

Terre Haute INDOT Project Listing Meeting Notes for the 2007 Long-Range Plan

Teleconference Meeting for the
Purpose of Reviewing the Draft Project Listings
Conducted January 18, 2007
11:00 A.M. to 12:00 Noon

In Attendance: Merv Nolot, Executive Director – Terre Haute MPO
Mark Albers, Crawfordsville District Deputy Commissioner of Planning
Joe Spear, Crawfordsville District Local Assistance
David Franklin, Federal Highway Indiana Division
Steve Smith, Manager INDOT Long-Range Planning Section
Roy Nunnally, Manager INDOT Travel Demand Modeling Section
Mary Doherty, INDOT Office of Urban & Corridor Planning
Jay Mitchell, INDOT Long-Range Planning Section

The meeting began with Steve Smith providing a brief overview for the updated INDOT Long-Range Plan Project listings: The first two funding periods (2006 – 2010 and 2011 – 2015) were exclusively reserved for the **Major Moves** projects which are fully funded and committed. The third funding period (2016 – 2020) was populated with carry-over Major Moves projects that would be finishing up and the new, non-Major Moves projects that were assigned to the period based on their scores and budget availability. Projects were assigned to the fourth and fifth funding periods (2021 – 2025 and 2026 – 2030) using the same principle, based on scoring and available budget. Due to projected budget constraints and lower ranking, many projects ended up not being included in the funded list of projects. This balance of projects was then included in a new project listing under the header, “Illustrative Unfunded Long Range Plan Project.” Mr. Smith noted that only those projects that were included in the “funded” listings could be included in the MPO’s fiscally constrained plan and moreover, only those projects on the funded list could be included in the network that would be used to demonstrate air quality conformity.

Mr. Smith then reviewed the fiscal forecast as provided to the Planning Section by INDOT’s Chief Financial Officer and the related business rules used to assign projects to funding periods. Mr. Smith first asked if everyone had received Jay Mitchell’s e-mail which included the fiscal projections broken out by funding period on an 80/20 split. He reiterated that the Major Moves projects were considered to be fully funded and that they made up all of the projects in the first two funding periods and part of the projects listed in the third funding period. All new projects had been assigned based on an 80/20% split business rule where 80% of the available new funding stream was dedicated to the interstate program and 20% was reserved for the non-interstate projects. With this in mind, projects were assigned based on the roadway classification (interstate/non-interstate) the project’s score and budget availability for the funding period. The following table lists the INDOT fiscal projection, broken out by funding period and by the 80/20% interstate/non-interstate split. This had been distributed in an earlier e-mail that Mr. Smith had referred to.

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

Mr. Smith also noted that for the first time, INDOT was applying an inflation factor to project costs. From a base 2006 year cost estimate that included engineering, right-of-way and construction costs, projects

were inflated by 11% for 2007 and then by a simple 3.5% per year thereafter to the year in which the project was assigned.

Roy Nunnally provided an overview, explaining how the Road Classification and Mobility (RCM) scores were generated for the projects. Road Classification was based on the functional classification of the roadway with NHS routes and the Statewide Mobility Corridors were assigned the highest point rankings. The Statewide Travel Demand Model was used to determine AADT and LOS improvement which made up the Mobility portion of the RCM score.

Steve Smith also noted that in addition to the RCM scores, each project was reviewed by the Planning Liaisons and assigned a 1, 2, 3, or, 4 point that related to the importance of the project to the local areas based on prior discussions with the MPO, local elected officials, input received at the summer District Meetings, project related correspondence and news articles. A number 3 represented the highest score and a number 1 the lowest score that would be assigned to the 2016 – 2030 projects. All Major Move projects and the Major Moves carry-over projects were assigned an automatic number 4 in order to separate and keep these projects at the top of the list. The rationale as Mr. Smith repeated was that the Major Moves projects and their carry-over components were fully funded and committed projects.

The Terre Haute listings were then reviewed. Under the Funded Long Range Plan Project listing from 2006 – 2015, the projects for Terre Haute included the SR 641 Terre Haute Bypass projects and a US 41/I-70 interchange modification. These were Major Moves projects. Also on the Funded Period 2026 – 2030 list, the US 41 project from Margaret Avenue to SR 63 (Hulman Street) was listed. Merv Nolot noted that the Terre Haute project listing did not include dates for the years that the project would be ready-for-contract or let. Steve Smith said that while INDOT had provided such RFC dates for its project listing in the past, the new direction that INDOT was taking was to place the projects in funding periods as shown in the listing and not to list RFC dates. Mr. Smith said that the planning staff MPO liaisons would work with those MPOs subject to air quality conformity to help determine the open-to-traffic dates for the projects as required for a conformity determination. The Illustrative Unfunded Long Range Plan Project listing included the added travel lane projects on I-70 from just west of the US 41 interchange to the SR 46 interchange. Jay Mitchell pointed out that when Terre Haute updates its Long-Range Plan for SAFETEALU, the I-70 projects will need to also be shown as illustrative or, unfunded and they would need to be taken out of the travel demand model network that will be used to demonstrate air quality conformity.

