04/01/03

Evaluation of the State Highway System and Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF)

RUTF Committee

Greg Reeder, Council Bluffs City Engineer
Larry Stevens, Oskaloosa City Engineer
Royce Fichtner, Marshall County Engineer
Tom Stoner, Harrison County Engineer
Mark Wandro, Iowa DOT, Director
Neil Volmer, Iowa DOT, Planning and Programming Division Director

April 1, 2003

Note: This report was prepared by a committee of city, county and state representatives. The committee met throughout 2002 with the purpose of reviewing and making recommendations to improve the efficiency and operation of Iowa's road and street system. This report is referenced in SF 451 and in Code Section 306.8A.

Table of Contents

Introduction **1**

Highway/Street System Description **2**

Study Process **4**

Issues Identified **6**

Recommendations **8**

Future Considerations **11**

Appendix A: Transfer of Jurisdiction Map **13**

Appendix B: Transfer of Jurisdiction Listing **17**

Appendix C: Farm-to-Market Extension Mileage (< 500 population) **23**

Introduction

In recent years it has become evident to transportation officials in the state of Iowa that it is time for a review of the public road system and the funding that is provided to improve and maintain that road system. Highway revenues at the state and Federal level have leveled off while needs for all roads and streets in the state have increased. In addition, there is much uncertainty in future revenues both at the state and Federal level due to the economic situation and changing priorities at the Federal level. All of these circumstances have come together to necessitate a review of the operation of the public road system.

In January of 2002, key officials representing the Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT), Iowa's counties, and Iowa's cities gathered to begin discussions related to Iowa's public road system. These officials represented the 'three legs of the stool' critical to maintain and operate the public road system in Iowa. Acknowledging that a review of the road and street system was necessary, these officials determined that they are best equipped to fully evaluate the public road system and make recommendations that will improve the efficiency and operation of Iowa's road and street system.

The Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF) Committee, made up of those key highway officials, met throughout 2002 with the following mission:

> "To study roadway standards and jurisdictional responsibilities, the road use tax fund and other sources of funding and distribution, and to make recommendations that meet current and future needs of the people of Iowa. The desired outcome is a report that has received general support from the associations represented on the committee for submission to the 2003 legislature."

The committee would like to thank the Associated General Contractors of Iowa and the Iowa Good Roads Association for facilitating this effort. Their assistance was invaluable.

RUTF Committee Membership
Greg Reeder, Council Bluffs City Engineer
Larry Stevens, Oskaloosa City Engineer
Royce Fichtner, Marshall County Engineer
Tom Stoner, Harrison County Engineer
Mark Wandro, Iowa DOT, Director
Neil Volmer, Iowa DOT, Planning and Programming Division Director

RUTF Committee Facilitators
Scott Newhard, Associated General Contractors of Iowa
Dave Scott, Iowa Good Roads Association

RUTF Committee Support Staff
Stuart Anderson, Iowa DOT
Tami Bailiff, Iowa DOT

Highway/Street System Description

The public road system in Iowa consists of over 113,000 miles of highways, roads, and streets. Those roads are the responsibility of the Iowa Department of Transportation, the 99 counties, and 950 cities. The Iowa DOT has responsibility over the primary road system, which consists of the Interstate system and numbered Iowa and US routes. The 99 counties have jurisdiction over the secondary road system, which includes every other non-primary public road outside of city corporate limits. Cities have responsibility over those streets within their corporate limits that are not primary roads. Table 1 is a breakdown of mileage and vehicle miles of travel on those systems of roads.

Table 1 – Mileage and Vehicle Miles of Travel by System

	Mileage*	% of Total Mileage	2001 Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT - 1,000,000s)	% of Total VMT
Primary	10,166.71	9.0%	18,624	61.1%
Secondary	89,136.78	78.8%	5,025	16.5%
City	13,808.23	12.2%	6,812	22.4%
Total	113,111.72		30,461	

* This table and report does not include the small amount of mileage within Iowa's parks and institutions.

All three levels of government play a critical role in serving Iowa's transportation needs. The primary road system directly serves 605 of Iowa's cities. Iowa's other 345 cities rely on the secondary road system to travel the state. Many residents of cities directly served by primary roads also rely on the secondary road system. Of greater importance is the service the primary and secondary road systems provide to get agricultural products literally from the farm to the market.

It is useful to think of the road system in Iowa as providing two services: mobility and accessibility. Each road to varying degrees provides both mobility and accessibility. To fully provide both, the road and street system in Iowa relies upon the state, county and city systems. City and county roads provide more direct access to the farms, manufacturers, services, educational facilities, hospitals, etc. while the state road system provides the mobility to connect Iowa's regions with Midwest, national, and international markets. It is vital that Iowa continue to have a fully supported road and street system at all levels.

State Road Use Tax Fund

State revenues for public roads and streets come from the Road Use Tax Fund (RUTF). The RUTF consists of revenues from fuel tax, registration fees, use tax, and other miscellaneous sources. For fiscal year 2003, it is estimated that the RUTF will generate approximately $1.046 billion with approximately 38% generated from fuel tax, 36% from registration fees and 22% from use tax.

After some off-the-top allocations for programs such as Revitalize Iowa's Sound Economy (RISE), motorcycle education, living roadway trust fund, etc., the RUTF is distributed by formula to the DOT for use on the primary road system, counties, and cities.

Table 2 – Distribution of Road Use Tax Fund

Jurisdiction	Formula Distribution of RUTF
DOT – Primary Road Fund	47.5%
Counties – Secondary Road Fund	24.5%
Counties – Farm-to-Market Road Fund	8.0%
City Street Fund	20.0%

Primary Road Fund revenues are used by the DOT to fund improvements on the primary road system both outside of and within cities. The Secondary Road Fund is distributed among Iowa's counties for use on all secondary roads. The Farm-to-Market Road Fund is distributed among the 99 counties for construction improvements on the Farm-to-Market system. The Farm-to-Market system is a subset of secondary roads that provide critical connections for the movement of agricultural goods. The Farm-to-Market system is approximately 32,000 miles. Both the Secondary and Farm-to-Market Road funds are distributed to counties based 70% on each county's share of total statewide system needs and 30% based on each county's share of total statewide land area.

The City Street Fund is distributed to Iowa's 950 cities based upon each city's share of total statewide city population.

Study Process

The RUTF Committee began meeting in January of 2002 and has met 16 times to evaluate the highway system. To begin the study effort, the committee heard from several associations and groups with an interest in the public road system. These groups included the Iowa State Association of Counties, Farm Bureau, League of Cities, Iowa Motor Truck Association, and the Iowa Chamber Alliance. Each group provided its thoughts regarding the public road system in Iowa and some also provided recommendations for change.

The committee then reviewed past studies of the public road system. Of particular interest was a 1989 legislatively mandated study of the RUTF. This study was titled "The Needs and Finances of Iowa's Roads." Table 3 lists some of the recommendations that came out of the 1989 study that are still relevant today.

