



# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

100 North Senate Avenue  
Room N758  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

PHONE: (317) 232-5525  
FAX: (317) 234-8365

**Eric Holcomb, Governor**  
**Joe McGuinness,**  
**Commissioner**

August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2020

Mayela Sosa  
Division Administrator  
FHWA Indiana Division  
575 N Pennsylvania St., Room 254  
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Subject: I-65 / I-70 North Split Project Financial Plan Annual Update Letter of Certification

Dear Ms. Sosa:

The Indiana Department of Transportation has developed a comprehensive Financial Plan Annual Update for the I-65 / I-70 North Split Project in accordance with the requirements of 23 U.S.C. §106 and the Financial Plan guidance issued by the Federal Highway Administration. The plan provides detailed cost estimates to complete the project and the estimates of financial resources to be utilized to fund the project.

The cost data in the Financial Plan provide an accurate accounting of costs incurred to date and include a realistic estimate of future costs based on engineer's estimates and expected construction cost escalation factors. While the estimates of financial resources rely upon assumptions regarding future economic conditions and demographic variables, they represent realistic estimates of resources available to fund the project as described.

The Indiana Department of Transportation believes the Financial Plan Annual Update provides an accurate basis upon which to schedule and fund the I-65 / I-70 North Split Project, and commits to provide Annual Updates according to the schedule outlined in the Initial Financial Plan.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, the Financial Plan Annual Update as submitted herewith, fairly and accurately presents the financial position of the I-65 / I-70 North Split Project, cash flows, and expected conditions for the project's life cycle. The financial forecasts in the Financial Plan Annual Update are based on our judgment of the expected project conditions and our expected course of action. We believe that the assumptions underlying the Financial Plan Annual Update are reasonable and appropriate. Further, we have made available all significant information that we believe is relevant to the Financial Plan Annual Update and, to the best of our knowledge and belief, the documents and records supporting the assumptions are appropriate.

Sincerely,

DLB

Daniel L. Brassard  
CFO, Deputy Commissioner - Finance  
Indiana Department of Transportation



## I-65 / I-70 North Split Project

# 2020 Financial Plan Annual Update\*

\*Project cost estimates and completion schedules reflect information available as of May 31, 2020.

Submitted to:  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

Submitted by:  
**Indiana Department of Transportation**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1. Project Description</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Introduction.....	1
Project Overview .....	1
Project Sponsor.....	1
Project Detail .....	1
Figure 1-1. North Split Map .....	2
Project Delivery Approach .....	3
Project History .....	3
Project Implementation – Management and Oversight .....	3
<b>Chapter 2. Project Schedule</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Introduction.....	4
Project Schedule Overview.....	4
Table 2-1. Project Schedule Overview .....	4
2020 Financial Plan Update .....	4
Project Delivery .....	4
Table 2-2. Procurement Schedule.....	5
2020 Financial Plan Update .....	5
<b>Chapter 3. Project Costs</b> .....	<b>6</b>
Introduction.....	6
Cost Estimates.....	6
Table 3-1. Project Cost Estimate by Activity .....	6
2020 Financial Plan Update .....	6
Figure 3-1. Project Cost Estimate by Activity.....	7
Inflation Assumptions.....	7
Cost Estimating Methodology .....	7
Table 3-2. Cost Estimating Methodology.....	7
Project Expenditures .....	8
Table 3-3. Project Cost Estimate by Fiscal Year.....	8
2020 Financial Plan Update .....	8
<b>Chapter 4. Project Funds</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Introduction.....	9
Financial Plan Overview.....	9
Procurement Approach and Financing .....	9
State Transportation and Federal-Aid Formula Funding.....	10
Table 4-1. Federal and State Funding (in \$ millions).....	10
Progress Payments .....	10
Federal Discretionary Funding .....	10
Special Funding Techniques.....	10
<b>Chapter 5. Financing Issues</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Introduction.....	11
Financing Strategy .....	11
<b>Chapter 6. Cash Flow</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Introduction.....	12
Estimated Sources and Uses of Funding.....	12
Table 6-1. Estimated Project Sources and Uses of Funds (in \$ millions) .....	12
2020 Financial Plan Update .....	12
Cash Management Techniques .....	12
Table 6-2. Advanced Construction Funding Status (in \$ millions).....	13
Financing Costs.....	13
Projected Cash Flows.....	13

Table 6-3. Project Cash Flows (in \$ millions).....	13
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	13
<b>Chapter 7. Public-Private Partnership (P3) Assessment.....</b>	<b>14</b>
Introduction.....	14
P3 Assessment .....	14
Legislative Authority .....	14
Indiana’s P3 Management Structure.....	14
Benefits – Disadvantages Comparison .....	14
Risk Allocation Analysis .....	15
Table 7-1. INDOT P3 Screening Criteria – Step One .....	15
Table 7-2. INDOT P3 Screening Criteria – Step Two.....	16
Table 7-3. INDOT DBBV Project Considerations .....	17
Market Conditions .....	18
Permits and Approvals.....	18
Table 7-4. Required Permits and Notifications .....	18
<b>Chapter 8. Risk and Response Strategies .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Introduction.....	19
Project Cost Risks and Response Strategies .....	19
Table 8-1. Project Cost – Risks and Response Strategies .....	19
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	19
Project Schedule Risks and Response Strategies.....	20
Table 8-2. Project Schedule – Risks and Response Strategies .....	20
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	22
Financing and Revenue Risks and Response Strategies .....	22
Table 8-3 Financing and Revenue – Risks and Response Strategies .....	22
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	22
Procurement Risks and Response Strategies .....	23
Table 8-4. Procurement – Risks and Response Strategies.....	23
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	23
Impact on Statewide Transportation Programs.....	23
<b>Chapter 9. Annual Update Cycle.....</b>	<b>24</b>
Introduction.....	24
Future Updates .....	24
<b>Chapter 10. Summary of Cost Changes Since Last Year’s Financial Plan.....</b>	<b>25</b>
Introduction.....	25
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	25
Figure 10-1. Project Expenditure & Cost Estimate Comparison by Activity (in \$ millions).....	25
<b>Chapter 11. Cost and Funding Trends Since the Initial Financial Plan.....</b>	<b>27</b>
Introduction.....	27
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	27
Table 11-1. Project Expenditures & Cost Estimate Comparison by SFY (in \$ millions) .....	27
<b>Chapter 12. Summary of Schedule Changes Since Last Year’s Financial Plan .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Introduction.....	28
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	28
<b>Chapter 13. Schedule Trends Since the Initial Financial Plan .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Introduction.....	29
2020 Financial Plan Update.....	29

