

Long Range Plan Consultation Teleconference with the Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana Metropolitan Planning Organization

Thursday, January 18th, 2007

9:00 AM EST

Attendees:

Steve Smith, INDOT Planning Andy Johns, OKI Bill Miller, OKI
Frank Baukert, INDOT Planning Andy Reser, OKI Mark Paine, OKI

- 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.
- 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.

- The US-50 Gateway Study was discussed. The study is wrapping up, and there will be some projects coming from it. The Town of Greendale was already on board with the recommendations for their portion of US-50.
- The MPO mentioned that Dearborn County was finishing up a capital improvements study. Among the recommendations that the study made was the construction of a new interchange on I-74 near Sunman to support economic development. The MPO named the County Engineer, Todd Listerman as a contact for more information.
- SAFETEA-LU compliance was discussed. The MPO reported that it was conducting the required "Gap Analysis" and would be done by July 1st, 2007.
- The MPO discussed its project list shown in Table 13-1 of the MPO's Long Range Plan. They listed several projects that were not shown on INDOT's list because they were located on non-state jurisdictional highways. The INDOT plan focuses on added capacity projects on state highways. These non-state projects were a SR-1 to SR-48 bypass and a Bright to I-74 connector.
- Both INDOT & the MPO agreed that their plans would match. The MPO stated that they didn't believe the required changes would trigger conformity problems.