Drive, where the roadway will transition to a five (5) lane rural section. The five (5) lane rural section will provide five (5) twelve (12) foot wide travel lanes with ten (10) foot paved shoulders and will transition to a three (3) lane curb and gutter section at approximate LM 11.48, west of Linda Drive. This section will continue to the end of the study area at approximate LM 12.16.

The existing roadway will be utilized where possible and the alignment will shift north or south dependent on vertical curves, potential right of way acquisitions and other constructability factors. The structure over Sugar Creek will need to be improved and another structure will need to be constructed. In addition, there are several locations where box culverts will need to be widened and constructed to accommodate the new highway.

In addition, this option includes a bypass, on new location, to the North around the Wheel Community beginning at LM 4.17, crosses over existing SR 64 at LM 5.84 and ties back in to the existing SR 64 at LM 7.13. Just west of Mt. Lebanon Church Road, the bypass crosses SR 64 and continues on new location to just west of the Bedford County Convenience Center where the new location transitions back to the existing SR 64. This alignment is necessary to avoid impacts to a wetland area and a large pond. In addition, this alignment avoids relocations of a church, several commercial, agricultural businesses and up to twelve (12) residences.

This bypass includes four (4) twelve (12) feet wide travel lanes with ten (10) feet paved shoulders that will also serve as bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The existing SR 64 alignment through the Wheel Community would need to remain as it accesses a number of residences and businesses within the community. Maintenance responsibility for the existing route would revert to Bedford County. The proposed improvement layout for Option 2 is located in the Appendix as the "Option 2 Corridor Map" display. The four (4) lane divided typical section is included in this report. The overall roadway length of this option is approximately 13.06 miles. The estimated total cost of this option is $\$ 97,132,000$.

(SEE BYPASS OF WHEL COR COMMORITY SNOWN BELOW)
(BASED ON STD. DWG. RDO1-TS-2A)
Exinibit 3.2.1-Four (4) Lane Divided Typical Section



Exihibit 3.2.3 - Five (5) Lane Rural Typical Section


STATE ROUTE 64
(BASED ON STD. DWG. RDOI-TS-7A)
Exinibit 3.3.4 - Three (3) Lane Curb \& Gutter Typical Section

### 3.3 Option 3 - Shoulder Widening / Improvements with a Three (3) Lane Section Through the Wheel Community

This option involves widening and improving the shoulders along the existing SR 64 corridor to provide two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes with ten (10) foot paved shoulders. The travel lanes are to receive an overlay and new pavement markings are to be installed. These widened and improved shoulders will serve as bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The improvements will be made within a proposed eighty (80) feet right of way width and the overall roadway length is 15.19 miles.

The existing roadway in Marshall County has a right of way width of one hundred (100) feet with two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes and eight (8) foot paved shoulders. There is sufficient right of way to widen and improve the shoulders in Marshall County. The approximate roadway length in Marshall County is 3.03 miles.

In Bedford County the existing roadway consists of two (2) twelve (12) foot travel lanes and five (5) foot shoulders or less with sixty (60) feet of right of way. Additional right of way, slope or construction easements will be required for this improvement. The overall length of the two (2) lane improvement in Bedford County is 12.16 miles.

Included in this option are roadway improvements through the Wheel Community to allow for improved left turn movements, minimize community impacts and improve safety. In the Wheel Community, a three (3) twelve (12) foot lane urban section with six (6) foot shoulders and five (5) foot sidewalks, will be utilized. The center lane will be a continuous left turn lane. The overall length of the three (3) lane section in Bedford County is 1.00 mile beginning the transition at LM 4.68, just west of Montgomery Road and ending at LM 5.68 , just east of Mt. Lebanon Church Road and Perryman Lane. The current speed limit for the entire section under review is 55 miles per hour (MPH). For this section of roadway, the speed limit will need to be reduced to 45 MPH , due to the urban section that is being used. The estimated total cost for this option is $\$ 27,289,000$.

Listed below are the typical sections and plan view layouts for Option 3 which are included in the following pages:

- Two (2) Lane typical sections with shoulder widening for Marshall and Bedford County
- Three (3) Lane typical section with curb and gutter and sidewalk through the Wheel Community
- Plan View layout for the three (3) lane section with curb and gutter and sidewalk through the Wheel Community


Exihibit 3.3.1 - Existing Two (2) Lane Typical Section with Shoulder Widening for Marshall County




STATE ROUTE 64
(BASED ON STD. DWG. RDOI-TS-7A)
Exinibit 3.3.4 - Three (3) Lane Curb \& Gutter Typical Section

### 3.4 Option 4 - Spot Improvements

During the field review with TDOT, FHWA and Marshall and Bedford County officials, several areas along the corridor were identified as locations in need of safety improvements. There were four (4) locations identified where SR 64 was intersected by local roadways. It was noted that these local roads provided access from recently developed residential growth areas to SR 64. Another identified improvement provides advanced warning of the intersection of SR 64 with US 31A. These options can be implemented independently or in combination as an overall improvement strategy along the corridor. These spot safety improvements are discussed in more detail in the following sections of this report.

### 3.4.1 - Option 4.1 - Three (3) Lane Section (Left Turn Lane) at the SR 64 and Highway 40 Intersection

This option recommends the addition of a left turn lane be added at the intersection of SR 64 and Highway 40. This option will allow for westbound traffic on SR 64 turning at Highway 40 to not interfere with through traffic. Due to the vertical curve just east of this intersection, the left turn lane will provide improved safety for vehicles making this movement. The improvement in this area will need additional right of way to allow for the proper alignment of Highway 40 intersecting with SR 64. Proper alignment of Highway 40 can be accomplished without requiring a residential relocation of the property in the northwest quadrant. The estimated cost of this improvement option is $\$ 578,000$.


Exhibit 3.4.1 - Plan View of Center Turn Lane at Highway 40 Intersection

### 3.4.2 - Option 4.2 - Three (3) Lane Section (Center Turn Lane) in Wheel Community from Haskins Chapel Road Intersection to Whitaker Road Intersection on SR 64

This option recommends a center turn lane be added to this area by widening equally to both sides of SR 64 for approximately 1800 linear feet. Haskins Chapel Road and Whitaker Road are frequently traveled in the Wheel Community. Haskins Chapel Road intersects SR 64 to the north and Whitaker Road intersects SR 64 to the south and located approximately 700 feet apart.

Due to the close proximity of the Wheel Cemetery on the north side of the roadway, the two (2) local roadways, and several residences located close to the roadway, a three (3) lane typical section is recommended to be used in this community. This typical section will require approximately seventy two (72) feet of right of way and will necessitate acquiring additional property. The estimated total cost for this option is $\$ 1,935,000$.


Exhibit 3.4.2 - Plan View of Center Turn Lane From Haskins Chapel Road to Whitaker Road

### 3.4.3 - Option 4.3 - Three (3) Lane Section (Left Turn Lane) at SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road Intersection

This option recommends the addition of a left turn lane at the intersection of SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road. This option will allow for westbound traffic on SR 64 turning at Bethlehem Church Road to not interfere with through traffic. In addition, Bethlehem Church Road provides access from recently developed residential growth areas to SR 64. The improvement in this area will need additional right of way to allow for the proper alignment of Bethlehem Church Road intersecting with SR 64. The estimated cost of this improvement option is $\$ 621,000$.


Exhibit 3.4.3 - Plan View of Left Turn Lane at Bethlehem Church Road

### 3.4.4 - Option 4.4 - Three (3) Lane Section (Left Turn Lane) at SR 64 and SR 130 Intersection

This option recommends that a left turn lane be added to the intersection of SR 64 and SR 130. This option allows for SR 64 westbound traffic turning at SR 130 to not interfere with through traffic. In addition, SR 130 provides access to truck traffic from several agribusinesses in the area. The improvement in this area will need additional right of way to allow for SR 130 to intersect SR 64 at a right angle. The estimated cost of this improvement option is $\$ 753,000$.


Exhibit 3.4.4 - Plan view of Left Turn Lane at SR 130

### 4.0 ASSESSMENT OF OPTIONS

The Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT) has adopted seven guiding principles against which all transportation projects are to be evaluated. These guiding principles address concerns for system management, mobility, economic growth, safety, community, environmental stewardship, and fiscal responsibility. These guiding principles are discussed in the following paragraphs as they relate to the options discussed in this report.

## 4.1 - Guiding Principle \#1 - Preserve and Manage the Existing Transportation System

Option 2 involves the construction of a four (4) lane divided highway with a bypass around the Wheel Community for the entire length of the study area. Option 1, 3 and 4 preserve the existing corridor either through a No-Build option (Option 1), through shoulder widening improvements (Option 3), or through spot improvements to the existing roadway (Option 4). Each of these options preserves the existing corridor with optimal changes or no changes at all.

## 4.2-Guiding Principle \#2 - Move a Growing, Diverse, and Active Population

The options in this study will improve service and operational efficiency as well as enhance the east-west corridor from Interstate 65 to Interstate 24 in South Central Tennessee. Even though the study area is in Marshall and Bedford Counties, the entire South Central region will benefit from these corridor improvements.

The existing SR 64 study area does not easily accommodate pedestrian and bicycle movements. However, the proposed improvement options provide additional safety measures for these alternative modes of transportation, such as improved shoulders and sight distance.

## 4.3 - Guiding Principle \#3 - Support the State's Economy

Marshall and Bedford County's industrial and commercial businesses require adequate transportation facilities to operate efficiently. These businesses include medical facilities such as Maury Medical Center, a Walmart Distribution Center in Shelbyville, Sanford has writing instrument facilties along the corridor and numerous agribusinesses raising chickens and horses. Without improvements to the transportation infrastructure, these counties will find it difficult to compete in attracting industry to the area or in keeping the current industries from looking elsewhere to relocate. Enhancing the corridor with the options discussed in this study will ultimately enhance the corridor for all users.

## 4.4-Guiding Principle \#4 - Maximize Safety and Security

From 2006 to 2008, eighty one (81) crashes were reported on SR 64 within the study area, including thirty four (34) injury crashes, six (6) with incapacitating injury crashes and one (1) fatality crash. Approximately $38 \%$ of the thirty one (31) crashes involved more than one (1) vehicle and approximately $44 \%$ of the thirty six (36) crashes were from vehicles departing the roadway. The actual crash rate for SR 64 within the study area was 1.739 , which slightly exceeds the statewide average for rural minor arterials of 1.652.

All the options considered, other than the No-Build, may improve some aspect of safety along this study corridor. One of the primary goals of each build option is to improve the system and address deficiencies or safety related issues. Creating a safer transportation system is aligned with this guiding principle.

## 4.5 - Guiding Principle \#5 - Build Partnerships for Livable Communities

TDOT's Long Range Transportation Plan promotes projects that are supported by the local community. The South Central East Rural Planning Organization requested this TPR because of the need for an improved east-west corridor connecting these two counties. Officials of Shelbyville and Lewisburg, as well as representatives of Bedford and Marshall Counties are in support of the corridor improvements. As this project advances to the environmental documentation phase, the public involvement process will continue as required by provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

## 4.6 - Guiding Principle \#6 - Promote Stewardship of the Environment

All of the options take stewardship of the environment into consideration. Further environmental studies will be required when decisions are made to improve the corridor and funding is secured for the selected improvement option. Several areas within the study area will be studied for avoidance or minimizing the impacts such improvements may have. These areas include churches, wetlands, potential Section 4(f) properties, historic properties and monuments.

## 4.7-Guiding Principle \#7-Emphasize Financial Responsibility

This Transportation Planning Report (TPR) is prepared in accordance with the Goals and Objectives set forth in Tennessee's Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

In achieving the LRTP's goal of providing responsibility, accountability, and sustainability in the expenditure of transportation funds, this planning document includes the estimated cost for roadway improvements. These cost estimates are important decision making tools when evaluating and maximizing the use of available resources.