## CHAPTER 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

### INTRODUCTION

*This document presents the Financial Plan Annual Update (FPAU) for the I-65 / I-70 North Split Project (the Project), including current cost estimates, expenditure data through the effective date of May 31, 2020, the current schedule for delivering the Project, and the financial analyses developed for the Project. This FPAU has been prepared generally in accordance with Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Financial Plans Guidance.*

### PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Project is in the northeast corner of downtown Indianapolis, Indiana, at the north junction of I-65 and I-70. Three legs of the interstate system serving the Indianapolis urban area join at the I-65/I-70 North Split interchange. As a result, the North Split is the second-most heavily traveled interchange in the SOI, accommodating about 214,000 vehicles per day. The Project incorporates complete reconstruction of the interchange infrastructure including pavement and bridges on both mainline interstates and all ramps. The number of lanes varies by location within the interchange. The Project length along I-65 is 1.74 miles and the Project length along I-70 is 1.90 miles. Environmental determination will be completed by the Indiana Department of Transportation (INDOT) in 2020 when final design work is completed.

### PROJECT SPONSOR

The INDOT is the Project Sponsor for the Project. The Project will be procured and managed by INDOT.

### PROJECT DETAIL

The Project area is centered on the I-65 and I-70 north junction interchange in downtown Indianapolis (see Figure 1-1). The layout and condition of connecting roadways were considered in defining the Project area limits. To the west, the project area begins at the I-65 overpass of Alabama Street. The large bridge spanning multiple streets to the west from that point was recently rehabilitated and may be reconstructed in a future project. The Project includes the ramps on each side of I-65 ending at Meridian Street to provide local access both north and south. The Project extends through the interchange and then east and south. To the east, the Project area extends to the I-70 overpass of Commerce Avenue, where reconstruction was performed in 2007. South of the interchange, the Project extends to the south end of the I-65 / I-70 interchange to just south of Washington Street and includes improvements for a series of deteriorated bridges.

The purpose of the Project is to rehabilitate and improve the existing interstate facilities within the North Split project area. The Project must meet the following transportation needs:

- Correct existing bridge deficiencies,
- Correct deteriorated pavement conditions,
- Improve interchange operations,
- Reduce traffic congestion, and
- Improve safety.

To meet these needs, the Project will construct new bridges and pavement within the Project area and reconstruct and realign mainline and ramp movements. The Project will address operations by eliminating weaving movements and reducing curvature on mainline and ramps. The Project will reduce traffic congestion by improving interstate level of service and reducing system delay. The



Project will improve safety by reducing conflict points and improving substandard roadway features, including meeting design requirements for roadway curvature, increasing shoulder width, and improving horizontal sight distance. Figure 1-1 below illustrates the general location and length of the Project.

**Figure 1-1. North Split Map**





## **PROJECT DELIVERY APPROACH**

INDOT is utilizing a Design-Build Best-Value (DBBV) procurement model for this project. Under this procurement type, INDOT issues a Request for Qualifications (RFQ), seeking qualified and interested design-build (DB) contractors to build the Project. Proposer teams will be shortlisted based on evaluation of their Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), essentially a response to the RFQ, and will compete for the Project. The Preferred Proposer, the selected DB contractor, will be selected based on combination of a technical proposal score and price proposal score. The Preferred Proposer will complete the work for a lump sum amount. INDOT will own, operate, and maintain the facility after final acceptance as described in the Public-Private Agreement (PPA). This facility is and will remain a non-tolled roadway.

Best-value determination of proposals received from short-listed proposers will be based on a Total Proposal Score using a 100-point scale. The Price Score will represent up to 65 points of the total score; the Technical Proposal score will represent up to 35 points of the total score. The determination of apparent highest ranked proposal will be based on the highest total proposal score computed as follows:

$$\text{Total Proposal Score} = \text{Price Score (maximum 65 points available)} + \text{Technical Proposal Score (maximum 35 points available)}$$

$$\text{Technical Proposal Score} = \text{Schedule Score} + \text{DB Plan Score} + \text{Project Management Plan Score}$$

The Price Score is based on the proposed price to complete the Project. The Technical Proposal Score is based on evaluation and review of three components; the proposer's Schedule Score (for overall duration and for closure durations of specific movements) (50% of technical proposal score), the proposer's DB Plan (30%) and the proposer's Project Management Plan (20%).

## **PROJECT HISTORY**

A full discussion of the project history can be found on the Project website found on the internet at <https://northsplit.com/> and specifically in the [Alternative Screening Analysis Report](#). Based on this analysis, the environmental study of the Project advanced, and the scope of the project is defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to address the immediate needs of the interchange.

## **PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION – MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT**

INDOT is the Project Sponsor for the Project and is managing and delivering the Project for the State of Indiana (SOI). The following is additional detail on the roles and responsibilities of various parties.

- **INDOT** will be responsible for all aspects of the Project and is supported by their technical team (described below).
- **Legal Advisor** will supplement and assist state personnel with short-listing potential design-builders, contract language, and contract negotiations and will work under the direction of INDOT. The contract is known as the PPA.
- **Technical Advisor** will supplement and assist state personnel with technical provisions, design review, contract administration, construction inspection, and quality control and quality assurance activities and will work under the direction of INDOT.
- **Preferred Proposer** will design and construct the Project under the direction of INDOT. INDOT will issue a final Request for Proposals (RFP) in the fall of 2019 and will receive proposals and select the Preferred Proposer in the spring of 2020.

## CHAPTER 2. PROJECT SCHEDULE

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter provides information on the planned implementation schedule for the Project. It also provides additional information regarding the allocation of implementation responsibilities and a summary of the necessary permits and approvals.*

### PROJECT SCHEDULE OVERVIEW

The current Project schedule is based on delivery of the Project under a DBBV procurement model. Substantial completion of the Project is expected by November 2022 with final acceptance in May 2023 as shown in Table 2-1 below. Environmental study and Preliminary Design began in 2017 and continue through procurement.