Table 3 - Status of Recommendations from 1989 RUTF Study "The Needs and Finances of Iowa's Roads"

Recommendation	Status
Review off-the-top allocations and find alternative funding for those that are not for road purposes.	Several off-the-top allocations have been eliminated since 1989.
Change RUTF formula State: 45% to 52% County: 37% to 29% City: 18% to 19%	RUTF formula changed in 1989 to State: 47.5% (+2.5%) County: 32.5% (-4.5%) City: 20% (+2%).
Increase needs component used in distribution of secondary RUTF among counties.	Need component of distribution factor calculation changed from 60% to 70% in 1990
Change city RUTF distribution to first distribute funds among population groups based upon pre-established percentages so that cities under 2,500 population receive adequate funding. Distribute to individual cities within population groups by population.	No change
Give counties responsibility to maintain extensions through municipalities with less than 2,500 population. Cities have option to retain responsibility.	No change
Establish a mechanism to promote and enable cities under 1,000 population to utilize the county for maintenance of entire street system.	No change
Recommend that all jurisdictions uniformly adhere to design guides regarding the paving of low-volume roads.	Paving of low-volume roads has decreased.
Cities and counties should implement systems to define levels of maintenance service.	The ICEA developed a "Model Snow Ordinance" that was upheld at the State Supreme Court level.
Counties develop plans to designate Level B secondary roads, maintenance levels on other roads, as well as roads that have potential for abandonment.	The area service 'B' classification was established.
Iowa enact a limitation on tort liability.	The legislature has not enacted a tort liability ceiling but additional immunities have been added that have reduced the number of claims.

After hearing from interested groups and reviewing past studies, the committee began identifying issues that need to be addressed. Many of these issues may need to be addressed with Code changes while others will require further study.

Issues Identified

Jurisdictional Responsibility

The existing primary highway system is a result of 1970 legislation creating the State Functional Classification system. That system was used in the Code of Iowa to define jurisdiction of roads and streets based upon the classification of that road/street. This provided a rational method to assign jurisdiction based upon the type of service provided by the road. Due to pressure from local jurisdictions reluctant to accept jurisdiction of primary highways, the legislature required in 1981 that all transfers of jurisdiction be agreed upon by both parties. This effectively eliminated the assignment of jurisdiction based upon service provided. The end result is that many highways in the state are under state jurisdiction even though they generally provide service to local areas. In addition, there are other primary highways that have been bypassed by new highway construction but have not been transferred to local governments. These highways also generally serve local areas but the DOT continues to have jurisdiction. This results in inefficiencies in DOT operations and a level of service that is not appropriate for roads of this type.

System Size

Much has been said about Iowa's large highway system, in particular the nearly 90,000-mile secondary road system. This system is the result of the one-mile by one-mile sectioning of land in the state. Roads were created around these sections to provide access to farmland. Some argue that with fewer and larger farms there is no longer the need for such an extensive county road system. While there are fewer farms in the state, those farms are often not contiguous and there is still a need for those roads to move from property to property and to market. While there is some truth that there are roads that could be abandoned, there are also significant hurdles in the abandonment process.

In addition to the political struggles in road abandonment, there can be substantial legal costs and damage awards associated with road abandonment. In reality, savings associated with road abandonment are not as significant as might be expected and, in fact, there may be no savings at all. Those roads that are candidates for abandonment are already receiving very minimal maintenance. With the potential high costs to abandon roadways and minimal savings, it is often difficult to justify abandonment proceedings.

An alternative, which can yield cost savings with minimal expense, is to convert low volume gravel roads with property access to area service 'C' roads. This classification allows a county, upon petition from all adjoining landowners, to significantly reduce the maintenance level of the road and to put up a gate or barrier. This alternative has provided many of the benefits of abandonment but without the associated costs.

Jurisdiction of Streets in Small Cities

Several past studies have made recommendations related to the transfer of responsibility of some or all of the street system in small cities to the county. Clearly there are efficiencies to be gained by having county government take over jurisdiction of small city streets. Cities in Iowa receive approximately $80 per person from the RUTF. For a city of 500 this amounts to $40,000 per year in revenue to maintain and improve the city street system. This level of funding is not sufficient to sustain the infrastructure required

to adequately maintain a street system. Because counties already maintain hundreds of miles of roads, they are the most appropriate jurisdiction to take on the additional responsibility for these routes.

Many counties in Iowa already provide maintenance and construction support for small communities. This support is provided either by informal agreement or formal 28E agreements.

Recommendations

- **Rationalize the primary highway system by transferring 712 miles to county and city governments.**

The RUTF Committee identified 712 miles of primary roads and streets that should be under local jurisdiction (see Appendix A). Some of these roads have been bypassed by new highway construction and generally serve local traffic. The other roads are remnants of the old jurisdictional assignment system that resulted in primary jurisdiction of some roads that generally serve local traffic. Improvement and maintenance of these roads can be accomplished more efficiently under local jurisdiction than DOT jurisdiction.

The committee recommends that legislation be drafted to transfer these roads to local jurisdiction effective July 1, 2003. In addition, the committee recommends that 1.75% of the formula allocation to the Primary Road Fund be set-aside into a Transfer of Jurisdiction Fund. The majority of the Transfer of Jurisdiction Fund (75%) will be used to compensate those local jurisdictions that assume jurisdiction of those roads and streets. This funding should be distributed to those jurisdictions for a period of ten years beginning in fiscal year 2004 and ending in fiscal year 2013 based upon each jurisdiction's share of construction needs for those transferred roads (see Appendix B).

For fiscal year 2004 through fiscal year 2013, the remaining 25% of the Transfer of Jurisdiction Fund should be transferred to the Secondary Road Fund and the City Street Fund. Of that amount, the committee recommends 90% be transferred to the Secondary Road Fund and 10% to the City Street Fund. These percentages reflect the approximate distribution of transferred roads and streets in Iowa. This transfer of funds is intended to address past transfers of jurisdiction from the state to local jurisdictions that did not include a corresponding transfer of RUTF revenues.

Following fiscal year 2013, the portion of Primary Road Fund set-aside for the Transfer of Jurisdiction Fund will be allocated to the Secondary Road Fund and the City Street Fund for distribution to all jurisdictions. The committee recommends that 90% of the Primary Road Fund set-aside be allocated to the Secondary Road Fund and 10% of the Primary Road Fund set-aside be allocated to the City Street Fund. This transfer of funds is also intended to address past transfers of jurisdiction from the state to local jurisdictions that did not include a corresponding transfer of RUTF revenues.

- **Transfer responsibility for Farm-to-Market extensions in cities under 500 population to the county.**

Cities with population under 500 generally do not have the staff and infrastructure necessary to efficiently improve and maintain their Farm-to-Market extensions. These extensions are often the major routes through town that carry higher levels of traffic, including significant movements of agricultural products. In many counties, the county already provides support for the city on those routes either informally or through a formal 28E agreement. The committee recommends legislation be enacted to require counties to assume responsibility for those Farm-to-Market extensions in cities under 500 population. This would result in approximately 363 miles of city streets becoming the responsibility of the respective county (see Appendix C). In order to plan and gear up for

this additional responsibility, the committee recommends this transition become effective July 1, 2004.

Along with the transfer of responsibility, the committee recommends a share of the city's allocation of the City Street Fund be allocated to the county to support the transfer of responsibility. The amount to be transferred to the county should represent the share of local street mileage that is Farm-to-Market extension.

In addition, if the recommendation to transfer 712 miles of primary road to local governments is adopted, the committee recommends that counties assume responsibility of those routes transferred to cities under 500 population effective July 1, 2004. This amounts to an additional 29 miles of streets transferred to county jurisdiction. The committee also recommends that the associated Transfer of Jurisdiction funding distributed to those cities be directly allocated to the county.

In order to avoid back and forth jurisdictional assignment, the county will continue to be responsible for Farm-to-Market extensions until the population of the city exceeds 750 through a certified Federal census or special census. Any city that drops below 500 population in a future certified Federal census or special census will have jurisdiction of its Farm-to-Market extension transfer to the county the following July 1.

- **Allow the Board of Supervisors to initiate a change in county road classification to area service 'C'**

The area service 'C' classification may be used to restrict access and provide a minimal level of maintenance on county roads that have little to no traffic. This classification has been used effectively by many counties to reduce maintenance and improvement needs. Currently, a county may classify a road as area service 'C' only upon petition signed by all landowners adjoining the road. The committee recommends legislation to allow a county to initiate an area service 'C' classification without the petition of all adjoining landowners. This recommendation will allow counties to proactively reduce maintenance and improvement needs on roads that no longer provide a service to the county.

