

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS CONGESTION POLICY

POLICY EXCEPTION PREPARATION AND REVIEW PROCESS GUIDANCE

Table of Contents

Section 1 — Introduction	3
Purpose	3
Relationship to the IHCP	3
Scope and Applicability	3
Section 2 — Roles and Responsibilities	4
Section 3 — When a Policy Exception Is NOT Required	7
Activities and Operations Exempt from the IHCP	7
Emergency Repairs and Urgent Repairs (Appendix A Declarations)	7
Restrictions that Fully Comply with Appendix B	8
Section 4 — When a Policy Exception Is Required	9
Triggers Requiring a Policy Exception	9
Exception Determination Guide	9
Section 5 — Overview of the Policy Exception Process	11
Phase 1: Preparation of the Request	11
Phase 2: Review and Coordination	11
Phase 3: Approval	12
Phase 4: Post-Approval Archiving, Distribution and Implementation	12
Section 6 — Preparing a Policy Exception Request	13
Step 1 — Define the Proposed Restriction and Acquire Data	13
Step 2 — Conduct an Alternatives Analysis Including Queue Analyses	14
Step 3 — Identify the Recommended Alternative	16
Step 4 — Select Appropriate Queue Mitigation Measures	17
Step 5 — Prepare the Policy Exception Request	18
Step 6 — Submit the Policy Exception Request, Transition Package to Phase 2 ..	19
Email Submittal Subject Line Format	20
Section 7 — High-Volume Interstate Segments Requirements (Appendix D)	21
Step 1 — Confirm Applicability of Appendix D	21
Step 2 — Complete the Mandatory Alternatives and User-Cost Analyses	21
Step 3 — Document HVIS Requirements in the Policy Exception Request	21
Step 4 — Policy Exception Request Submittal and Work Zone Council Review ..	22
Section 8 — District Special Project Corridor Requirements (Appendix E)	23
Section 9 — Review Workflow and Timelines	24
Step 1 — Intake & Logging	24
Step 2 — Initial Review for Completeness & Technical Sufficiency	24
Step 3 — Early FHWA Notification (When Applicable)	24
Step 4 — District Traffic Engineer (DTE) Operational evaluation	25
Step 5 — Work Zone Council Submission (When Required)	25
Step 6 — DTE Handoff to Approver, Transition Package to Phase 3	26
Timelines & Escalation Practices	26
INDOT MOT Mailbox	26

Table of Contents (Continued)

Section 10 — Approval Process	27
Step 1 — Receive the Recommendation from the District Traffic Engineer	27
Step 2 — Confirm Completeness of the Package	27
Step 3 — Verify FHWA Concurrence (When Applicable)	28
Step 4 — Evaluate Safety, Mobility, and Operational Impacts	28
Step 5 — Issue Final Approval or Denial	28
Step 6 — Transition Package to Phase 4	28
Section 11 — Recordkeeping and Distribution	29
Step 1 — Archive the Approved Policy Exception	29
Step 2 — Distribute the Approved Policy Exception	29
Step 3 — Provide Documentation to the Responsible Site Supervisor	29
A Reminder of Notification Requirements	30

SECTION 1 — INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE

The Interstate Highways Congestion Policy (IHCP) establishes statewide requirements for planning, evaluating, reviewing, approving, and implementing work zone–related restrictions on Indiana’s interstate system. These restrictions can significantly affect safety, mobility, and overall system performance. When properly planned and executed, they enable essential construction, maintenance, utility, and operational activities to proceed while minimizing congestion and reducing the likelihood of queue-related crashes.

This document is intended to ensure that all parties preparing Policy Exception requests understand the procedural expectations, documentation needs, and coordination steps required to obtain the necessary approvals in accordance with the IHCP. This guidance document describes the process for preparing and submitting a Policy Exception request. It outlines the responsibilities of each role in the review and approval workflow, and it identifies additional requirements that apply in specific circumstances, including High Volume Interstate Segments and District Special Project Corridors. The guidance is intended for consultants, contractors, permittees, INDOT staff, and any entity responsible for planning or proposing interstate restrictions when a proposed restriction cannot be implemented within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times and therefore requires a Policy Exception.

RELATIONSHIP TO THE IHCP

This guidance document serves as the procedural companion to the IHCP. The procedural steps and workflows formerly embedded in earlier IHCP versions—particularly the 2017 Appendix C—are no longer contained in the policy and now reside externally to allow updates as operational needs evolve. This guidance consolidates all required procedures for preparing and submitting a Policy Exception, aligns exception preparation with the IHCP’s current workflows and approval hierarchy, and establishes consistent statewide expectations for documentation and engineering justification. Because it is separate from the IHCP, INDOT can update these procedures without revising policy language. Users should consult both this guidance and the IHCP to ensure full compliance.

SCOPE AND APPLICABILITY

Nothing in this guidance document supersedes the governing policies, standards, regulations, or FHWA requirements that apply to interstate work zones. In any instance of conflict, those governing requirements prevail. This document provides procedural expectations only; it does not modify policy or create new authority. In preparing an IHCP Exception request, users should consult this guidance together with those governing requirements.

This guidance applies to any interstate work zone restriction requiring a Policy Exception under the IHCP. It is intended for INDOT personnel, consultants, contractors, utilities, permittees, and any entity responsible for proposing or implementing restrictions that cannot be performed within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times in Appendix B or that trigger elevated IHCP requirements such as High Volume Interstate Segments or District Special Project Corridors.

Activities exempted under IHCP Appendix A—including Emergency Repairs, Urgent Repairs, winter operations, incident response, and law enforcement or queue-truck activities—are not subject to this guidance.

SECTION 2 — ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Effective preparation, review, approval, and implementation of Policy Exception requests under the IHCP requires coordinated effort among several parties. Each role has defined responsibilities that support the safe and efficient management of interstate work zone-related restrictions. The following descriptions clarify these responsibilities and provide Requestors with a complete understanding of how their work fits into INDOT's administrative and operational framework. This section summarizes the roles involved in preparing, reviewing, and approving Policy Exception requests. Full policy definitions and requirements remain in the IHCP and its appendices.

Requestor.....The Requestor is the individual or entity responsible for planning or proposing a restriction and initiating the Policy Exception process when required. Requestors may be INDOT staff, consultants, contractors, utilities, or permittees. The Requestor is responsible for:

- Developing Temporary Traffic Control Plans (TTCs) of sufficient detail to convey the intended strategy for maintaining safety and mobility during the restriction.
- Preparing and submitting the IHCP Restriction Notification form, including all required information and supporting documentation.
- Determining whether a proposed restriction complies with the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times in Appendix B or requires a Policy Exception.
- Preparing a complete Policy Exception package when necessary, including any required analysis, documentation, alternatives evaluations, and queue mitigation considerations.
- Ensuring the Responsible Site Supervisor receives all approved restrictions and requirements before the work begins.
- Addressing any comments or required revisions from the Reviewer, District Traffic Engineer, Approver, or Work Zone Council.

