

# **INDOT 2006-2030 LRP Update Coordination Meeting:** Indianapolis/Anderson MPOs, Greenfield/Crawfordsville Districts and Federal Highway Administration Review of INDOT Project Selection for The Years 2016-2030

**January 18, 2007; 3 pm – 5 pm**

## **ATTENDEES:**

Steve Smith, INDOT; Dan Buck, INDOT; Roy Nunnally, INDOT; Bob Rebling, Greenfield District INDOT; Jay Mitchell, INDOT; Joe Spear, Crawfordsville District INDOT, Eryn Hays, INDOT; (Phil Roth, Indy MPO; Jerry Bridges, Anderson MPO; Pete Mitchell, Anderson MPO; on conference line); Joyce Newland, FHWA

## **INTRODUCTION:**

Steve Smith started the meeting with an explanation of the purpose of the meeting. The Long Range Plan project update uses the fiscal forecast provided by Bernie Seel, INDOT Deputy Commissioner of Finance. That fiscal forecast is shown in the table below:

<b>Time Frame</b>	<b>Total Funding</b>	<b>80% for Interstates</b>	<b>20% for Non-Interstates</b>
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

INDOT explained how scores were included in the project ranking. The scores are based partly on the IPOC scoring criteria using road congestion, mobility and AADT values for both auto and trucks; this was the best available information. LOS was also considered from the statewide travel demand model. Projects received points for LOS improvement. If a project improves LOS from F to D, the project receives 2-points as the LOS improves two levels.

Following this composite score a “priority” score was added by long-range planning staff in order to elevate (or not) priorities according to the local community. Points ranging from 1 to 4 were added, with 4 being a “committed” project from Major Moves (including carryover projects into 2016/the third time period), 3 = high local support, 2 = moderate support, and 1 being a low priority.

After the scores were complete, the funding amounts were applied to determine which projects could be funded in each time frame, with 80% going to Interstate projects and 20% for non-interstate projects (INDOT Business Rule determined by John Weaver).

Projects that did not make the funding cut are listed in the “Illustrative Unfunded Long Range Plan Projects”. As additional funding is identified, projects on this list can be added to the Funded list. All projects are included on one of these lists; no projects dropped-out.

## **□ MPO DISCUSSION:**

Both Phil Roth and Jerry Bridges were very concerned regarding the fact they did not receive the INDOT 2016-2030 project listings until January, 2007. They had been informed by INDOT for the last year that they would receive all INDOT LRP Update changes by the very latest December, 2006.

This was necessary to give all three MPO's the minimum time possible to conduct all of the activities required to update the LRP's and conformities for each of the three MPOs, which includes substantial coordination among the three MPOs that none of the other Indiana MPOs are forced to address.

They MPO's are currently in the process of amending the LRPs to incorporate current changes including the I-69 Interim Improvements in Indy into the various subject LRP(s) and TIP (s), and they do not want to stop those processes and restart to try to add the changes resultant from the new listing of 2016-2030 project listings. Given the nature of the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and Approval Process for the three MPO non-attainment areas (Indy, Anderson, Columbus), the time required to meet all requirements, and effort necessary to conduct the processes, they feel that would move back approval of the MPO's LRP's back into the third or fourth quarter of 2007 at the earliest, if that was even possible.

Both Phil Roth and Jerry Bridges felt it was unacceptable for them to stop their current process to add the new INDOT LRP project changes and that such a move might endanger their meeting the July 1, 2007 deadline for meeting the SAFETEA-LU Requirements. Given the fact they did not receive the subject changes early enough to adequately incorporate them into their extensive procedures.

The Two MPOs stated that given the unique nature of the three MPO Non-attainment area, and all of the special activities, coordination, approvals and timing of such to meet the Air Quality Conformity regulations for the entire Non-attainment area, they would not be able to stop the current amendment process (which would affect those projects), and they would then only be able to include the new INDOT project changes into the next Indy Area LRP Update process that would be completed at the earliest in February, 2008.

This is due to the fact that the MPOs have been forced to go to a once/year LRP(s) amendment process This was done in order to be able to meet all of the unique and special activities required of them to fully conduct the air quality conformity analysis, modeling, public and MPO coordination, and other activities required of the three MPO non-attainment area.

## **□ INDOT AND FHWA DISCUSSION:**

Eryn Hays of INDOT stated she had talked Jay DuMontelle of the FHWA who informed her that as long INDOT submitted and the MPOs received the 2016-2030 INDOT LRP project listings by January 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2007 then there should be no problems. INDOT submitted the subject project listings on that date.

Joyce Newland of the FHWA stated that she would support the 3 MPOs contention and decision to delay incorporating the subject project listing until the next 3 MPO LRP Update was conducted.

Eryn then asked for clarification of the FHWA position on this matter with the apparent contradiction of internal FHWA statements.

It was then determined to table the current topic of discussion and arrange another meeting/conference call with the FHWA to resolve and clarify the positions of the FHWA and any final decision on the course of action for the three MPO non-attainment area under discussion.

## **□ Miscellaneous Project/Topics Discussions:**

The MPOs inquired as to how to treat the projects that might arise out of the latest INDOT Innovative Financing List. Specifically the MPOs wanted to know how to show such projects in the MPO LRP(s) and how to model them regarding the Indiana Commerce Corridor (ICC) concept identified by INDOT.

The MPOs were informed for any projects/corridors identified under innovative financing that they should be treated as study placeholders and a “no build “ alternative was to be assumed for modeling purposes.

Jerry Bridges discussed his concerns that the projects in the previous LRP identified for US 36 between I-465 and SR 38 have now been moved to the unfunded “illustrative list”. Jerry feels that from his own experience and knowledge of the area that the US 36 projects should be placed in the funded category.

He believes that current and future growth in that area is already showing a need for the projects. Jerry was informed that if he had any specific information such as modeling from his own planning activities that he can present that information and the need for those projects can be re-evaluated as is necessary.

## **□ CLOSING:**

A future meeting/conference call with Jay DuMontell of the FHWA will be arranged as soon as possible and clarification of exactly what the 3 MPOs can produce in the shorted time frame and what they will be required to produced will be discussed with a final decision from FHWA to be reached.

The meeting adjourned approximately at 5:00 PM.