- **Establish a study committee to evaluate the distribution of the City Street Fund.**

The City Street Fund is currently distributed based upon population. This does not take into consideration many factors which may impact the funding needs of Iowa's cities such as traffic, condition, age, number and size of structures, etc. Previous studies have documented the need to reevaluate the distribution of the City Street Fund and the committee agrees the need exists. Therefore, the committee recommends a study committee be established to evaluate alternative distribution methodologies of the City Street Fund and make recommendations to the legislature by January 1, 2004.

This study committee will match similar efforts underway as a result of legislation last session to evaluate the distribution of the Secondary and Farm-to-Market Road Funds. The study committee for that effort has representation from county engineers and county supervisors and is supported by DOT staff.

- **The RUTF Committee should continue to meet after the next legislative session to further evaluate the RUTF.**

The proposed recommendations in this report go a long way to improving the efficiency and operation of the public road system in the state of Iowa. However, the committee members acknowledge additional study is necessary to complete the evaluation and intends to continue to meet after the next legislative session.

Future Considerations

The question of the reallocation of RUTF revenues as proposed by the Iowa Chamber Alliance (50% State, 25% county, 25% city) has been considered by the committee. The committee agreed that reallocation of the RUTF formula without addressing increased funding is not feasible. The needs of all levels of our highway system are not being met by today's funding levels. Mere reallocation without addressing this shortfall is not in the public interest. If additional revenues become available in the future, the redistribution of those revenues should be addressed. Consensus was reached on the specific recommendations outlined in this report and that the following revenue issues should be considered in the future.

One of the areas for future study by the RUTF Committee is the level of Federal and State revenues available for roads and streets. Iowa, along with the rest of the country, may be faced with reduced Federal revenues in the future. Anticipated Federal revenue for fiscal year 2003 will likely be lower than fiscal year 2002 for all jurisdictions in Iowa. Federal highway revenue in fiscal year 2004 and beyond is dependent on a new six-year highway reauthorization to be debated by Congress next fall. As a result of increased priorities on national security and the economy, increased funding for highways is not expected. In fact, Federal funding may decrease even further. This will have a real impact on Iowa and its local governments.

At the state RUTF level, the registration fees for pick-ups warrants additional study. The highest registration fee now paid by pick-up truck owners is $65 per year. This is significantly less than the registration fee paid by owners of cars, mini-vans, and sport utility vehicles whose registration fee is dependent on the value and weight of the vehicle. This disparity in registration fees may have been warranted in an era when pick-up trucks were used almost entirely on the farm or for business. Today, however, the large majority of pick-ups are used for personal use just the same as a car, mini-van, or sport utility vehicle. If pick-ups were registered using the same formula as cars, over $70 million per year in additional RUTF revenues would be generated.

The state of Iowa has not raised the fuel tax rate on gasoline, gasohol, or diesel since 1989. Between 1989 and 2001, the consumer price index has increased approximately 43% without a corresponding increase in fuel tax. The fuel tax rate in Iowa should be studied further along with the concept of applying an inflation index to fuel tax rates in Iowa. This concept has been adopted by other states including Nebraska and Wisconsin.

Future RUTF revenues and Federal revenues collected from fuel taxes will be reduced as vehicles enter the market that utilize alternative fuels such as electricity and hydrogen. Efforts are underway nationwide to study this issue and make recommendations on alternative road user charge methodologies. Iowa needs to continue to participate in these studies and plan for the potential impact on revenues.

Unlike counties, cities do not have the ability to establish a dedicated road levy. The committee recommends further study to determine the benefits of allowing cities to establish a municipal road levy.

Appendix A
Transfer of Jurisdiction Map

Routes proposed for transfer of jurisdiction from state to local governments. (Local Service)

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS 80
U.S. HIGHWAYS 6
STATE HIGHWAYS 3
ROUTES NOT SHOWN 943
COUNTY SEAT

wsplanning/systemsplanning/highway/misc/shortrte_alt4.dgn

Appendix B
Transfer of Jurisdiction Listing

Summary of Transfer of Jurisdiction Proposal
Mileage and Needs by Jurisdiction

03/30/03

		2000 Census Population	Miles of Proposed Primary Road Transfer of Jurisdiction (TJ)	% Share of Total TJ Mileage	% Share of Construction Needs
	MUNICIPAL				
1	Adair	839	1.30	0.18%	0.261424%
2	Adel	3,435	1.52	0.21%	0.120088%
3	Akron	1,489	0.48	0.07%	0.011008%
4	Albert City	709	0.69	0.10%	0.071954%
5	Alden	904	1.35	0.19%	0.094157%
6	Alexander	165	2.09	0.29%	0.055389%
7	Allerton	559	0.68	0.10%	0.163680%
8	Arcadia	443	0.73	0.10%	0.022280%
9	Avoca	1,610	0.42	0.06%	0.032230%
10	Blairsburg	235	0.25	0.04%	0.037662%
11	Blairstown	682	0.15	0.02%	0.042534%
12	Brandon	311	0.32	0.05%	0.113082%
13	Buckeye	110	1.08	0.15%	0.125819%
14	Burlington	26,839	1.94	0.27%	0.252057%
15	Bussey	450	0.02	0.00%	0.003692%
16	Casey	478	0.80	0.11%	0.126642%
17	Cedar Rapids	120,758	3.73	0.52%	0.836868%
18	Center Point	2,007	1.39	0.19%	0.333310%
19	Cherokee	5,369	0.67	0.09%	0.071974%
20	Columbus City	376	0.52	0.07%	0.099414%
21	Coralville	15,123	1.82	0.26%	0.372481%
22	Council Bluffs	58,268	0.24	0.03%	0.026377%
23	Crawfordsville	295	0.49	0.07%	0.011126%
24	Crescent	537	1.62	0.23%	0.228932%
25	Davenport	98,359	0.67	0.09%	0.020853%
26	Dedham	280	0.75	0.11%	0.149392%
27	Derby	131	0.29	0.04%	0.052265%
28	Dexter	689	1.44	0.20%	0.276599%
29	Diagonal	312	0.37	0.05%	0.054086%
30	Drakesville	185	0.48	0.07%	0.092046%
31	Dubuque	57,686	0.13	0.02%	0.036190%
32	Durant	1,677	1.76	0.25%	0.223247%
33	Eldon	998	0.30	0.04%	0.033507%
34	Eldora	3,035	1.00	0.14%	0.023077%
35	Fort Madison	10,715	0.55	0.08%	0.053141%
36	Garden Grove	250	1.03	0.14%	0.179399%
37	Garwin	565	0.32	0.04%	0.011953%
38	Gilbertville	767	0.82	0.12%	0.205544%
39	Glenwood	5,358	1.48	0.21%	0.053073%
40	Grandview	600	0.34	0.05%	0.007731%
41	Harpers Ferry	330	0.26	0.04%	0.013662%
42	Harris	200	0.52	0.07%	0.079181%
43	Imogene	66	0.37	0.05%	0.043108%
44	Independence	6,014	0.30	0.04%	0.060483%
45	Iowa City	63,027	1.24	0.17%	0.159460%
46	Jackson Junction	60	2.19	0.31%	0.063415%
47	Jesup	2,212	0.34	0.05%	0.054670%
48	Johnston	8,649	0.06	0.01%	0.187640%
49	Keota	1,025	0.89	0.13%	0.222036%
50	Lacona	360	0.30	0.04%	0.061280%
51	Lake Mills	2,140	0.78	0.11%	0.024186%
52	Lake View	1,278	0.31	0.04%	0.027041%