Reviewer(District Traffic Office) The Reviewer is typically a staff engineer within the District Traffic Office who conducts the first technical and administrative review of all IHCP Restriction Notification forms and any associated Policy Exception requests. The Reviewer is responsible for:

- Reviewing all submitted restrictions for compliance with Appendix B or determining whether a Policy Exception request is required.
- Coordinating with the Requestor to resolve questions, request additional documentation, or clarify analysis methods.
- Coordinating with the District Traffic Engineer and Approver for Policy Exception requests.
- Uploading all approved restrictions and Policy Exception documentation into the Department's electronic document/record retention and management system.
- Initiating FHWA coordination when required for restrictions involving federal oversight.

DTE(District Traffic Engineer) The DTE provides a higher-level review of Policy Exception requests to evaluate whether the proposed restriction meets operational, safety, and mobility requirements defined by the IHCP. The District Traffic Engineer is responsible for:

- Reviewing Policy Exception requests forwarded by the Reviewer.
- Evaluating the operational feasibility, traffic impacts, and safety considerations associated with the proposed restriction.
- For High-Volume Interstate Segment restrictions associated with INDOT Construction Contracts, reviewing the submittal in accordance with Appendix D requirements and providing recommendations to the Work Zone Council or Approver.
- Coordinating with the Reviewer and Approver to ensure a complete and consistent review process.

Work Zone Council.....The Work Zone Council (WZC) is convened when required under Appendix D for Policy Exception requests associated with INDOT Construction Contracts on High-Volume Interstate Segments. The Council is responsible for:

- Reviewing the Policy Exception request in accordance with Appendix D requirements.
- Evaluating whether the proposed restriction and associated queue mitigation strategy sufficiently protect safety and mobility given the high-volume context.
- Providing a determination of concurrence or non-concurrence, which is communicated to the Reviewer and Approver for final decision-making.

In addition to the Appendix D requirements, the Work Zone Council may also be consulted at the discretion of the Approver or District Traffic Engineer. In practice, the Council has served as a resource for reviewing Maintenance of Traffic Alternatives Analyses (MOTAA) for longer-range projects that have not yet entered design, and for providing additional technical input or recommendations on Policy Exception requests when requested by the Approver. These discretionary uses of the Council are not mandated by IHCP policy but reflect established INDOT practice and may be employed when additional review or advisement is beneficial.

The Work Zone Council may require multiple rounds of review or meetings before issuing a final determination.

ApproverThe Approver is the authority responsible for granting final approval for Policy Exception requests. Approval responsibilities vary depending on the type of work:

- INDOT Construction Contracts: Managing Director of Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO) or designee.
- Department Maintenance Work or Permit Work: District Deputy Commissioner (DDC) or designee.
- ITS Infrastructure Work: Managing Director of TSMO or designee.

The Approver is responsible for:

- Reviewing all submitted materials and determinations from the Reviewer, DTE, and, where applicable, the Work Zone Council.
- Securing FHWA concurrence or approval when required.
- Issuing the final approval or denial and ensuring the decision is reflected on the IHCP Notice of Restriction form.

Approvers may waive certain submittal requirements at their discretion.

FHWA(Federal Highway Administration) FHWA involvement is required when specific types of interstate restrictions or full closures necessitate federal concurrence or approval. FHWA is responsible for reviewing and granting concurrence or approval for restrictions requiring federal oversight, as coordinated through the Approver; early notification may be made by the Reviewer when FHWA involvement is required.

SECTION 3 — WHEN A POLICY EXCEPTION IS NOT REQUIRED

Certain activities, operations, and work zone situations do not require a Policy Exception under the Interstate Highways Congestion Policy (IHCP). Some activities are exempt from the IHCP entirely, while others bypass specific IHCP components due to emergency or urgent conditions. This section identifies all circumstances where a Policy Exception is not required and clarifies the differences between policy-level exemptions, Appendix A declarations, and restrictions that fully comply with Appendix B.

ACTIVITIES AND OPERATIONS EXEMPT FROM THE IHCP

The IHCP identifies several activities and operations that are fully exempt from the policy. These activities do not require compliance with Appendix B, the Policy Exception process, or any other IHCP requirements, and may proceed under normal operational procedures. When an activity or operation falls under one of these categories, it is exempt from the IHCP in its entirety and does not require a Policy Exception. Exempt IHCP activities include:

- Emergency response to incidents and crashes
- Winter operations related to snow removal or ice treatment
- Queue truck operations
- Law enforcement operations, including traffic enforcement

EMERGENCY REPAIRS AND URGENT REPAIRS (APPENDIX A DECLARATIONS)

Emergency Repairs and Urgent Repairs are not exempt from IHCP responsibilities as a whole, but when formally declared under Appendix A, they are exempt from Appendix B's Select Interstate Restrictions and Times and from the Policy Exception requirements described in Appendices C, D, and E. These declarations allow immediate implementation of restrictions needed to address infrastructure failures or urgent safety conditions.

A declaration may be made by authorized INDOT leadership, including the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, District Deputy Commissioner, or an authorized designee. While Appendix A bypasses Appendix B and the Exception process, it does not remove INDOT's operational responsibilities. Even under an Appendix A declaration:

- Required notifications, including CARS and TMC reporting, must still be made
- Queue mitigation should be implemented when practical
- Restrictions must be carried out using safe work zone practices

An Important Note About “Emergencies”

Emergency Repair and Urgent Repair declarations under Appendix A may only be issued by authorized INDOT leadership in response to an immediate safety or infrastructure condition. A Requestor's project-related urgencies, including schedule pressures or delays caused by planning or coordination issues, do not constitute an Emergency Repair or Urgent Repair under the IHCP. During implementation in the field, work pressures may create a sense of urgency for the Requestor; however, such circumstances do not meet Appendix A criteria for an Emergency or Urgent Repair. Project-related urgencies should be addressed through proper planning, including

early consideration of TTC needs and timely IHCP submittals, and not through Appendix A declarations.

RESTRICTIONS THAT FULLY COMPLY WITH APPENDIX B

A Policy Exception is not required when a proposed restriction can be implemented entirely within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times (SIRT) described in Appendix B. Compliance with Appendix B avoids the need for a Policy Exception, but does not eliminate notification or queue mitigation responsibilities. Two obligations still apply to Appendix B–compliant restrictions:

- All Appendix B-compliant restrictions must be reported to the appropriate District Traffic Office using the IHCP Restriction Notification form.
- Even when a restriction is fully compliant with Appendix B, any restriction that produces congestion or queueing in the field must either implement appropriate queue-mitigation measures or, if safe to do so, be removed from the roadway. Planners of restrictions are encouraged to anticipate how this contingency will be managed in the field.

SECTION 4 — WHEN A POLICY EXCEPTION IS REQUIRED

Under the 2026 IHCP, a Policy Exception is required whenever a planned interstate restriction cannot be implemented within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times (SIRT) in Appendix B, or when other IHCP conditions independently trigger exception-level review. Appendix B is the primary gatekeeper: if the times or the allowed restriction types in the tables and text do not permit the work, the Requestor must prepare and submit a Policy Exception.