### 5.0 SUMMARY

The Tennessee Department of Transportation's (TDOT) Long Range Planning Division conducted a Preliminary Needs Assessment for State Route 64 from State Route 50 in Maury County State Route 10 in Bedford County. The study recommended further review be performed for the segment of SR 64 from SR 11 to SR 130, which is the segment being reviewed under this TPR. This study was prepared at the request of the South Central East Rural Planning Organization. The RPO considers this segment to be the major east-west corridor between Marshall and Bedford Counties.

A stakeholders meeting and field review was held on December 22, 2009 to identify safety concerns and identify some options to address such concerns. Existing operational and geometric conditions have been reviewed and capacity analyses for future traffic projections have been conducted which led to the development of several conceptual improvements which independently or in combination, may improve safety and operational conditions. These improvements address the purpose, need and goals which have been set to improve the SR 64 corridor.

Criteria for selecting route options should incorporate the purpose, need, goals and guiding principles listed within various sections of this report. The route options are summarized as follows:

- Option 1 - No Build: This option assumes no modifications or improvements are made to the existing roadway over the planning horizon.
- Option 2 - Four (4) Lane Divided: This option would utilize the existing roadway where possible, along with the addition of a fifty two (52) foot grass median and an additional two (2) twelve (12) foot lanes. Additional right of way would be necessary as the existing right of way widths vary from sixty (60) to one hundred (100) feet. The proposed improvement would require approximately two hundred fifty (250) feet of right of way. The location of the additional lanes would shift from the north to south to minimize relocations as well as minimize environmental impacts.

In addition, this option recommends a bypass to the north of the Wheel Community in Bedford County. This bypass will be on new location and would require additional right of way and relocations. In these areas, additional evaluation would be necessary to minimize impacts. The bypass starts on new location to the North at the Wheel Community beginning at LM 4.17, crosses over existing SR 64 at LM 5.84 and ties back in to the existing SR 64 at LM 7.13 for an approximate length of three (3) miles. The bypass is being considered due to the close proximity of residences, businesses and a cemetery in the Wheel Community.

- Option 3 - Shoulder Widening / Improvements: This option seeks to improve existing shoulder widths and address clear zone issues where appropriate. Existing right of way widths in Marshall County are one hundred (100) feet and right of way widths in Bedford County are sixty (60) feet along the majority of the corridor. In Marshall County, all improvements or modifications could be accomplished within existing right of way. In Bedford County, there will be areas where additional right of way will be required. Through the Wheel Community, this option proposes a three (3) lane curb and gutter section due to the close proximity of residences, businesses and a cemetery.
- Option 4-Spot Improvements: There are four (4) potential locations for localized improvements. Three (3) of these improvements consist of adding a left turn lane. Another improvement is adding a center lane in the Wheel Community between Haskins Chapel Road and Whitaker Road, due to the close proximity of the Wheel Cemetery on the north side of the roadway, the two (2) local roadways, and several residences located close to the roadway. These improvements can be implemented independently or in combination as an overall improvement option.

The recommended priority of these spot improvements, based on safety are:
a. Left turn lane at SR 64 and Highway 40 Intersection
b. Center turn lane at Haskins Chapel Road Intersection and Whitaker Road Intersection
c. Left turn lane at SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road Intersection
d. Left turn lane at SR 64 and SR 130

In conclusion, future improvements to the existing State Route 64 corridor are necessary to address the purpose and need. The "No Build" option does not address the purpose and need discussed in this report. Some combination of these proposed improvements are recommended to provide safer operations and enhance the mobility for the roadway users, as well as to encourage economic development within Marshall and Bedford Counties. Although it may not be feasible at this time to construct all of proposed improvements, they could be built in increments or phases to produce the desired benefits.

## APPENDIX














| Route: | SR 64 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Description: | From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 10 in Shelbyville |
|  | 4 Lane Divided Hwy., 5 Lane Rural, 3 Lane Curb and Gutter |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |
| Length: | 15.58 Miles |
| Date: | 10/20/2010 |

RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 450 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $=\$$ | $6,750,000$ |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Incidentals | 207 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 828,000 |
| Relocations | 74 Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | $18,500,000$ |
|  | 3 Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | $1,500,000$ |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | $27,578,000$ |

## UTILITY RELOCATION

| Reimbursable | \$ | 7,595,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-reimbursable | \$ | 0 |
| UTILITY COST | \$ | 7,595,000 |
| TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 61,959,000 |
| TOTAL PROJECT COST * | \$ | 97,132,000 |

[^0]Option 2

| Route: Description: | SR 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 10 in Shelbyville |  |  |
|  | 4 Lane Divided Hwy, 5 Lane Rural, 3 Lane Curb and Gutter |  |  |
| County: <br> Length: <br> Date: | Marshall / Bedford |  |  |
|  | 15.58 Miles |  |  |
|  | 10/20/2010 |  |  |
| CLEAR AND GRUBBING |  | \$ | 1,350,000 |
| EARTHWORK |  | \$ | 6,782,000 |
| PAVEMENT REMOVAL |  | \$ | 106,000 |
| DRAINAGE |  | \$ | 4,561,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  | \$ | 2,258,000 |
| RAILROAD CROSSING OR SEPARATION |  | \$ |  |
| PAVING |  | \$ | 20,742,000 |
| RETAINING WALLS |  | \$ |  |
| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC |  | \$ | 3,456,000 |
| TOPSOIL |  | \$ | 2,135,000 |
| SEEDING |  | \$ | 209,700 |
| SODDING |  | \$ | 88,200 |
| SIGNING |  | \$ | 38,300 |
| LIGHTING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNALIZATION |  | \$ |  |
| FENCE |  | \$ | 601,900 |
| GUARDRAIL |  | \$ | 79,000 |
| RIP RAP OR SLOPE PROTECTION |  | \$ |  |
| OTHER CONST. ITEMS (15\%) |  | \$ | 6,361,000 |
| MOBILIZATION |  | \$ | 2,438,000 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 51,206,000 |
|  | 10\% ENG. \& CONT. | \$ | 5,121,000 |
|  | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 56,327,000 |
|  | 10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING | \$ | 5,633,000 |
|  | TOTAL COST * | \$ | 61,960,000 |

[^1]Option 3

| Route: <br> Description: | SR 64 |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 10 in Shelbyville |
|  | Widen shdr to 12' 3 C\&G in Wheel Comm. \& Shelbyville |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |
| Length: | 15.19 Miles |
| Date: | 10/20/2010 |

RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 51 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $=\$$ | 765,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: |
| Incidentals | 227 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 908,000 |
| Relocations | 10 Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | $2,500,000$ |
|  | 1 Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | 500,000 |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | $4,673,000$ |

UTILITY RELOCATION
Reimbursable
Non-reimbursable
UTILITY COST


TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST *
$\$ 16,530,000$

[^2]Option 3

| Route: | SR 64 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Description: | From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville |
|  | Widen shdr to 12' 3 C\&G in Wheel and Shelbyville |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |
| Length: | 66,898 LF = 12.67 Miles |
| Date: | 10/20/2010 |

## CLEAR AND GRUBBING

## EARTHWORK

PAVEMENT REMOVAL
DRAINAGE
STRUCTURES
RAILROAD CROSSING OR SEPARATION PAVING
RETAINING WALLS
MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC
TOPSOIL
SEEDING
SODDING
SIGNING
LIGHTING
SIGNALIZATION
FENCE
GUARDRAIL
RIP RAP OR SLOPE PROTECTION
OTHER CONST. ITEMS (15\%)
MOBILIZATION
CONSTRUCTION COST
10\% ENG. \& CONT.
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST
10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING TOTAL COST *

| \$ | 122,500 |
| :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 907,500 |
| \$ | 363,900 |
| \$ | 2,273,100 |
| \$ | 560,000 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 2,616,500 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 3,455,800 |
| \$ | 299,700 |
| \$ | 129,400 |
| \$ | 41,800 |
| \$ | 38,300 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 397,900 |
| \$ | 107,400 |
| \$ |  |
| \$ | 1,697,000 |
| \$ | 651,000 |
| \$ | 13,662,000 |
| \$ | 1,366,000 |
| \$ | 15,028,000 |
| \$ | 1,503,000 |
| \$ | 16,531,000 |

[^3]Option 4.1
Route: $\quad$ SR 64
Description: From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville Const left turn lane on SR 64 and relocate Hwy 40
County: Marshall / Bedford
Length: $\quad 0.23$ Miles
Date: 7/29/2010

RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 0.06 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $=\$$ | 1,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Incidentals | 1 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 4,000 |
| Relocations | Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | 5,000 |

UTILITY RELOCATION
Reimbursable
Non-reimbursable
UTILITY COST

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST *


[^4]Option 4.1

| Route: | SR 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description: | From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR | 0 in |  |
|  | Const left turn lane on SR 64 and relo | cat |  |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |  |  |
| Length: | 1,200 LF = 0.23 Miles |  |  |
| Date: | 7/29/2010 |  |  |
| CLEAR AND GRU | UBBING | \$ | 3,000 |
| EARTHWORK |  | \$ | 13,000 |
| PAVEMENT REM | MOVAL | \$ | 15,000 |
| DRAINAGE |  | \$ | 8,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  | \$ |  |
| RAILROAD CRO | SSING OR SEPARATION | \$ |  |
| PAVING |  | \$ | 249,000 |
| RETAINING WAL | LS | \$ |  |
| MAINTENANCE | OF TRAFFIC | \$ | 1,000 |
| TOPSOIL |  | \$ | 18,000 |
| SEEDING |  | \$ | 5,000 |
| SODDING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNING |  | \$ | 1,000 |
| LIGHTING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNALIZATION |  | \$ |  |
| FENCE |  | \$ |  |
| GUARDRAIL |  | \$ |  |
| RIP RAP OR SLO | OPE PROTECTION | \$ |  |
| OTHER CONST. | ITEMS (15\%) | \$ | 47,000 |
| MOBILIZATION |  | \$ | 18,000 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 378,000 |
|  | 10\% ENG. \& CONT. | \$ | 38,000 |
|  | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 416,000 |
|  | 10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING | \$ | 42,000 |
|  | TOTAL COST * | \$ | 458,000 |

[^5]Option 4.2
Route: $\quad$ SR 64
Description: From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville Const left turn lane on SR 64 to Haskins Chapel Road and Whittaker Road
County: $\quad$ Marshall / Bedford
Length: 0.50 Miles
Date:
7/29/2010

## RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 1.12 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 4,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Incidentals | 28 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 112,000 |
| Relocations | 2 Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | 500,000 |
|  | Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | 616,000 |

## UTILITY RELOCATION

Reimbursable
Non-reimbursable

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST *


* For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

Option 4.2

| Route: Description: | SR 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville |  |  |
|  | Const left turn lane on SR 64 to Haskins Chapel Road and |  |  |
|  | Whittaker Road |  |  |
| County: Length: Date: | Marshall / Bedford |  |  |
|  | 2,662 LF = 0.50 Miles |  |  |
|  | 7/29/2010 |  |  |
| CLEAR AND GRUBBING |  | \$ | 7,000 |
| EARTHWORK |  | \$ | 28,000 |
| PAVEMENT REMOVAL |  | \$ | 31,000 |
| DRAINAGE |  | \$ | 20,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  | \$ |  |
| RAILROAD CROSSING OR SEPARATION |  | \$ |  |
| PAVING |  | \$ | 588,000 |
| RETAINING WALLS |  | \$ |  |
| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC |  | \$ | 2,000 |
| TOPSOIL |  | \$ | 29,000 |
| SEEDING |  | \$ | 8,000 |
| SODDING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNING |  | \$ | 2,000 |
| LIGHTING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNALIZATION |  | \$ |  |
| FENCE |  | \$ | 17,000 |
| GUARDRAIL |  | \$ |  |
| RIP RAP OR SLOPE PROTECTION |  | \$ |  |
| OTHER CONST. ITEMS (15\%) |  | \$ | 110,000 |
| MOBILIZATION |  | \$ | 42,000 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 884,000 |
|  | 10\% ENG. \& CONT. | \$ | 88,000 |
|  | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 972,000 |
|  | 10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING | \$ | 97,000 |
|  | TOTAL COST * | \$ | 1,069,000 |

