



Federal Transit Administration
901 Locust Street, Suite 404
Kansas City, MO 64106
816-329-3920
816-329-3921 (fax)

Federal Highway Administration
6111 SW 29th Street, Suite 100
Topeka, KS 66614-4271
785-273-2600
785-273-2620 (fax)

U.S. Department of Transportation

November 23, 2022

Burt Morey, P.E.
Deputy Secretary and State Transportation Engineer
Kansas Department of Transportation
Topeka, KS 66603

Subject: FHWA Approval of Special Amendment #1 of the
FY 2023-2026 Kansas STIP

Dear Mr. Morey:

As requested by your November 23, 2022 letter, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has reviewed the proposed Special Amendment #1 to the FY 2023-2026 Kansas Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which includes updates to highway projects in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Based on our review, we find that this STIP Special Amendment is compliant with a statewide transportation planning process that satisfies the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135, 49 U.S.C. 5303 and 5304, and 23 CFR 450. Therefore, this STIP Special Amendment is hereby approved.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Cecelie Cochran of FHWA at (785) 273-2636.

Sincerely yours,

Richard E. Backlund, AICP
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration



Dwight D. Eisenhower State Office Building
700 S.W. Harrison Street
Topeka, KS 66603-3745

Julie L. Lorenz, Secretary
Burt Morey, P.E., Deputy Secretary and
State Transportation Engineer

Phone: 785-296-3285
Fax: 785-368-7415
kdot#publicinfo@ks.gov
<http://www.ksdot.org>
Laura Kelly, Governor

November 23, 2022

Mr. Richard Backlund
Federal Highway Administration
6111 SW 29th St., Suite 100
Topeka, KS 66614

RE: Special Amendment #1 to the 2023-2026 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

Dear Mr. Backlund,

The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) has approved Special Amendment #1 to the Kansas 2023-2026 STIP which includes projects within the Kansas City metropolitan area. This item is enclosed for your review.

We are requesting your concurrence and approval of this amendment to the 2023-2026 STIP.

The public involvement activities conducted by the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) for their Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) serve to satisfy the requirements of 23 CFR §450.326. Public comments were received and are included for your reference.

Please forward questions or comments regarding projects within the metropolitan area to Allison Smith, Bureau of Transportation Planning, at (785) 296-0341.

Sincerely,

Burt Morey, P.E.
Deputy Secretary and
State Transportation Engineer

Enclosures: MARC FFY 2022-2026 TIP Special Amendment #2 Approval Request Letter &
Related Documents

cc: Matt McDonald, FHWA-KS
Cecelie Cochran, FHWA-KS
Cathy Monroe, FTA Region VII
Eva Steinman, FTA Region VII

Mr. Richard Backlund

Page 2

November 23, 2022

Mike Moriarty, KDOT Transportation Planning
Allison Smith, KDOT Transportation Planning
Ryne Dowling, KDOT Transportation Planning
Cory Davis, KDOT Multimodal Transportation and Innovation
Matt Messina, KDOT Multimodal Transportation and Innovation
Rene Hart, KDOT Multimodal Transportation and Innovation
Tod Salfrank, KDOT Local Projects
Kimberly Marotta, KDOT Local Projects
Susie Lovelady, KDOT Program and Project Management
Linda Fritton, KDOT Program and Project Management
Lisa Roth, KDOT Program and Project Management
Marcy Anderson, KDOT Program and Project Management

600 Broadway, Suite 200
Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1659

816-474-4240
816-421-7758 FAX
marcinfo@marc.org
www.marc.org



November 22, 2022

To: KDOT and Federal Offices

Subject: 2022 Special Amendment #2 to the *FFY 2022-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)*

On November 22, 2022, the Mid-America Regional Council amended the *FFY 2022-2026 Transportation Improvement Program* for the Kansas City metropolitan region. This 2022 Special Amendment #2 consists of 3 Kansas projects.

Details of specific funding and other information are included in the project listing of the amendment and the project index list specifies the project by type (new, modified or deleted), state, and TIP number. The amendment and index list are posted on the MARC website at <https://www.marc.org/transportation/plans-and-studies/transportation-improvement-program> and are printable for filing.

MARC's Public Involvement Plan requires that proposed amendments to the TIP be released for public review and comment prior to adoption. Six comments were received during the comment period. The comments and responses from MARC are attached for your reference.

This amendment is financially constrained and maintains the financial feasibility of the *FFY 2022-2026 TIP*.

Since the MARC TIP is incorporated by reference, without modification, into the statewide transportation improvement program (STIP), the MARC TIP represents the most current listing of projects within the boundaries of the Kansas City metropolitan planning area and should be the basis for comparison of projects listed in the amendment. The MARC TIP is available for review online at: <https://www.marc.org/transportation/plans-and-studies/transportation-improvement-program>.