Merv Nolot asked about the proposed I-70/Tabertown Road interchange which is currently listed as an “illustrative project” in the Terre Haute Long-Range Plan. Mr. Nolot explained that the Vigo County Tabertown Road Master Plan was now complete and that there was a potential major client interested in the nearby proposed industrial park. He said that there was great interest in the project on the local level and that the MPO was fully supporting the study. Steve Smith confirmed that the proposed I-70/Tabertown Road location was included in the current Interchange Study to be evaluated as a proposed new interchange. The interchange study was not yet complete and Mr. Smith asked Mr. Nolot if he had been contacted by HNTB, the consultant hired by INDOT to conduct the study. Mr. Nolot said that the MPO had indeed been contacted by HNTB and that it was participating in the site location survey distributed by HNTB. Jay Mitchell noted that currently no I-70/Tabortown Road interchange project existed. INDOT had received a copy of the County’s Master Plan and was aware of the interest in the location and was awaiting the results of the Interchange Study. Should the determine that sufficient purpose & need existed and that the proposed location scored well, it could be included as an “illustrative,” unfunded project in the next plan update. Mr. Mitchell also pointed out that should the nearby industrial park secure a major new employer, the location would in all probability then rapidly be included in the funded side of the program due to the economic development that a confirmed major industry would generate.

Jay Mitchell asked if the new INDOT listing would pose any problem for Terre Haute in updating its travel demand model network that will be used to demonstrate air quality conformity. Mr. Nolot thought that the new listing would not be a problem and he noted that the MPO was in the process of securing the necessary funding to solicit proposals from consultants to update the Long Range Transportation Plan.

Dave Franklin said that they FHWA did not anticipate any major problems either. Terre Haute was in pretty good shape and it should be relatively easy to meet the State Implementation Plan (SIP) budgets as established for Terre Haute. Mr. Franklin noted that he had already had discussions with the MPO and that they had even considered a "fall-back" plan whereby any and all amendments would be included in the Terre Haute TIP prior to the July 1, 2007 deadline for SFAETEALU compliance. This would permit projects to continue should any problems arise with the plan and while any such problems were being resolved.

Merv Nolot said that the Chief Transportation Planner position would soon be filled. Applicants had been interviewed and a candidate selected for hire. The Board however still needed to endorse the selection and that action was scheduled to take place soon.

Steve Smith asked if there were any other project questions or comments. Merv Nolot provided a brief overview of the progress of the 13th Street/Canal Road Corridor project intended to tie into the new SR 641 bypass. Mr. Nolot explained that the MPO and County were working with the District and that phase II of the project was going well. He said that the County was trying to expedite phase II. Mr. Nolot also noted that phase I was progressing towards letting and that there were still a few issues related to construction to work out.

Mark Albers asked if the Major Pavement Program was going to be included in the listings. Steve Smith pointed out that in the past some of the major reconstruction or, Major Pavement Preservation was included in the Long-Range Plan but that a decision had been made to no longer include those projects. One reason for this was that a new business unit headed up under Dave Andrewski had been established at INDOT and that that unit had its own project scoring system and its own project listing.

Merv Nolot asked if there was any progress on negotiating a new or amended relinquishment agreement for US 40 in Terre Haute. He pointed out that the current agreement had been negotiated and signed by former Terre Haute Mayor Pete Chalos prior to 1995 with the understanding that SR 641 would be finished in the early part of the decade. The current Terre Haute administration would like to take possession of US 40 sooner but that they expected additional improvements to be made to the roadway prior to taking it over. Mark Albers stated that the District was aware of Terre Haute's desire to take over the roadway sooner. He said that the District anticipates some treatment for the roadway prior to relinquishment. The District would need to scope, cost and program a project for the pavement on US 40 prior to relinquishment. This could perhaps be a starting point for further negotiations. Mr. Nolot asked if the MPO could help to facilitate the negotiation process. Mark Albers said that could be helpful and he would try to include the MPO in the process.