[^6]Option 4.3
Route: $\quad$ SR 64
Description: From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville
Adding left turn onto Bethleham Road
County: Marshall / Bedford
Length: $\quad 0.33$ Miles
Date: 7/29/2010

RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 1.08 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $=\$$ | 16,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Incidentals | 5 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 20,000 |
| Relocations | Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | 36,000 |

## UTILITY RELOCATION

Reimbursable
Non-reimbursable
UTILITY COST

TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST *


[^7]Option 4.3

| Route: | SR 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description: | From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR | 0 in |  |
|  | Adding left turn onto Bethleham Road |  |  |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |  |  |
| Length: | 1,753.2 LF $=0.33$ Miles |  |  |
| Date: | 7129/2010 |  |  |
| CLEAR AND GRU | UBBING | \$ | 2,600 |
| EARTHWORK |  | \$ | 10,000 |
| PAVEMENT REM | IOVAL | \$ | 22,000 |
| DRAINAGE |  | \$ |  |
| STRUCTURES |  | \$ |  |
| RAILROAD CRO | SSING OR SEPARATION | \$ |  |
| PAVING |  | \$ | 183,000 |
| RETAINING WAL | LS | \$ |  |
| MAINTENANCE | OF TRAFFIC | \$ | 29,000 |
| TOPSOIL |  | \$ | 20,000 |
| SEEDING |  | \$ | 600 |
| SODDING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNING |  | \$ | 900 |
| LIGHTING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNALIZATION |  | \$ |  |
| FENCE |  | \$ | 19,000 |
| GUARDRAIL |  | \$ |  |
| RIP RAP OR SLO | OPE PROTECTION | \$ |  |
| OTHER CONST. | ITEMS (15\%) | \$ | 43,000 |
| MOBILIZATION |  | \$ | 17,000 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 347,000 |
|  | 10\% ENG. \& CONT. | \$ | 35,000 |
|  | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 382,000 |
|  | 10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING | \$ | 38,000 |
|  | TOTAL COST * | \$ | 420,000 |

[^8]Option 4.4
Route: $\quad$ SR 64
Description: From US 31A (SR 11)ISR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville
Adding left turn onto SR 130
County: Marshall / Bedford
Length: 0.22 Miles
Date: 7/29/2010

RIGHT OF WAY

| Land | 0.13 Acres | $x$ | $\$ 15,000$ | $=\$$ | 2,000 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Incidentals | 1 Tracts | $x$ | $\$ 4,000$ | $=\$$ | 4,000 |
| Relocations | Residences | $x$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Businesses | $x$ | $\$ 500,000$ | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | Non-Profits | $x$ |  | $=\$$ | 0 |
|  | RIGHT OF WAY COST |  |  | $\$$ | 6,000 |

UTILITY RELOCATION
Reimbursable
Non-reimbursable
UTILITY COST


TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST

TOTAL PROJECT COST *


[^9]Option 4.4

| Route: Description: | SR 64 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | From US 31A (SR 11)/SR 271 to SR 130 in Shelbyville |  |  |
|  | Adding left turn onto SR 130 |  |  |
| County: | Marshall / Bedford |  |  |
| Length: | 1,143.79 LF $=0.22$ Miles |  |  |
| Date: | 7129/2010 |  |  |
| CLEAR AND GRUBBING |  | \$ | 310 |
| EARTHWORK |  | \$ | 9,600 |
| PAVEMENT REMOVAL |  | \$ | 14,100 |
| DRAINAGE |  | \$ |  |
| STRUCTURES |  | \$ | 57,600 |
| RAILROAD CROSSING OR SEPARATION |  | \$ |  |
| PAVING |  | \$ | 139,000 |
| RETAINING WALLS |  | \$ |  |
| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC |  | \$ | 22,000 |
| TOPSOIL |  | \$ | 179,000 |
| SEEDING |  | \$ | 450 |
| SODDING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNING |  | \$ | 550 |
| LIGHTING |  | \$ |  |
| SIGNALIZATION |  | \$ |  |
| FENCE |  | \$ | 17,200 |
| GUARDRAIL |  | \$ | 27,000 |
| RIP RAP OR SLOPE PROTECTION |  | \$ |  |
| OTHER CONST. ITEMS (15\%) |  | \$ | 70,000 |
| MOBILIZATION |  | \$ | 27,000 |
|  | CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 564,000 |
|  | 10\% ENG. \& CONT. | \$ | 56,000 |
|  | TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST | \$ | 620,000 |
|  | 10\% PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING | \$ | 62,000 |
|  | TOTAL COST * | \$ | 682,000 |

[^10]
## TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PLANNING DIVISION

PROJECT NO.:
COUNTY: $\qquad$
ROUTE: SR 64
PROJECT PIN NUMBER:
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
From: US 31 at SR 64 intersection to the east (Marshall County)
To : SR 64 at SR 130 intersection to the south (Bedford County)
(1) SR 64
(2) SR 130 (3) US 31

DIVISION REQUESTING:

MAINTENANCE
PLANNING
PROG. DEVELOPMENT \& ADM. PUBLIC TRANS. \& AERO.

PAVEMENT DESIGN
STRUCTURES
SURVEY \& DESIGN
TRAFFIC SIGNAL DESIGN OTHER
$\qquad$ YEAR PROJECT PROGRAMMED FOR CONSTRUCTION:
PROJECTED LETTING DATE: $\qquad$
TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT:

1

| BASE YEAR |  | DESIGN YEAR |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { DESIGN } \\ \text { ROADWAY } \\ \text { \% TRUCKS } \end{gathered}$ |  | DESIGNAVERAGEDAILY LOADS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AADT | YEAR | AADT | DHV | \% | YEAR | DIR.DIST. | DHV | AADT | FLEX | RIGID |
| 6000 | 2014 | 8,200 | 656 | 8 | 2034 | 60-40 | 8 | 12 |  |  |
| 2,700 | 2014 | 4,100 | 369 | 9 | 2034 | 65-35 | 9 | 13 |  |  |
| 9,000 | 2014 | 13,000 | 1,300 | 10 | 2034 | 55-45 | 5 | 8 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

REQUESTED BY: NAME $\qquad$
REVIEWED BY: TONY ARMSTRONG
DATE
TRANSPORTATION MANAGER 1
SUITE 1000, JAMES K. POLK BUILDING
APPROVED BY: BILL HART
DATE
TRANSPORTATION MANAGER 2
SUITE 1000, JAMES K. POLK BUILDING

## COMMENTS:

Traffic based on count stations $23,24,84,47,48,52$, and 53 and growth trends within the limits of the project.

# Amended Traffic Forecast <br> SR 64 <br> Marshall/Bedford County, Tennessee 

## Prepared for:

Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT)

Prepared by:
Palmer Engineering

March 2010

## Introduction

The purpose of this document is to summarize the steps taken by Palmer Engineering to prepare the traffic forecast for the SR 64/US 31, SR 271/US 31, and SR 64/Hwy 40 intersections in Marshall County, Tennessee and the SR 64/Haskins Chapel Rd, SR 64/Whitaker Rd, SR 64/Bethlehem Church Rd and SR 64/SR 130 intersections in Bedford County, Tennessee for the Tennessee Department of Transportation (TDOT). The study area begins on US 31 where SR 64 intersects to the east and extends approximately 12.5 miles to SR 64 where SR 130 intersects to the South. Figure 1 shows the study corridor.

This report includes the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) and Design Hourly Volumes (DHV) forecast for the base year 2014 and future year 2034.


Figure 1: Vicinity Map

## Intersection Turning Movement Volumes

Turning movement counts were performed by Palmer Engineering on Wednesday, July 22 and Thursday, July 23, 2009 between 6:00-9:00 AM, 11:00 AM - 1:00 PM, and 3:00-6:00 PM for the following intersections:

- SR 64 and US 31
- SR 271 and US 31
- SR 64 and SR 130

An additional count was requested and performed by Palmer Engineering on Wednesday, February 10 and Thursday, February 18, 2010 between 6:00-9:00 AM, 11:00 AM - 1:00 PM, and 3:00-6:00 PM for the following intersections:

- SR 64 and Highway 40
- SR 64 and Haskins Chapel Road
- SR 64 and Whitaker Road
- SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road


## Methodology

The turning movement counts collected by Palmer Engineering were adjusted based on the Average Monthly Variation Factors provided by TDOT. The variation factor of 1.00 was used for counts collected on Wednesday's in July on Rural Other roadways while an adjustment factor of 0.95 was used for counts collected on Thursday's in July on Rural Other roadways. For counts on Wednesday's in February on Rural Other roadways, variation factors of 1.02 were applied, while variation factors of 1.01 were applied to Rural Other roadways on counts taken on Thursday's in February. Volumes were then increased by $20 \%$ at the direction of TDOT to get from peak hour to design hour volumes.

Historical ADAM data for count stations 23, 24, 84, 47, 48, 52, and 53 were compared to 2009 and 2010 field counts and determined to be consistent.

Raw volume data from the count stations for the same timeframe as the field count were used to determine an expansion factor of 1.80 for the SR 64 and US 31 intersection. An expansion factor of 1.85 was used for the SR 271 and US 31 intersection as well as the SR 64 and SR 130 intersection, the SR 64 and Haskins Chapel Road intersection, the SR 64 and Whitaker Road intersection, and the SR 64 and Bethlehem Church Road intersection. The 8 hour field counts were then expanded to 24 hr counts based on these factors. The 2009 and 2010 ADT volumes were forecasted to 2014 and 2034 using historical growth rates (ranging from $1.22 \%$ to 1.87\%) since model data was not available.

ADT turning movements were proportioned based on the 8 hour field counts. The AM and PM Design Hour turning movements were based on their respective peak hour from the field counts.

## K Factors

K Factors were calculated based on the turning movement counts conducted by Palmer Engineering and historical trends. A K Factor between $4.3 \%$ and $11.1 \%$ was used for the AM peak hour. A K Factor between $8.0 \%$ and $13.8 \%$ was used for the PM peak hour.

## Truck Percentages

Counts conducted by Palmer Engineering categorized traffic by Cars, Pick-Ups, \& Panels; Other Single Units; and Combinations. The percent of Other Single Units by approach ranged from $0.8 \%$ to $5.9 \%$. The percent of Combinations by approach ranged from $0.6 \%$ to $5.4 \%$.


## Turning Movement Counts
















## TPR Stakeholders Meeting <br> SR 64, From US 31A in Marshall County to SR 130 in Bedford County

 Tuesday, December 22, 2009Sign-in Sheet

| Name | Representing | Email / Phone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Terry York | Paumer engingering Co | tyork@palmernet.com 615.297-8957 |
| 2. Todd Kemp | Palmer engineering Co | tkempopalmernet.com 615-297-8957 |
| Bob Allen | TDOT-Env. Div. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Bob. Allen } Q+\left\{g^{90}\right. \\ & 615-263-2468 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4. Paul lane | TDOT - Planding | Paul.Lane eta.gov 615-253-2432 |
| 5. Gena Gilliam | TDOT-Planning | gena.gilliam@tn.gov (615) 253-7692 |
| Terrance Hill | TDOT-Lang Range Planning | $\text { terronce. nilletn.gor (u/5) } 532-58$ |
| 7. Gary Fottrell | FHWA | gary. fottrell e dotigov |
| 8. Mike Wiles | MARSHALL COUNTY | MIKE.WILES © MARS |
| 9. JOE BOYD LIGGETT | MARSHALL COUNTY MAYYOR | JBL @MARSHALL COUNTYTN. COM |
| 10. Don neison | marstall county zoninc | DON. NELSON@ mars hall countytn. |
| 11. Engene Ray | Bedford County mayon | E. RAY Countimayorlbell sowth, wet |
| Stanter Smotherman | Bedfoad Co. Raso Smpt. | Highway 2 cafur wat |
| 13. Lesu Cross | SCTDD-RPO | lcross@ sctdd.org/931.490-5890 |
| 14. Wallace Aatinright | Ciry of Syelbyulle - mayon | Wallace.CarTuruchur@stebbyullete or |
| 15. Mark C/anton | City of Shelbyrille Tablic Wores | mark. clan ta Cshelbyullth or |

## Stakeholder Meeting Notes

- The meeting was held on Tuesday, December 22, 2009 beginning at 9:00 AM at the TDOT Construction Office in Belfast Tennessee. Attached is the sign in sheet of those present for the meeting.
- The meeting began with introductions of those present. Following was a brief description of the study corridor and a brief history of events that have taken place up to the beginning of this TPR. Provided for all attendees was a layout out map showing the study corridor. In addition, they were provided an aerial display of the route with environmental features and landmarks noted.
- We began by asking the group for input concerning current and future land use information that would be useful in preparing this report. There was no solid input concerning future developments along the corridor.
- We discussed environmental issues and concerns and asked for any further features we should be aware of. None were mentioned.
- We discussed the crash history along the corridor. The group indicated that run offs, rear ends and side swipes were there major concerns.
- There was a period of open discussion prior to the group gathering for the drive through of the corridor.
- The meeting and drive through concluded at approximately noon.