Please take the necessary steps to amend the STIP to include these projects. Please contact me if you have any questions about this action.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "RA" with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Ronald B. Achelpohl, P.E.
Director of Transportation & Environment

Chair
Harold Johnson Jr.
Commissioner
Unified Government
of Wyandotte County/
Kansas City, Kansas

1st Vice Chair
Carson Ross
Mayor
Blue Springs,
Missouri

2nd Vice Chair
Janeé Hanzlick
Commissioner
Johnson County,
Kansas

Treasurer
Beto Lopez
Mayor Pro Tem
Lee's Summit,
Missouri

Secretary
Damien Boley
Mayor
Smithville,
Missouri

Executive Director
David A. Warm

**Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6
Transportation Improvement Program 2nd Special Amendment
Public Comments and Proposed Responses**

TTPC Released CKC2050 Amendment #6 and Special TIP Amendment #2 for public review and comment on October 19, 2022. Eight comments were received from the public, all of which expressed concern or were in opposition to the proposed amendment. Reasoning provided for these concerns included:

- propensity of highway expansion projects to disperse land use patterns (create sprawl),
- propensity of highway expansion projects to generate induced growth in traffic,
- desire to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- impacts on climate due to growth in greenhouse gas emissions,
- high project cost and financial resources
- opportunity costs and desire for increased investments on bicycling infrastructure and public transit (including rail),
- highway capacity investments leading to inequity in access to transportation by non-drivers and public health concerns,

These comments remain consistent with feedback received in support of adoption of the overall plan, where respondents and participants of various engagement activities “heavily favor finding new money to invest in transit and did not favor spending money on new roadway capacity to serve possible future development” (<https://connectedkc.org/plan-development/>)

All received comments and proposed MARC responses are included below:

Name: Ron McLinden

Comment #1

“How would this plan change if the Kansas City Region were to adopt a policy to limit outward expansion (AKA sprawl) as part of a Climate Action KC strategy to reduce VMT and GHG emissions?”

Response to Comment #1: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include active transportation, land use, public transit, roadway operational and capacity strategies. MARC shares concerns about any project’s potential impacts of induced traffic demand, growth in dispersed land use patterns and emissions and subsequent impact on climate, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network which is supported by adequate financial resources for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MARC policy does not currently seek to limit outward expansion of urban footprint. However, MARC policy favors the focus of energy around key activity centers and the corridors that connect them to help promote livable, vibrant resilient and adaptable places. Further, MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies, as is the case with this project.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Adam Rossi

Comment #2:

“I am disappointed in MARC's approach to reduce congestion. Adding toll lanes will only encourage people to use cars to get places, which is not a forward-thinking way to address Kansas City's transportation issues. When I think of toll lanes, I think of DC and Atlanta, places with altogether too much traffic. I would prefer to see investment in public transportation, and particularly rail transportation. The passenger rail infrastructure in and around Kansas City is severely lacking. Simply making more passenger car lanes is a bandaid to a problem, and could just make the problem worse by encouraging yet more people to drive. Investing in public rail transportation would be a much more transformative approach and result in a much more long-term solution.”

Response to Comment #2: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include public transit and roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project's potential impacts of induced traffic demand, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies, as is the case with this particular project.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Liam Liam

Comment #3

“DO NOT support any projects that expand lane miles including 69 expansion”

Response to Comment #3: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include public transit and roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project's potential impacts of induced traffic demand, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies, as is the case with this particular project.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Adam Rossi

Comment #4

“I would generally like to see a larger focus on transformative changes, not temporary bandages. I don't like the idea of just tolling a road in the area; I like the idea of more investment in public transportation, particularly rail travel. Instead of investing in this project, what if we took all the money and instead invested it in a more reliable bus service? What if we invested it in more streetcar lines or a light rail system? These would both be much better investments than putting more dollars towards cars on the road.”

Response to Comment #4: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include public transit and roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project's potential impacts of induced traffic demand, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies, as is the case with this particular project.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Robin Ganahl

Comment #5

“I'm a resident of Kansas City, MO and I strongly urge MARC to not pursue projects that use public money to widen highways for several reasons. First, it is simply way too expensive. Second, it encourages more sprawl, which increases greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. Third, widening highways induces more demand and, therefore, does not alleviate traffic congestion. Highway widening is a waste of public money, especially in Kansas City where we already have more highway lanes per capita than most cities. MARC should be investing those funds in public transportation and biking/walking infrastructure instead. Please do not pursue these projects.”

Response to Comment #5: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include active transportation, land use, public transit, roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project's potential impacts of induced traffic demand, growth in emissions and subsequent impact on climate, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network which is supported by adequate financial resources for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies, as is the case with this particular project.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: William Davies

Comment #6

“As a resident of Kansas City, MO and active volunteer in city and regional transportation, environmental, and other policy, I write to oppose this amendment and ask that it be rejected. At the launch of Connected KC 2050, I saw many of my neighbors speak out against spending more millions of dollars on expanding highways, and for good reason. The region is plagued by issues related to the sprawling expansion of highways that has developed over the last century, which happened at the same time other modes of transportation, particularly transit, saw disinvestment.

Connected KC and MARC have stated protecting public health and environmental quality, while supporting a more connected region that does not depend on personal automobiles, is a key goal of the project. This amendment to pour more money into highways (that could be used for truly innovative and far more beneficial projects supporting transit and active transportation) directly conflicts with that.

Recently an old map of the interurban electric rail system of Kansas City (that connected folks throughout the region at its peak), made its way across social media, inspiring folks about what was and could be. I urge MARC to thoroughly consider ways to connect us in ways that does not rely on personal autos, which is the desire of the region and its jurisdictions. This can start with making the choice to NOT waste more money on paving more land with unnecessary highways.

Please reject the proposed amendment. Thank you for your service.”