**Table 2-1. Project Schedule Overview**

State Fiscal Year	2019 & Prior	2020	2021	2022	2023
Environmental	IFP				
	2020 FPAU				
Preliminary Design	IFP				
	2020 FPAU				
Final Design			IFP		
			2020 FPAU		
Utilities Relocation		IFP			
		2020 FPAU			
Construction			IFP		
			2020 FPAU		

INDOT awarded a construction contract in June 2020 as shown in the procurement schedule in the Project Delivery discussion below (see Table 2-2). The environmental document is anticipated to be received in October 2020. The level of completed design by the time the Final RFP was issued in October 2019 is approximately 25%. The Project does not require right-of-way (RW) acquisitions. Table 2-2 provides the current procurement schedule for the Project.

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

This Update brings some minor changes in schedule activities but does not change the overall anticipated schedule of Project completion by the end of State Fiscal Year (SFY)23. The preliminary and final design, and construction activities have had their schedules adjusted to reflect anticipated timeframes of work on the Project. Primarily, construction was extended to the end of SFY23 as shown in Table 2-2 below, as final acceptance by INDOT will occur in May 2023.

### PROJECT DELIVERY

INDOT has evaluated various alternative contracting methods permitted under current Indiana law. Such alternative delivery models are expected to enhance the feasibility of the Project through accelerated project delivery; avoidance of inflation costs; and the transfer of various risks to the private sector, such as construction risk. As a result, the Project is being procured as a DBBV. Table 2-2 provides the current procurement schedule for each component.



**Table 2-2. Procurement Schedule**

Scheduled Item	IFP
Issue Request for Qualifications	4/4/2019
SOQ Due Date	5/17/2019
Announcement of Short-listed Proposers	6/12/2019
Circulate Draft of RFP to Short-listed Proposers	7/17/2019
Issue Final RFP to Proposers	10/11/2019
Proposal Due Date	3/10/2020
Announce Preferred Proposer	4/6/2020
Award and Execution of PPA (Commercial Close)	6/3/2020
Substantial Completion - Open to Traffic	11/24/2022
Contract Completion - Final Voucher/Acceptance	5/30/2023

**2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE**

Since the IFP, the award and execution of the PPA (Commercial Close) date for the Project has changed from May 26, 2020 to June 3, 2020. This change is a result of the technical challenges of remote work during the Covid-19 pandemic and the ability to get signatures. The Preferred Proposer has been selected in-line with the schedule.

## CHAPTER 3. PROJECT COSTS

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter provides a detailed description of Project cost elements and current cost estimates in year-of-expenditure dollars for each element. This chapter also summarizes the costs incurred to date since the original Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register and provides detail on key cost-related assumptions.*

### COST ESTIMATES

The total estimated cost for the Project is \$387.60 million in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars. All figures shown in this document are in YOE unless otherwise stated. This cost estimate includes the most current Project cost estimates. Table 3-1 below provides an overview of Project costs, broken down by component. The estimates are presented in year of expenditure dollars and incorporate industry standard inflation multipliers, as described further below.

**Table 3-1. Project Cost Estimate by Activity**


Activity	IFP	2020 FPAU	Change from IFP \$	Change from IFP %
PE, Environmental	\$ 22.38	\$ 56.06	\$ 33.68	150.5%
Final Design	\$ 14.39	\$ 14.60	\$ 0.21	1.4%
Construction	\$ 234.51	\$ 286.56	\$ 52.05	22.2%
CEI & Admin	\$ 9.03	\$ 22.36	\$ 13.33	147.7%
Utilities & Railroad	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.02	\$ 0.02	0.3%
<b>Project Total</b>	<b>\$ 288.30</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>	<b>\$ 99.29</b>	<b>34.4%</b>

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

Since the IFP, the cost estimate on the Project has increased by \$99.29 million as shown in Table 3-1. Construction accounts for \$52.05 million of the Project costs estimate and is a 22.2% increase over the IFP. Other large changes since the IFP include a \$33.68 million increase on preliminary engineering and environmental, 150.5%, and \$13.33 million for CEI and administrative costs, 147.7%. These changes are discussed in further detail in Chapters 10 and 11.

Figure 3-1 below illustrates the Project costs by component and share of the total cost. Construction accounts for nearly three quarters of the total cost at 74%. Preliminary engineering and environmental accounts for 14% while construction engineering, inspection, and administrative tasks are 6% of the Project cost. Lastly, final design, utilities, and railroad share of the total Project cost are 4% and 2%, respectively.

**Figure 3-1. Project Cost Estimate by Activity**



**INFLATION ASSUMPTIONS**

The inflation assumptions have been applied at three percent (3%) per year. These inflation rates reflect calendar year rates that were applied on a prorated basis to monthly expenditure forecasts.

**COST ESTIMATING METHODOLOGY**

Initial cost estimates were developed by consultant in conjunction with INDOT and FHWA. The cost estimates were developed by breaking down the Project into eight major cost categories and, further, into two primary construction segments broken out by four phases. The methodology is further described below in Table 3-2.

**Table 3-2. Cost Estimating Methodology**

Cost Elements
<b>Engineering and Design</b>
<i>Preliminary and final engineering design services.</i>
Final engineering will be part of the alternative delivery contracts for North Split, 3.8%. Engineering and design cost estimates are currently estimated at 14.5% of the construction cost estimate.
<b>Design Program Management</b>
<i>Cost to state for services of the GEC during the design phase and miscellaneous departmental program management costs.</i>
Program Management estimates are based on currently negotiated contracts and estimates that cover the currently planned Project schedule.
<b>Construction Administration and Inspection</b>
<i>All construction and program management, administration, and inspection activities during the construction phase of the Project.</i>
Construction Administration and Inspection costs are estimated at 5.8% of the construction cost estimate.
<b>Construction</b>
<i>Estimated cost of construction.</i>
Construction estimates reflect current industry practices and procedures of cost build up reflective of a large alternative delivery contract. The estimate is inclusive of all labor, materials, equipment, general conditions, escalations, and contractor construction risk.
<b>Construction Contingency</b>