Summary of Transfer of Jurisdiction Proposal
Mileage and Needs by Jurisdiction

03/30/03

		2000 Census Population	Miles of Proposed Primary Road Transfer of Jurisdiction (TJ)	% Share of Total TJ Mileage	% Share of Construction Needs
53	Lanesboro	152	0.68	0.10%	0.078207%
54	Lehigh	497	0.98	0.14%	0.217757%
55	Letts	392	0.58	0.08%	0.020340%
56	Lime Springs	496	0.52	0.07%	0.133263%
57	Little Sioux	217	1.04	0.15%	0.189840%
58	Lone Tree	1,151	0.03	0.00%	0.003808%
59	Lynnville	366	1.22	0.17%	0.033791%
60	Malvern	1,256	0.83	0.12%	0.268185%
61	Manilla	839	0.49	0.07%	0.011972%
62	Maquoketa	6,112	0.03	0.00%	0.003854%
63	McGregor	871	0.31	0.04%	0.056425%
64	Melcher-Dallas	1,298	1.08	0.15%	0.024946%
65	Melrose	130	0.90	0.13%	0.151699%
66	Menlo	365	0.68	0.10%	0.127773%
67	Middletown	535	0.21	0.03%	0.025205%
68	Milford	2,474	0.15	0.02%	0.005559%
69	Milo	839	0.03	0.00%	0.004638%
70	Milton	550	0.44	0.06%	0.046914%
71	Minden	564	0.63	0.09%	0.091627%
72	Missouri Valley	2,992	1.29	0.18%	0.311585%
73	Modale	303	0.49	0.07%	0.104237%
74	Montrose	957	0.89	0.13%	0.189655%
75	Murray	766	0.79	0.11%	0.141240%
76	Neola	845	1.19	0.17%	0.156556%
77	Nevada	6,658	0.97	0.14%	0.228424%
78	New London	1,937	1.22	0.17%	0.082775%
79	New Providence	227	0.49	0.07%	0.011346%
80	New Virginia	469	0.30	0.04%	0.068175%
81	Nora Springs	1,532	1.55	0.22%	0.139070%
82	Northwood	2,050	1.88	0.26%	0.211869%
83	Norway	601	0.54	0.08%	0.012485%
84	Oakville	439	0.43	0.06%	0.024023%
85	Oelwein	6,692	1.29	0.18%	0.034318%
86	Orleans	583	3.50	0.49%	0.238686%
87	Oxford	705	0.42	0.06%	0.086035%
88	Quasqueton	574	0.69	0.10%	0.180163%
89	Randall	148	0.47	0.07%	0.088912%
90	Randolph	209	0.62	0.09%	0.014215%
91	Raymond	537	0.35	0.05%	0.035512%
92	Redfield	833	0.31	0.04%	0.012231%
93	Rockford	907	0.37	0.05%	0.008432%
94	Roland	1,324	1.02	0.14%	0.032049%
95	Royal	479	0.39	0.06%	0.063479%
96	Russell	559	0.44	0.06%	0.068602%
97	Ryan	410	0.04	0.01%	0.004362%
98	Searsboro	155	0.18	0.03%	0.027231%
99	Sergeant Bluff	3,321	0.08	0.01%	0.014008%
100	Seymour	810	0.85	0.12%	0.091585%
101	Silver City	259	0.41	0.06%	0.009493%
102	Sioux City	85,013	0.17	0.02%	0.013989%
103	Solon	1,177	0.50	0.07%	0.021307%
104	Spirit Lake	4,261	0.02	0.00%	0.000554%
105	Sprague ville	89	0.44	0.06%	0.074418%

Summary of Transfer of Jurisdiction Proposal
Mileage and Needs by Jurisdiction

03/30/03

		2000 Census Population	Miles of Proposed Primary Road Transfer of Jurisdiction (TJ)	% Share of Total TJ Mileage	% Share of Construction Needs
106	Strawberry Point	1,386	0.09	0.01%	0.011046%
107	Stuart	1,712	1.09	0.15%	0.235780%
108	Sully	904	0.30	0.04%	0.030711%
109	Thurman	236	0.91	0.13%	0.068847%
110	Underwood	688	0.83	0.12%	0.041801%
111	Union	427	0.39	0.06%	0.009046%
112	Urbana	1,019	1.22	0.17%	0.047193%
113	Van Horne	716	0.03	0.00%	0.005377%
114	Van Wert	231	0.64	0.09%	0.092930%
115	Victor	952	0.25	0.03%	0.114846%
116	Walcott	1,528	0.26	0.04%	0.052353%
117	Wall Lake	841	0.59	0.08%	0.026144%
118	Wapello	2,124	0.63	0.09%	0.014492%
119	Waucoma	299	0.81	0.11%	0.183802%
120	Weldon	145	0.12	0.02%	0.012969%
121	Wellsburg	716	0.70	0.10%	0.029974%
122	West Burlington	3,161	1.55	0.22%	0.218851%
123	West Okoboji	432	0.54	0.08%	0.078673%
124	Williams	427	0.75	0.11%	0.133412%
125	Williamson	163	0.29	0.04%	0.052012%
126	Wilton	2,829	1.64	0.23%	0.067293%
127	Winfield	1,131	0.55	0.08%	0.012762%
128	Winthrop	772	0.52	0.07%	0.094979%
129	Woodburn	244	0.47	0.07%	0.084296%
	Sub-Total	**679,967**	**94.17**	**13.23%**	**11.998859%**
	RURAL				
1	Adair		0.82	0.12%	0.128969%
2	Adams		5.49	0.77%	0.857621%
3	Allamakee		5.88	0.83%	0.614006%
4	Benton		26.70	3.75%	3.120502%
5	Black Hawk		2.37	0.33%	0.372714%
6	Buchanan		27.91	3.92%	4.077841%
7	Buena Vista		1.88	0.26%	0.281387%
8	Calhoun		2.57	0.36%	0.240731%
9	Carroll		9.79	1.38%	1.779769%
10	Cedar		1.75	0.25%	0.274256%
11	Cherokee		1.34	0.19%	0.557593%
12	Clarke		0.80	0.11%	0.089124%
13	Clay		6.00	0.84%	0.896110%
14	Clayton		3.99	0.56%	0.483223%
15	Crawford		0.83	0.12%	0.128746%
16	Dallas		14.40	2.02%	2.234530%
17	Davis		9.55	1.34%	1.149346%
18	Decatur		12.63	1.77%	1.494993%
19	Delaware		0.15	0.02%	0.016131%
20	Des Moines		24.14	3.39%	4.238961%
21	Dickinson		3.52	0.49%	0.467973%
22	Dubuque		7.53	1.06%	1.166564%
23	Fayette		7.84	1.10%	1.140816%
24	Floyd		6.33	0.89%	0.899682%
25	Franklin		9.15	1.29%	0.912060%
26	Fremont		33.99	4.78%	3.757891%