TRIGGERS REQUIRING A POLICY EXCEPTION

A. Non-Compliance with Appendix B (Primary Trigger)

A Policy Exception is required for any planned restriction that falls outside Appendix B allowances (tables and text). This includes operations outside paved areas, shoulder width reductions, shoulder closures, lane width reductions, lane closures, full closure of a non-system interchange exit or entrance ramp, and temporary traffic breaks that exceed permitted conditions or other types of restrictions not permitted by or listed in Appendix B. Several ramp scenarios are now explicitly addressed in SIRT materials; if a planned ramp restriction is not covered or is outside the allowed times, an Exception is required.

B. High Volume Interstate Segments (HVIS) — Duration-Based Trigger (Appendix D)

For segments identified as HVIS, Appendix D imposes duration-based requirements that can trigger exception-level review even when a restriction otherwise complies with the Appendix B tables. If the restriction will be continuous for more than 14 days, Appendix D requirements apply via a Policy Exception in accordance with Appendix C.

C. District Special Project Corridor Segments (Appendix E)

Restrictions within District Special Project Corridor segments (Appendix E) require elevated scrutiny and may necessitate a Policy Exception to address corridor-specific analysis and coordination requirements.

EXCEPTION DETERMINATION GUIDE

To determine whether a Policy Exception is required, evaluate the proposed restriction using the following steps.

- Confirm whether the work is part of an activity or operation that is exempt from the IHCP. If the work is fully exempt, no Policy Exception is required.
- Determine whether the work qualifies for a declared Emergency Repair or Urgent Repair in accordance with Appendix A. If an authorized declaration is made, a Policy Exception is not required.
- Assess whether the proposed restriction can be implemented entirely within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times in Appendix B. If the restriction fully complies with Appendix B, a Policy Exception is not required; however, notification and queue mitigation obligations remain in effect.
- If the restriction cannot comply with Appendix B, a Policy Exception is required.

- When the restriction is located on a High-Volume Interstate Segment and will result in fewer than two lanes available for a continuous period longer than fourteen days, the requirements of Appendix D apply through the Policy Exception.
- When the restriction is located within a District Special Project Corridor Segment, requirements described in Appendix E apply and may require additional justification or considerations through the Policy Exception.

SECTION 5 — OVERVIEW OF THE POLICY EXCEPTION PROCESS

The Policy Exception process is a coordinated sequence of preparation, review, approval, and distribution activities intended to ensure that proposed interstate restrictions are thoroughly evaluated, documented, and implemented in a safe and operationally sound manner. This section provides a high-level overview of how a Policy Exception request moves through INDOT from initial development by the Requestor to final approval and distribution by the Reviewer and Approver. Detailed requirements and supporting procedures are provided in the sections that follow.

PHASE 1: PREPARATION OF THE REQUEST

The process begins when the Requestor determines that a proposed restriction requires a Policy Exception. The Requestor develops the request package by gathering the necessary information, completing required analyses, preparing Temporary Traffic Control Plans, identifying applicable IHCP conditions, and assembling all documentation needed for review. Early consultation with the Reviewer is encouraged so questions regarding applicability, data needs, or special requirements can be addressed before the formal submittal. The Reviewer can also assist with clarifying expectations, confirming preliminary timeframes, or resolving questions about applicable IHCP considerations such as High-Volume Interstate Segment requirements or District Special Project Corridor designations.

During preparation, the Requestor ensures that the proposed restriction is described clearly, that all technical elements are accurate, and that any operational considerations such as duration, lane configurations, detours, staging, and feasible alternatives are documented. The objective of this phase is to produce a complete and review-ready Policy Exception request.

PHASE 2: REVIEW AND COORDINATION

Once the request is submitted with the IHCP Restriction Notification form, the Reviewer begins the formal review stage.

The Reviewer evaluates the completeness and clarity of the submission, ensures that the required components are present, and verifies that analyses, lane configurations, durations, and proposed work times align with IHCP expectations. The Reviewer may request correction or refinement from the Requestor as needed. When the Reviewer is satisfied that the request is ready for further consideration, it is passed to the District Traffic Engineer for additional review.

The District Traffic Engineer evaluates the proposed restriction from an operational perspective, considering district needs and priorities, ongoing work, traffic patterns, ongoing projects, seasonal influences, and the impacts to and from adjacent project work zones and detours.

When required, the Reviewer and District Traffic Engineer coordinate with the Work Zone Council. Work Zone Council review is necessary for certain scenarios such as restrictions on High-Volume Interstate Segments or other cases identified in the IHCP where elevated operational or safety considerations exist.

If the restriction requires FHWA involvement, the Reviewer and Approver ensure that concurrence or approval is obtained before final approval.

The review stage is complete once all required concurrences have been obtained and the package is ready for final approval.

PHASE 3: APPROVAL

Approval is carried out by the Approver designated according to the type of work involved. The Approver validates that the exception request is complete, that required reviews and concurrences have been obtained, and that the proposed restriction is justified, that queue mitigation and monitoring strategies are adequate, and that the overall submittal meets IHCP expectations. Once approved, the request becomes an approved Policy Exception.

PHASE 4: POST-APPROVAL ARCHIVING, DISTRIBUTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

After approval, the Reviewer ensures that the Policy Exception is archived appropriately within the Department's electronic document/record retention and management system. The Reviewer also distributes the approved Policy Exception to the Requestor and all applicable project personnel on the distribution list. The Requestor is responsible for ensuring that the Responsible Site Supervisor is provided a copy of the approval and any requirements.

This phase completes the Policy Exception process and allows for a safe and compliant operation of the approved restriction by the Responsible Site Supervisor and field personnel. Field implementation, including queue mitigation and monitoring expectations, is carried out by the Responsible Site Supervisor in accordance with requirements and terms of the approved Policy Exception and the IHCP.

SECTION 6 — PREPARING A POLICY EXCEPTION REQUEST

Preparing a Policy Exception request involves several coordinated steps to ensure that the proposed restriction is described accurately, evaluated thoroughly, and supported by the technical information needed for review and approval.

These steps should be initiated as early as practicable during project development or work planning to allow sufficient time for analysis, documentation, coordination, and review.

For contract work, IHCP considerations should begin as early as possible, including during scoping. See the Indiana Design Manual for expectations regarding IHCP-related submittals during the design phase.

STEP 1 — DEFINE THE PROPOSED RESTRICTION AND ACQUIRE DATA

Begin preparing the Policy Exception request by identifying the planned work activity, the range of restrictions that may be needed to perform the work, and the initial set of work zone strategies that could feasibly support those restrictions. At this stage, the Requestor is gathering inputs and outlining possible approaches—not selecting or committing to a final strategy. This step frames the problem space—what work is needed, where, under what conditions, and what range of work zone strategies and restriction types could reasonably support that work.

