

**Long Range Plan Consultation Teleconference with the Louisville Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Friday, January 19th, 2007  
11:00 AM EST**

Attendees:

Steve Smith, INDOT Planning      Mary Lou Hauber, KIPDA      David Burton, KIPDA  
 Frank Baukert, INDOT Planning      Harold Tull, KIPDA      Carter Keith, INDOT  
 Randy Simon, KIPDA

- 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:

<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

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 MPO asked about projects that involved median construction and/or reconstruction which were being shown in the MPO plan, but not in the INDOT plan. The MPO includes these projects in its plan in order to meet the federal regulations requiring projects that utilize federal funds be included in the Transportation Plan and to better inform the public about transportation improvements in the area. INDOT’s plan focuses on added capacity projects because they are capital-intensive and require the longest development time. INDOT is using a more stringent definition of “added capacity” than it had in the past, so that the overlap is smaller than it had been. The MPO asked for guidance from INDOT. INDOT’s response was that MPO could continue to show other state projects, but INDOT would only show added capacity projects in its plan. The MPO wanted to know the source for information on these other projects and funding so as to maintain fiscal responsibility.. INDOT suggested that the median construction information would be found in the Major Preservation Program. Frank Baukert, the Seymour District Planning Liaison would work with the MPO to provide the needed project information.
- The MPO had a question about LRP#278 Added Travel Lanes on I-64 from US-150 to I-265. They wanted to know the Open to Traffic Date. The MPO asked for specific Ready for Contracts(RFC) dates for projects listed

in the INDOT plan in order to determine an Open To Traffic(OTT). This is required for air quality conformity modeling. INDOT declined saying that the projects would be shown in five-year funding periods instead. INDOT explained that this was an INDOT policy decision. It was felt that listing a specific year would mislead the public since it was likely that the RFC dates for projects in the outer years would change multiple times. The projects in the first two funding periods were shown by year in Major Moves. The MPO could use those to calculate OTT dates, but the projects in the last 15 years would be shown by funding period. The MPO would be able to make a determination and as long as the RFC year lay within the appropriate funding period, INDOT would concur. INDOT added that the 10-year construction plan provides RFC dates in which the MPO will need to exercise judgment to calculate OTT (usually the RFC date plus 1-2 years).

- The issue of fiscal constraint was raised. INDOT stated that by including projects in their plans, the state was taking fiscal responsibility for the projects, and that this for the state portion of the MPO TIP & Plan constituted de facto constraint.