Summary of Transfer of Jurisdiction Proposal
Mileage and Needs by Jurisdiction

03/30/03

		2000 Census Population	Miles of Proposed Primary Road Transfer of Jurisdiction (TJ)	% Share of Total TJ Mileage	% Share of Construction Needs
27	Grundy		5.03	0.71%	0.790749%
28	Guthrie		18.50	2.60%	2.357556%
29	Hamilton		22.56	3.17%	3.280112%
30	Hardin		27.77	3.90%	4.776941%
31	Harrison		14.94	2.10%	2.622569%
32	Henry		6.33	0.89%	0.272936%
33	Howard		0.51	0.07%	0.086647%
34	Iowa		0.79	0.11%	0.206371%
35	Jackson		9.56	1.34%	0.256528%
36	Jasper		3.36	0.47%	0.728921%
37	Johnson		26.01	3.65%	4.121538%
38	Keokuk		1.79	0.25%	0.262739%
39	Lee		20.87	2.93%	3.152639%
40	Linn		15.60	2.19%	2.568598%
41	Louisa		14.72	2.07%	3.567354%
42	Lucas		2.22	0.31%	0.304942%
43	Lyon		4.64	0.65%	0.481178%
44	Madison		2.66	0.37%	0.260850%
45	Marion		13.24	1.86%	2.175316%
46	Marshall		0.88	0.12%	0.020285%
47	Mills		16.12	2.26%	2.076997%
48	Monona		0.51	0.07%	0.058426%
49	Monroe		1.03	0.14%	0.101830%
50	Montgomery		1.24	0.17%	0.123330%
51	Muscatine		5.06	0.71%	0.786227%
52	Osceola		0.54	0.08%	0.051960%
53	Palo Alto		0.06	0.01%	0.001614%
54	Polk		0.06	0.01%	0.187635%
55	Pottawattamie		59.16	8.31%	7.870609%
56	Poweshiek		2.63	0.37%	0.488956%
57	Ringgold		7.65	1.07%	1.014294%
58	Sac		2.65	0.37%	0.387174%
59	Scott		8.03	1.13%	1.206866%
60	Story		2.89	0.41%	0.431997%
61	Tama		4.92	0.69%	0.494861%
62	Van Buren		4.22	0.59%	0.424154%
63	Wapello		2.43	0.34%	0.322104%
64	Warren		12.61	1.77%	1.695133%
65	Washington		1.51	0.21%	0.150051%
66	Wayne		6.50	0.91%	0.892311%
67	Webster		7.16	1.01%	0.821975%
68	Winneshiek		3.62	0.51%	0.711064%
69	Woodbury		27.78	3.90%	4.025267%
	Rural Sub-Total		**617.67**	**86.77%**	**88.001141%**
	Grand Total		**711.83**		

Appendix C
Farm-to-Market Extension Mileage (< 500 population)

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
01 ADAIR	BRIDGEWATER	0.68	178
01 ADAIR	CASEY	0.27	478
01 ADAIR	ORIENT	0.82	402
		1.77	
02 ADAMS	CARBON	1.61	28
02 ADAMS	NODAWAY	0.83	132
02 ADAMS	PRESCOTT	0.36	266
		2.80	
03 ALLAMAKEE	HARPERS FERRY	1.34	330
03 ALLAMAKEE	WATERVILLE	0.75	145
		2.09	
04 APPANOOSE	CINCINNATI	1.02	428
04 APPANOOSE	EXLINE	2.21	191
04 APPANOOSE	NUMA	0.93	109
04 APPANOOSE	PLANO	0.00	58
04 APPANOOSE	RATHBUN	0.76	88
04 APPANOOSE	UDELL	0.00	58
04 APPANOOSE	UNIONVILLE	1.53	127
		6.46	
05 AUDUBON	BRAYTON	0.67	145
05 AUDUBON	GRAY	1.06	82
05 AUDUBON	KIMBALLTON	0.25	342
		1.98	
06 BENTON	GARRISON	0.52	413
06 BENTON	LUZERNE	0.51	105
06 BENTON	MOUNT AUBURN	0.66	160
		1.69	
08 BOONE	BEAVER	0.00	53
08 BOONE	BERKLEY	0.77	24
08 BOONE	BOXHOLM	0.00	215
08 BOONE	FRASER	2.19	137
08 BOONE	LUTHER	1.05	243
08 BOONE	PILOT MOUND	0.00	214
08 BOONE	SHELDAHL	0.00	336
		4.00	
09 BREMER	FREDERIKA	0.88	199
09 BREMER	PLAINFIELD	0.00	438
		0.88	
10 BUCHANAN	AURORA	1.51	194
10 BUCHANAN	BRANDON	0.39	311
10 BUCHANAN	ROWLEY	0.62	290
10 BUCHANAN	STANLEY	0.40	128
		2.92	

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
11 BUENA VISTA	LAKESIDE	0.00	484
11 BUENA VISTA	LINN GROVE	0.66	211
11 BUENA VISTA	MARATHON	0.48	302
11 BUENA VISTA	REMBRANDT	0.29	228
11 BUENA VISTA	TRUESDALE	0.46	91
		1.89	
12 BUTLER	AREDALE	1.49	89
12 BUTLER	BRISTOW	1.96	202
		3.46	
13 CALHOUN	FARNHAMVILLE	0.56	430
13 CALHOUN	JOLLEY	0.53	54
13 CALHOUN	KNIERIM	1.50	70
13 CALHOUN	LOHRVILLE	0.75	431
13 CALHOUN	LYTTON	0.28	305
13 CALHOUN	RINARD	1.01	72
13 CALHOUN	SOMERS	0.80	165
13 CALHOUN	YETTER	0.25	36
		5.68	
14 CARROLL	ARCADIA	0.77	443
14 CARROLL	BREDA	0.57	477
14 CARROLL	DEDHAM	1.01	280
14 CARROLL	HALBUR	0.62	202
14 CARROLL	LANESBORO	0.93	152
14 CARROLL	LIDDERDALE	2.36	186
14 CARROLL	RALSTON	1.03	98
14 CARROLL	TEMPLETON	0.97	334
14 CARROLL	WILLEY	0.49	103
		8.73	
15 CASS	CUMBERLAND	0.77	281
15 CASS	LEWIS	0.65	438
15 CASS	MARNE	1.06	149
15 CASS	MASSENA	1.14	414
15 CASS	WIOTA	0.00	149
		3.61	
16 CEDAR	BENNETT	0.36	395
		0.36	
17 CERRO GORDO	DOUGHERTY	1.56	80
17 CERRO GORDO	MESERVEY	0.00	252
17 CERRO GORDO	PLYMOUTH	1.40	429
17 CERRO GORDO	ROCK FALLS	1.34	170
17 CERRO GORDO	SWALEDALE	0.00	174
17 CERRO GORDO	THORNTON	0.77	422
		5.06	

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
18 CHEROKEE	CLEGHORN	0.56	250
18 CHEROKEE	LARRABEE	0.00	149
18 CHEROKEE	MERIDEN	0.00	184
18 CHEROKEE	QUIMBY	0.56	368
18 CHEROKEE	WASHTA	1.04	282
		2.16	
19 CHICKASAW	ALTA VISTA	1.50	286
19 CHICKASAW	BASSETT	0.75	74
19 CHICKASAW	IONIA	1.50	277
19 CHICKASAW	LAWLER	0.87	461
19 CHICKASAW	NORTH WASHINGTON	0.60	118
19 CHICKASAW	PROTIVIN	0.00	317
		5.22	
20 CLARKE	WOODBURN	0.40	244
		0.40	
21 CLAY	DICKENS	1.06	202
21 CLAY	FOSTORIA	0.48	230
21 CLAY	GILLETT GROVE	0.89	55
21 CLAY	GREENVILLE	0.39	93
21 CLAY	PETERSON	0.51	372
21 CLAY	ROSSIE	0.00	58
21 CLAY	ROYAL	0.23	479
21 CLAY	WEBB	0.49	165
		4.04	
22 CLAYTON	CLAYTON	0.42	55
22 CLAYTON	ELKPORT	0.95	88
22 CLAYTON	FARMERSBURG	1.32	300
22 CLAYTON	GARBER	0.67	103
22 CLAYTON	LITTLEPORT	1.04	26
22 CLAYTON	LUANA	2.47	299
22 CLAYTON	MARQUETTE	0.91	421
22 CLAYTON	MILLVILLE	0.12	23
22 CLAYTON	NORTH BUENA VISTA	1.37	124
22 CLAYTON	OSTERDOCK	1.55	50
22 CLAYTON	ST. OLAF	1.07	136
22 CLAYTON	VOLGA	2.67	247
		14.56	
23 CLINTON	ANDOVER	0.34	87
23 CLINTON	CALAMUS	0.69	394
23 CLINTON	CHARLOTTE	0.54	421
23 CLINTON	GOOSE LAKE	0.36	232
23 CLINTON	LOST NATION	0.61	497
23 CLINTON	LOW MOOR	0.51	240
23 CLINTON	TORONTO	0.59	134
23 CLINTON	WELTON	0.00	159
		3.64	

