

Lafayette

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

**Teleconference Meeting for the
Purpose of Reviewing the Draft Project Listings
Conducted January 19, 2007
9:00 A.M. to 10:00 A.M.**

In Attendance: Sallie Fahey, Executive Director – Lafayette MPO
 John Thomas, Assistant Director - Lafayette MPO
 Doug Poad, Senior Planner - Lafayette MPO
 Melissa Baldwin, Transportation Planner - Lafayette 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
 Randy Walter, 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

Doug Poad asked about project costs. Mr. Smith explained that new cost estimates were generated for all of the non-Major Moves projects using INDOT's new cost estimating tool. The costs included engineering, right-of-way and construction estimates. For the first time, INDOT was also applying an inflation factor to project costs. From a base 2006 year cost estimate, project costs 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.

The project scoring process was then reviewed. Mr. Smith explained 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.

Sallie Fahey asked if the Major Moves projects were all funded using the proceeds from the Toll Road lease. Steve Smith responded that the Planning Section does not specifically identify the funding source for each project and that each project may be funded from many sources, federal state and or, Toll Road money. However, the fully funded Ten-Year Major Moves Program was made possible with the additional funds from the Toll Road lease.

John Thomas asked about the scoring for SR 26 – the added travel lanes project from US 52 to I-65. John noted that the traffic counts are high on this segment of SR 26 and that something needed to be done sooner rather than later. Doug Poad said that the traffic forecast from the Lafayette model showed 50,000 plus traffic in 2030. He said that the project was originally scheduled for 2013. Sallie Fahey noted that the current pavement was in poor shape and that it would not last until the later funding periods and Randy Walter concurred. John Thomas asked if INDOT wanted a copy of the traffic forecast map for the section of SR 26. Steve Smith said that INDOT would indeed like to have a copy of that map.

In response to the need for the project, Steve Smith responded that INDOT was working within budget constraints for the outer years (beyond Major Moves) funding periods of the plan. Sallie Fahey asked where the interest from the Toll Road money was going. Steve Smith pointed out that interest received from the Toll Road lease would still be outpaced by the inflation rates applied to projects.

Sallie Fahey asked if the MPO could advance the SR 26 project and push back one of the I-65 interstate projects. Steve Smith said that he did not know but that the MPO could e-mail the request to John Weaver. Sallie Fahey then looked at the interstate projects to see where comparable costs to non-interstate projects could be identified. Doug Poad reiterated the need for the SR 26 project.

John Thomas asked about potential community wide impacts that would result from the I-69 innovative financing. The answer was that there would be no adverse impact on Lafayette from the innovative finance strategies for I-69. Jay Mitchell explained that the Major Moves program had already budgeted \$700 million from the lease of the Toll Road to be used to start I-69. It was estimated that the \$700 million would be used to build from I-64 to US 231 near the Crane Naval Warfare Center. The balance of the I-69 projects would be paid for under an innovative finance strategy. The current plan is to use estimated excess proceeds to be generated from the proposed new Indiana Commerce Connector (ICC) to finance the completion of I-69 from US 231 near Crane to Indianapolis.

Sallie Fahey noted that the US 25 Hoosier Heartland projects used the same DES number and description: *"Hoosier Heartland – From I-65 to CR 450N (Segment 1 – Phase A)"* and that that was

misleading to the public. It implied that only one of the three segments of the SR 25 project in Tippecanoe County would be built in the 2006 – 2015 time-frame. She said that she had pointed this out before and that she wanted to be sure that all of the Hoosier Heartland in Tippecanoe County would be built in the 2006 – 2015 time frame. Jay Mitchell agreed with Sallie in that she has pointed this out before. For the present however, the project listings for the Major Moves projects were to mirror the listings on the INDOT web page; all of SR 25 in Tippecanoe County is programmed to be let prior to 2015.

Doug Poad pointed out that the interchange modification project at I-65/SR 26 (DES #9802780) was included in Major Moves but not in the new project listings handed out by INDOT. Jay Mitchell said that that was an error and that it would be corrected; the project would be included in the funded project listing in the 2006 – 2010 time period.

Sallie Fahey asked about the US 52 bridge project. Steve Smith said that bridge projects, other than major bridges crossing the Ohio River, were not included in the new listings. Bridge projects are now evaluated under another program managed by others at INDOT. At some point, there would be a bridge project listing with associated project scoring but that has not yet happened. Sallie Fahey wanted to know when the Bridge program would be published.

John Thomas asked if the reconstruction projects would be included in the INDOT Long-Range Plan project listings. Steve Smith replied that major preservation projects would no longer be included in the Long-Range Plan for much the same reason as the bridges. Reconstruction projects are scored and managed by another unit at INDOT under Dave Andrews.

Doug Poad followed up with questions about the SR 43 and SR 26 reconstruction projects. According to the Engineer's Report, parts of those projects did include added travel lanes in addition to reconstruction. He wanted to know if those projects would be included in the Long-range Plan. Steve Smith replied that projects such as he described would still not be included in the plan because such projects were more reconstruction than added travel lanes. Doug Poad also asked about the interchange reconstruction project at I-65/SR43; it was not included in the listing. The response was that the project appeared to be included in a preservation project for SR 43 and as such, should not be listed in the Long-Range Plan. Doug Poad asked if a copy of the SR 26 Engineer's Report had been located. Jay Mitchell replied that he had found the project file but the final Engineer's Report was not included in the file. The thought was that the report had been shifted to the group that was managing the preservation program. Mr. Mitchell said that he would follow-up and continue to look for the report.

Doug Poad asked if the Purdue Ring Road would be included in the plan since it was part of the university and thus a state owned and maintained facility. Steve Smith replied that the road was not part of the INDOT State jurisdictional program and that there was no framework to include it in the Long-Range Plan. He did however note that it was a unique situation and that he would discuss it with John Weaver.

Mark Albers also pointed out that the road was not adding capacity to the state system and that there were some relinquishment concerns. Sallie Fahey said that Stadium Avenue was under State control.

Doug Poad asked about CR 350 South; it's shown as being part of a Mobility Corridor. Mark Albers said that there were still some relinquishment issues to be resolved. A brief discussion took place regarding the Statewide Mobility Corridors. Steve Smith said that a new map would be provided to the MPO.