## TD(1)T

# Tennessee Department of Transportation EARLY ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING PROCESS (EES) PROJECT SCORING 

## Project Score Factors

|  | Total Impacts <br> Evaluated | Total Impacts <br> to Evaluate | EES Evaluation |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Project Impact Areas: | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | Complete |
| Date of Evaluation: | June 26, 2009 |  |  |
| Evaluation done by: | Gena Gilliam |  |  |
| County: | Transportation Planner 3 |  |  |
| Route: | Marshall/ Bedford |  |  |
| PIN: | State Route 64 |  |  |
| Termini: | From State Route 11/271 to State Route 130 |  |  |


| Impact Ranking of Features Evaluated: | Total by Rank |
| :--- | :--- |
| Features with No Impact | 9 |
| Bat |  |
| TDEC Conservation Sites \& TDEC Scenic Waterways |  |
| Superfund Sites |  |
| Caves |  |
| Pyritic Rock |  |
| Railroads |  |
| Tennessee Natural Areas Program |  |
| Wildlife Management Areas |  |
| TWRA Lakes \& Other Public Lands | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| Features with Low Impact | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| Features with Moderate Impact |  |
| Cemetery Sites \& Cemetery Properties |  |
| National Register Sites |  |

## Features with Substantial Impact

Large Wetland Impacts

Community Impacts Present:

## Institutions:

Church
Populations:
No population present
Linguistically isolated populations
Populations below poverty - State average- 13\%

## Impacts Evaluated Within 1,000 Ft of Study Area

## CEMETERY SITES \& CEMETERY PROPERTIES

Impact

| Project Impact |
| :--- | :--- |
| (Environmental, Time, |
| Cost, Design, and |$\quad$| Voderate - Medium impact on environment is anticipated as there is a cemetery within the |
| :--- |
| Maintenance) |$\quad$| project study area or corridor. It is possible to avoid impacts to the cemetery. Although the |
| :--- |
| cemetery site is present in the study area or corridor, it is possible to avoid impacts to the |
| cemetery. An environmental impact may still result and necessitate an archaeological |
| review as part of NEPA. A moderate level of environmental documentation and time will |
| be required to proceed with development of the project, including steps reach 'no adverse |
| effect' and/or de minimus impact determination on the impacts to the cemetery. |

## INSTITUTIONS \& SENSITIVE COMMUNITY POPULATIONS

| Sensitive Populations Project Impact: | Present | Not Present |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Institutions: | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Hospital | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| School | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Church | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Public Building | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Populations: | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| No population present | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| 65 and older populations | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Disability populations | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Households without a vehicle | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| Minority populations 24\% |  |  |
| Linguistically isolated populations |  |  |


| Populations below poverty - State average $-13 \%$ | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Populations below poverty - State average $-27 \%$ | $\Gamma$ | $\Gamma$ |

## BAT

Impact

Project Impact
(Environment, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

None - No project impact is anticipated. There is no occurrence of Indiana or gray bats within 4 miles of the proposed project study area or corridor.

## RAILROADS

Impact

Project Impact (Environment, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

None - No impact on the project is anticipated. There are no railroads located within the project study area or corridor.

## Impacts Evaluated Within 2,000 Ft of Study Area

## NATIONAL REGISTER SITES

## Impact

Project Impact
(Environmental, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

V Moderate - Medium impact on the project is anticipated as there is a National Register historic property within the project study area or corridor. It is possible to avoid a taking of the historic property. There may be visual or audible effects upon the survey site and/or historic property that need to be considered and minimized. An environmental impact may still result and necessitate coordination with State Historic Preservation Office as part of NEPA. With more precise project location and design, direct impacts of the tract can be avoid and not require any taking of the surveyed sites or listed properties. Indirect effects (visual and audible) upon the surveyed sites or listed properties need to be reviewed.

## SUPERFUND SITES

Impact

Project Impact (Environment, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

V None - No project impact is anticipated as there are no known contaminated land tracts abutting or within the project study area or corridor.

## PYRITIC ROCK

## Impact

Project Impact (Environment, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

$\sqrt{V}$ None - No project impact is anticipated. Pyritic rock is not known to occur in the study area/corridor or project does not involve excavation. Limestone (symbolized as dark green) and dolomite (symbolized as light green) are present.

## TWRA LAKES \& OTHER PUBLIC LANDS

## Impact

Project Impact (Environment, Time, Cost, Design, and Maintenance)

$\sqrt{ }$ None - No impact on the project is anticipated as there area no parks located within or abutting the project study area or corridor.

## Impacts Evaluated Within 4,000 Ft of Study Area

## TERRESTRIAL SPECIES

## Impact

| Project Impact |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| (Environment, Time, | VModerate - Medium impact on the project is likely as there is a known federally-protected <br> terrestrial species or a state protected species with a status of threatened or endangered <br> located within the project study area or corridor, and it is possible to avoid any impacts to <br> the species with additional design. Additional alternatives will likely eliminate impacts to <br> the species. Additional design alternatives and minimizations may be required if additional <br> populations are found during required field surveys. |
| Maintenance) |  |

## TDEC CONSERVATION SITES \& TDEC SCENIC WATERWAYS

## Impact

| Project Impact <br> (Environment, Time, <br> Cost, Design, <br> Maintenance) | Vone - No project impact is expected as there are no scenic waterways or TDEC <br> Conservation Sites within project study area or corridor. |
| :--- | :--- |

## LARGE WETLAND IMPACTS

## Impact

Project Impact
(Environment, Time, Cost, Design, Maintenance)

F Substantial-Regions 1, 2, and 3: A substantial impact to the project is probable as there is greater than 2 acres of wetlands within the project study area or corridor. Compensatory mitigation will be required. Design effort will be needed to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands to the maximum extent practicable. If a floodplain is crossed by the project, floodplain culverts may be necessary.

## TENNESSEE NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM

## Impact

| Project Impact | F None - No impact on the project is anticipated as the project study area or corridor does not |
| :--- | :--- |

(Environment, Time, include a Natural Area. Cost, Design, and
Maintenance)

## WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT AREAS

Impact

| Project Impact |
| :--- |
| (Environment, Time, |
| Cost, Design, and |
| Maintenance) |

$\sqrt{ }$ None - No project impact is anticipated as a WMA does not abut nor is located within the project study area or corridor.

## Impacts Evaluated Within 10,000 Ft of Study Area

## AQUATIC SPECIES

Impact

| Project Impact | FModerate - Medium impact on the project is expected as there is a known occurrence of <br> federally-protected aquatic species or a state protected species with a status of threatened or <br> environment, Time, <br> endangered located within the project study area or corridor. Additional alternatives could <br> likely reduce species impacts. Consultation with the US Fish and Widlife Service andor and <br> the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency will be required possibly resulting in a survey <br> for the species. Special construction considerations may be required. |
| :--- | :--- |

## CAVES

## Impact

| Project Impact <br> Environment, Time, <br> Cost, Design, and <br> Maintenance) | None - No project impact is anticipated as there are no caves in the project study area or <br> corridor. |
| :--- | :--- |

## EES Report

| PIN 112890.00 <br> 1,000 Foot Corridor | Study Line ID: <br> Version Date: <br> Created by: | 112890_0201V01 <br> June 23, 2009 <br> CHARLES GILLIHAN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cemetery Sites \& Cemetery Properties |  |  |
| Cemetery Sites | Total $=$ | 7 |
| Confederate Memorial Park |  |  |
| Wheel Cemetery |  |  |
| Marsh Cemetery |  |  |
| Doughan Cemetery |  |  |
| New Bethel Cemetery |  |  |
| Brame Cemetery |  |  |
| Muse Cemetery |  |  |
| Cemetery Property | None we | found |
| Institutions \& Sensitive Community Populations |  |  |
| Institutions: | Total |  |
| Church <br> New Bethe | urch |  |
| Populations: |  |  |
| No population present | Present |  |
| 65 \& older populations | None we | found |
| Disability populations | None we | found |
| Households without a vehicle | None we | found |
| Minority populuations 24\% | None we | found |
| Linguistically isolated populations | Present |  |
| Populations below poverty-State average-13\% | Present |  |
| Populations below poverty-State average-27\% | None we | found |
| Bat | None we | found |
| Railroads | None we | found |

## EES Report



## EES Report

| PIN 112890.00 | Study Line ID: <br> Version Date: <br> 112890_0201V01 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Created by: | June 23, 2009 |
| CHARLES GILLIHAN |  |  |

## TDEC Conservation Sites \& TDEC Scenic Waterways

TDEC Conservation Sites
TDEC Scenic Waterways
Large Wetland Impacts
PEM1A
PEM1C
PEM1C
PEM1Cx
PEM1Cx
PEM1Cx
PEM1Cx
PEM1Cx
PEM1F
PFO1A
POWF
POWFx
POWH
POWH
POWH
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh
POWHh

None were found
None were found
Total Acerage $=65.02$
0.27 acres
0.40 acres
0.55 acres
0.26 acres
0.16 acres
0.27 acres
0.29 acres
0.26 acres
0.74 acres
2.33 acres
0.17 acres
0.29 acres
0.22 acres
0.21 acres
0.51 acres
0.35 acres
1.18 acres
0.31 acres
1.03 acres
0.83 acres
0.38 acres
0.47 acres
0.75 acres
0.26 acres
0.27 acres
0.30 acres
0.30 acres
0.36 acres
0.31 acres

| PIN 112890.00 | Study Line ID: | $112890 \_0201$ V01 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4,000 Foot Corridor | Version Date: | June 23, 2009 |
|  | Created by: | CHARLES GILLIHAN |


| POWHh | 0.32 | acres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POWHh | 0.32 | acres |
| POWHh | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHh | 0.20 | acres |
| POWHh | 1.03 | acres |
| POWHh | 0.39 | acres |
| POWHh | 0.68 | acres |
| POWHh | 0.29 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.28 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.51 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.57 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.26 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.23 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.32 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.50 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.21 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.29 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.62 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.23 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.70 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.29 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.17 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.25 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.17 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.23 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.51 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.17 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.38 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.35 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.27 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.34 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.19 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.30 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.35 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.41 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.17 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.16 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.21 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.23 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.61 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.44 | acres |


| PIN 112890.00 | Study Line ID: | $112890 \_0201$ V01 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4,000 Foot Corridor | Version Date: | June 23, 2009 |
|  | Created by: | CHARLES GILLIHAN |


| POWHx | 0.27 | acres |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POWHx | 0.29 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.33 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.33 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.16 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.28 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.38 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.21 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.81 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.30 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.16 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.38 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.18 | acres |
| POWHx | 9.72 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.22 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.26 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.40 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.37 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.14 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.33 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.37 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.17 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.39 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.65 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.22 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.41 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.23 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.35 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.39 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.19 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.61 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.34 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.15 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.16 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.24 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.27 | acres |
| POWHx | 0.19 | acres |