Response to Comment #6: *Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.*

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include active transportation, land use, public transit, roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project's potential impacts of induced traffic demand, growth in dispersed land use patterns, emissions and subsequent impact on climate, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network which is supported by adequate financial resources for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Michael Kelley

Comment #7

“We know all too well that highway expansion only supports drivers while excluding the needs of all other road users (pedestrians, transit riders, people with disabilities, and cyclists). We also know that transportation is the largest source of GHG emissions in the region and that one of the largest sources of those emissions come from cars, trucks, and SUVs.

There is a growing desire and need for more people to move through Overland Park and northeast Kansas in a form beyond driving alone. We have to prioritize policies, planning, projects and corresponding funds to support those needs. For all of these reasons and more I strongly urge the rejection of this proposed amendment.

I oppose this amendment to the Connected KC 2050 plan.”

Response to Comment #7

Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include active transportation, land use, public transit, roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project’s potential impacts of induced traffic demand, growth in emissions and subsequent impact on climate, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network which is supported by adequate financial resources for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

Name: Shawn Tolivar

Comment #8

“I would like to comment and say that expansion of highway 69 is a terrible idea. The cost has already doubled since the initial presentation last year. Homes will be destroyed, this will only create more GHG emissions as it induces more demand, and further exacerbates poor land use decisions by incentivising people to live further away from jobs and the city. There is literally no upside to this project other than to save a few drivers a few minutes on their commute, which will likely be wasted as many move further away negating any savings. We are in a climate emergency, highway expansion is climate change denial. We should be investing in electrified commuter rail and electrified BRT for these outlying areas.

Please scrap this dated idea of highway expansion.”

Kansas

TIP #: 380208		Juris: KDOT		Location/Improvement	
State #: KA-5700-03		Fed #:		Co: JOHNSON Project Typ	
Phase	Year of Obligation	Type	Source	Cost(\$1,000's)	
Engineering	2022	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$9,000.0	
Engineering	2022	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$36,000.0	
Construction	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$113,512.3	
Construction	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$454,049.0	
Conversion	2024	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8	
Credit	2024	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)	
Conversion	2025	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8	
Credit	2025	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)	
Conversion	2026	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8	
Credit	2026	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)	
Conversion	2027	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8	
Credit	2027	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)	
Conversion	2028	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8	
Credit	2028	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)	
Federal Total:		\$490,049.0	Non-Federal Total:	\$122,512.3	Total: \$612,561.3

Response to Comment #8

Thank you for your recent comment regarding proposed Connected KC 2050 Amendment #6. We shared your comment with the MARC Total Transportation Policy Committee, and the MARC Board of Directors for their consideration.

Connected KC 2050 identifies a number of regional goals and strategies which are multi-disciplinary in nature and include active transportation, land use, public transit, roadway operational and capacity strategies. Connected KC 2050 acknowledges that residents need a reliable transportation system that helps them connect to jobs, housing and services, and engages them in transportation decision-making processes. MARC shares concerns about any project’s potential impacts of induced traffic demand, growth in dispersed land use and emissions and subsequent impact on climate, and the need for a balanced multi-modal transportation network which is supported by adequate financial resources for ongoing operations and maintenance.

MARC policy supports highway capacity projects when existing congestion and reliability concerns are documented, and when other appropriate operational and/or demand management strategies are considered as part of the project scope and implemented by sponsoring agencies.

We look forward to your continued participation in the regional transportation planning process and encourage you to review [A Guide to Transportation Planning](#). This guide is designed to help area residents understand the complex process of transportation decision-making and learn how they can more effectively provide input.

How to Read the TIP Amendment Project Listings

The project listing is a complete list of all projects in the TIP amendment. The state is noted in the heading. Bistate projects are listed first, followed by Kansas, then Missouri projects.

Below is a sample TIP amendment project listing. The numbered fields are described in the key below.

SAMPLE TIP AMENDMENT PROJECT LISTING

Missouri		DRAFT 2011 2nd Quarter Amendment			
1 TIP #: 590161	2 Juris: CLAY COUNTY	3 Location/Improvement: SMITHVILLE LAKE TRAIL (HWY W TO 188TH ST.)			
County: CLAY	4 Project Type: PEDESTRIAN AND/OR BIKE WAYS	Length (miles):			
5 Federal ID#: STP-3301(428)	6 State ID #:				
7 Phase	8 Year of Obligation	9 Type	10 Source	Cost (IN THOUSANDS)	12 Description: Smithville Lake Trail (Hwy W to 188th St.)
Construction	2011	Federal	TE-MO	\$202.7	13 Amendment Description: New project
Construction	2011	Non-Federal	LOCAL	\$133.5	
Federal Total: \$202.7		Non-Federal Total: \$133.5		11 Total: \$336.2	
14 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New <input type="checkbox"/> Deleted <input type="checkbox"/> Schedule <input type="checkbox"/> Budget <input type="checkbox"/> AirQuality <input type="checkbox"/> Scope					

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1 TIP #: The number assigned to TIP project, which is how an agency identifies a project.</p> <p>2 Juris: The lead public agency or municipality responsible for the project.</p> <p>3 Location/Improvement: Name of project, identifying what it is and where it is located.</p> <p>4 Project Type: Projects are classified into descriptive categories.</p> <p>5 Federal ID#: Identification number within a federal funding program.</p> <p>6 State ID#: Identification number within a state funding program.</p> <p>7 Phase: Shows phases of project, classified into categories.</p> | <p>8 Year of Obligation: Shows when each phase is scheduled to be obligated.</p> <p>9 Type: Indicates whether federal funds will be used in each phase.</p> <p>10 Source: Indicates funding source abbreviation for each phase.</p> <p>11 Total: Total estimated federal and non-federal funds being spent on the project.</p> <p>12 Description: Provides a short outline of the project. This may include type, scope and major features of the project.</p> <p>13 Amendment Description: Describes what is being modified by the amendment.</p> <p>14 Indicates the reason(s) for inclusion in the amendment.</p> |
|---|---|