<b>Cost Elements</b>
<i>Contingency to cover additional construction services in the event unforeseen circumstances arise that result in additional cost.</i>
Construction contingency estimates are based on the level of engineering undertaken to date for the Project. Contingency factors have been developed based on the cost estimates that assessed the likelihood and potential cost of various major project risk items. Contingency cost has been carried based upon the level of each risk to the project [high, medium, low] and a prorated value of each risk item is added to contingency.
<b>Utilities &amp; Railroads</b>
<i>All public and private project-related utility and railroad relocation and new construction.</i>
Costs include those related to telephone, electric, gas, fiber optics, water, sewer, TV cable, storm drainage, and railroads and are based on the most up-to-date cost information available.
<b>Enhancements</b>
<i>Various Project-related commitments as identified in the EA.</i>
This includes fixed dollar commitments made for various National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) commitments.

### PROJECT EXPENDITURES

Table 3-3 shows the breakdown of costs for the Project annually by component and SFY, respectively. As shown, \$9.57 million has been expended on the Project through SFY19. Expenditures in future years are summarized in the table and described herein.

Approximately \$7.57 million was expended in SFY20. As the DBBV procurement ends, expenditures will continue through SFY21 for environmental, utility and railroad engineering. Final design will begin followed by construction, construction engineering and inspection in SFY21. Approximately \$169.91 million is anticipated to be obligated in SFY21, \$156.96 million in SFY22, and \$43.6 million in SFY23.

**Table 3-3. Project Cost Estimate by Fiscal Year**

<b>Component / State Fiscal Year</b>	<b>2019 &amp; Prior</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>Total</b>
PE, Environmental	\$ 9.57	\$ 7.56	\$ 38.93	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56.06
Final Design	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11.74	\$ 1.43	\$ 1.43	\$ 14.60
Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 95.00	\$ 149.40	\$ 42.17	\$ 286.56
CEI, Admin & Prog Costs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16.23	\$ 6.13	\$ -	\$ 22.36
Utility & Railroad Relocations	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 8.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.02
<b>Total Costs</b>	<b>\$ 9.57</b>	<b>\$ 7.57</b>	<b>\$ 169.91</b>	<b>\$ 156.96</b>	<b>\$ 43.60</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

The values presented in Table 3-3 reflect the Preferred Proposer’s bid and schedule of values for the Project. As shown in Table 3-3, construction is most of the Project’s costs at \$286.56 million followed by preliminary engineering and environmental of \$56.06 million. CEI and administrative components account for \$22.36 million, final design \$14.6 million, utility, and railroad relocations at \$8.02 million. These changes are discussed in further detail in Chapters 10 and 11.



## CHAPTER 4. PROJECT FUNDS

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter discusses the project funding sources that are dedicated to the Project. Specifically, it presents the available and committed funding required to complete the Project, including state transportation and federal-aid formula funds, and federal discretionary fund. A discussion of risks associated with funding availability also is included.*

### FINANCIAL PLAN OVERVIEW

This FPAU reflects the planned funding and finance strategy by which the Project will be financed through a combination of conventional state and federal transportation program funds. The INDOT has developed a financial plan that recognizes the limitations on conventional state and federal transportation funding and finds the right balance of funding alternatives to meet the following goals:

- ensuring Indiana’s financial obligations to the Project are manageable,
- ensuring the Project delivers value to Indiana, taxpayers, project partners, and end users through the lowest feasible Project cost,
- seeking private sector innovation and efficiencies and encouraging design solutions that respond to environmental concerns, permits, and commitments in the environmental study,
- developing the Project in a safe manner that supports congestion management,
- ensuring the Project is constructed within a time period that meets or exceeds final completion target dates, and
- transparently engaging the public and minimizing disruptions to existing traffic, local businesses, and local communities.

The alternative delivery method selected by Indiana has the potential of providing private sector innovation, efficiencies, and best value to taxpayers. Importantly, INDOT, together with their advisory team, have developed a pro forma financial plan that provides a certain view of how a DB contractor may deliver this Project. Ultimately the financial plan will reflect what the Preferred Proposer proposes based on its view of the Project.

### PROCUREMENT APPROACH AND FINANCING

The Project will be procured using a DBBV procurement model through a PPA. Under this model, INDOT will make progress payments to a Preferred Proposer as consideration for the contractor designing and constructing a facility in accordance with the performance standards set forth in the PPA, which upon release in October 2019, will be made viewable at the [Project website](#).

On April 4, 2019, INDOT issued a RFQ for the Project. In response to the RFQ, SOQs were received on May 17, 2019. Shortly thereafter, a draft RFP was issued to the shortlisted proposers on July 17, 2019. The final RFP was issued on October 11, 2019. INDOT received RFP responses from three proposer teams on March 10, 2020. Following evaluation, INDOT selected a Preferred Proposer in April 2020. Following negotiations in April and May, award, and execution of the PPA occurs on June 3, 2020.

A combination of state and federal funds will be used to make progress payments to the Preferred Proposer. INDOT will budget for these using INDOT’s state appropriation determined by the Indiana General Assembly. The sources of federal funds used to support the payments are anticipated to be from the National Highway Performance Program (NHPP). This FPAU is based on public funds by INDOT.

**STATE TRANSPORTATION AND FEDERAL-AID FORMULA FUNDING**

Indiana has historically used federal-aid resources for the Project and has committed specific funding from their respective near-term federal-aid highway funding programs, as described further below in Table 4-1. Federal-aid formula funds provided to the Project have been and will continue to be matched by a combination of state funds. Indiana has a demonstrated track record of meeting their state match obligations with a variety of state funding sources, including state-imposed fuel taxes and a variety of transportation-related fees. The Project has an estimated \$387.6 million of federal-aid highway formula and state transportation funds which are reasonably expected to be available to the Project (see Table 4-1). The Project costs of \$387.6 million is 3.23% of INDOT’s capital program with 10.51% utilization of NHPP funds and 2.47% of Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. This includes \$9.57 million of federal and state funds expended through SFY19. The funding is estimated to be split between federal-aid funds and state funds is 79.85% and 20.15%, respectively. Any funds in Advanced Construction (AC) that have not been converted to federal funds are included in the State Highway Fund line.