- Coordinate early with the District Traffic Office. The Requestor is encouraged to reach out to the appropriate District Traffic Office for early input, guidance, and direction. Under the 2026 IHCP, all planned restrictions must ultimately be vetted by the District Traffic Office, and early coordination helps ensure feasibility, awareness of local corridor conditions, and alignment with district expectations.
- When planning a detour through a signalized intersection at an interchange, it is recommended that this be discussed with the District Traffic Office and INDOT's Traffic Control Systems Section.
- Identify the work activity and potential restriction types. Determine the type of work being performed and identify all restriction types that may be required to complete it. Potential restrictions may include lane closures, shoulder closures, ramp closures, full closures, lane-width reductions, traffic breaks, or rolling slowdowns. Identify needed restrictions to accomplish phase changes (MOT for MOT). Multiple restriction types may remain viable at this stage; all should carry forward to Step 2 for alternatives development and analysis.
- Identify the limits and designations of the interstate segment. Establish the beginning and ending limits of the potential restriction area using mile markers, ramps, system interchanges, bridges, and other defining features. Determine whether the location falls within a High-Volume Interstate Segment (Appendix B/Appendix D) or a District Special Project Corridor (Appendix E). These designations influence analysis requirements, documentation needs, and whether an elevated review may apply with extra time requirements.
- Outline possible work zone strategies. Identify the range of feasible work zone strategy concepts (MOT/TTC approaches) that could potentially support the work,

consistent with principles described in IDM Chapter 503. Possible strategies may include temporary widening, contraflow/crossover configurations, phased lane closures, shoulder-use operations, nighttime-only restrictions, or short-duration closures. At this step, the intent is to outline viable strategy concepts—not evaluate or select one. These candidate strategies will be formally analyzed in Step 2.

- Gather project information needed for later analysis. Collect all foundational data needed for alternatives development and queue analysis, including:
 - traffic counts and appropriate adjustment factors,
 - lane configurations, typical sections, and shoulder widths,
 - geometric constraints such as narrow shoulders or reduced bridge offsets,
 - contextual information such as nearby ramps, merges/diverges, recurring congestion patterns, or recent work-zone performance,
 - any preliminary staging or TTCP concepts provided by design.
- Establish the operational context. Identify corridor operational characteristics that may influence feasibility, such as bottleneck tendencies, truck volumes, merge/weave patterns, narrow shoulders, locations of construction ingress/egress, or other constraints. Understanding this context ensures that the alternatives developed in Step 2 are realistic and appropriately tailored to the segment and its operational characteristics.

STEP 2 — CONDUCT AN ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS INCLUDING QUEUE ANALYSES

Using the assembled information, the Requestor must develop and evaluate multiple feasible work zone strategies and restriction options. This step determines whether the work can be accomplished within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times of Appendix B, whether queues will occur, and how each alternative compares in terms of impacts, feasibility, and required queue mitigation. It establishes the technical foundation for selecting a recommended alternative. Work zone strategy concepts are described in IDM Chapter 503 and form the basis of the alternatives analysis framework required under IHCP Appendix D.

Begin by developing a set of feasible alternatives. The Requestor should identify work zone strategies and restriction options that could realistically accomplish the work. These may include staged construction or phased lane closures, temporary widening, nighttime or weekend operations, short-duration closures, shoulder-use configurations, contraflow or crossover approaches, lane-width reductions or modified cross-sections, and MOT for MOT restrictions needed for phase changes.

At a minimum, alternatives should include the following cases:

- A fully IHCP compliant option that would not require a Policy Exception and prioritizes safety and mobility over cost and schedule.
- An option that would require a Policy Exception and prioritizes cost and schedule over safety and mobility.
- An option that would require a Policy Exception and is a compromise between the other two extremes balancing safety, mobility, cost, and schedule.

Each alternative should be evaluated to characterize its mobility impacts, restriction duration, phasing requirements, cross-section constraints, user costs, and queue mitigation needs. Each alternative should also be evaluated for operational

Work zone configuration and limits	• Number of open lanes in each direction • Lane widths and shoulder widths • Maximum length of the restriction • Phasing sequence and phase duration • Whether the restriction affects mainline, ramps, or intersecting facilities
Traffic impact metrics	• Hourly or weekly queue length (per direction) • Queue duration (per direction) • Total estimated queue accumulation • Identification of hours in which queueing begins • Expected need for queue mitigation measures
Detour and rerouting impacts	• Additional travel distance due to detours • Additional travel time due to detours • Any operational complications related to detours
Schedule and duration	• Total expected duration of the restriction • Duration of each MOT phase • Required time for setups, takedowns, or transitions
Cost considerations	• Estimated MOT construction cost • Estimated user costs (delay, vehicle operating cost, crash cost, and other user-impact costs)
Other operational or geometric considerations	• Locations of constrained geometry (narrow shoulders, bridges, pinch points) • Impacts related to construction access (ingress/egress) • Impacts to adjacent facilities (ramps, intersections, frontage roads) • Any additional project-specific criteria identified during scoping or design

Table 1. Potential Evaluation Criteria for MOT Alternatives Analyses.

considerations such as truck volumes, merge/weave conditions, narrow shoulders, locations of construction ingress/egress, recurring daily congestion, and known downstream constraints. Evaluate whether shorter durations, different work hours, or staging adjustments could reduce or eliminate queueing. Detour or ramp-related alternatives must include route-specific capacity comparisons and documentation consistent with IHCP provisions. Table 1 summarizes potential criteria that may be considered when conducting an MOT alternatives analysis.

For INDOT Construction Contracts on High-Volume Interstate Segments, Appendix D requires that alternatives needing a Policy Exception include a user-cost analysis consistent with IDM Chapter 311/50. Each alternative must also evaluate recurring congestion patterns and downstream bottlenecks, assess geometric and operational constraints, and verify that the proposed cross-section complies with IDM Chapter 503. Because HVIS segments often operate near capacity, every assumption must be justified and documented, and each phase with fewer than two open lanes must be evaluated individually.

Evaluate each alternative to determine whether it can be performed entirely within the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times in Appendix B. If any alternative can be implemented without exceeding Appendix B allowances, a Policy Exception may not be required. If no alternative is feasible within Appendix B, proceed with full traffic and

queue analysis for each remaining option. Perform the required traffic and queue analyses using the procedures established in the Queue Analysis Guidance.

Modeling must be performed for each MOT phase and, when the work spans multiple segments, for each applicable segment—or for the highest-volume segment when warranted. The analysis must identify expected queue lengths and durations. For comparison of alternatives, queue mile-hours should be computed on a weekly basis. Total queue mile-hours for each phase should be determined based on the duration of each phase. Alternatives may then be compared by totaling queue mile-hours for all phases combined.

All modeling inputs, assumptions, spreadsheets, and output files must be retained and provided so reviewers can verify the results. This includes queue analysis input and output files, modeling parameters, capacity values, diagrams illustrating lane configurations for each alternative, and any approved deviations from the Queue Analysis Guidance.

Document rejected alternatives and clearly explain the reason each was dismissed. Reasons may include excessive queueing, operational or constructability challenges, inability to meet IHCP requirements, geometric limitations, or impractical impacts on duration or cost. These rejected alternatives form part of the comparative justification in Step 3.