KANSAS CITY METROPOLITAN REGION
 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
 FISCAL YEARS 2022-2026
2022 Special Amendment #2

Kansas

TIP #: 380194		Juris: KDOT		Location/Improvement: ALT DELIVERY: US-69 JOHNSON CO-151ST ST NORTH TO 103RD ST		
State #: KA-5700-02		Fed #:		Co: JOHNSON		Project Type: Engineering (Roadway) Length (mi): 7
Phase	Year of Obligation	Type	Source	Cost(\$1,000's)	Description:	
Engineering	2021	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$28,440.8	PMC Services for Project Management of the Alternate Delivery Project- 69-46 KA-5700-03. The Project Manager is to assist in the development of contract documents and assist the Alternate Delivery Contractor during Project 69-46 KA-5700-03 development and construction. Project will also be for Advance acquisitions of ROW and Utility. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 14,220.4 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2026. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 14,220.4 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2027. The UTIL phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 2,695.2 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2026. The UTIL phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 2,695.2 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2027.	
Engineering	2021	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$7,110.2		
Engineering	2021	Non-Federal	LOCAL	\$99.0		
Other	2021	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$5,390.5		
Other	2021	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$1,347.6		
Right-of-Way	2022	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$7,883.3		
Conversion	2026	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$16,915.6		
Credit	2026	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$16,915.6)		
Conversion	2027	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$16,915.6		
Credit	2027	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$16,915.6)		
Federal Total: \$33,831.2		Non-Federal Total: \$16,440.2		Total: \$50,271.4		

Amendment Description: Revise budget to reflect the latest estimates

New
 Deleted
 Schedule
 Budget
 AirQuality
 Scope

Kansas

TIP #: 380208		Juris: KDOT		Location/Improvement: US-69 FROM 151ST STREET NORTH TO 103RD STREET AND 167TH STREET INTERCHANGE IN OVERLAND PARK IN JOHNSON COUNTY		
State #: KA-5700-03		Fed #:		Co: JOHNSON		Project Type: Reconstruction
						Length (mi): 7
Phase	Year of Obligation	Type	Source	Cost(\$1,000's)	Description:	
Engineering	2022	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$9,000.0	US-69 from 151st Street North to 103rd Street and Reconstruction of the 167th Street Interchange and addition of Noise Walls along the corridor. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 7,200 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2024. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 7,200 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2025. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 7,200 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2026. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 7,200 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2027. The PE phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 7,200 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2028. The CONST phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 90,809.8 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2024. The CONST phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 90,809.8 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2025. The CONST phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 90,809.8 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2026. The CONST phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 90,809.8 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2027. The CONST phase will utilize AC in the amount of \$ 90,809.8 K with conversion to NHPP funds in 2028.	
Engineering	2022	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$36,000.0		
Construction	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$113,512.3		
Construction	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS (AC)	\$454,049.0		
Conversion	2024	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8		
Credit	2024	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)		
Conversion	2025	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8		
Credit	2025	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)		
Conversion	2026	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8		
Credit	2026	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)		
Conversion	2027	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8		
Credit	2027	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)		
Conversion	2028	Federal	NHPP-KS	\$98,009.8		
Credit	2028	Non-Federal	CREDIT	(\$98,009.8)		
Federal Total: \$490,049.0		Non-Federal Total: \$122,512.3		Total: \$612,561.3		

Amendment Description: Revise budget and schedule to reflect the latest estimates

New Deleted Schedule Budget AirQuality Scope

TIP #: 380224		Juris: KDOT		Location/Improvement: US-69 FROM 151ST STREET NORTH TO 103RD STREET		
State #: KA-5700-06		Fed #:		Co: JOHNSON		Project Type:
						Length (mi): 7
Phase	Year of Obligation	Type	Source	Cost(\$1,000's)	Description:	
Engineering	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$4,000.0	Open Road Tolling Integration	
Construction	2023	Non-Federal	STATE-KS	\$9,500.0		
Federal Total:		Non-Federal Total: \$13,500.0		Total: \$13,500.0		

Amendment Description: New Project

New Deleted Schedule Budget AirQuality Scope

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Financial Plan Updates

Approval of the 2022 4th Quarter Amendment to the 2022–2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will require tables from the financial plan of the 2022–2026 TIP, adopted on October 26, 2021, and amended on January 25, 2022, April 25, 2022, May 24, 2022, July 26, 2022, October 25, 2022 (scheduled) and November 29, 2022 (scheduled) to be modified as shown in Tables 1 – 4. The tables from the anticipated to be approved 2022 4th Quarter Amendment are provided for comparison in Tables 5 – 8.