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
24 CRAWFORD	ARION	0.41	136
24 CRAWFORD	ASPINWALL	0.00	58
24 CRAWFORD	BUCK GROVE	0.00	49
24 CRAWFORD	DELOIT	1.12	288
24 CRAWFORD	KIRON	0.52	273
24 CRAWFORD	RICKETTS	0.75	144
24 CRAWFORD	VAIL	1.26	452
24 CRAWFORD	WESTSIDE	1.02	327
		5.07	
25 DALLAS	BOUTON	0.86	136
25 DALLAS	DAWSON	1.41	155
25 DALLAS	LINDEN	1.77	226
25 DALLAS	MINBURN	0.86	391
		4.89	
26 DAVIS	DRAKESVILLE	0.48	185
26 DAVIS	FLORIS	0.92	153
26 DAVIS	PULASKI	0.65	249
		2.04	
27 DECATUR	DAVIS CITY	0.21	275
27 DECATUR	DECATUR CITY	0.62	199
27 DECATUR	GARDEN GROVE	0.42	250
27 DECATUR	GRAND RIVER	0.63	225
27 DECATUR	LE ROY	1.26	13
27 DECATUR	PLEASANTON	0.99	37
27 DECATUR	VAN WERT	0.23	231
27 DECATUR	WELDON	0.22	145
		4.57	
28 DELAWARE	COLESBURG	0.60	412
28 DELAWARE	DELAWARE	0.00	188
28 DELAWARE	DELHI	1.48	458
28 DELAWARE	DUNDEE	1.07	179
28 DELAWARE	GREELEY	0.00	276
28 DELAWARE	MASONVILLE	0.30	104
28 DELAWARE	RYAN	0.79	410
		4.23	
29 DES MOINES	BUSSEY	0.00	450
		0.00	
30 DICKINSON	SUPERIOR	0.00	142
30 DICKINSON	TERRIL	0.43	404
30 DICKINSON	WAHPETON	0.00	462
30 DICKINSON	WEST OKOBOJI	0.00	432
		0.43	
31 DUBUQUE	BALLTOWN	0.43	73

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
31 DUBUQUE	BANKSTON	0.17	27
31 DUBUQUE	BERNARD	0.28	97
31 DUBUQUE	CENTRALIA	0.81	101
31 DUBUQUE	DURANGO	0.06	24
31 DUBUQUE	GRAF	0.37	73
31 DUBUQUE	HOLY CROSS	0.67	339
31 DUBUQUE	LUXEMBURG	0.00	246
31 DUBUQUE	NEW VIENNA	0.64	400
31 DUBUQUE	RICKARDSVILLE	0.15	191
31 DUBUQUE	SAGEVILLE	0.45	203
31 DUBUQUE	SHERRILL	0.85	186
31 DUBUQUE	WORTHINGTON	0.87	381
31 DUBUQUE	ZWINGLE	0.00	100
		5.77	
32 EMMET	DOLLIVER	0.47	77
32 EMMET	GRUVER	0.00	106
32 EMMET	RINGSTED	1.07	436
32 EMMET	WALLINGFORD	1.02	210
		2.55	
33 FAYETTE	ARLINGTON	1.52	490
33 FAYETTE	HAWKEYE	1.75	489
33 FAYETTE	RANDALIA	0.56	84
33 FAYETTE	ST. LUCAS	1.04	178
33 FAYETTE	WADENA	1.58	243
33 FAYETTE	WAUCOMA	0.52	299
33 FAYETTE	WESTGATE	0.75	234
		7.71	
34 FLOYD	COLWELL	0.81	76
34 FLOYD	FLOYD	0.81	361
34 FLOYD	MARBLE ROCK	1.80	326
34 FLOYD	RUDD	0.95	431
		4.37	
35 FRANKLIN	ALEXANDER	2.04	165
35 FRANKLIN	COULTER	2.16	262
35 FRANKLIN	GENEVA	1.01	171
35 FRANKLIN	HANSELL	0.99	96
35 FRANKLIN	POPEJOY	0.75	78
		6.96	
36 FREMONT	IMOGENE	0.80	66
36 FREMONT	RANDOLPH	0.00	209
36 FREMONT	RIVERTON	0.60	304
36 FREMONT	THURMAN	0.76	236
		2.16	
37 GREENE	CHURDAN	1.88	418
37 GREENE	DANA	0.54	84

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
37 GREENE	PATON	0.73	265
37 GREENE	RALSTON	1.00	98
37 GREENE	RIPPEY	1.76	319
		5.91	
38 GRUNDY	BEAMAN	0.00	210
38 GRUNDY	HOLLAND	0.72	250
38 GRUNDY	MORRISON	0.00	97
38 GRUNDY	STOUT	0.65	217
		1.37	
39 GUTHRIE	BAGLEY	0.00	354
39 GUTHRIE	CASEY	0.07	478
39 GUTHRIE	JAMAICA	0.49	237
39 GUTHRIE	MENLO	0.00	365
39 GUTHRIE	YALE	0.49	287
		1.05	
40 HAMILTON	BLAIRSBURG	0.00	235
40 HAMILTON	KAMRAR	1.18	229
40 HAMILTON	RANDALL	0.81	148
40 HAMILTON	STANHOPE	0.00	488
40 HAMILTON	WILLIAMS	0.00	427
		1.99	
41 HANCOCK	CORWITH	2.07	350
41 HANCOCK	CRYSTAL LAKE	0.98	285
41 HANCOCK	GOODELL	0.68	174
41 HANCOCK	WODEN	0.68	243
		4.41	
42 HARDIN	BUCKEYE	0.58	110
42 HARDIN	NEW PROVIDENCE	1.55	227
42 HARDIN	OWASA	1.24	38
42 HARDIN	STEAMBOAT ROCK	2.15	336
42 HARDIN	UNION	1.04	427
42 HARDIN	WHITTEN	0.50	160
		7.07	
43 HARRISON	LITTLE SIOUX	0.62	217
43 HARRISON	MAGNOLIA	0.58	200
43 HARRISON	MODALE	1.51	303
43 HARRISON	MONDAMIN	0.00	423
43 HARRISON	PERSIA	0.57	363
43 HARRISON	PISGAH	1.29	316
		4.56	
44 HENRY	COPPOCK	0.24	57
44 HENRY	HILLSBORO	0.98	205
44 HENRY	MOUNT UNION	1.05	132
44 HENRY	OLDS	0.00	249