This step produces the complete set of evaluated alternatives, their traffic impacts, queue estimates, and user-cost considerations.

STEP 3 — IDENTIFY THE RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

After performing an alternatives analysis, the Requestor must identify the recommended alternative and provide a clear justification for its selection. The recommended alternative should represent the option that best balances safety, mobility, cost, schedule, constructability, and operational feasibility while aligning with IHCP requirements and corridor-specific constraints.

The Requestor should compare all evaluated alternatives using the results of the queue analysis, user-cost evaluation, operational considerations, and constructability factors documented in Step 2. The comparison should highlight how each alternative performs relative to the criteria summarized in Table 1, including mobility impacts, restriction duration, phasing complexity, cross-section feasibility, detour effects, and overall traffic performance. Alternatives that were dismissed should be referenced for context, along with a concise explanation of the constraints or impacts that rendered them impractical.

When identifying the recommended alternative, the Requestor should consider how well each option minimizes adverse mobility impacts, reduces queue formation, limits the duration of disruptions, and maintains compliance with roadway cross-section requirements. The justification should clearly articulate why the selected alternative is preferable to the others, particularly when safety and mobility trade-offs are present or when constructability constraints limit feasible MOT strategies.

For INDOT Construction Contracts on High-Volume Interstate Segments, the recommended alternative must meet the additional expectations in Appendix D,

including demonstrating that the preferred option reasonably minimizes delay, is supported by the required user-cost analysis, and reflects appropriate consideration of recurring congestion and downstream bottlenecks. Recommendations should be coordinated with the District Traffic Office to ensure that the final selection aligns with district priorities and operational experience.

The recommended alternative identified in this step becomes the basis for preparing the Policy Exception request package in Step 5.

STEP 4 — SELECT APPROPRIATE QUEUE MITIGATION MEASURES

Based on the analysis, select queue mitigation measures appropriate to the predicted operational impacts. Queue mitigation may include adjusting work hours or staging, deploying ITS strategies and traveler information, using enforcement presence, or removing the restriction when conditions warrant. Operating within Appendix B windows does not, by itself, eliminate the obligation to mitigate if queues form; Requestors must plan and implement queue mitigation wherever analysis indicates queuing or notable congestion.

Queue mitigation strategies should reflect the expected severity and behavior of queues and may range from static warning strategies to active dynamic measures. On interstates, dynamic strategies are preferred over purely static approaches because they respond to real-time traffic conditions with real-time information for motorists.

Static Queue Mitigation Strategies

Static queue mitigation strategies represent baseline, low-complexity options. They are generally simple and inexpensive to implement; however, they require continual monitoring to ensure they are used appropriately. These measures must be deactivated, covered, or removed when queues are not present, as they are not “set-and-forget” solutions. In accordance with the IMUTCD, temporary traffic control elements that are no longer applicable must be covered or removed when their message does not apply.

- Static advance warning construction signs placed in front of the back-of-queue for the maximum expected queue length. Examples include “BE PREPARED TO STOP” W3-4; “WATCH FOR STOPPED TRAFFIC” XW3-4a; and “SLOW TRAFFIC AHEAD” W23-1.
- Pairing flashing beacons and a “WHEN FLASHING” (S4-4) plaque on construction signs.
- Providing Temporary Transverse Rumble (“Buzz”) Strips in conjunction with and in advance of static construction signing/messaging.
- Portable changeable message signs (PCMS) with queue messaging provided only when queue is present.

Dynamic Queue Mitigation Strategies

Dynamic queue mitigation strategies should be considered for long-duration work on high-volume routes where queue formation is likely. These strategies provide automated or actively monitored, real-time messaging and, when properly implemented, are highly effective at reducing hard-braking events and preventing back-of-queue crashes. Although more costly than static treatments, their responsiveness to changing traffic conditions makes them significantly more effective on freeways and busy corridors.

Queue trucks, in particular, require trained and knowledgeable drivers who continuously monitor conditions and reposition to protect the back-of-queue. Law enforcement can also perform back-of-queue warning; however, their availability is not always guaranteed, and officers may be called away for other law-enforcement duties. If law enforcement is used as the sole queue mitigation and must leave the work zone, the operation may need to be paused and the restriction removed until appropriate queue mitigation can be restored.

- A Queue Detection and Warning System (QDWS), which is a specific type of Automated Worksite Information System (AWIS) with dynamic PCMS messaging tied to live traffic data from sensors placed along the approach to the work zone.
- Queue trucks with trained drivers actively monitoring conditions and repositioning to protect the back-of-queue. Note, the use of Queue Trucks requires INDOT approval. Coordinate on their potential use with the District Traffic Office.
- Law enforcement performing back-of-queue warning per LEO program guidance (see RSP 801-R-672). Do not rely solely on law enforcement for queue protection; TTC and other queue mitigation strategies should be robust so that LEOs are supplemental, not the only queue mitigation available.

This step completes the selection of queue mitigation measures and sets up the documentation you will include in the Policy Exception request package.

STEP 5 — PREPARE THE POLICY EXCEPTION REQUEST

The Requestor must assemble a complete, review-ready Policy Exception request package and submit it to the District Traffic Office to initiate the review process. All components must be organized into a single, clearly structured PDF, with supporting native-format files provided separately. With the 2026 IHCP update, the new IHCP Restriction Notification form now replaces legacy templates for cover memos and body documents. Policy Exception requests for INDOT Construction Contracts must also include RSP 801-T-216 Lane Closures listing all planned interstate restrictions.

A Policy Exception request includes the following components:

- A. IHCP Restriction Notification Form. This form is always required for every interstate restriction, regardless of whether a Policy Exception is needed.
- B. RSP 801-T-216 Lane Closures. The recurring special provision is required for INDOT Construction Contracts, whether or not a Policy Exception is needed. To ensure consistency between the approved Policy Exception and the restriction schedule included in the Construction Information Book (CIB), the RSP must:
 - List all the types of restrictions being planned for the contract;
 - Be attached to the IHCP Restriction Notification form;
 - Not be duplicated within the IHCP Restriction Notification form.
- C. Cover Memo (Optional). A cover memo based on a legacy template may be included, but is no longer required because the IHCP Restriction Notification form replaces the legacy memo function.
- D. Analysis & Justification / Abbreviated TMP (Optional). A document that provides an Analysis, Justification, and an Abbreviated TMP may be included for additional clarity,

but is not required under the 2026 IHCP update because the IHCP Restriction Notification form captures the essential content previously contained in the legacy body document.