**Table 4-1. Federal and State Funding (in \$ millions)**

Fund Type / State Fiscal Year	2019 & Prior	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
<b>Federal</b>						
Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	\$ 4.25	\$ 5.48	\$ 2.66	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12.39
National Highway Performance Program	\$ 3.80	\$ 0.01	\$ 132.79	\$ 125.57	\$ 34.88	\$ 297.04
Highway Infrastructure Program	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.07	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 0.07
<b>Subtotal, Federal Funds</b>	<b>\$ 8.04</b>	<b>\$ 5.49</b>	<b>\$135.53</b>	<b>\$125.57</b>	<b>\$34.88</b>	<b>\$309.50</b>
<b>State</b>						
State Highway Fund	\$ 1.52	\$ 2.08	\$ 34.38	\$ 31.39	\$ 8.72	\$ 78.09
<b>Subtotal, State Funds</b>	<b>\$ 1.52</b>	<b>\$ 2.08</b>	<b>\$ 34.38</b>	<b>\$ 31.39</b>	<b>\$ 8.72</b>	<b>\$ 78.09</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9.57</b>	<b>\$ 7.57</b>	<b>\$169.91</b>	<b>\$156.96</b>	<b>\$43.60</b>	<b>\$387.60</b>

It is anticipated that future funds will come from the NHPP funding category, although the commitment of specific funding categories of federal funding is subject to adjustment based on the availability of more restricted categories.

**PROGRESS PAYMENTS**

The progress payments will be funded with a combination of state and federal funds appropriated by INDOT. In addition to being reflected in INDOT’s internal budget and financial control systems, all anticipated funding amounts are reflected in the fiscally-constrained 2020-2024 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program ([STIP](#)), as well as the 2020-2023 Indianapolis MPO Indiana Regional Transportation Improvement Plan ([IRTIP](#)).

**FEDERAL DISCRETIONARY FUNDING**

The Project has not utilized any funding outside of federal-aid formulary and state transportation funds to date. The use of discretionary funding in future periods remains a possibility but no plans to do so as of this IFP.

**SPECIAL FUNDING TECHNIQUES**

INDOT is prepared to mitigate unanticipated changes in expected funding. Strategies to mitigate changes include but are not limited to; acquisition of additional funds, modify other project’s timelines to manage cash flows. Special funding techniques are discussed in Chapter 6 as the techniques are utilized to address cash flows while projects concurrently advance.

## CHAPTER 5. FINANCING ISSUES

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter discusses the specific costs associated with financing the Project, including the issuance costs, interest costs, and other aspects of borrowing funds for the Project.*

### FINANCING STRATEGY

The Project will not utilize funding outside of the federal-aid and state transportations funds appropriated to INDOT. This plan eliminates issuance, interest, and borrowing costs.

## CHAPTER 6. CASH FLOW

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter provides an estimated annual construction cash flow schedule for the Project and an overview of the planned sources of funds.*

### ESTIMATED SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDING

An indicative summary of the sources and uses of funds is shown in Table 6-1. This summary reflects INDOT’s view of the funding structure based on the Project’s economics. Sources of funds for the Project are currently fully funded through public funds. The following sources of funds will fund construction and other development costs.

**Table 6-1. Estimated Project Sources and Uses of Funds (in \$ millions)**

	IFP	2020 FPAU	Change from IFP	% of Change
<b>Sources</b>				
IN State & Federal Funding - Formulary	\$ 288.30	\$ 387.60	\$ 99.29	100.0%
IN State & Federal Funding - Discretionary	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	0.0%
<b>Source of Funds Subtotal</b>	<b>\$288.30</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>	<b>\$ 99.29</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Uses</b>				
PE, Environmental	\$ 22.38	\$ 56.06	\$ 33.68	33.9%
Final Design	\$ 14.4	\$ 14.6	\$ 0.2	0.2%
Construction Costs	\$ 234.51	\$ 286.56	\$ 52.05	52.4%
CEI, Admin & Program Costs	\$ 9.03	\$ 22.36	\$ 13.33	13.4%
Utility & Railroad Relocations	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.02	\$ 0.02	0.0%
<b>Expenditures Subtotal</b>	<b>\$288.30</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>	<b>\$ 99.29</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

As illustrated in Table 6-1 and previously mentioned in Chapter 3, this Update realizes a \$99.29 million increase of sources and uses of funds. This increase is largely attributed to the Preferred Proposer’s bid. Construction, preliminary engineering, and environmental account for most of this increase. The change in construction, PE and environmental, and CEI account for most of the Project increases at 52.4%, 33.9%, and 13.4% respectively. These changes are discussed in further detail in Chapters 10 and 11.

### CASH MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES

For Project funding expected to be contributed from state and federal sources, INDOT intends to utilize available cash management techniques, including but not limited to AC and Tapered Match (TM), to manage the timing of cash needs against the availability of federal and state funds. These techniques provide INDOT authority to “concurrently advance projects ....” utilizing the federally accepted practice of AC. Current year expenditures will be converted to limitation obligation while future year expenditure estimates will remain under AC. This practice will continue throughout the life of the project. At no time will Indiana’s AC exceed Indiana’s future federal estimates. Indiana also will utilize TM provisions to manage the timing of federal and state expenditures for the Project.

Table 6-2 below provides the AC conversion status for Indiana updated through May 31, 2020. As shown, the Project currently has authorized AC funds of \$12 thousand with \$4.18 million converted to federal funds to date.



**Table 6-2. Advanced Construction Funding Status (in \$ millions)**

State Fiscal Year	Amount AC'd to Date	Amount Converted to Date	Amount Remaining in AC
2019	\$ 0.01	\$ -	\$ 0.01
2020	\$ 4.19	\$ 4.18	\$ 0.01

**FINANCING COSTS**

The Project will not utilize funding outside of federal-aid and state transportation funds appropriated to INDOT as previously discussed in Chapter 5.