Table 1 -- Revenue

State	Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas	BRF-KS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,729.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-KS	\$1,710.44	\$1,020.00	\$1,144.00	\$2,930.90	\$2,930.90
	CREDIT	(\$46,256.00)	(\$40,897.20)	(\$181,824.20)	(\$107,047.60)	(\$124,801.80)
	CRRSAA-KS	\$0.00	\$5,316.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-KS	\$856.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-KS	\$2,486.59	\$12,802.56	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$750.00
	LOCAL	\$99,784.83	\$97,656.62	\$94,138.90	\$40,599.37	\$39,358.04
	NHPP-KS	\$70,103.60	\$10,208.20	\$172,160.50	\$103,314.80	\$124,051.80
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$95,521.45	\$155,747.80	\$17,204.70	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS (AC)	\$128,836.60	\$508,799.70	\$42,090.60	\$750.00	\$750.00
	STBGM-KS	\$14,296.84	\$12,577.36	\$10,535.06	\$13,276.84	\$13,276.84
	STP-KS	\$911.40	\$19,838.90	\$2,184.70	\$2,982.80	\$0.00
	TA-KS	\$1,704.00	\$520.00	\$1,350.00	\$1,020.00	\$1,020.00
Missouri	5307	\$300.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	ARP-MO	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	BRO-MO	\$2,815.08	\$1,265.00	\$412.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$1,906.06	\$170.00	\$1,969.09	\$3,067.84	\$3,067.84
	CREDIT	(\$24,164.40)	(\$22,517.80)	(\$21,747.40)	(\$24,783.00)	(\$13,079.80)
	CRRSAA-MO	\$0.00	\$8,393.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-MO	\$2,678.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HPP-MO	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-MO	\$7,338.80	\$16,356.80	\$147,094.80	\$2,683.40	\$74.40
	LOCAL	\$119,669.49	\$68,189.40	\$55,726.06	\$38,573.79	\$39,149.87
	NHFP-MO	\$1,536.00	\$18,670.90	\$37,712.00	\$90.00	\$90.00
	NHPP-MO	\$56,688.30	\$135,356.30	\$80,066.20	\$184,908.00	\$59,373.20
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$2,470.00	\$2,470.00	\$2,496.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-MO	\$26,261.50	\$50,413.00	\$50,241.20	\$36,231.90	\$16,748.40
	STATE-MO (AC)	\$22,456.40	\$25,322.70	\$21,269.30	\$27,538.60	\$12,941.00
STBGM-MO	\$12,046.85	\$22,868.00	\$15,765.00	\$21,159.67	\$21,159.67	

	STBG-MO	\$24,613.20	\$22,257.80	\$21,747.40	\$24,578.60	\$13,079.80	
	STP-MO	\$0.00	\$260.00	\$0.00	\$796.00	\$0.00	
	TA-MO	\$8,750.49	\$3,799.77	\$1,573.66	\$1,623.63	\$1,623.63	
Regional	CMAQ-KS	\$411.00	\$766.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CMAQ-MO	\$411.00	\$818.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	LOCAL	\$943.00	\$1,271.75	\$856.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STBGM-KS	\$180.00	\$910.00	\$210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STPBG-MO	\$1,220.00	\$792.62	\$490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Transit	5307	\$26,647.46	\$32,076.99	\$24,982.18	\$22,985.32	\$28,730.34
		5309	\$23,259.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
5311		\$129.92	\$133.82	\$137.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	
5337		\$1,241.25	\$2,761.11	\$1,316.85	\$0.00	\$0.00	
5339		\$2,118.16	\$2,181.71	\$2,247.16	\$2,314.57	\$2,350.00	
ARP-MO		\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
BUILD-MO		\$0.00	\$14,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
CMAQ-KS		\$1,295.00	\$542.51	\$1,669.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	
CMAQ-MO		\$787.50	\$1,319.51	\$523.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	
CRRSAA-MO		\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
LOCAL		\$304,790.83	\$180,948.55	\$170,975.28	\$175,539.91	\$176,413.00	
STATE-KS		\$27.41	\$28.23	\$29.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	
STBGM-KS		\$0.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
STBGM-MO		\$0.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
TA-MO		\$0.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
		Kansas Subtotal	\$369,955.91	\$784,040.62	\$166,463.26	\$58,577.11	\$57,335.78
	Missouri Subtotal	\$265,865.92	\$362,075.20	\$414,385.31	\$316,468.43	\$154,228.01	
	Regional Subtotal	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Transit	\$371,796.80	\$236,992.43	\$202,681.90	\$200,839.80	\$207,493.34	
	Subtotal by Year	\$1,010,783.63	\$1,387,667.00	\$786,014.22	\$575,885.34	\$419,057.13	
	Total	\$4,179,407.31					

Table 2 – Expenditure

State	Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas	CMAQ-KS	\$1,710.44	\$1,020.00	\$1,144.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CRRSAA-KS	\$0.00	\$5,316.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-KS	\$856.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-KS	\$1,736.59	\$1,320.46	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$65,823.57	\$66,097.66	\$54,497.62	\$10.00	\$572.00