- E. Queue Analysis Reports. For mainline restrictions, include the queue analysis reports for the Recommended Alternative. For other restriction types, provide output from INDOT-supported analysis tools, when available. Include all relevant inputs, outputs, adjusted volumes, capacities, and predicted queue lengths, durations, and queue mile-hours. See the Queue Analysis Guidance for detailed reporting requirements.
- F. Alternatives Analysis Documentation. While every planned interstate restriction should consider feasible options through an alternatives analysis, documentation is required only when the IHCP requires it under Appendix D for High Volume Interstate Segments. For construction contracts, Alternatives Analysis documentation prepared as part of a TMP may be used to avoid duplication. The documentation must summarize screened alternatives, queueing comparisons, user cost analysis (HVIS only), rejected alternatives, and the rationale for the Recommended Alternative.
- G. Temporary Traffic Control Plans. MOT plans and detour information are required to provide necessary context for the planned restrictions. Include plans for temporary traffic breaks, such as rolling slowdowns, short-term stoppages, diversions and other applicable strategies.
- H. Native-Format Source Files. Native-files files may be included in the submittal as separate attachments, including:
 - Queue analysis spreadsheets
 - Modeling tools
 - Supporting calculations
 - Any input files used for alternative analysis
- I. Other Supporting Documentation. Supporting documents that help reviewers understand the context of the Policy Exception request may be included. Examples include figures, maps, diagrams, photos, congestion heat map plots, detour capacity checks, summary tables, traffic data, adjustment factor calculations, modeling files, TMP excerpts, relevant correspondence, and previously approved Policy Exceptions, as applicable.

STEP 6 — SUBMIT THE POLICY EXCEPTION REQUEST, TRANSITION PACKAGE TO PHASE 2

Once the Policy Exception request package is complete, the Requestor must submit it by email to the appropriate District Traffic Office. District contact information is provided on INDOT's IHCP webpage, and the Requestor must select the correct District based on the location of the planned restriction. This email serves as the official submittal and initiates the District review process.

The email must include the IHCP Restriction Notification form with the complete Policy Exception request package attached, including all required native-format files. Submittals should be made as early as practicable to allow sufficient time for review, coordination, and approval prior to the planned restriction.

Review timelines are established by the IHCP. Restrictions that fully comply with the Select Interstate Restrictions and Times in Appendix B will be reviewed within seven days.

Policy Exception requests will be reviewed within twenty-one days. Requests requiring Work Zone Council review will be completed within sixty days. Complex scenarios may require multiple submissions, resubmissions, or meetings to obtain a final decision from the Work Zone Council. Failure by INDOT to meet these review timelines does not constitute approval. Requestors should plan project schedules accordingly.

Bear in mind, if a submittal is incomplete or contains issues that require a response from the Requestor, the review period resets. Each resubmittal starts a new review cycle, and the applicable review timeline begins again upon receipt of the updated submittal. Also note that the Work Zone Council typically meets on or near the first Tuesday of each month. DTEs are asked to submit recommendations for consideration at least two weeks in advance of the meeting to ensure Council members have adequate time to review the request. Submissions received within the two-week window may be discussed at the Council's discretion, but a response is not guaranteed and may be deferred to a future meeting if additional review time is needed.

After the Policy Exception request is submitted, the District Traffic Office will log the notification, begin its evaluation, and coordinate with other parties as needed according to the IHCP review workflow.

EMAIL SUBMITTAL SUBJECT LINE FORMAT

For any email in the Policy Exception process, please provide a subject that follows one of the following formats:

IHCP Exception [WrkTyp] [ID#] [RTE] {DIR} [MM] – [MM] {AMD#} {Desc}
 IHCP Exception [WrkTyp] [ID#] [RTE] {DIR} to [RTE] {DIR} Ramp {AMD#} {Desc}

where

[WrkTyp].....is the work type and is one of the following based on the type of work:

for Contract work: CN
 for Permit work: PMT
 for Maintenance work: MNT

[ID#].....is an identification number associated with the work and is one of the following:

for Contract work: the Contract Number
 for Permit work: the Permit Number
 for Maintenance work: work order number, if known

[RTE]Interstate route. For example, I-65.

{DIR}Direction (optional). NB, SB, EB, or WB, when only specific directions apply.

[MM]Mile marker. For example, MM 25-30.

{AMD#}Amendment # (optional). For example, Amend 1, Amend 2, etc.

{Desc}Description (optional). This can be anything else.

Examples:

IHCP Exception – PMT T-1234567 I-465 MM 10-20 RSD

IHCP Exception – CN B-12345 I-465 MM 10-20 Stg 2 Submittal

IHCP Exception – CN R-23456 I-469E to I-69N Ramp Amend 7 N Jct Ramp closure

IHCP Exception – MNT WO-1234 I-70 MM 65-70 Lane closure

SECTION 7 — HIGH-VOLUME INTERSTATE SEGMENTS REQUIREMENTS (APPENDIX D)

High-Volume Interstate Segments (HVIS) are identified in Appendix B and require elevated consideration due to sustained volumes and the potential for rapid queue formation. Appendix D defines additional requirements that apply only when a Policy Exception request is prepared for INDOT Construction Contracts on HVIS segments.

STEP 1 — CONFIRM APPLICABILITY OF APPENDIX D

Appendix D requirements apply only when all the following conditions are met:

- The restriction is associated with an INDOT Construction Contract;
- The restriction occurs on an HVIS segment identified in Appendix B;
- The restriction will provide fewer than two open lanes for a series of 24-hour closures totaling more than 14 days.

If these criteria are met, Appendix D requirements apply and Work Zone Council review is required as part of the Policy Exception process.

STEP 2 — COMPLETE THE MANDATORY ALTERNATIVES AND USER-COST ANALYSES

Appendix D requires that Policy Exception requests meeting HVIS criteria include a formal alternatives analysis as part of the Policy Exception request.

The alternatives analysis must:

- Evaluate multiple feasible work zone strategy options appropriate for the segment;
- Assess operational feasibility and traffic impacts for each option;
- Demonstrate how each option minimizes queueing and motorist delay;
- Address relevant geometric, operational, and constructability constraints;
- Include a user-cost analysis evaluating delay and mobility impacts consistent with Appendix D requirements.

Early coordination with the District Traffic Office is recommended to confirm expectations before initiating the analyses.

STEP 3 — DOCUMENT HVIS REQUIREMENTS IN THE POLICY EXCEPTION REQUEST

The Policy Exception request must clearly demonstrate compliance with Appendix D requirements. The submittal package must include:

- An alternatives analysis (including user-cost analysis);
- Modeling results and assumptions needed to verify the analysis;

STEP 4 — POLICY EXCEPTION REQUEST SUBMITTAL AND WORK ZONE COUNCIL REVIEW

Once the Policy Exception request package is complete, it should be submitted to the District Traffic Office in accordance with Section 6. When Appendix D applies, the Policy Exception request must undergo review by the Work Zone Council (WZC), which adds additional steps to the overall review process.

After the District Traffic Engineer (DTE) has reviewed the request, the DTE will either return the Policy Exception Request to the Requestor with appropriate guidance or forward the Policy Exception Request to the Work Zone Council. The DTE must provide a statement of concurrence with the Recommended Alternative when forwarding a Policy Exception Request to the Work Zone Council. The Council will:

- Evaluate the operational feasibility and safety of the proposed restrictions,
- Review the results of the alternatives analysis and the associated queue modeling,
- Determine whether the proposed queue mitigation strategies are appropriate for HVIS conditions.
- Provide concurrence or non-concurrence to the Reviewer and Approver.