**PROJECTED CASH FLOWS**

Plans will include a table summarizing the prior, current, and anticipated total, annual cash outlays for the Project. Table 6-3 below presents the anticipated cash flows of the Project. More specific cash flow schedules will continue to be developed as the Project progresses towards Substantial Completion.

**Table 6-3. Project Cash Flows (in \$ millions)**

Revenue	2019 & Prior	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
Carry Forward		\$ -	\$ -	\$ 38.85	\$ 16.05	
INDOT Funding	\$ 9.57	\$ 7.57	\$ 169.91	\$ 156.96	\$ 43.60	\$ 387.60
<b>Revenue Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 9.57</b>	<b>\$ 7.57</b>	<b>\$ 169.91</b>	<b>\$ 156.96</b>	<b>\$ 43.60</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>
<b>Total Revenue Available</b>	<b>\$ 9.57</b>	<b>\$ 7.57</b>	<b>\$ 169.91</b>	<b>\$ 195.81</b>	<b>\$ 59.65</b>	
<b>Expenditures</b>						
PE, Environmental	\$ 9.57	\$ 7.56	\$ 32.08	\$ 4.80	\$ 2.05	\$ 56.06
Final Design	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.24	\$ 4.93	\$ 1.43	\$ 14.60
Construction	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71.00	\$ 161.40	\$ 54.17	\$ 286.56
CEI, Admin, Prgm	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11.73	\$ 8.63	\$ 2.00	\$ 22.36
Utilities/Railroads	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.01	\$ 8.02	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8.02
<b>Expenditures Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 9.57</b>	<b>\$ 7.57</b>	<b>\$ 131.06</b>	<b>\$ 179.76</b>	<b>\$ 59.65</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>
<b>Net Cash Flow</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 38.85</b>	<b>\$ 16.05</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	

As shown above in Table 6-3, INDOT has expended \$17.14 million through SFY20 on the Project. SFY21 is anticipated to obligate \$169.91 million and expend \$131.06 million. The remaining project costs of \$239.41 million are anticipated to be fully obligated and expended through SFY23 with most of the preliminary engineering, final design, and railroad engineering in SFY21. Construction and CEI are expected to extend from SFY21 through SFY23 as presented.

**2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE**

The estimated timing of funds availability in SFY20 through SFY23 have changed since the IFP. As discussed previously in Chapters 3, the Preferred Proposer’s bid has resulted in additional anticipated expenditures requiring allocations of more funds.

## CHAPTER 7. PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP (P3) ASSESSMENT

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter provides information on the process used to assess the appropriateness of a P3 to deliver the project.*

### P3 ASSESSMENT

INDOT has evaluated alternative contracting methods permitted under current Indiana law. Such alternative delivery models are expected to enhance the feasibility of the project through accelerated project delivery; construction cost certainty; and the transfer of various risks to the private sector, such as design and construction risk. As a result, the project is being procured as a P3 using a DBBV delivery method. Due to Indiana laws on transportation procurement, any procurement method that does not award to a lowest bid is managed by the Major Project Delivery Department under the Major Projects Division.

### LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

The P3 Program operates within the general legal framework set forth in the Indiana Code (IC). INDOT has been granted legislative authority to procure P3 projects in Indiana. The statute providing authorization to procure P3 projects is [IC 8-15.7](#). INDOT will lead the procurement and will be responsible for the technical aspects of P3 projects and will commit its appropriations towards a project where it is appropriate. The relevant statute allows for the development, financing, and operation of P3 projects.

### INDIANA'S P3 MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Indiana has established itself as a national leader in using alternative delivery models to deliver major transportation infrastructure projects. INDOT will be the procuring agency and will be responsible for the technical aspects of the procurement.

INDOT has an established [P3 Program](#) that resides within the [Major Project Delivery](#) Department under the [Major Projects](#) Division. Both the P3 Program and the Major Project Delivery Department are responsible for delivering and overseeing P3s at INDOT.

### BENEFITS – DISADVANTAGES COMPARISON

The Project is being procured using a DBBV delivery model and will be managed by INDOT. While P3s are not suitable for all projects, there are a few main benefits to P3s of all sizes and complexities. Using innovative project delivery models, such as P3s, to deliver and operate infrastructure projects have many benefits for INDOT including:

- **Accelerated project delivery:** An integrated consortium of qualified firms working concurrently on the design and construction of the project can accelerate project delivery. This process typically results in efficiencies and synergies for a more streamlined, accelerated delivery process.
- **Cost certainty and predictability:** INDOT's cost for the project is locked in at commercial close and is only subject to cost changes approved by INDOT. This provides more cost certainty when compared to traditional delivery. INDOT can better budget and allocate funding for other projects with the confidence that costs are less likely to increase.
- **Private sector innovation:** Innovative project delivery can be structured for multiple facets of the project to be coordinated and managed under a single entity and to enhance collaboration between the design and construction managers in the development of the project bid. The exchange of ideas

between these parties can result in significant value engineering efficiencies and can help to avoid technical issues. Private entities are typically experienced in the design and construction of similar projects and are incentivized to use these efficiencies and economies of scale to achieve lower costs.

- **Performance-based incentives:** Financial incentives imposed by the contract structure, which include withholding a portion of payment to the Preferred Proposer until the Project has been constructed to the established standards and is sufficiently available for public use, act as a powerful motivator toward on-time completion and project delivery.
- **Improved accountability:** One party, the Preferred Proposer, is responsible for project delivery and operation regardless of the number of subcontractors. If the project is not delivered according to the contractual requirements, then the Preferred Proposer is responsible.

While there are benefits to innovative project delivery, there are also disadvantages that should be considered, including:

- **Longer procurement timeline:** Innovative project delivery requires extensive upfront negotiations of the PPA. The PPA governs rights and obligations associated with the Project for the length of the contract. As a result, the procurement timeline can take longer for major project delivery when compared to traditional delivery.
- **Paying a risk premium to transfer unknown risks upfront:** The P3 delivery model transfers many risks associated with project delivery to the private sector. This is done through performance-based agreements that lock in project cost at commercial close. Given the nature of these contracts, not all risks are fully known at the outset. Therefore, a private entity may build a “risk premium” into their proposal. Not unlike the purchase of insurance, this investment is made to help lock-in costs and mitigate exposure to certain risks for the public sponsor. These costs can be mitigated in part by robust competition between bidders.

