

Evansville

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

Teleconference Meeting for the
Purpose of Reviewing the Draft Project Listings
Conducted January 18, 2007
2:00 P.M. to 3:00 P.M.

In Attendance: Brad Mills, Executive Director – Evansville MPO
Seyed Shokouhzadeh, Assistant Director – Evansville MPO
Laura M. Lamb, Transportation Planner – Evansville MPO
John Curry, Deputy Director Planning & Programming – Vincennes District
Pamela S. Drach, Program and Budget Manager – Vincennes District
Brittney Smith, INDOT Vincennes District Planning
David Franklin, Federal Highway Indiana Division
Steve Smith, Manager INDOT Long-Range Planning Section
Emmanuel Nsonwu, 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 were 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 periods. 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

Mr. Smith then briefly explained how the Road Classification and Mobility (RCM) scores were generated for the projects. The road classification was based on the functional classification of the roadway with NHS routes and the Statewide Mobility Corridors scoring the highest. Mobility/congestion relief scores were based on output from the Statewide Travel Demand Model. These components made up the RCM scores. Seyed Shokouhzadeh pointed out that in the past, when comparing the Statewide Travel Demand Model output to the EMPO Model output, the statewide model produced lower projected AADT. He wanted to make the point that this could adversely affect project scores in the Evansville area.

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.

Mr. Smith also noted that for the first time, INDOT was applying an inflation factor to project costs. From a base 2006 year cost estimate that included engineering, right-of-way and construction costs, projects 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.

Pam Drach asked if a separate meeting could be set up with the District to review the District's project listings. Steve Smith said yes, a separate meeting could be set up for the Vincennes District.

The MPO said that it was concerned that no new projects were listed for EMPO during the 2016 to 2020 funding period. Brad Mills also said that he and Seyed had been looking at the map and comparing it to the project listings and that the project number (374) printed on the I-69 Henderson to Evansville Ohio River Bridge was actually for the I-164 project from the bridge to I-64. The correct project number for the bridge was 372. Mr. Smith said that it would be corrected on the next version of the map.

Seyed Shokouhzadeh expressed concerns about air quality conformity. He pointed out that by pushing back some of the State projects and eliminating others from the network due to fiscal constraint, Evansville might not be able to continue to meet conformity and that would affect I-69. The Evansville model used to demonstrate conformity was based on the assumption that the State projects as listed in the 2004 plan update would be built and opened-to-traffic by specific time periods. Steve Smith said that INDOT's project listings were constrained by the new fiscal forecast and by the inflation factors applied to project costs.

The project listings were then reviewed. The SR 62 Lloyd Expressway projects were discussed. It was noted that the projects (which amount to segments) from Eickhoff Road (USI) to Boehne Camp Road and from Rosenberger Avenue to the Pigeon Creek Bridge were included in the funded project listings while the middle segment from Boehne Camp Road to Rosenberger Avenue was included in the unfunded project listing. The convention that INDOT had originally planned for the Lloyd was to begin east, downtown at Fulton Avenue and build the segments westward to Eickhoff Road. A discussion followed as to whether or not the western-most segment from Eickhoff Road to Boehne Camp Road could be switched to the unfunded period and the Boehne Camp Road to Rosenberger Avenue segment could be switched to the funded period. This would result in a logical progression for the corridor as originally planned. The projects however were not equal in costs and the MPO would review.

Jay Mitchell pointed out that the SR 66/Burkhardt Road interchange project was no longer included on the list of projects. Brad Mills said that he was not happy about that and asked why it had been dropped from the listing. Jay Mitchell explained that the problems with the design could not at this time be resolved and that this, plus severe budget limitations were the reasons for dropping the project from the listing. Brad Mills asked about the status of the proposed SR 66 Lloyd Expressway east access management study.

Mr. Mitchell explained that INDOT was planning on putting out a PSB for that study in the very near future.