PIN $\quad 112890.00$
4,000 Foot Corridor

Study Line ID: 112890_0201V01<br>Version Date: June 23, 2009<br>Created by: CHARLES GILLIHAN

| POWHx | 0.32 | acres |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| POWHx | 0.33 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.21 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.48 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.34 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.58 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.55 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.42 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.44 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.53 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.32 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.37 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.31 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.27 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.35 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.37 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.27 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.33 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.39 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.45 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.44 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.31 | acres |  |
| POWHx | 0.54 | acres |  |
| PUSA | 0.42 | acres |  |
| PUSA | 0.21 | acres |  |
| PUSC | 0.26 | acres |  |
| PUSC | 0.32 | acres |  |
| PUSC | 0.28 | acres |  |
| PUSC | 0.15 | acres |  |
| PUSCh | 1.48 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.13 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.34 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.24 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.38 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.31 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.20 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.49 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.30 | acres |  |
| PUSCx | 0.34 | acres |  |
| Tennessee Natural Areas Program |  |  | None were found |
| Wildlife Management Areas |  |  | None were found |

## EES Report

| PIN 112890.00 <br> 10,000 Foot Corridor | Study Line ID: <br> Version Date: <br> Created by: | 112890_0201V01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | June 23, 2009 |
|  |  | CHARLES GILLIHAN |
| Aquatic Species | Total $=4$ | 4 USESA SPROT |
| Etheostoma striatulum |  | T |
| Toxolasma lividus |  |  |
| Etheostoma luteovinctum |  | D |
| Etheostoma luteovinctum |  | D |
| Caves | None were found |  |

MARSHALL County - SR064
COUNTY: MARSHALL


BEDFORD County - SR064
COUNTY: BEDFORD


| County: | Bedford | Station Number: 000101 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | 1988 | Station Type: | Other Rural | Station Out: | NO |
| Location: | NEAR MARSHALL CO LINE |  |  |  |  |


| Month | Year | Average <br> Weekday <br> Traffic | Average Daily <br> Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | 1985 | 98 | 108 | 105 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1986 | 83 | 95 | 93 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 105 | 120 | 117 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1988 | 190 |  | 214 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 1989 | 260 |  | 255 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 209 |  | 217 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1991 | 331 | 328 | 321 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1992 | 406 | 406 | 398 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 1993 | 370 | 362 | 354 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 1994 | 396 | 388 | 380 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1995 | 338 | 348 | 341 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 428 | 415 | 407 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 426 | 439 | 430 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 1998 |  |  | 440 | 0.98 | EST |
| 06 | 1999 | 496 | 481 | 471 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2000 |  |  | 506 | 0.98 | EST |
| 02 | 2001 | 567 | 595 | 583 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2002 | 0 | 0 | 580 | 0.98 | EST |
| 08 | 2003 | 554 | 531 | 521 | 0.98 |  |
| 10 | 2004 | 0 | 0 | 536 | 0.98 | EST |
| 06 | 2005 | 179 | 172 | 552 | 0.98 | ACTUAL $=168$ |
| 10 | 2006 | 725 | 703 | 689 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 2007 | 707 | 672 | 658 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2008 | 632 | 613 | 601 | 0.98 |  |
| 11 | 2009 | 636 | 617 | 605 | 0.98 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 711 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 734 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 756 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 779 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 802 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 825 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 847 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 870 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 893 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 916 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 938 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 961 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 984 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 1,007 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 1,029 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 1,052 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 1,075 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 1,098 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 1,120 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 1,143 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 1,166 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2031 | 0 | 0 | 1,189 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2032 | 0 | 0 | 1,211 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2033 | 0 | 0 | 1,234 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2034 | 0 | 0 | 1,257 | 0.00 |



Forecast Line based on years 2010-2034 and is calculated based on years 1985-2009 Growth Factor: 3.307

| County: | Marshall | Station Number: 000084 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | 483 | Station Type: | Other Rural |  |
| Location: | NE OF LEWISBURG |  |  | Station Out: NO |


| Month | Year | Average <br> Weckday <br> Traffic | Average Daily <br> Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | 1985 | 780 | 866 | 857 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1986 | 816 | 930 | 920 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 877 | 1,044 | 1,034 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1988 | 862 |  | 905 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1989 | 811 |  | 955 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 481 | 0 | 920 | 0.99 | ACTUAL $=514$ |
| 02 | 1991 | 1,122 | 1,324 | 1,311 | 0.99 |  |
| 01 | 1992 | 1,006 | 1,237 | 1,225 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1993 | 1,075 | 1,043 | 1,033 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1994 | 1,109 | 1,076 | 1,065 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1995 | 857 | 900 | 891 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 1,067 | 1,024 | 1,014 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1997 |  |  | 1,010 | 0.99 | EST |
| 02 | 1998 | 917 | 972 | 962 | 0.99 |  |
| 06 | 1999 |  |  | 1,022 | 0.99 | EST |
| 07 | 2000 | 748 | 726 | 719 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 2001 | 0 | 0 | 889 | 0.99 | EST |
| 07 | 2002 | 0 | 0 | 956 | 0.99 | EST |
| 07 | 2003 | 688 | 660 | 653 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 2004 | 562 | 584 | 578 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 2005 | 605 | 575 | 569 | 0.99 |  |
| 08 | 2006 | 520 | 489 | 484 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2007 | 625 | 606 | 600 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 2008 | 424 | 416 | 411 | 0.99 |  |
| 01 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 595 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 573 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 550 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 528 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 506 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 483 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 461 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 439 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 416 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 394 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 371 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 349 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 327 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 304 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 282 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 260 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 237 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 215 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 193 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 170 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 148 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 0.00 |



| County: | Marshall | Station Number: 000024 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | SR-271 | Station Type: $\quad$ Other Rural | Station Out: NO |

Location: NEAR BEDFORD CO LINE

| Month | Year | Average <br> Weekday <br> Traffic | Average Daily Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03 | 1985 | 353 | 392 | 388 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1986 | 338 | 385 | 381 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 372 | 443 | 439 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1988 | 340 |  | 356 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1989 | 355 |  | 418 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 464 |  | 496 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1991 | 425 | 502 | 497 | 0.99 |  |
| 01 | 1992 | 426 | 524 | 519 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1993 | 556 | 539 | 534 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1994 | 654 | 634 | 628 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1995 | 433 | 433 | 429 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 548 | 526 | 521 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 599 | 617 | 611 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1998 | 610 | 647 | 640 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 1999 | 716 | 673 | 666 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2000 | 719 | 697 | 690 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 2001 | 723 | 752 | 744 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 2002 | 671 | 631 | 624 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2003 | 678 | 650 | 644 | 0.99 |  |
| 09 | 2004 | 644 | 611 | 605 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 2005 | 694 | 659 | 653 | 0.99 |  |
| 08 | 2006 | 702 | 660 | 653 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2007 | 711 | 690 | 683 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 2008 | 624 | 612 | 605 | 0.99 |  |
| 01 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 726 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 739 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 752 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 766 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 779 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 792 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 805 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 819 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 832 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 845 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 859 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 872 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 885 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 899 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 912 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 925 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 939 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 952 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 965 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 978 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 992 | 0.00 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 1,005 | 0.00 |



Forecast Line based on years 2009-2030 and is calculated based on years 1985-2008 Growth Factor: 1.868

| County: | Marshall | Station Number: 000023 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | SR-64 | Station Type: | Other Rural | Station Out: |
| Location: | NEAR BEDFORD CO LINE |  |  |  |


| Month | Year | Average <br> Weekday <br> Traffic | Average <br> Daily <br> Traffic | Annual <br> Average <br> Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 03 | 1985 | 2,616 | 2,904 | 2,730 | 0.94 | LOOKS HIGH |
| 02 | 1986 | 2,234 | 2,547 | 2,394 | 0.94 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 2,590 | 3,082 | 2,897 | 0.94 |  |
| 03 | 1988 | 2,701 |  | 2,742 | 0.94 |  |
| 02 | 1989 | 2,531 |  | 2,831 | 0.94 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 3,594 | 0 | 2,900 | 0.94 | ACTUAL $=3649$ |
| 02 | 1991 | 2,655 | 3,053 | 2,870 | 0.94 |  |
| 01 | 1992 | 1,830 | 2,251 | 2,860 | 0.94 | ACTUAL $=2116$ |
| 05 | 1993 | 3,043 | 2,982 | 2,803 | 0.94 |  |
| 04 | 1994 | 3,543 | 3,437 | 3,231 | 0.94 |  |
| 02 | 1995 | 2,981 | 2,981 | 2,802 | 0.94 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 3,763 | 3,650 | 3,431 | 0.94 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 3,863 | 3,979 | 3,740 | 0.94 |  |
| 02 | 1998 | 3,769 | 3,995 | 3,755 | 0.94 |  |
| 05 | 1999 | 3,905 | 3,710 | 3,487 | 0.94 |  |
| 07 | 2000 | 3,136 | 3,042 | 3,518 | 0.94 | ACTUAL $=2859$ |
| 03 | 2001 | 4,772 | 4,963 | 3,587 | 0.94 | ACTUAL $=4665$ |
| 09 | 2002 | 3,235 | 3,203 | 3,011 | 0.94 |  |
| 07 | 2003 | 4,195 | 4,027 | 3,785 | 0.94 |  |
| 09 | 2004 | 4,456 | 4,233 | 3,979 | 0.94 |  |
| 04 | 2005 | 4,146 | 3,939 | 3,702 | 0.94 |  |
| 08 | 2006 | 3,683 | 3,462 | 3,254 | 0.94 |  |
| 07 | 2007 | 3,700 | 3,589 | 3,374 | 0.94 |  |
| 05 | 2008 | 3,654 | 3,581 | 3,366 | 0.94 |  |
| 01 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 3,779 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 3,824 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 3,870 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 3,915 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 3,961 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 4,006 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 4,052 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 4,097 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 4,143 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 4,188 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 4,233 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 4,279 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 4,324 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 4,370 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 4,415 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 4,461 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 4,506 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 4,552 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 4,597 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 4,643 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 4,688 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 4,734 | 0.00 |



Forecast Line based on years 2009-2030 and is calculated based on years 1985-2008

| County: | Bedford |  | Station Number: |  | 000047 | Station Out: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route: | 1036 |  | Station Type: | Other Ru |  |  |
| Location: | HASKINS CH - NEAR MARSHALL CO LINE |  |  |  |  |  |
| Month | Year | Average Weekday Traffic |  | Annual Average Daily | Axle <br> Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| 02 | 1985 | 433 | 480 | 475 | 0.99 | ACTAL $=701$ |
| 02 | 1986 | 538 | 613 | 607 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 470 | 536 | 530 | 0.99 |  |
| 02 | 1988 | 514 |  | 585 | 0.99 |  |
| 06 | 1989 | 569 |  | 563 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 523 |  | 549 | 0.99 |  |
| 09 | 1991 | 511 | 506 | 501 | 0.99 |  |
| 09 | 1992 | 708 | 708 | 520 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 1993 | 646 | 633 | 626 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 1994 | 700 | 686 | 679 | 0.99 |  |
| 05 | 1995 | 650 | 670 | 663 | 0.99 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 758 | 735 | 728 | 0.99 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 780 | 803 | 795 | 0.99 |  |
| 06 | 1998 |  |  | 810 | 0.99 | EST |
| 06 | 1999 | 833 | 808 | 800 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2000 |  |  | 814 | 0.99 | EST |
| 02 | 2001 | 984 | 1,033 | 1,023 | 0.99 |  |
| 06 | 2002 | 0 | 0 | 902 | 0.99 | EST |
| 08 | 2003 | 833 | 799 | 791 | 0.99 |  |
| 10 | 2004 | 416 | 391 | 822 | 0.99 | ACTUAL $=387$ <br> AADT GREATER THAN <br> EXPECTED VALUE <br> BASED ON PREVIOUS <br> YEARS DATA |
| 06 | 2005 | 1,027 | 986 | 976 | 0.99 |  |
| 10 | 2006 | 1,037 | 1,006 | 996 | 0.99 |  |
| 06 | 2007 | 1,276 | 1,212 | 1,026 | 0.99 |  |
| 07 | 2008 | 474 | 460 | 929 | 0.99 | $\mathrm{ACTUAL}=455$ |
| 11 | 2009 | 912 | 885 | 876 | 0.99 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 1,026 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 1,047 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 1,069 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 1,091 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 1,113 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 1,134 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 1,156 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 1,178 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 1,199 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 1,221 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 1,243 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 1,265 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 1,286 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 1,308 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 1,330 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 1,351 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 1,373 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 1,395 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 1,417 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 1,438 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 1,460 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2031 | 0 | 0 | 1,482 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2032 | 0 | 0 | 1,503 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2033 | 0 | 0 | 1,525 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2034 | 0 | 0 | 1,547 | 0.00 |