	NHPP-KS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STATE-KS	\$95,521.45	\$155,747.80	\$17,204.70	\$0.00	\$1.00	
	STATE-KS (AC)	\$128,836.60	\$508,799.70	\$42,090.60	\$750.00	\$750.00	
	STBGM-KS	\$12,343.84	\$12,577.36	\$10,535.06	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STP-KS	\$0.00	\$632.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	TA-KS	\$1,704.00	\$520.00	\$1,350.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Missouri	5307	\$300.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	ARP-MO	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	BRO-MO	\$1,531.50	\$1,265.00	\$412.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CMAQ-MO	\$1,906.06	\$170.00	\$1,969.09	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CRRSAA-MO	\$0.00	\$8,393.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	HIP-MO	\$2,678.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	HPP-MO	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	HSIP-MO	\$7,338.80	\$16,356.80	\$147,094.80	\$2,683.40	\$74.40	
	LOCAL	\$76,838.17	\$38,970.46	\$15,760.76	\$2,496.00	\$0.00	
	NHFP-MO	\$1,536.00	\$18,670.90	\$37,712.00	\$90.00	\$90.00	
	NHPP-MO	\$56,688.30	\$135,356.30	\$80,066.20	\$184,908.00	\$59,373.20	
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STATE-KS	\$2,470.00	\$2,470.00	\$2,496.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STATE-MO	\$26,261.50	\$50,413.00	\$50,241.20	\$36,231.90	\$16,748.40	
	STATE-MO (AC)	\$22,456.40	\$25,322.70	\$21,269.30	\$27,538.60	\$12,941.00	
	STBGM-MO	\$12,046.85	\$22,868.00	\$15,765.60	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	STBG-MO	\$448.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	TA-MO	\$9,250.49	\$3,299.77	\$1,573.66	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	Regional	CMAQ-KS	\$411.00	\$766.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
		CMAQ-MO	\$411.00	\$818.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
LOCAL		\$943.00	\$1,271.75	\$856.75	\$0.00	\$0.00	
STBGM-KS		\$180.00	\$910.00	\$210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
STBGM-MO		\$1,220.00	\$792.62	\$490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
Transit	5307	\$26,647.46	\$32,076.99	\$24,982.18	\$22,985.32	\$28,730.34	
	5309	\$23,259.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	5311	\$129.92	\$133.82	\$137.83	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	5337	\$1,241.25	\$2,761.11	\$1,316.85	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	5339	\$2,118.16	\$2,181.71	\$2,247.16	\$2,314.57	\$2,350.00	
	ARP-MO	\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	BUILD-MO	\$0.00	\$14,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CMAQ-KS	\$1,295.00	\$542.51	\$1,669.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CMAQ-MO	\$787.50	\$1,319.51	\$523.72	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	CRRSAA-MO	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
	LOCAL	\$230,084.85	\$127,475.09	\$118,867.24	\$122,578.88	\$118,846.75	
	STATE-KS	\$27.41	\$28.23	\$29.08	\$0.00	\$0.00	

	STBGM-KS	\$0.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-MO	\$0.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TA-MO	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Kansas Subtotal	\$308,532.65	\$752,031.66	\$127,271.98	\$760.00	\$1,323.00
	Missouri Subtotal	\$222,251.02	\$332,356.26	\$374,420.61	\$253,947.90	\$89,227.00
	Regional Subtotal	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Transit	\$297,090.82	\$183,518.97	\$150,573.86	\$147,878.77	\$149,927.09
	Subtotal by Year	\$831,039.49	\$1,272,465.64	\$654,750.20	\$402,586.67	\$240,477.09
	Total	\$3,401,319.09				

Table 3 – Summary

Highway Revenues vs. Expenditures					
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas Revenue	\$369,955.91	\$784,040.62	\$166,463.26	\$58,577.11	\$57,335.78
Kansas O&M Expenditure	\$25,124.67	\$25,512.72	\$25,906.65	\$26,306.89	\$26,713.18
Kansas Project Expenditure	\$308,532.65	\$752,031.66	\$127,271.98	\$760.00	\$1,323.00
Difference	\$36,298.59	\$6,496.24	\$13,284.63	\$31,510.22	\$29,299.60
Missouri Revenue	\$265,865.92	\$362,075.20	\$414,385.31	\$316,468.43	\$154,228.01
Missouri O&M Expenditure	\$28,345.14	\$28,770.31	\$29,201.87	\$29,639.90	\$30,084.49
Missouri Project Expenditure	\$222,251.02	\$332,356.26	\$374,420.61	\$253,947.90	\$89,227.00
Difference	\$15,269.77	\$948.62	\$10,762.83	\$32,880.64	\$34,916.51
Regional Revenue	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
Regional Expenditure	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
Difference	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Revenue	\$638,986.83	\$1,150,674.57	\$583,332.32	\$375,045.54	\$211,563.78
Total Expenditure	\$587,418.48	\$1,143,229.70	\$559,284.86	\$310,654.69	\$147,347.67
Difference	\$51,568.36	\$7,444.86	\$24,047.46	\$64,390.86	\$64,216.11

Table 4 – Transit Summary

Transit Revenues vs. Expenditures					
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Transit Revenue	\$371,797	\$236,992	\$202,682	\$200,840	\$207,493
Transit O&M Expenditure	\$126,082	\$127,973	\$129,892	\$131,841	\$133,818
Transit O&M Programmed in the TIP	\$126,720	\$122,219	\$124,807	\$123,535	\$124,423
Remaining Transit O&M	\$0	\$5,753	\$5,085	\$8,305	\$9,395
Transit Revenue Remaining for Non O&M Expenditures	\$272,915	\$75,820	\$72,790	\$68,999	\$73,675
Transit Project Expenditure	\$195,571	\$28,100	\$25,767	\$24,343	\$25,004
Difference	\$77,344	\$47,720	\$47,023	\$44,656	\$48,671