Based on its review, the Council may recommend additional conditions or operational adjustments. The Council may also request consideration of other alternatives or revisions to the proposed approach. The District Traffic Office will coordinate any required updates with the Requestor. Multiple meetings or resubmittals may be necessary to obtain Council concurrence. Incomplete submissions can delay Council review and may result in resubmittals; Requestors should plan project timelines accordingly.

Following Council concurrence, the Policy Exception request will be routed for final approval to the Approver for INDOT Construction Contracts, which is the Managing Director of Transportation Systems Management & Operations (TSMO) or designee.

SECTION 8 — DISTRICT SPECIAL PROJECT CORRIDOR REQUIREMENTS (APPENDIX E)

District Special Project Corridor Segments (DSPCs) are specific interstate corridors identified in Appendix E of the IHCP as requiring additional planning considerations, supplemental documentation, or enhanced review due to persistent operational challenges, regional mobility importance, geometric constraints, or high sensitivity to work zone–related disruptions. These corridors may experience recurring congestion, significant freight movement, or limited detour alternatives.

As no District has yet designated DSPCs in Appendix E, this section serves as a placeholder for future development once such corridors are formally defined and district-specific requirements are established.

SECTION 9 — REVIEW WORKFLOW AND TIMELINES

The IHCP establishes a standardized, statewide review workflow for evaluating planned interstate restrictions and Policy Exception requests. This section outlines the Reviewer's responsibilities, routing procedures, and timelines for the review process depending on the case.

STEP 1 — INTAKE & LOGGING

Upon receipt of the Policy Exception request, the Reviewer logs the IHCP Restriction Notification Form and attached Policy Exception package.

STEP 2 — INITIAL REVIEW FOR COMPLETENESS & TECHNICAL SUFFICIENCY

The Reviewer:

- Confirms whether the restriction is policy compliant or requires a Policy Exception.
- Evaluates the request for completeness and technical sufficiency. This review and evaluation should include, but is not limited to:
 - Confirming the latest versions of forms and templates have been used.
 - Confirming the IHCP Restriction Notification form provided and properly filled out.
 - For Contract work, confirming RSP 801-T-216 is provided and properly filled out.
 - If provided, confirming the Cover Memo and Analysis & Justification / Abbreviated TMP are the correct versions for the type of work. Confirm optional and custom elements of the templates make sense, are appropriate and are applicable to the request.
 - If required by Appendix C or Appendix D, confirming the analyses conform to the requirements outlined herein and in the Queue Analysis Guidance.
 - If applicable, confirming that an alternatives analysis is provided.
 - Considering whether any needed restrictions appear to be missing.
 - If applicable, checking if MOT for MOT has been considered.
 - Confirming that sufficient supporting information has been provided to understand the context of the planned restrictions. This could include the provision of MOT plans and typical cross sections, detour plans, the TMP report, correspondence, photos, maps, etc.
- Requests clarification or supplemental information from the Requestor if needed.
- When ready to forward the package, the Reviewer sends it to the DTE via email following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

STEP 3 — EARLY FHWA NOTIFICATION (WHEN APPLICABLE)

If FHWA concurrence or approval is required, providing early notice may be helpful for complex requests or requests with significant impacts.

- Although the Approver obtains FHWA concurrence or approval prior to final decision, the Reviewer may notify FHWA during initial review.
- FHWA correspondence may be included in the final package submitted for approval.

STEP 4 — DISTRICT TRAFFIC ENGINEER (DTE) OPERATIONAL EVALUATION

When the Reviewer determines the package is complete and technically sufficient, the Policy Exception request is routed to the District Traffic Engineer for operational evaluation.

The DTE:

- Verifies operational feasibility, safety, and mobility impacts, considering district priorities, traffic patterns, adjacent work, and detours.
- When ready to forward the package, depending on where a Policy Exception request is in the process and whether Appendix D applies, the DTE may route the package a few different ways:
 - If additional information is needed before the request can proceed, the DTE may route it back to the Reviewer.
 - When Appendix D criteria apply and the DTE is not in agreement with the Recommended Alternative, the DTE routes it back to the Reviewer.
 - When Appendix D criteria apply, the DTE is in agreement with the Recommended Alternative, and the package is ready to be sent to the Work Zone Council, the DTE forwards the Policy Exception request to the Work Zone Council via the INDOT MOT mailbox along with a statement of concurrence following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.
 - When the Policy Exception request is ready to be sent for approval, and the Work Zone Council has provided concurrence when Appendix D criteria applies, the DTE forwards the Policy Exception request to the Approver via the INDOT MOT mailbox along with a statement of concurrence following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

STEP 5 — WORK ZONE COUNCIL SUBMISSION (WHEN REQUIRED)

When Appendix D criteria applies and the DTE is in agreement with the Recommended Alternative, the package is forwarded to the Work Zone Council.

The Work Zone Council typically meets on or near the first Tuesday of each month. DTEs are asked to submit recommendations for consideration at least two weeks in advance of the meeting to ensure Council members have adequate time to review the request. Submissions received within the two-week window may be discussed at the Council's discretion, but a response is not guaranteed and may be deferred to a future meeting if additional review time is needed.

The Work Zone Council:

- At the Council meeting, the DTE presents the Policy Exception request and the recommended alternative to the Work Zone Council.
- The Council reviews the alternatives analysis, queue modeling, and adequacy of queue mitigation to assess operational feasibility from a safety and mobility perspective.
- The Council issues a concurrence or non-concurrence.

- If additional information is needed or further alternatives need to be analyzed before the request can proceed, the Council may request resubmittal, and the DTE may route it back to the Reviewer.
- Decisions may be issued during a meeting if there is sufficient time for deliberation or thereafter, depending on the number of requests on the agenda or the complexity of a request.
- Council decisions are documented on the Policy Exception request and returned to the DTE via the INDOT MOT mailbox along with a statement of concurrence following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

STEP 6 — DTE HANDOFF TO APPROVER, TRANSITION PACKAGE TO PHASE 3

When Phase 2 is complete, the Policy Exception request is forwarded to the appropriate Approver as defined in the policy:

- The Reviewer or the DTE finalizes the review record, confirms Council concurrence (if applicable), and routes the request to the Approver.
- When ready to forward the package, the Reviewer or the DTE sends it to the Approver using the INDOT MOT mailbox following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

TIMELINES & ESCALATION PRACTICES

Reviewers are encouraged to provide early involvement and advance notice for complex or controversial requests to avoid last-minute surprises. The INDOT MOT mailbox should be used for Council submissions and statewide policy questions; districts are encouraged to transition communications there for exception routing and general questions.

The policy also outlines target turn-around times for reviews:

Type of Review	Review Time
Policy-Compliant Restriction	Within 7 days
Policy Exception Request	Within 21 days
Work Zone Council Review	Within 60 days

Failure to meet timelines does not constitute approval.