| County: | Bedford | Station Number: 000048 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route: | SR-64 | Station Type: | Other Rural | Station Out: |
| Location: | NEAR MARSHALL CO LINE |  |  |  |


| Month | Year | Average Weekday Traffic | Average Daily <br> Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | 1985 | 2,662 | 2,955 | 2,866 | 0.97 | LOOKS HIGH |
| 02 | 1986 | 2,203 | 2,511 | 2,436 | 0.97 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 2,298 | 2,620 | 2,541 | 0.97 |  |
| 02 | 1988 | 2,477 |  | 3,879 | 0.97 | NEW MRKT |
| 06 | 1989 | 2,521 |  | 2,445 | 0.97 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 2,467 |  | 2,537 | 0.97 |  |
| 09 | 1991 | 2,442 | 2,418 | 2,345 | 0.97 |  |
| 09 | 1992 | 2,980 | 2,980 | 2,891 | 0.97 |  |
| 07 | 1993 | 2,919 | 2,860 | 2,774 | 0.97 |  |
| 05 | 1994 | 3,114 | 3,052 | 2,960 | 0.97 |  |
| 04 | 1995 | 3,405 | 3,473 | 3,369 | 0.97 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 3,684 | 3,573 | 3,466 | 0.97 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 3,902 | 4,019 | 3,898 | 0.97 |  |
| 05 | 1998 | 4,274 | 4,018 | 3,897 | 0.97 |  |
| 06 | 1999 | 3,668 | 3,558 | 3,451 | 0.97 | 2ND COUNT |
| 07 | 2000 | 3,370 | 3,303 | 3,204 | 0.97 |  |
| 02 | 2001 | 4,166 | 4,374 | 3,640 | 0.97 | ACTUAL $=4243$ |
| 05 | 2002 | 3,798 | 3,570 | 3,463 | 0.97 |  |
| 08 | 2003 | 3,494 | 3,354 | 3,253 | 0.97 |  |
| 05 | 2004 | 3,552 | 3,445 | 3,342 | 0.97 |  |
| 06 | 2005 | 3,854 | 3,700 | 3,589 | 0.97 |  |
| 10 | 2006 | 3,700 | 3,589 | 3,481 | 0.97 |  |
| 06 | 2007 | 3,831 | 3,639 | 3,530 | 0.97 |  |
| 07 | 2008 | 3,470 | 3,366 | 3,265 | 0.97 |  |
| 11 | 2009 | 3,367 | 3,266 | 3,168 | 0.97 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 3,657 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 3,693 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 3,729 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 3,765 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 3,801 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 3,837 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 3,874 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 3,910 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 3,946 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 3,982 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 4,018 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 4,054 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 4,090 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 4,126 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 4,162 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 4,199 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 4,235 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 4,271 | 0.00 |  |


| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 4,307 | 0.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 01 | 2029 | 0 | 0 | 4,343 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2030 | 0 | 0 | 4,379 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2031 | 0 | 0 | 4,415 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2032 | 0 | 0 | 4,451 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2033 | 0 | 0 | 4,487 | 0.00 |
| 01 | 2034 | 0 | 0 | 4,523 | 0.00 |



| County: | Bedford | Station Number: 000052 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | SR-64 | Station Type: $\quad$ Other Rural | Station Out: NO |

Location: W. OF JCT SR- 64 \& SR-130

| Month | Year | Average <br> Weekday <br> Traffic | Average Daily <br> Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | 1985 | 2,936 | 3,258 | 3,160 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1986 | 2,984 | 3,402 | 3,334 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 3,206 | 3,655 | 3,582 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1988 | 3,743 |  | 3,960 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 1989 | 3,733 |  | 3,658 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 3,765 |  | 3,911 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1991 | 3,802 | 3,764 | 3,689 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1992 | 4,298 | 4,298 | 4,212 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 1993 | 4,482 | 4,392 | 4,304 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 1994 | 5,144 | 5,041 | 4,940 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1995 | 4,498 | 4,633 | 4,540 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 4,745 | 4,603 | 4,511 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1997 | 5,429 | 5,212 | 5,108 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 1998 | 5,346 | 5,025 | 4,925 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 1999 | 5,424 | 5,262 | 5,157 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2000 | 4,938 | 4,839 | 4,742 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 2001 | 5,053 | 5,306 | 5,200 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 2002 | 5,867 | 5,515 | 5,405 | 0.98 |  |
| 08 | 2003 | 5,616 | 5,391 | 5,283 | 0.98 |  |
| 10 | 2004 | 5,744 | 5,284 | 5,179 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 2005 | 0 | 0 | 5,636 | 0.98 | EST |
| 10 | 2006 | 5,457 | 5,293 | 5,187 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 2007 | 5,955 | 5,657 | 5,544 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2008 | 5,226 | 5,069 | 4,968 | 0.98 |  |
| 01 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 5,792 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 5,888 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 5,984 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 6,080 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 6,177 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 6,273 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 6,369 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 6,465 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 6,561 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 6,658 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 6,754 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 6,850 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 6,946 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 7,043 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 7,139 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 7,235 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 7,331 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 7,427 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 7,524 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2028 | 0 | 0 | 7,620 | 0.00 |  |



Forecast Line based on years 2009-2030 and is calculated based on years 1985-2008

| County: | Bedford | Station Number: 000053 |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route: | SR-130 | Station Type: Other Rural | Station Out: NO |  |

Location: S. OF JCT SR-64 \& SR-130

| Month | Year | Average Weekday Traffic | Average Daily Traffic | Annual Average Daily | Axle Adjustment Factor | Remarks |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 02 | 1985 | 951 | 1,055 | 1,034 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1986 | 1,378 | 1,571 | 1,540 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1987 | 1,251 | 1,426 | 1,397 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 1988 | 1,777 |  | 2,003 | 0.98 | STA 72 UP |
| 06 | 1989 | 1,403 |  | 1,375 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1990 | 1,850 |  | 1,922 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1991 | 1,650 | 1,634 | 1,601 | 0.98 |  |
| 09 | 1992 | 1,910 | 1,910 | 1,872 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 1993 | 2,270 | 2,224 | 2,179 | 0.98 | STA 72 UP |
| 05 | 1994 | 1,975 | 1,936 | 1,897 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1995 | 2,394 | 2,442 | 2,393 | 0.98 |  |
| 04 | 1996 | 2,340 | 2,270 | 2,225 | 0.98 |  |
| 03 | 1997 | 2,266 | 2,334 | 2,287 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 1998 | 2,573 | 2,419 | 2,371 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 1999 | 2,111 | 2,048 | 2,007 | 0.98 | 2ND COUNT |
| 07 | 2000 | 2,187 | 2,143 | 2,100 | 0.98 |  |
| 02 | 2001 | 2,352 | 2,470 | 2,421 | 0.98 |  |
| 05 | 2002 | 2,596 | 2,440 | 2,391 | 0.98 |  |
| 08 | 2003 | 2,843 | 2,729 | 2,674 | 0.98 |  |
| 10 | 2004 | 2,694 | 2,478 | 2,429 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 2005 | 2,360 | 2,266 | 2,220 | 0.98 |  |
| 10 | 2006 | 2,889 | 2,802 | 2,746 | 0.98 |  |
| 06 | 2007 | 2,591 | 2,461 | 2,412 | 0.98 |  |
| 07 | 2008 | 2,294 | 2,225 | 2,181 | 0.98 |  |
| 01 | 2009 | 0 | 0 | 2,685 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2010 | 0 | 0 | 2,734 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2011 | 0 | 0 | 2,784 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2012 | 0 | 0 | 2,833 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2013 | 0 | 0 | 2,882 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2014 | 0 | 0 | 2,931 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | 2,981 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 3,030 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2017 | 0 | 0 | 3,079 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 3,128 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2019 | 0 | 0 | 3,177 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 3,227 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2021 | 0 | 0 | 3,276 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2022 | 0 | 0 | 3,325 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2023 | 0 | 0 | 3,374 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2024 | 0 | 0 | 3,424 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2025 | 0 | 0 | 3,473 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2026 | 0 | 0 | 3,522 | 0.00 |  |
| 01 | 2027 | 0 | 0 | 3,571 | 0.00 |  |



## HIGHWAY LOG REPORT

County : (59) MARSHALL
Route No: SR064
Special Case: 0-NONE
Cnty Seq: 1

| FUNCTIONAL <br> CLASSIFICATION | PROJECT <br> NUMBER | LETTING <br> DATE | DATE <br> COMP | SURFACE WIDTH AND TYPE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



## TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

PROJECT PLANNING DHVSION
SAFETY PLANNING SECTION

## CRASH DATA REQUEST

| Requested by:Name: <br> Division: <br> Address:$\frac{\text { Gena Gilliam }}{\text { Project Planning }}$$\quad$ Date: $\underline{6 / 1 / 09}$ TDOT HQ | Telephone No.: $253-7692$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Project No.:
Location: Region: 3 County: Marshall/ Bedford City: Shelbyville
Route: SR 64
From US 31 A (SR 11/271) to SR. 130 in Shelbyville Marshall Co. LM 0.02 to 3.03; Bedford
Location on Route: Co. LM 0.00 to 9.64 SR 130
Beginning Log Mile: 0.02 Ending Log Mile: 3.03

## MAP SHOWING LOCATION MUST BE ATTACHED

TYPE OF CRASH DATA REQUESTED

Crash Listing:
Collision Diagram:
Crash Rates:
High Hazard Rank:
Update Previous Request:
Special Request:

TIME PERIOD OR YEARS REQUESTED

Describe Specifics:
(3 Years or Specify)
$\frac{\overline{2006}}{\frac{2006}{20}} \overline{2007}=\frac{2008}{2007}=\frac{2008}{\square}=\square$
$\frac{2006}{\frac{\pi}{2006}} \overline{\frac{2007}{2007}}=\frac{2008}{2008}=\square$


Request Analyzed By:
Reviewed By:


Comments:


Thasak State Route 64
Major Roads/Bedford County



| COUNTY: MARSHALL |  |  |  | COUNTY NO. 59 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE: | SR064 | SPECIAL CASE: | None | CTY SEQ: | 1 |  |
| LOG MILE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITEM } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ |  | ROUTE FEATURE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DESC } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0.000 | 3 | SR-11 NASHVILLE HWY. RT |  |  |  | 310 |
| 0.000 | 0 | BEGIN HWY. 64 |  |  |  | 920 |
| 0.000 | 9 | 1-WAY STOP / FLASHING R |  |  |  | 901 |
| 0.000 | 9 | BEGIN 55 MPH |  |  |  | 932 |
| 0.020 | 7 | RAMP TO SR-11 NASHVILLE | LT, |  |  | 712 |
| 0.030 | 7 | RAMP FROM SR-11 NASHVI | WY. RT. |  |  | 714 |
| 0.473 | 5 | A146 PARKRD. RT. |  |  |  | 520 |
| 0.711 | 5 | A119 HUNTER RD. RT. \& LT. |  |  |  | 510 |
| 0.893 | 5 | A004 HWY. 40 RT. |  |  |  | 520 |
| 0.970 | 9 | CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL |  |  |  | 913 |
| 2.246 | 5 | A139 PHILLIPS RD. RT. |  |  |  | 520 |
| 2.540 | 5 | A122 PALMETTO CEMETER |  |  |  | 530 |
| 2.989 | 5 | A140 GOLD RD. RT. |  |  |  | 520 |
| 3.030 | 1 | MARSHALL-BEDFORD COUN |  |  |  | 125 |


| COUNTY: BEDFORD |  |  | COUNTY NO. 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROUTE: | SR064 | SPECIAL CASE: None | CTY SEQ: | 1 |  |
| LOG <br> MILE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ITEM } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ | ROUTE FEATURE |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DESC } \\ & \text { CODE } \end{aligned}$ |
| 0.000 | 1 | MARSHALL-BEDFORD COUNTY LINE |  |  | 120 |
| 0.000 | 0 | BEGIN WALKING HORSE PKWY. |  |  | 920 |
| 0.000 | 9 | BEGIN 55 MPH |  |  | 932 |
| 0.290 | 9 | CULVERT: BRANCH |  |  | 980 |
| 0.473 | 5 | A124 JACK PICKLE LN. LT. |  |  | 530 |
| 0.890 | 9 | CULVERT: BRANCH |  |  | 980 |
| 1.510 | 9 | CULVERT: BRANCH |  |  | 980 |
| 1.727 | 5 | A246 MONTGOMERY RD. RT. |  |  | 520 |
| 1.850 | 9 | WHEEL CEMETERY LT. |  |  | 913 |
| 1.960 | 4 | 1036 HASKINS CHAPEL RD. LT. |  |  | 430 |
| 2.129 | 5 | A667 WHITE LN. LT. |  |  | 530 |
| 2.181 | 5 | A351 WHITAKER RD. RT. |  |  | 520 |
| 2.220 | 9 | SHILOH UNITED METHODIST CHURCH RT. |  |  | 912 |
| 2.698 | 5 | A249 JOHN PICKLE RD. RT. |  |  | 520 |
| 3.019 | 5 | A256 PERR YMAN LN. RT. \& A256 MT. LEBANON RD. LT. |  |  | 510 |
| 3.370 | 2 | BRIDGE [02SR0640001]: SINKING CREEK |  |  | 241 |
| 3.870 | 5 | A238 HENDERSON RD. RT |  |  | 520 |
| 3.870 | 4 | 2006 SIMMS RD. LT. |  |  | 430 |
| 4.650 | 2 | BRIDGE [02SR0640003]: LITTLE SINKING CREEK |  |  | 231 |
| 4.990 | 9 | W. E. T. S. COMMUNITY PARK LT. |  |  | 999 |
| 5.208 | 5 | A252 HENSLEE RD. LT. |  |  | 530 |
| 5.670 | 4 | 1988 BETHLEHEM CHURCH RD RT. |  |  | 420 |
| 5.730 | 9 | NEW BETHEL BAPTIST CHURCH \& CEMETERY LT. |  |  | 914 |
| 6.072 | 5 | A236 THOMPSON LN. LT. |  |  | 530 |
| 6.600 | 2 | BRIDGE [02SR0640005]: POWELL CREEK |  |  | 221 |
| 6.758 | 5 | A 137 COMSTOCK RD. LT. |  |  | 530 |



County Route Log Date of Crash Tine of Total
Date of Crash Time of Total Total Crash Killed inj $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 0.100 & 07 / 19 / 2007 & 1500 & 0 & \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 0.610 & 01 / 04 / 2006 & 1730 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 0.711 & 09 / 14 / 2005 & 815 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 0.711 & 10 / 03 / 2006 & 155 & 0 & 3\end{array}$ MARSHALL SR064 0.920 05/16/2007 2010 0 0 $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 1.540 & 08 / 30 / 2006 & 2130 & 0 & 1\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 2.070 & 02 / 11 / 2007 & 1100 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 2.200 & 11 / 10 / 2006 & 615 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL SR064 } & 2.450 & 12 / 06 / 2005 & 1750 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { MARSHALL } & \text { SR064 } & 2.989 & 02 / 18 / 2006 & 950 & 0\end{array} 1$

Type of Crash

| Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway |
| :--- | :--- |
| Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | Along Roadway Prop Damage (over) At an intersection Incap injury At an Intersection Prop Damage (under) Along Roadway Non-Incap Injury Along Roadway Prop Damage (over) Along Roadway Prop Damage (over) Along Roadway Prop Damage (over) Along Roadway Non-Incap Injury At an intersection

        No Contributing Actions
    Failure to Obey Traffic Controls

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { Lane Departure } \\
\text { Lane Departure } \\
\text { No Contributing Actions } \\
\text { No Contributing Actions }
\end{gathered}
$$ No Contributing Actions

Most Harmful Event
Wail
Deer (Animal)
Vehicle in Transport Utility Pole Ditch
Bullding
Other Post, Fole, Supports Deer (Animai) Deer (Animal)
Vehicle in Transport

Manner of First Colision Volicie
No Collision w/ Vehicie No Collision w/ Vehicle Angle No Collision w/ Vehicle No Collision w/ Vehicie No Collision w/ Vehicle No Collision w/ Vehicle No Collision w/ Vehicle No Collision w/ Vehicle Head-On
WEST No Adverse Cond. 9626394
SOUTH No Adverse Cond. 9405383
2 No Adverse Cond. 50078843
WEST No Adverse Cond. 9405380
4 No Adverse Cond. 50047990
WEST No Adverse Cond. 9405399
WEST No Adverse Cond. 9627124
WEST Sleet, Hail 9627069

| County | Route | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | Date of Crash | Time | Total <br> Killed | Total inj | Type of Crash | Location | Total Veh | Driver Actions | Most Harmful Event | Manner of First Collision | Vehicle Going | Weather Cond | Case Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.030 | 02/10/2007 | 1205 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Unknown Action | Other Type Non-Motorist | Unknown | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9060783 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.090 | 11/05/2007 | 510 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Deer (Animal) | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 50081338 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.580 | 03/23/2006 | 1920 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Other Animal | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029673 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.580 | 09/30/2006 | 2015 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Other Animal | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | Э405505 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.600 | 04/12/2006 | 2300 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Embankment | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311353 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 0.970 | 06/14/2005 | 9999 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 1 | Unknown Action | Fence | No Collision w/Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9626637 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 1.000 | 06/03/2007 | 2036 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | Lane Departure | hicle in Transport | Sideswipe, Opposite Dir | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 50078136 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 1.280 | 07/02/2005 | 345 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Other (Narrative) | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8247490 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 1.560 | 04/07/2006 | 54 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Other Animal | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029695 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 1.930 | 10/31/2006 | 936 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | ntive (Eating, Reading, Talking | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9061322 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 1.960 | 03/02/2005 | 1700 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | At an Intersection | 2 | Failure to Yield Right of Way | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623312 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 2.380 | 08/20/2005 | 2134 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Driving Left of Center | Ditch | No Collision w/ Vehicie | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623461 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 2.580 | 10/06/2006 | 1820 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Deer (Animal) | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311882 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 2.650 | 05/12/2005 | 1440 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Venicle in Transport | Rear-End | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8624148 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 2.920 | 05/04/2005 | 125 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623415 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.019 | 02/01/2006 | 1750 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 2 | Lane Departure | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623182 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.570 | 12/20/2005 | 715 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | Other (Narrative) | hicle in Transport | Angle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029510 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.870 | 08/26/2005 | 2000 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 1 | Lane Departure | Tree | No Collision w/ Vehicle | SOUTH | No Adverse Cond. | 3623668 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.870 | 01/31/2006 | 1820 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 1 | Lane Departure | Overiurn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029651 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.370 | 05/31/2006 | 2347 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | At an intersection | 2 | Other (Narrative) | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | EAST | Fog | 9311739 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 3.370 | 11/02/2006 | 750 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 2 | Failure to Yield Right of Way | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | SOUTH | No Adverse Cond. | 9410972 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.000 | 11/23/2007 | 1832 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Deer (Animal) | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 50133767 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.070 | 06/48/2006 | 847 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Tree | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311746 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.140 | 04/15/2007 | 1411 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Ditch | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 4 | No Adverse Cond. | 50058601 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.170 | 08/02/2005 | 1320 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (under) | Along Roadway | 1 | Other (Narrative) | Ditch | No Collision wr Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623456 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.400 | 03/18/2006 | 530 | 0 | 1 | Non-incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029728 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.570 | 11/25/2005 | 9999 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029438 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.670 | 09/25/2005 | 220 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Fence | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029284 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.770 | 04/27/2007 | 655 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 50060503 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.870 | 12/09/2006 | 1955 | 0 | 2 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9312079 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 4.970 | 03/18/2006 | 1450 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 2 | Following Improperly | Venicle in Transport | Rear-End | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029477 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.010 | 04/03/2005 | 700 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623438 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.208 | 12/06/2006 | 1845 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | At an Intersection | 2 | Improper Passing | Vehicie in Transport | Angle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9312017 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.300 | 06/20/2005 | 30 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Other (Narrative) | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9653315 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.640 | 11/11/2005 | 640 | 0 | 2 | Non-Incap Injury | At an Intersection | 2 | Improper Turn | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | SOUTH | No Adverse Cond. | 9029372 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.670 | 03/19/2005 | 1300 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623119 |


| County | Route | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | Date of Crash | Time of | Total <br> Killed | Totai Inj | Type of Crash | Location | Total <br> Veh | Driver Actions | Most Harmful Event | Manner of First Collision | Vehicle Going | Weather Cond | Case Number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.670 | 08/24/2005 | 1805 | 0 | 2 | Non-Incap Injury | At an Intersection | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Head-On | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 3623666 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.670 | 08/17/2007 | 1634 | 0 | 2 | Non-Incap Injury | At an Intersection | 1 | ntive (Eating, Reading, Talking | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 4 | No Adverse Cond. | 5009968 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.670 | 08/25/2007 | 1800 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 3 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | 4 | No Adverse Cond. | 5009673 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 5.870 | 09/04/2006 | 710 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311795 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.072 | 08/02/2005 | 1535 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (under) | At an Intersection | 2 | to Observe Warnings or Instri | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623457 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.072 | 04/07/2006 | 1248 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | SOUTH | No Adverse Cond. | 949230 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.270 | 06/17/2006 | 1820 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | ntive (Eating, Reading, Talking | Vehicle in Transport | Sideswipe, Same Dir | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029497 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.660 | 07/20/2005 | 640 | 1 | 1 | Fatai | Along Roadway | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Head-On | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623521 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.660 | 11/30/2006 | 1900 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Deer (Animal) | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9312057 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.660 | 12/20/2006 | 1726 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | to Yield Right of Way | Venicle in Transport | Angle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9312066 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.758 | 04/01/2005 | 1410 | 0 | 1 | Non-incap Injury | At an Intersection | 1 | Lane Departure | Mail Box | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | Rain | 8623435 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 6.758 | 08/18/2007 | 1615 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Sideswipe, Same Dir | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 5009967 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.120 | 10/14/2006 | 1655 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicie | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311885 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.416 | 09/27/2005 | 1615 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | At an intersection | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029287 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.416 | 07/19/2006 | 1540 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 2 | Following Improperly | Vehicle in Transport | Sideswipe, Same Dir | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311807 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.520 | 12/24/2006 | 907 | 0 | 3 | incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Other (Narrative) | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9312072 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.600 | 12/03/2006 | 350 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Bridge | 1 | Lane Departure | Bridge Rail | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9411130 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.620 | 08/19/2005 | 150 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8622960 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.720 | 04/26/2006 | 9999 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Culvert | No Coilision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311427 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.880 | 05/19/2006 | 1509 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Fence | No Colision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311729 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.927 | 06/17/2005 | 1820 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | At an intersection | 2 | Following Improperly | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 862364 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 7.927 | 10/03/2006 | 1612 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 3 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicie in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9311869 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 8.040 | 04/11/2005 | 920 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | No Contributing Actions | Vehicle in Transport | Sideswipe, Same Dir | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623345 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 8.040 | 05/06/2005 | 820 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Following Improperly | Utility Pole | No Collision wt Vehicie | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 8623023 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 8.470 | 03/43/2007 | 658 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | No Contributing Actions | Deer (Animal) | Angle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9061220 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 8.670 | 06/02/2007 | 1040 | 0 | 1 | Non-Incap Injury | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Fence | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 2 | No Adverse Cond. | 50078466 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 8.740 | 12/16/2005 | 300 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 2 | Failure to Yield Right of Way | Vehicle in Transport | Angle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029578 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.200 | 05/16/2006 | 1040 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Overturn | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029848 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.400 | 04/21/2006 | 1745 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Tree | No Collision w/ Vehicle | EAST | Rain | 9029748 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.400 | 08/09/2007 | 1630 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Ditch | No Collision w/ Vehicie | 4 | No Adverse Cond. | 50102465 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.530 | 04/26/2007 | 5 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | Along Roadway | 1 | Lane Departure | Utility Pole | No Collision w/ Vehicle | 4 | No Adverse Cond. | 5006051 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.640 | 05/07/2005 | 330 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an intersection | 1 | Lane Departure | Ditch | No Collision w/ Vehicle | WEST | No Adverse Cond. | 8622929 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.640 | 02/06/2006 | 1245 | 0 | 0 | Proo Damage (over) | At an intersection | 2 | Other (Narrative) | Vehicie in Transport | Rear-End | WEST | Rain | 9029655 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.640 | 04/27/2006 | 720 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (over) | At an Intersection | 2 | Other (Narrative) | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9029674 |
| BEDFORD | SR064 | 9.640 | 04/23/2007 | 712 | 0 | 0 | Prop Damage (under) | At an Intersection | 2 | ntive (Eating, Reading, Talking | Vehicle in Transport | Rear-End | EAST | No Adverse Cond. | 9558502 |