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
44 HENRY	ROME	0.60	113
44 HENRY	SALEM	1.76	464
44 HENRY	WESTWOOD	0.00	127
		4.64	
45 HOWARD	CHESTER	1.28	151
45 HOWARD	LIME SPRINGS	1.70	496
45 HOWARD	PROTIVIN	0.50	317
		3.47	
46 HUMBOLDT	BODE	1.24	327
46 HUMBOLDT	BRADGATE	1.27	101
46 HUMBOLDT	HARDY	0.96	57
46 HUMBOLDT	LIVERMORE	1.24	431
46 HUMBOLDT	LUVERNE	1.04	158
46 HUMBOLDT	OTTOSEN	0.85	61
46 HUMBOLDT	PIONEER	0.00	21
46 HUMBOLDT	RENWICK	1.09	306
46 HUMBOLDT	RUTLAND	1.57	145
46 HUMBOLDT	THOR	1.98	174
		11.24	
47 IDA	ARTHUR	0.00	245
47 IDA	GALVA	1.61	368
		1.61	
48 IOWA	LADORA	0.41	287
48 IOWA	MILLERSBURG	0.50	184
48 IOWA	PARNELL	0.24	220
		1.15	
49 JACKSON	ANDREW	0.37	460
49 JACKSON	BALDWIN	0.51	127
49 JACKSON	LA MOTTE	1.51	272
49 JACKSON	MILES	1.64	462
49 JACKSON	MONMOUTH	0.77	180
49 JACKSON	SPRAGUEVILLE	1.33	89
49 JACKSON	SPRINGBROOK	1.56	182
49 JACKSON	ST. DONATUS	0.34	140
49 JACKSON	ZWINGLE	0.24	100
		8.26	
50 JASPER	LAMBS GROVE	0.00	225
50 JASPER	LYNNVILLE	0.25	366
50 JASPER	MINGO	0.77	269
50 JASPER	OAKLAND ACRES	0.00	166
50 JASPER	REASNOR	1.44	194
50 JASPER	VALERIA	0.00	62
		2.46	
51 JEFFERSON	COPPOCK	0.00	57

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
51 JEFFERSON	LIBERTYVILLE	1.48	325
51 JEFFERSON	LOCKRIDGE	1.09	275
51 JEFFERSON	PACKWOOD	1.26	223
51 JEFFERSON	PLEASANT PLAIN	2.12	131
		5.95	
52 JOHNSON	SHUEYVILLE	2.03	250
		2.03	
53 JONES	CENTER JUNCTION	0.00	131
53 JONES	MARTELLE	0.64	280
53 JONES	MORLEY	0.44	88
53 JONES	ONSLOW	0.00	223
		1.08	
54 KEOKUK	DELTA	1.88	410
54 KEOKUK	GIBSON	0.34	92
54 KEOKUK	HARPER	0.41	134
54 KEOKUK	HAYESVILLE	0.49	64
54 KEOKUK	KESWICK	0.76	295
54 KEOKUK	KINROSS	0.00	80
54 KEOKUK	MARTINSBURG	0.50	126
54 KEOKUK	OLLIE	2.02	224
54 KEOKUK	SOUTH ENGLISH	0.26	213
54 KEOKUK	THORNBURG	0.00	84
54 KEOKUK	WEBSTER	0.16	110
		6.82	
55 KOSSUTH	FENTON	0.00	317
55 KOSSUTH	LAKOTA	0.43	255
55 KOSSUTH	LEDYARD	0.78	147
55 KOSSUTH	LONE ROCK	0.30	157
55 KOSSUTH	LUVERNE	0.93	158
55 KOSSUTH	WESLEY	0.00	467
		2.44	
56 LEE	FRANKLIN	0.53	136
56 LEE	HOUGHTON	0.13	130
56 LEE	ST. PAUL	1.09	118
		1.75	
57 LINN	BERTRAM	1.86	263
57 LINN	PRAIRIEBURG	0.98	175
		2.83	
58 LOUISA	COLUMBUS CITY	1.18	376
58 LOUISA	COTTER	0.17	48
58 LOUISA	FREDONIA	0.43	251
58 LOUISA	LETTS	0.69	392
58 LOUISA	OAKVILLE	0.72	439
		3.19	

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
59 LUCAS	DERBY	0.42	131
59 LUCAS	LUCAS	0.62	249
59 LUCAS	WILLIAMSON	0.58	163
		1.61	
60 LYON	ALVORD	0.00	187
60 LYON	LESTER	1.19	251
60 LYON	LITTLE ROCK	2.29	489
		3.49	
61 MADISON	BEVINGTON	0.00	58
61 MADISON	EAST PERU	2.45	153
61 MADISON	MACKSBURG	2.00	142
61 MADISON	PATTERSON	0.29	126
61 MADISON	TRURO	1.81	427
		6.55	
62 MAHASKA	BARNES CITY	1.34	201
62 MAHASKA	KEOMAH VILLAGE	0.00	97
62 MAHASKA	LEIGHTON	0.17	153
62 MAHASKA	ROSE HILL	0.49	205
		2.00	
63 MARION	BUSSEY	0.94	450
63 MARION	HAMILTON	1.65	144
63 MARION	HARVEY	0.86	277
63 MARION	MARYSVILLE	0.91	54
63 MARION	SWAN	0.00	121
		4.36	
64 MARSHALL	CLEMONS	0.62	148
64 MARSHALL	FERGUSON	0.42	126
64 MARSHALL	HAVERHILL	0.29	170
64 MARSHALL	LAUREL	0.50	266
64 MARSHALL	LISCOMB	2.19	272
64 MARSHALL	RHODES	1.66	294
64 MARSHALL	ST. ANTHONY	1.56	109
		7.25	
65 MILLS	EMERSON	0.57	480
65 MILLS	HASTINGS	0.39	214
65 MILLS	HENDERSON	0.48	171
65 MILLS	SILVER CITY	0.24	259
		1.69	
66 MITCHELL	CARPENTER	0.70	130
66 MITCHELL	MCINTIRE	1.00	173
66 MITCHELL	MITCHELL	1.60	155
66 MITCHELL	ORCHARD	0.52	88
66 MITCHELL	STACYVILLE	1.24	469

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
		5.05	
67 MONONA	BLENCOE	0.95	231
67 MONONA	CASTANA	0.49	178
67 MONONA	MOORHEAD	0.43	232
67 MONONA	RODNEY	0.77	74
67 MONONA	SOLDIER	0.00	207
67 MONONA	TURIN	0.30	75
67 MONONA	UTE	0.00	378
		2.94	
68 MONROE	MELROSE	1.10	130
		1.10	
69 MONTGOMERY	COBURG	0.44	31
69 MONTGOMERY	ELLIOTT	0.55	402
69 MONTGOMERY	GRANT	0.30	102
		1.28	
70 MUSCATINE	ATALISSA	0.10	283
70 MUSCATINE	CONESVILLE	0.10	424
70 MUSCATINE	NICHOLS	0.00	374
70 MUSCATINE	STOCKTON	0.57	182
		0.76	
71 O'BRIEN	ARCHER	0.20	126
71 O'BRIEN	CALUMET	0.44	181
		0.63	
72 OSCEOLA	ASHTON	0.00	461
72 OSCEOLA	HARRIS	0.98	200
72 OSCEOLA	MELVIN	0.51	243
		1.49	
73 PAGE	BLANCHARD	0.68	61
73 PAGE	BRADDYVILLE	0.38	176
73 PAGE	COIN	1.41	252
73 PAGE	COLLEGE SPRINGS	2.36	246
73 PAGE	HEPBURN	0.14	39
73 PAGE	NORTHBORO	0.63	60
73 PAGE	SHAMBAUGH	0.06	188
73 PAGE	YORKTOWN	0.61	82
		6.28	
74 PALO ALTO	AYRSHIRE	0.34	202
74 PALO ALTO	CURLEW	1.75	62
74 PALO ALTO	CYLINDER	0.00	110
74 PALO ALTO	MALLARD	0.50	298
74 PALO ALTO	RODMAN	0.95	56
		3.53	