### RISK ALLOCATION ANALYSIS

INDOT employs a two-step screening process when assessing whether a project should be delivered using an alternative delivery model. During the initial project screening phase, INDOT reviews available project information and data and assesses the project against a set of screening criteria to determine the feasibility of delivering a proposed project via an alternative delivery method. Table 7-1 below summarizes criteria examined during the initial project screening phase. The primary screening criteria are merely a guide for assessment. A project that does not meet some or all the primary screening criteria may still advance to a secondary screening based on other considerations. Other unique characteristics of the project may require assessment of additional considerations.

**Table 7-1. INDOT P3 Screening Criteria – Step One**

High Level Project Screening Criteria		Rating
Project Complexity	Is the project sufficiently complex in terms of technical and/or financial requirements to effectively leverage private sector innovation and expertise?	High
Accelerating Project Development	If the required public funding is not currently available for the project, could using a P3 delivery method accelerate the delivery of the project?	Low
Transportation Priorities	Is the project consistent with overall transportation objectives of the State?	High
	Does the project adequately address transportation needs?	High
Project Efficiencies	Would the P3 delivery method help foster efficiencies through the most appropriate transfer of risk over the project life cycle?	Medium

High Level Project Screening Criteria		Rating
	Is there an opportunity to bundle projects or create economies of scale?	High
Ability to Transfer Risk	Would the P3 delivery method help transfer project risks and potential future responsibilities to the private sector on a long-term basis?	Low
Funding Requirement	Does the project have revenue generation potential to partially offset the public funding requirement if necessary?	Low
	Could a public agency pay for the project over time, such as through an availability payment, as opposed to paying for its entire costs up front?	Low
Ability to Raise Capital	Would doing the project as a P3 help free up funds or leverage existing sources of funds for other transportation priorities with the State?	Medium

Projects that proceed to the second screening step undergo a detailed screening. The objective of the detail level project screening is to further assess delivering the project as a P3, examine in greater detail the status of the project, and identify potential risk elements. In addition, the detail level project screening criteria evaluates the desirability and feasibility of delivering projects utilizing the P3 delivery method. The desirability evaluation includes factors such as effects on the public, market demand, and stakeholder support. The feasibility evaluation includes factors such as technical feasibility, financial feasibility, financial structure, and legal feasibility. INDOT will also begin to assess a timeline for achieving environmental approvals based on specific project criteria during this screening step. Detail level screening criteria are provided below in Table 7-2.

**Table 7-2. INDOT P3 Screening Criteria – Step Two**

Detail Project Screening Criteria		Rating
Public Need	Does the project address the needs of the local, regional, and state transportation plans, such as congestion relief, safety, new capacity, preservation of existing assets?	High
	Does the project support improving safety, reducing congestion, increasing capacity, providing accessibility, improving air quality, improving pedestrian biking facilities, and/or enhancing economic efficiency?	High
Public Benefits	Will this project bring a transportation benefit to the community, the region, and/or the state?	High
	Does the project help achieve performance, safety, mobility, or transportation demand management goals?	High
	Does this project enhance adjacent transportation facilities or other modes?	Low
Economic Development	Will the project enhance the State's economic development efforts?	Med
	Is the project critical to attracting or maintaining competitive industries and businesses to the region, consistent with stated objectives?	Med
Market Demand	Does sufficient market appetite exist for the project? Are there ways to address industry concerns?	High
Stakeholder Support	What is the extent of support or opposition for the project? Does the proposed project demonstrate an understanding of the national and regional transportation issues and needs, as well as the impacts this project may have on those needs?	Med
	What strategies are proposed to involve local, state and/or federal officials in developing this project?	Med
	Has the project received approval in applicable local and/or regional plans and programs?	High



Detail Project Screening Criteria		Rating
	Is the project consistent with federal agency programs or grants on transportation (FHWA, FTA, MARAD, FAA, FRA, etc.)?	Low
Legislative Considerations	Are there any legislative considerations that need to be considered such as tolling, user charges, or use of public funds?	Low
Technical Feasibility	Is the project described in sufficient detail to determine the type and size of the project, the location of the project, proposed interconnections with other transportation facilities, the communities that may be affected and alternatives that may need evaluation?	High
	Is the proposed schedule for project completion clearly outlined and feasible?	Med
	Does the proposed design appear to be technically sound and consistent with the appropriate state and federal standards?	High
	Is the project consistent with applicable state and federal environmental statutes and regulations?	Med
	Does the project identify the required permits and regulatory approvals and a reasonable plan and schedule for obtaining them?	High
	Does the project set forth the method by which utility relocations required for the transportation facility will be secured and by whom?	Med
Financial Feasibility	Are there public funds required and, if so, are the State's financial responsibilities clearly stated?	High
	Is the preliminary financial plan feasible in that the sources of funding and financing can reasonably be expected to be obtained?	High
Legal/Legislative Feasibility	Is legislation needed to complete the project?	Low
Project Risks	Are there any risks unique to the projects that have not been outlined above that could impair project viability?	Low
	Are there any project risks proposed to be transferred to INDOT that are likely to be unacceptable?	Low
Term	Does the project include a reasonable term of concession for proposed operation and maintenance?	N/A
	Is the proposed term consistent with market demand, providing a best value solution for the State?	N/A
	Is the proposed term optimal for a whole-of-life approach?	N/A

Using the standard INDOT screening process, including the high-level screening, detailed level screening and financial feasibility analysis, it was determined the I-65/I-70 North Split Project is a strong candidate for P3 DBBV delivery. Table 7-3 below provides additional considerations to the Project using the DBBV delivery model.

**Table 7-3. INDOT DBBV Project Considerations**

DB Project Considerations	
<b>Technical Considerations</b>	Considerations pertaining to project complexity, design, schedule acceleration, cost savings, lifecycle performance and lifecycle cost objectives.
<b>Market Considerations</b>	Considerations pertaining to the market demand and market capacity and the marketability of the project to DB providers.
<b>Resources and Capabilities</b>	Considerations pertaining to INDOT's internal resources to deliver the project.