|  |  |  | BEG | END |  |  |  |  | US | FUNCTIONAL | ADM |  |  | GOV | ROAD |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | CTY | LOG |  |  |  |  | RTE | RTE2 | CLASS | SYS | AREA | AREA | CON | NAME | SEC_ID |
| NBR | CASE | SEQ | MILE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 0.000 | 6.600 | 23 | 13 |  |  |  | R/MIN ART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 6.600 | 11.114 | 13 |  |  |  |  | R/MIN ART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | State HWay | WALKING HORSE PKINY |  |
|  |  | 1 | 11.114 | 11.560 | 13 |  |  |  |  | R/MIN ART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKIVY | 21S0641111 |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 11.560 | 11.810 | 13 |  |  |  |  | R/MIN ART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SRO64 SR064 | 0 | 1 | 11.810 | 11.811 | 13 |  |  |  |  | U OTHPRIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 |  | STATE HWAY | LEWIS AVE. | 020150641184 |
| SR,064 SR064 | 0 | 1 | 11.811 | 12.260 | 13 |  |  |  |  | U OTH PRIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | IEWIS AVE | 020150641184 |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 11.811 12260 | 12.440 | 01 |  |  |  |  | U/MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | LANE PARKWAY |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 12.260 | 12.440 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/ MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | E. DEPOT ST |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 12.440 | 12.560 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/ MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | E. DEPOT ST | $02018064127 \%$ |
| SR264 | 0 | 1 | 12.560 | 13.334 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | StATE HWAY | E. DEPOT ST |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 13.334 | 13.590 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | E DEPOT ST |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 13.590 | 14.244 | 01 |  |  |  |  | R/MIN ART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | STATE HWY. 64 |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | , 14.244 | 15.440 | 01 |  |  |  |  | U/MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | STATE HWY. 64 |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 15.440 | 15.800 | 01 |  |  |  |  | U/ MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | RICE-COFFEE HWY. | 020150641600 |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 15.800 | 15940 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/MIN ART | STP STATE URBAN | 265 | 265 | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 15.940 | 16.021 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | STP STATE URBAN | 265 |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 16.021 | 16.030 | 23 |  |  |  |  | U/MINART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 16.030 | 21.300 | 23 |  |  |  |  | RMINART | STP STATE RURAL |  |  | STATE HWAY | WALKING HORSE PKWY |  |
| SROEA 4 | 0 | 1 | 21.300 | 21.307 | 23 |  |  |  |  | MINART | STP STATE RURAL |  | 304 | STATE HWAY | ARNOLD ST. |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 21.307 | 21.690 | 01 |  |  |  |  | RIMINARI | STP STATE RURAL |  | 304 | STATE HWAY | BLACKMAN BLVD. | 020150642197 |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 21.690 | 22.260 | 01 |  |  |  |  | R/MINARI | stp staiz rural |  |  | STATE HWAY | HIGHWAY 64 EAST |  |
| SR064 | 0 | 1 | 22.260 | 30.760 | 01 |  |  |  |  | R/MINARI | STP STATERURAL |  |  |  |  |  |

## MARSHALL County - SR064

County: MARSHALL

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Beg } \\ & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | EndLogMile | ROW | Access Control | School Truck  <br> Mll  <br> Operation Spd <br> Spd Spd <br> Spd  |  |  |  |  |  | Land Use | Thru Lanes | Nbr Lanes | Feature information |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Terrain |  |  |  | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Compasition |
| 0.000 | 3.030 | 100 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 8 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 9 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 10 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 12 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 13 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |

County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case 0-NONE County Sequence 1

| Beg <br> Log <br> Mile | $\begin{aligned} & \text { End } \\ & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | ROW | Access Control | Operation | illumination | Schoo Spd Lmt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spd } \\ & \text { Lmt } \end{aligned}$ | Truck Spd Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | Nbr Lanes | Feature Information |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Seq. \# | Type | Width | 1 Composition |
| 0.000 | 11.300 | 60 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 11.300 | 11.560 | 60 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | drainage |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | drainage |  | DITCH |
| 11.560 | 11.810 | 50 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) |  | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 11.810 | 12.260 | 50 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 30 |  | 2-ROLLING | 7-RESIDENTIAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |

County: BEDFORD
(2) Route No, SR064

Special Case 0-NONE
County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  | Featu | e inforn | mation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Log <br> Mile | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | ROW | Access Control | Operation | lliumination | Spd Lmt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spd } \\ & \text { Lmt } \end{aligned}$ | Spd Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | Nbr Lanes | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 12.260 | 12.270 | 50 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 30 |  | 2-ROLLING | 7-RESIDENTIAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | BITUMINOUS SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PARKING LANE | 10.0 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 5.0 | BITUMINOUS SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | drainage |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 7 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB ONLY |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 9 | MEDIAN | 18.0 | OTHER MOUNTABLE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 17 | drainage |  | CURB ONLY |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 13 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 15 | PARKING LANE | 10.0 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 17 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
| 12.270 | 12.310 | 102 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | YES |  | 30 |  | 2-ROLLING | 2-COMMERCIAL | 4 | 4 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
|  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 3 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 5 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 7 | LEFT TURN LANE | 12.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 9 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB ONLY |
|  |  | 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 11 | MEDIAN | 6.0 | MOUNTABLE (CONCRETE) |

County: BEDFORD


County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case 0-NONE County Sequence 1


County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case O-NONE County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  | e Inforn | mation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | Log <br> Mile | ROW | Access Control | Operation | Illumination | Spd Lmt | Spd Lmt | Spd Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | Nbr Lanes | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 13.420 | 13.520 | 100 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WA. } \end{aligned}$ | YES |  | 45 |  | 2-ROLLING | 4-FRINGE (MIX RES. COMM.) | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 3.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 12.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | MEDIAN | 12.0 | PAINTED |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | PAVEMENT | 12.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 6 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | $3.0$ | PORTLAND CEMENT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 7 | dRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
| 13.520 | 14.570 | 100 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | YES |  | 45 |  | 2-ROLLING | 4-FRINGE (MIX RES. COMM.) | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 14.570 | 15.940 | 100 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 A | ASPhALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 15.940 | 21.300 | 150 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |

County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case O-NONE County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | e Inforn | mation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Log Mile | Log <br> Mile | ROW | Access Control | Operation | lllum. ination | Spd <br> Lmt | Spd Lmt | Spd <br> Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | Nbr Lanes | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 15.940 | 21.300 | 150 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 21.300 | 21.540 | 150 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | YES |  | 30 |  | 2-ROLLING | $\begin{gathered} \text { 4-FRINGE (MIX RES. } \\ \text { COMM.) } \end{gathered}$ | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 21.540 | 22.470 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | YES |  | 30 |  | 2-ROLLING | 4-FRINGE (MIX RES. COMM.) | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | A.SPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB, GUTTER \& SIDEWALK |
| 22.470 | 22.920 | 60 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 22.920 | 24.780 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 9 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 11 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 13 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |

County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case O-NONE County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  | Infor | rmation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Nile } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | ROW | Access <br> Control | Operation | Illumination | Spd <br> Lmt | Spd Lmt | Spd <br> Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nbr } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 22.920 | 24.780 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WA } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 15 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 17 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 24.780 | 24.930 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RUPAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 24.930 | 25.820 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 25.820 | 26.000 | 120 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 26.000 | 26.010 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB AND GUTTER |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER <br> (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |

County: BEDFORD
(2) Route No. SR064

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  | re Intorm | mation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Log <br> Mile | Log <br> Mile | ROW | Access <br> Control | Operation | Illumination | Spd Lmt | Spd Lmt | Spd Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Nbr} \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 26.000 | 26.010 | 120 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLINE | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | CURE AND GUTTER |
| 26.010 | 26.100 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WA } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | drainage |  | CURB AND GUTTER |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | CURB AND GUTTER |
| 26.100 | 27.070 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | drainage |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 20.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 27.070 | 27.190 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 40 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 27.190 | 28.450 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |

County: BEDFORD
(2) Route No. SR064

Special Case O-NONE
County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | School |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  | e inform |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Log <br> Mile | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | ROW | Access Control | Operation | lliumination | Spd Lmt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spd } \\ & \text { Lmt } \end{aligned}$ | Spd <br> Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nbr } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 27.190 | 28.450 | 120 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 28.450 | 28.700 | 60 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 A | HALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 28.700 | 29.090 | 100 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 A | HALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 8.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 29.090 | 29.840 | 60 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 A | HALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 29.840 | 30.160 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 A | HALT CONCRETE |

County: BEDFORD (2) Route No. SR064 Special Case O-NONE County Sequence 1

| Beg | End |  |  |  |  | Schoo |  | Truck |  |  |  |  |  |  | Inforn | mation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Log Mile | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { Mile } \end{aligned}$ | ROW | Access <br> Control | Operation | lllumination | Spd Lmt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Spd } \\ & \text { Lmt } \end{aligned}$ | Spd Lmt | Terrain | Land Use | Thru Lanes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Nbr } \\ & \text { Lanes } \end{aligned}$ | Seq. \# | Type | Width | Composition |
| 29.840 | 30.160 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 30.160 | 30.420 | 60 | O-NONE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2-TWO } \\ & \text { WAY } \end{aligned}$ | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 A | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 2.0 | GRAVEL |
|  |  | 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 30.420 | 30.660 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | BITUMINOUS SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 22.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 7.0 | BITUMINOUS SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
| 30.660 | 30.760 | 120 | O-NONE | 2-TWO WAY | NO |  | 55 |  | 2-ROLLING | O-RURAL | 2 | 2 | 1 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | BITUMINOUS <br> SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | PAVEMENT | 24.0 | ASPHALT CONCRETE |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 4 | SHOULDER (OUTSIDE) | 10.0 | BITUMINOUS <br> SURFACE TREATED |
|  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 5 | DRAINAGE |  | DITCH |





[^0]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^1]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of 10\% per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^2]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^3]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of 10\% per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^4]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^5]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^6]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^7]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^8]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^9]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

[^10]:    * For estimating future project costs, a compounded inflation rate of $10 \%$ per year will be applied from the date of this estimate.

