

# Long Range Plan Consultation Teleconference with Michiana Area Council of Governments

Thursday, January 18th, 2007

10:00 AM EST

## Attendees:

Steve Smith, INDOT Planning	Janice Osadczyk, FHWA	Sandra Seanor, MACOG
Stephanie Belch, INDOT Planning	Don Abraham, INDOT LaPorte District	Roy Nunnally, INDOT
Frank Baukert, INDOT Planning	Jerry Halperin, INDOT Planning	Eryn Hays, INDOT Planning
Corey Hull, MACOG	Keith Dimond, INDOT LaPorte District	J.P. Hopman, MACOG
Ben Shaffer, INDOT FW District	Mike Rauch INDOT FW District	Jamile Smith, INDOT LaPorte Dist.

- 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 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. Eryn Hays 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. These funding periods should be viewed as periods in which there will be some sort of construction activity. A consultation process will be implemented to assist in determining OTT dates. The MPO expressed concerns; this is a problem if consultation is required for each project prior to selecting an OTT date. If the MPO could determine the OTT date, then this won't be an issue. INDOT and FHWA agreed. 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).

- MPO question if the INDOT plan will extend to the 2035, since they are extending their plan out to that year. Steve explained that the ISTDM socio-economic data does not extend to 2035, so, INDOT would not extend its plan at this time.
- LRP#61 is on the unfunded list. The MPO plan shows it opening in 2015. The MPO wanted to know if they need to remove it from their plan. INDOT's response was yes.
- LRP#65 Des#0101528 Added Travel Lanes on US-20 from CR 17 to SR 15 is not included in the list. This project is in Major Moves for 2015. INDOT's response was that the project is included in the database but is not showing in the MPO owing to a join issue. INDOT promised to correct the problem..
- LRP#185 Added Travel Lanes on SR 23 from Brick to Michigan Stateline missing from list, but is shown on map! INDOT promised to investigate & correct the problem.
- US 33 project with median construction is missing. Though this project is not adding capacity, it needs to be modeled because the project length is over 1 mile. INDOT promised to correct this.
- A US 331 project is missing at McKinley, one of the approaches to the US 331 projects (Old US 331). INDOT promised to correct this.
- The MPO expressed concerns relative to existing lane configuration on portions of US 331 that is currently open to traffic. These open segments are built for 6-lanes but striped for 4. Is it safe to assume that when the remaining segments are completed in the near future that the striped 4-lanes will be re-striped to 6-lanes? District says yes. Frank Baukert will coordinate with the project manager and the district to ensure this occurs.
- INDOT promised to correct the database errors noted above and provide MACOG with an updated project listing showing the corrections.
- MPO asked about the ISTDM update and its timeline. INDOT responded that an RFP will be posted and INDOT anticipate having a consultant selected by this summer who will evaluate the ISTDM and begin the update process. INDOT expects to have a product (Updated ISTDM) within a year and a half.
- MACOG and the other MPO's will need Operations and Maintenance costs by county as part of SAFETEA-LU compliance. Staff will research as to who has this information. The District Highway Management sections was suggested as the starting point.
- Sandy requested that these lists be provided in electronic format (Excel is preferred) for St. Joseph, Elkhart, Marshall, and Kosciusko Counties.