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
75 PLYMOUTH	BRUNSVILLE	0.00	146
75 PLYMOUTH	CRAIG	0.25	102
75 PLYMOUTH	OYENS	0.23	132
75 PLYMOUTH	STRUBLE	0.51	85
75 PLYMOUTH	WESTFIELD	0.28	189
		1.27	
76 POCAHONTAS	HAVELOCK	0.73	177
76 POCAHONTAS	PALMER	1.14	214
76 POCAHONTAS	PLOVER	1.11	95
76 POCAHONTAS	VARINA	0.37	90
		3.35	
77 POLK	ALLEMAN	1.24	439
77 POLK	ELKHART	1.99	362
77 POLK	RUNNELLS	0.00	352
77 POLK	SHELDAHL	0.93	336
		4.15	
78 POTTAWATTAMIE	HANCOCK	0.37	207
78 POTTAWATTAMIE	MACEDONIA	0.50	325
78 POTTAWATTAMIE	MCCLELLAND	0.39	129
		1.26	
79 POWESHIEK	BARNES CITY	0.20	201
79 POWESHIEK	DEEP RIVER	0.39	288
79 POWESHIEK	GUERNSEY	0.89	70
79 POWESHIEK	HARTWICK	0.00	83
79 POWESHIEK	MALCOM	0.78	352
79 POWESHIEK	SEARSBORO	0.00	155
		2.26	
80 RINGGOLD	BEACONSFIELD	0.71	11
80 RINGGOLD	BENTON	0.00	40
80 RINGGOLD	CLEARFIELD	0.00	371
80 RINGGOLD	DELPHOS	0.47	25
80 RINGGOLD	DIAGONAL	1.03	312
80 RINGGOLD	ELLSTON	0.81	57
80 RINGGOLD	KELLERTON	1.37	372
80 RINGGOLD	MALOY	0.81	28
80 RINGGOLD	REDDING	0.99	78
80 RINGGOLD	SHANNON CITY	0.99	70
80 RINGGOLD	TINGLEY	1.06	171
		8.24	
81 SAC	AUBURN	0.00	296
81 SAC	LYTTON	0.00	305
81 SAC	NEMAHA	0.00	102
		0.00	
82 SCOTT	DIXON	0.62	276

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
82 SCOTT	DONAHUE	0.91	293
82 SCOTT	LOW MOOR	0.00	240
82 SCOTT	MAYSVILLE	0.24	163
82 SCOTT	MCCAUSLAND	1.56	299
82 SCOTT	NEW LIBERTY	0.10	121
82 SCOTT	PANORAMA PARK	0.00	111
		3.42	
83 SHELBY	DEFIANCE	0.38	346
83 SHELBY	EARLING	0.52	471
83 SHELBY	IRWIN	1.55	372
83 SHELBY	KIRKMAN	0.42	76
83 SHELBY	PANAMA	0.00	212
83 SHELBY	PORTSMOUTH	0.57	225
83 SHELBY	TENNANT	1.11	73
83 SHELBY	WESTPHALIA	0.00	160
		4.55	
84 SIOUX	CHATSWORTH	0.00	89
84 SIOUX	GRANVILLE	0.00	325
84 SIOUX	MATLOCK	0.70	83
84 SIOUX	MAURICE	0.76	254
		1.46	
85 STORY	COLLINS	0.00	499
85 STORY	KELLEY	0.76	300
85 STORY	MCCALLSBURG	1.31	318
85 STORY	SHELDAHL	0.50	336
		2.57	
86 TAMA	CHELSEA	2.54	287
86 TAMA	CLUTIER	0.78	229
86 TAMA	ELBERON	0.81	245
86 TAMA	LINCOLN	0.75	182
86 TAMA	MONTOUR	1.05	285
86 TAMA	VINING	1.61	70
		7.53	
87 TAYLOR	ATHELSTAN	0.58	18
87 TAYLOR	BLOCKTON	0.72	192
87 TAYLOR	CLEARFIELD	1.01	371
87 TAYLOR	CONWAY	0.97	63
87 TAYLOR	GRAVITY	0.93	218
87 TAYLOR	NEW MARKET	0.74	456
87 TAYLOR	SHARPSBURG	0.46	98
		5.39	
88 UNION	ARISPE	1.14	89
88 UNION	CROMWELL	1.01	120
88 UNION	KENT	0.00	52
88 UNION	LORIMOR	0.76	427

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
88 UNION	SHANNON CITY	0.00	70
88 UNION	THAYER	0.43	66
		3.34	
89 VAN BUREN	BIRMINGHAM	1.48	423
89 VAN BUREN	BONAPARTE	1.33	458
89 VAN BUREN	CANTRIL	1.18	257
89 VAN BUREN	MOUNT STERLING	1.70	40
89 VAN BUREN	STOCKPORT	1.51	284
		7.19	
90 WAPELLO	BLAKESBURG	1.07	374
90 WAPELLO	CHILLICOTHE	1.29	90
90 WAPELLO	KIRKVILLE	1.30	214
		3.66	
91 WARREN	ACKWORTH	0.00	85
91 WARREN	BEVINGTON	0.15	58
91 WARREN	CUMMING	0.90	162
91 WARREN	LACONA	0.81	360
91 WARREN	MARTENSDALE	0.00	467
91 WARREN	NEW VIRGINIA	0.92	469
91 WARREN	SANDYVILLE	0.25	61
91 WARREN	SPRING HILL	0.00	92
91 WARREN	ST. MARYS	0.23	134
		3.26	
92 WASHINGTON	COPPOCK	0.22	57
92 WASHINGTON	CRAWFORDSVILLE	0.73	295
92 WASHINGTON	WEST CHESTER	0.50	159
		1.45	
93 WAYNE	CLIO	1.62	91
93 WAYNE	LINEVILLE	0.87	273
93 WAYNE	MILLERTON	0.54	48
93 WAYNE	PROMISE CITY	0.00	105
		3.03	
94 WEBSTER	BARNUM	0.00	195
94 WEBSTER	CALLENDAR	1.01	424
94 WEBSTER	CLARE	1.46	190
94 WEBSTER	DUNCOMBE	1.92	474
94 WEBSTER	FARNHAMVILLE	0.00	430
94 WEBSTER	HARCOURT	0.00	340
94 WEBSTER	LEHIGH	1.58	497
94 WEBSTER	MOORLAND	0.59	197
94 WEBSTER	VINCENT	0.45	158
		7.01	
95 WINNEBAGO	LELAND	0.31	258
95 WINNEBAGO	RAKE	0.75	227

03/30/03

Farm-to-Market Extensions
Cities Under 500 Population

County	City	FM Extension Mileage	2000 Population
95 WINNEBAGO	SCARVILLE	0.35	97
		1.41	
96 WINNESHIEK	CASTALIA	0.50	175
96 WINNESHIEK	FORT ATKINSON	0.46	389
96 WINNESHIEK	JACKSON JUNCTION	0.27	60
96 WINNESHIEK	RIDGEWAY	1.51	293
96 WINNESHIEK	SPILLVILLE	1.33	386
		4.07	
97 WOODBURY	BRONSON	0.67	269
97 WOODBURY	CUSHING	0.73	246
97 WOODBURY	DANBURY	1.01	384
97 WOODBURY	HORNICK	0.50	253
97 WOODBURY	OTO	0.20	145
97 WOODBURY	PIERSON	0.60	371
97 WOODBURY	SALIX	1.59	370
97 WOODBURY	SMITHLAND	0.47	221
		5.77	
98 WORTH	FERTILE	1.82	360
98 WORTH	GRAFTON	1.29	290
98 WORTH	HANLONTOWN	0.95	229
98 WORTH	JOICE	1.42	231
98 WORTH	KENSETT	0.97	280
		6.45	
99 WRIGHT	GALT	0.84	30
99 WRIGHT	ROWAN	0.76	218
99 WRIGHT	WOOLSTOCK	0.00	204
		1.60	
	GRAND TOTAL	363.07	