Table 5 -- Revenue

State	Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas	BRF-KS	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$6,729.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-KS	\$1,710.44	\$1,020.00	\$1,144.00	\$2,930.90	\$2,930.90
	CREDIT	(\$46,256.00)	(\$40,897.20)	(\$158,739.40)	(\$100,083.80)	(\$84,819.40)
	CRRSAA-KS	\$0.00	\$5,316.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-KS	\$856.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-KS	\$2,486.59	\$12,802.56	\$750.00	\$750.00	\$750.00
	LOCAL	\$144,784.83	\$97,656.62	\$94,138.90	\$40,599.37	\$39,358.04
	NHPP-KS	\$70,103.60	\$10,208.20	\$149,075.70	\$96,351.00	\$84,069.40
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$115,432.25	\$28,735.50	\$17,204.70	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS (AC)	\$392,554.60	\$54,750.70	\$42,090.60	\$750.00	\$750.00
	STBGM-KS	\$14,296.84	\$12,577.36	\$10,535.06	\$13,276.84	\$13,276.84
	STP-KS	\$911.40	\$19,838.90	\$2,184.70	\$2,982.80	\$0.00
	TA-KS	\$1,704.00	\$520.00	\$1,350.00	\$1,020.00	\$1,020.00
Missouri	5307	\$300.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	ARP-MO	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	BRO-MO	\$2,815.08	\$1,265.00	\$412.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$1,906.06	\$170.00	\$1,969.09	\$3,067.84	\$3,067.84
	CREDIT	(\$24,164.40)	(\$22,517.80)	(\$21,747.40)	(\$24,783.00)	(\$13,079.80)
	CRRSAA-MO	\$0.00	\$8,393.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-MO	\$2,678.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HPP-MO	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-MO	\$7,338.80	\$16,356.80	\$147,094.80	\$2,683.40	\$74.40
	LOCAL	\$119,669.49	\$68,189.40	\$55,726.06	\$38,573.79	\$39,149.87
	NHFP-MO	\$1,536.00	\$18,670.90	\$37,712.00	\$90.00	\$90.00
	NHPP-MO	\$56,688.30	\$135,356.30	\$80,066.20	\$184,908.00	\$59,373.20
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$2,470.00	\$2,470.00	\$2,496.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-MO	\$26,261.50	\$50,413.00	\$50,241.20	\$36,231.90	\$16,748.40
	STATE-MO (AC)	\$22,456.40	\$25,322.70	\$21,269.30	\$27,538.60	\$12,941.00
	STBGM-MO	\$12,046.85	\$22,868.00	\$15,765.00	\$21,159.67	\$21,159.67
	STBG-MO	\$24,613.20	\$22,257.80	\$21,747.40	\$24,578.60	\$13,079.80
STP-MO	\$0.00	\$260.00	\$0.00	\$796.00	\$0.00	
TA-MO	\$8,750.49	\$3,799.77	\$1,573.66	\$1,623.63	\$1,623.63	
Regional	CMAQ-KS	\$411.00	\$766.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$411.00	\$818.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$943.00	\$1,271.75	\$856.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-KS	\$180.00	\$910.00	\$210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STPBG-MO	\$1,220.00	\$792.62	\$490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Transit	5307	\$26,647.46	\$32,076.99	\$24,982.18	\$22,985.32	\$28,730.34

	5309	\$23,259.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5311	\$129.92	\$133.82	\$137.83	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5337	\$1,241.25	\$2,761.11	\$1,316.85	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5339	\$2,118.16	\$2,181.71	\$2,247.16	\$2,314.57	\$2,350.00
	ARP-MO	\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	BUILD-MO	\$0.00	\$14,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-KS	\$1,295.00	\$542.51	\$1,669.80	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$787.50	\$1,319.51	\$523.72	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CRRSAA-MO	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$304,790.83	\$180,948.55	\$170,975.28	\$175,539.91	\$176,413.00
	STATE-KS	\$27.41	\$28.23	\$29.08	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-KS	\$0.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-MO	\$0.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TA-MO	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Kansas Subtotal	\$698,584.71	\$202,979.32	\$166,463.26	\$58,577.11	\$57,335.78
	Missouri Subtotal	\$265,865.92	\$362,075.20	\$414,385.31	\$316,468.43	\$154,228.01
	Regional Subtotal	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Transit	\$371,796.80	\$236,992.43	\$202,681.90	\$200,839.80	\$207,493.34
	Subtotal by Year	\$1,339,412.43	\$806,605.70	\$786,014.22	\$575,885.34	\$419,057.13
	Total	\$3,926,974.81				

Table 6 – Expenditure

State	Source	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas	CMAQ-KS	\$1,710.44	\$1,020.00	\$1,144.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CRRSAA-KS	\$0.00	\$5,316.68	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-KS	\$856.16	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-KS	\$1,736.59	\$1,320.46	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$110,823.57	\$66,097.66	\$54,497.62	\$10.00	\$572.00
	NHPP-KS	\$27,642.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$450.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$115,432.25	\$28,735.50	\$17,204.70	\$0.00	\$1.00
	STATE-KS (AC)	\$392,554.60	\$54,750.70	\$42,090.60	\$750.00	\$750.00
	STBGM-KS	\$12,343.84	\$12,577.36	\$10,535.06	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STP-KS	\$0.00	\$632.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TA-KS	\$1,704.00	\$520.00	\$1,350.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Missouri	5307	\$300.00	\$6,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	ARP-MO	\$500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

