

Long Range Plan Consultation Teleconference with Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission
Wednesday, January 17, 2007
3:00 PM EST

Attendees:

Steve Smith, INDOT Planning	Janice Osadczuk, FHWA	Bill Brown, NIRPC
Stephanie Belch, INDOT Planning	Jamile Smith, INDOT LaPorte District	Roy Nunnally, INDOT
Frank Baukert, INDOT Planning	Steve Strains, NIRPC	

- Janice Osadczuk wanted to insure that Chris DiPalma from FHWA Illinois would be sent copies of the meeting minutes.
- Bill Brown wanted to know which project listing would be discussed today. The response was the MPO project listing.
- The meeting began with an explanation of the project lists. The Major Moves projects would be shown in the first two funding periods. The projects selected for funding in the last three. Projects that were not selected for funding would be shown on the Illustrative Unfunded Projects list. Finally, there was a list of projects to be built with innovative financing techniques such as public-private partnerships.
- NIRPC requested documentation of the fiscal constraint process and the plan update interval saying it was needed to meet new requirements under SAFETEA-LU. FHWA concurred and asked that INDOT document these assumptions and distribute the formal document to all districts and MPOs.
- Steve Smith explained the project scoring and project selection process. A fiscal forecast was prepared by the INDOT Fiscal Section and approved by INDOT's chief financial officer. It assumed a 1% growth in state funds and a 5% growth in federal funds. The fiscal projects were broken out into funding periods and a business rule mandating an 80%/20% split between interstate and non-interstate funding was implemented. The resulting forecast was:

Time Frame	Total Funding	80% for Interstates	20% for Non-Interstates
2016 – 2020	\$2.859 billion	\$2.287 billion	\$571 million
2021 – 2025	\$2.274 billion	\$1.819 billion	\$455 million
2026 – 2030	\$4.314 billion	\$3.451 billion	\$863 million

Each project was ranked using three criteria. The first was its road classification based upon its mobility corridor and NHS status as well as its functional class. The second was congestion relief based upon auto & truck volumes, and the forecasted improvement in Level of Service(LOS). Finally, projects were evaluated by the district planning liaisons in terms of their importance to the local community. Projects that were seen as a high priority received a score of three points. Projects that were evaluated as medium priority received two points. Projects that were classed as low priority received one point. Additionally, some of the Major Moves projects that had been chosen for funding had been extended out past 2015 due to constructability issues. To ensure that these projects were not left out, they were awarded four points. The total score was calculated for each project, and all projects were ranked. Interstate and non-interstate projects were selected by rank from highest to lowest for funding. Each project's cost was inflated to the year of construction using a factor of 11% from 2006 to 2007 and 3.5% per year thereafter. When the allocated funds were exhausted, the process would move into the next funding period. When all funding periods were filled, the remaining projects were moved to the Illustrative Unfunded list.

- FHWA would like to see cost information and funding source information included for the innovative financing projects. For the Illiana Expressway Study, they would like to see the project listed as a study and assume the "No Build" alternative and P3 financing. The MPO would not have to model it. When the study is complete, the project listing can be revised, and the project will have to be modeled. For the Toll Road ATL projects, they would like to see the funding source listed. FHWA wanted to see the project costs shown. The current project listing zeros these costs out. INDOT responded that this was done to separate the funding calculations. FHWA understood, but noted the amount needs to be added somewhere with a description of how the project would be funded.

- The MPO commented that there were I-90 projects currently in the MPO plan which are missing from the INDOT plan. INDOT noted that the toll road lease committed the concessionaire to 3 added capacity projects. These were included in the INDOT plan. The other projects should be removed from the MPO plan. The Lease Agreement has a provision for identifying future added capacity needs and developing projects to meet them. These projects would then be show in the innovative financing list.
- NIRPC had a question about LRP#173 Interchange Modification at SR-2 and I-65. They noted that the proposed work would just add lanes to SR-2 and leave the ramps untouched, therefore, the project was really an added travel lanes project. INDOT agreed to change the project type.
- NIRPC had a question about the I-65/I-80 interchange work. There was only one project listing shown, although there were three separate projects involved. Frank Baukert stated that the interchange modification had been shown as 3 separate projects, but two projects weren't appearing in the report. Roy Nunnally responded that it was probably a problem with the database join used to produce the report. INDOT promised to correct the problem.
- Bill Brown wished to know if there had been changes in the project design that would affect how the project had been modeled. He had received an update diagram from the consultant but couldn't tell if there had been any changes to the design. Frank Baukert stated that he had talked with the design consultant who indicated that the NIRPC model was accurate, but that he would follow up with the consultant to make sure that was still the case..
- NIRPC had a question about LRP#177 Reconstruct the ramp from EB US-20 to EB US-20/35. Since the project didn't really involve adding any additional capacity, the MPO was interested in the reason for showing this project in INDOT's plan. INDOT's response was that the project was listed in the Major New Construction portion of Major Moves, and that for the sake of consistency, all of those projects were being shown in the Long Range Plan.
- Bill Brown had a question about LRP#213 New Interchange on SR-49 at CR400N. He wanted to know if the design had changed. He had modeled it as a simple diamond. The local newspaper had printed a diagram showing loop ramps. INDOT promised to investigate and get back with him. He wanted to know if the design had changed and would this pose a problem. INDOT's response was that it shouldn't be a problem.
- LRP#217 New Interchange Construction on I-65 at 109th was also modeled as a diamond. The MPO wanted to know about the RFC date since this was a project that INDOT was attempting to accelerate. INDOT's response was that the project would still have an RFC date of 2011. INDOT had wanted to move it up but it ran into problems in the inter-agency consultation meetings between INDOT, FHWA, and the City of Crown Point. Crown Point had hired a consultant to conduct a feasibility study relative to the placement of the new interchange. Apparently, copies of the draft and final study were not distributed to INDOT & FHWA in a timely fashion. It is believed that the study raised some issues. The INDOT project manager is Jonathon Wallace. He might be able to provide additional information. For now, assume that the project timeline will follow the 2011 RFC as shown in Major Moves.
- The MPO had a question about LRP#218 Added Travel Lanes on I-65 from US-231 to US-30. This project was not selected for funding. The MPO was concerned about the project cost of \$188.7 million in 2025. They pointed out that the pavement was in good condition, much of it was already widened, but striped for four lanes, so that it could actually be built for a lot less than estimated. The MPO suggested that room could be found in the earlier funding periods for a cheaper version of this project saving INDOT even more because it would reduce the impact of inflation. INDOT stated that it would look into this.
- Bill Brown noted that he would rather not delete the I-80/Toll Road projects & the I-80 at SR-51 interchange improvements. Steve Strains noted that both interchanges were sub-standard designs with high volumes of traffic, and both needed improvement. INDOT's response was that the Concessionaire was responsible for identifying and implementing future improvements on the Toll Road/I-80 interchange, The Lease Agreement sets out a process for performing these duties. Presumably, this process would identify the interchange as a problem, and develop a project to fix it. INDOT at this time did not have any plans to modify the SR-51/Ripley Ave interchange. There had been discussion of a mega-project involving both interchanges, but that idea had been dropped due to the lease of the toll road. The SR-51 interchange had been studied separately for improvement, but INDOT had decided not to pursue the project.
- The issue was raised about the status of the projects on the Unfunded List and whether they needed to be removed from the MPO model. INDOT's response was yes. Janice asked if removing that many projects would affect the MPO's conformity status. Bill Brown stated that the MPO had enough of a cushion that it

shouldn't. He added that the MPO had an appeal being reviewed by USEPA that would improve the MPO's position assuming a favorable ruling.