If a submittal is incomplete or contains issues that require a response from the Requestor, the review period resets. Each resubmittal starts a new review cycle, and the applicable review timeline begins again upon receipt of the updated submittal.

INDOT MOT MAILBOX

In the context of the IHCP, the INDOT MOT mailbox is intended for internal INDOT use by the DTE, the Work Zone Council and Approvers only for communications between these groups. Other email communications involving other parties should be directed to individual accounts.

Section 10 — Approval Process

Phase 3 of the Policy Exception workflow concludes with formal approval by the designated Approver as defined by the IHCP. This phase transitions requests into fully executed Policy Exceptions.

The Approver validates the completeness of the review, ensures required concurrences have been obtained, and determines whether the proposed restriction meets IHCP expectations for safety, mobility, operational feasibility, and queue mitigation. The following steps outline the Approver's responsibilities and decision-making process once the Policy Exception request has completed Phase 2 review.

STEP 1 — RECEIVE THE RECOMMENDATION FROM THE DISTRICT TRAFFIC ENGINEER

The Approver receives:

- The final Policy Exception package
- The DTE's concurrence and recommendation
- Any Work Zone Council determination if Appendix D applies

STEP 2 — CONFIRM COMPLETENESS OF THE PACKAGE

As Approvers are intended to provide the final, high-level review and approval of Policy Exception requests, the IHCP does not expect them to perform technical evaluations independently or to redesign the restriction or direct alternative strategies. Instead, the policy intends for the Approvers to rely on the Reviewers who perform technical reviews and on the DTE and the Council, if applicable, who provide reviews of operational considerations. Approvers and DTEs are encouraged to coordinate and communicate throughout the review process.

The Approver should nonetheless verify that:

- The DTE has provided a clear recommendation
- Required reviews by the Reviewer, DTE, and Work Zone Council, if applicable, have been completed
- The Policy Exception request package includes:
 - The IHCP Restriction Notification form
 - RSP 801-T-216 for Contract work, if applicable
 - Council concurrence, if applicable
 - FHWA coordination, if applicable
 - Required analyses are attached
- Appropriate queue mitigation strategies are included

While any necessary refinements to the Policy Exception request package should already have occurred in Phase 2 by the Reviewer and DTE, if materials are missing or unclear, the Approver should request clarification through the Reviewer or DTE.

STEP 3 — VERIFY FHWA CONCURRENCE (WHEN APPLICABLE)

If FHWA involvement is required:

- The Approver ensures concurrence has been obtained
- FHWA correspondence is included in the package
- Any FHWA-specific conditions are documented

A Policy Exception cannot be approved without FHWA concurrence when FHWA review applies.

STEP 4 — EVALUATE SAFETY, MOBILITY, AND OPERATIONAL IMPACTS

The Approver's evaluation focuses on whether the proposed restriction:

- Supports safe interstate operations
- Minimizes congestion and queue risk
- Follows requirements of the policy and its appendices
- Includes queue mitigation adequate for anticipated impacts

STEP 5 — ISSUE FINAL APPROVAL OR DENIAL

The Approver may:

- Approve the request
- Approve with conditions
- Deny the request

Approval or denial is formalized through the IHCP Notice of Restriction form. If the Approver denies the request, the Reviewer and DTE will communicate required changes to the Requestor before resubmittal.

If approved, the Approver signs the IHCP Notice of Restriction form. The approval is not valid until this form is executed.

STEP 6 — TRANSITION PACKAGE TO PHASE 4

Upon approval, the Approver sends the fully executed Policy Exception to the Reviewer or the DTE using the INDOT MOT mailbox following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

SECTION 11 — RECORDKEEPING AND DISTRIBUTION

Phase 4 concludes the Policy Exception process and ensures that the approved restriction is recorded, distributed, and implemented in accordance with the IHCP. Once the Approver has issued formal Approval and fully executed the Policy Exception, the Reviewer and Requestor must carry out specific actions to ensure compliance with the policy, proper documentation, communication, and field execution.

STEP 1 — ARCHIVE THE APPROVED POLICY EXCEPTION

Archival to the Department's electronic document/record retention and management system makes prior exceptions accessible for verification and reuse. Proper archival supports transparency, long-term tracking, and consistent statewide implementation. Upon receipt of the approved and fully executed Policy Exception, the Reviewer or the DTE uploads the complete approved package to the Department's electronic document/record retention and management system. At a minimum, the uploaded PDF must include:

- The IHCP Restriction Notification form with authorized approval
- RSP 801-T-216 for Contract work, if applicable
- Council concurrence, if applicable
- FHWA coordination, if applicable
- Required analyses

STEP 2 — DISTRIBUTE THE APPROVED POLICY EXCEPTION

When the approval has been archived, the Reviewer or the DTE distributes the approved and fully executed Policy Exception to the Requestor and recipients listed on the distribution list following the guidance on Email Submittal Subject Line Format in Section 6.

STEP 3 — PROVIDE DOCUMENTATION TO THE RESPONSIBLE SITE SUPERVISOR

Upon receipt, the Requestor has the responsibility of ensuring that the Responsible Site Supervisor is provided with a copy of the fully executed Policy Exception, clearly outlining all requirements stipulated with the approval, including any queue mitigation requirements. Failure of the Requestor to provide these requirements to the Responsible Site Supervisor may lead to violations of the IHCP during the field implementation of the restrictions.

For Contract work in design, this typically requires the designer to ensure that the Temporary Traffic Control Plan and the Contract Information Book (CIB) contain all the necessary information to comply with the terms of the approval. This may include, but is not limited to, RSP 801-T-216 Lane Closures, MOT Plans, special provisions, and pay items.

For Contract work in construction, this typically requires the Project Engineer to receive a copy of the fully executed Policy Exception. The Project Engineer should ensure that all terms of the approval are communicated to the Contractor.

For INDOT Maintenance work, a copy of the fully executed Policy Exception should be provided to the Crew Leader or Foreman.

For Permit work, a copy of the fully executed Policy Exception should be included in the permit. The permit should make it clear that the Permittee is responsible for all requirements stipulated with the approval, including any queue mitigation requirements. If the Permittee is not the one doing the work, it is their responsibility to ensure that the requirements are passed on to those performing the work.

A REMINDER OF NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Regardless of work type (Contract work, Permit work, or INDOT Maintenance work), the Responsible Site Supervisor shall provide advance notification for the restrictions as outlined in the policy. Generally, this entails:

- Providing advance notice at least 2 weeks prior to the planned field implementation date to the Department's Travel Information Site in accordance with the Department's CARS policy.
- Providing advance notice about the planned restrictions to the INDOT District Public Relations Director as soon as possible but no later than at the time the CARS entries are made.
- Coordinate with the Traffic Management Center (TMC) by calling 317-899-8690, ext. 1 on the day of implementation of a restriction in the field:
 - Call no sooner than 1 hour BEFORE the scheduled start time to confirm the restriction is about to be implemented on the interstate.
 - Call at the scheduled END time to confirm the restriction has been removed from the interstate.