	BRO-MO	\$1,531.50	\$1,265.00	\$412.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$1,906.06	\$170.00	\$1,969.09	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CRRSAA-MO	\$0.00	\$8,393.33	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HIP-MO	\$2,678.15	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HPP-MO	\$0.00	\$2,800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	HSIP-MO	\$7,338.80	\$16,356.80	\$147,094.80	\$2,683.40	\$74.40
	LOCAL	\$76,838.17	\$38,970.46	\$15,760.76	\$2,496.00	\$0.00
	NHFP-MO	\$1,536.00	\$18,670.90	\$37,712.00	\$90.00	\$90.00
	NHPP-MO	\$56,688.30	\$135,356.30	\$80,066.20	\$184,908.00	\$59,373.20
	OTHER	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$60.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-KS	\$2,470.00	\$2,470.00	\$2,496.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STATE-MO	\$26,261.50	\$50,413.00	\$50,241.20	\$36,231.90	\$16,748.40
	STATE-MO (AC)	\$22,456.40	\$25,322.70	\$21,269.30	\$27,538.60	\$12,941.00
	STBGM-MO	\$12,046.85	\$22,868.00	\$15,765.60	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBG-MO	\$448.80	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TA-MO	\$9,250.49	\$3,299.77	\$1,573.66	\$0.00	\$0.00
Regional	CMAQ-KS	\$411.00	\$766.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$411.00	\$818.19	\$463.50	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$943.00	\$1,271.75	\$856.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-KS	\$180.00	\$910.00	\$210.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-MO	\$1,220.00	\$792.62	\$490.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Transit	5307	\$26,647.46	\$32,076.99	\$24,982.18	\$22,985.32	\$28,730.34
	5309	\$23,259.27	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5311	\$129.92	\$133.82	\$137.83	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5337	\$1,241.25	\$2,761.11	\$1,316.85	\$0.00	\$0.00
	5339	\$2,118.16	\$2,181.71	\$2,247.16	\$2,314.57	\$2,350.00
	ARP-MO	\$7,500.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	BUILD-MO	\$0.00	\$14,200.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-KS	\$1,295.00	\$542.51	\$1,669.80	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CMAQ-MO	\$787.50	\$1,319.51	\$523.72	\$0.00	\$0.00
	CRRSAA-MO	\$4,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	LOCAL	\$230,084.85	\$127,475.09	\$118,867.24	\$122,578.88	\$118,846.75
	STATE-KS	\$27.41	\$28.23	\$29.08	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-KS	\$0.00	\$800.00	\$800.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	STBGM-MO	\$0.00	\$1,600.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	TA-MO	\$0.00	\$400.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Kansas Subtotal	\$664,803.45	\$170,970.36	\$127,271.98	\$760.00	\$1,323.00
	Missouri Subtotal	\$222,251.02	\$332,356.26	\$374,420.61	\$253,947.90	\$89,227.00

	Regional Subtotal	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
	Transit	\$297,090.82	\$183,518.97	\$150,573.86	\$147,878.77	\$149,927.09
	Subtotal by Year	\$1,187,310.29	\$691,404.34	\$654,750.20	\$402,586.67	\$240,477.09
	Total	\$3,176,528.59				

Table 7 -- Summary

Highway Revenues vs. Expenditures					
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Kansas Revenue	\$698,584.71	\$202,979.32	\$166,463.26	\$58,577.11	\$57,335.78
Kansas O&M Expenditure	\$25,124.67	\$25,512.72	\$25,906.65	\$26,306.89	\$26,713.18
Kansas Project Expenditure	\$664,803.45	\$170,970.36	\$127,271.98	\$760.00	\$1,323.00
Difference	\$8,656.59	\$6,496.24	\$13,284.63	\$31,510.22	\$29,299.60
Missouri Revenue	\$265,865.92	\$362,075.20	\$414,385.31	\$316,468.43	\$154,228.01
Missouri O&M Expenditure	\$28,345.14	\$28,770.31	\$29,201.87	\$29,639.90	\$30,084.49
Missouri Project Expenditure	\$222,251.02	\$332,356.26	\$374,420.61	\$253,947.90	\$89,227.00
Difference	\$15,269.77	\$948.62	\$10,762.83	\$32,880.64	\$34,916.51
Regional Revenue	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
Regional Expenditure	\$3,165.00	\$4,558.75	\$2,483.75	\$0.00	\$0.00
Difference	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total Revenue	\$967,615.63	\$569,613.27	\$583,332.32	\$375,045.54	\$211,563.78
Total Expenditure	\$943,689.28	\$562,168.40	\$559,284.86	\$310,654.69	\$147,347.67
Difference	\$23,926.35	\$7,444.86	\$24,047.46	\$64,390.86	\$64,216.11

Table 8 – Transit Summary

Transit Revenues vs. Expenditures					
	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Transit Revenue	\$371,797	\$236,992	\$202,682	\$200,840	\$207,493
Transit O&M Expenditure	\$126,082	\$127,973	\$129,892	\$131,841	\$133,818
Transit O&M Programmed in the TIP	\$126,720	\$122,219	\$124,807	\$123,535	\$124,423
Remaining Transit O&M	\$0	\$5,753	\$5,085	\$8,305	\$9,395
Transit Revenue Remaining for Non O&M Expenditures	\$272,915	\$75,820	\$72,790	\$68,999	\$73,675
Transit Project Expenditure	\$195,571	\$28,100	\$25,767	\$24,343	\$25,004
Difference	\$77,344	\$47,720	\$47,023	\$44,656	\$48,671