Seyed Shokouhzadeh said that SR 57 was important to the travel network and important to the community. He said that the EMPO model predicts that SR 57 will become one of the major links from Evansville to I-69. He further explained that development was already starting to take place along the SR 57 corridor.

Emmanuel Nsonwu asked if INDOT could meet with the MPOs. Steve Smith said that a consultation and coordination process with the MPOs has been on ongoing process. In 2006, INDOT's Planning Section released the preliminary project scorings in a series of 24 meetings with all of the MPOs, INDOT Districts and the RPOs, and a follow up occurred during the July and August, 2006 District Meetings. Mr. Smith reiterated that the fiscal forecast was insufficient to include all of the projects on the funded list.

Brad Mills said that the projects seem to be pushing out. Evansville was updating its plan and its planning horizon would extend to 2035 while INDOT's planning horizon extended only to 2030. Dave Franklin asked if the INDOT plan was a 25, 23 or a 20 year plan. He noted that SAFETEALU requires the MPO to maintain an active 20-year plan. Steve Smith replied that INDOT's plan was for 25 years, although the first year, 2006 had already passed. Dave Franklin then asked when INDOT planned to next update its long-range plan. Steve Smith said the update frequency had not yet been determined but that in the past, it had taken place on a one-year basis. A lot depended on when the Statewide Travel Demand Model was updated; INDOT was currently in the process of updating its model.

Seyed Shokouhzadeh asked about the I-164/Millersburgh Road interchange. He said that it was very important to include the proposed new interchange in network because many other critical local projects depended on it. Jay Mitchell responded that the Millersburg Road interchange was not currently a project; it was not included in either the funded or unfunded project listings. However, he did note that the INDOT Interchange Study was reviewing the location.

Seyed Shokouhzadeh asked what the consequences would be if EMPO ignored INDOT's project listings. Dave Franklin replied that if that were to happen, FHWA would determine that the EMPO plan was not consistent with the INDOT Long-Range Plan and that it was not fiscally constrained. FHWA would not sign off on the air quality conformity. He said if INDOT has determined that a project is unfunded, that project cannot be included in the network. Mr. Shokouhzadeh said that with the changes to the network, conformity may not be achieved. Mr. Franklin replied that Evansville did not know that to be the case until after the network had been recoded and the model run.

Jay Mitchell explained that \$700 million had been dedicated to I-69 from the proceeds of the Toll Road lease. This funding was expected to pay for I-69 from I-64 to the Crane Naval Warfare Center – that would be US 231. The first segment, from I-64 to SR 68 was planned for letting in 2008; ground-breaking was anticipated to take place in 2008. This was reflected in the MPO and District project listings

The balance of I-69 from US 231 to I-465 and the Henderson to Evansville segment would all be financed through innovative financing. Those I-69 projects, from Henderson to Evansville and from US 231 to the Vincennes/Seymour District line are included in the "Innovative Financing Projects for the Vincennes District" listing. The I-69 projects included in that listing are considered to be fiscally constrained and where applicable, they should be included in the network used to demonstrate air quality conformity. Seyed Shokouhzadeh asked whether or not the I-69 Henderson to Evansville segment could be included in the network. He believed that Kentucky Federal Highway would not consider the project fiscally constrained until the Kentucky Transportation Cabinet had identified a funding source for its portion of the project. The consensus was that even though Indiana was fiscally committed to the project, Kentucky had not yet reached that level of financial commitment and that the I-69 Henderson to Evansville segment could probably not be included in the network used to demonstrate conformity at this time. The other applicable segments of I-69 from I-64 northward did however need to be included in Evansville's Travel Demand Model network.

Mr. Shokouhzadeh asked about open-to-traffic dates. Steve Smith responded that based upon the information thus far provided. The MPO could determine open-to-traffic dates and that INDOT would be willing to work with the MPO to come up with reasonable assumptions for open-to-traffic dates.