The qualitative and quantitative screening analyses indicated the project to be a strong candidate for DBBV delivery for the following reasons:

- The project is large and is in a high traffic volume area, as the second-busiest interchange in Indiana, seeing around 214,000 vehicles per day.
- An accelerated construction schedule would help to limit construction impacts to stakeholders and while addressing safety concerns during the construction period.
- Traffic maintenance will be a challenge; coordinating the traffic including several interstate and local road closures could benefit from a high level of multi-discipline coordination and integrated approach to construction sequencing.
- The project characteristics (size, high traffic volumes and truck traffic) are such that a performance-based contract would help to reduce the risk of change orders and cost overruns.
- The project size will be highly attractive to regional and national contractors and designers and is likely to attract a strong pool of bidders willing to work under a DBBV model.

Therefore, INDOT identified the DBBV model as the preferred delivery model and proceeded with procuring the project on that basis.

### MARKET CONDITIONS

The Project will not utilize funding outside of federal-aid and state transportation funds appropriated to INDOT as previously discussed in Chapter 5, therefore market conditions are not applicable to financing.

### PERMITS AND APPROVALS

The FHWA approved the preferred alternative as Alternative 4C with refinements in July 2019 with the understanding the environmental study is not yet completed but is anticipated in October 2020. All permitting activity will be carried out in accordance with the environmental study.

The RFP for final design and construction includes provisions to ensure compliance with all NEPA commitments that will be included in the environmental study. INDOT will apply for permits with key federal regulatory agencies. The permits and notifications that may be required by the environmental study are outlined in Table 7-4 below.

**Table 7-4. Required Permits and Notifications**

Agency	Permit/Notification	Responsibility
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Section 404 Permit for Discharge of Dredged or Fill Material into Waters of the United States	INDOT
Federal Aviation Administration	Tall Structure Permit FAA Form 7460-1 Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration for a crane	DB
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	Isolated wetland permit	INDOT
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	Section 401 Water Quality Certification	INDOT
Indiana Department of Environmental Management	Rule 5 National Pollution Discharge Elimination System	DB

## CHAPTER 8. RISK AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter addresses several important factors that could affect the Project and the financial plan for the Project. These risks fall under one or more of the following categories: Project Cost, Project Schedule, Financing, and Procurement. Significant consideration has been given to identifying risks and potential mitigation measures, and this chapter outlines these factors. Additionally, this chapter addresses the impact of the state’s financial contribution to the Project on its respective statewide transportation program.*

### PROJECT COST RISKS AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES

The factors shown in Table 8-1 have been identified as possible reasons for cost overruns.

**Table 8-1. Project Cost – Risks and Response Strategies**

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
Original Cost Estimates		Realized	2020 FPAU
The risk that original cost estimates are lower than bids received.	Recent US DB and P3 experience indicates that competition may result in aggressive bids below the state sponsor’s estimates. Should that prove not to be the case, the state will revise its financial plans, accordingly, including the possible inclusion of additional state and federal funding. It is the expectation of the Project Sponsor that the planned DBBV procurement approach will help to accelerate project delivery and, in turn, reduce costs.	High	Medium
Inflation			
Highway construction inflation has been very volatile over the past several years and could significantly increase the cost of the Project.	Reasonable inflationary assumptions based on recent and historical trends in construction inflation have been included in current cost estimates. These estimates consider current low commodity prices and relatively high unemployment rates which are expected to result in favorable contract pricing.	Low	Low
Contingency		Realized	2020 FPAU
The amount of contingency factored into Project cost estimates may be insufficient to cover unexpected costs or cost increases.	While petroleum prices have an inflationary risk, both a DB and a progress payment concession structure, as contemplated by the state, helps transfer much of this risk from the public to the private sector DB or concessionaire.	Medium	Medium
Cost Overruns During Construction			
Cost overruns after start of construction could result in insufficient upfront funds to complete the project.	A DB or progress payment concession structure helps transfer much of this risk from the public to the private sector DB or concessionaire.	Low	Medium

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

The original cost estimates were lower than the bids received risk was realized. In October 2019 INDOT received an updated estimate from consultant that resulted in an increase in construction by \$27.73 million. These changes were vetted within the INDOT via a change management application to the Capital Program Management excluding the consultants’ contingency funds. The additional funds were approved to be programmed on the Project and were done so. In April 2020, the preliminary

engineering and design consultant contract was presented with an amendment to provide services through Project completion including added/amended activities in Project development, construction oversight, and design oversight services. Therefore, the original cost estimates risk in Table 8-1 above has been updated to reflect the realized risk and mitigation strategy with the likelihood and impact of occurrence updated from low to high with a medium impact. These changes are discussed in further detail in Chapters 10 and 11.

The information on the cost and estimate increases, along with what for, was assembled and sent to MPD Director for final vetting prior to taking to the INDOT Executive Funds Team (EFT) which oversees the entire INDOT capital program as well as operational needs. The funding allocation request was approved after vetting the various components with the EFT and subsequently programmed. Therefore, the contingency risk in Table 8-1 above has been updated to reflect the realized risk and mitigation strategy with the likelihood and impact of occurrence updated from low to high with a medium impact.

The response strategy is touched on in the preceding paragraphs, change management. The Capital Program Management has a variety of options to address such increases in project cost estimates. The additional need submitted to change management would have been greater if the contingency had also been included. Further, the gap between programmed funds based on the estimate and the Preferred Proposer’s bid would have been smaller had the contingency been included. The response was to allocate the needed funding to the Project from within the capital program. This impacted other projects within the capital program moving into future periods or eliminated. Therefore, the contingency risk in Table 8-1 above has been updated to reflect the realized risk and mitigation strategy with the likelihood and impact of occurrence updated from low to medium with a medium impact

**PROJECT SCHEDULE RISKS AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES**

The risks shown in Table 8-2 have been identified as those that may affect Project schedule and, therefore, ability of the Project Sponsor to deliver the Project in a timely basis.

**Table 8-2. Project Schedule – Risks and Response Strategies**

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
<b>Litigation</b>			
Lawsuits filed within the statutory protest period may result in significant delays to the start of construction and expose the Project to additional inflationary costs.	To mitigate the potential impacts of future litigation that could cause schedule delays and cost escalation, risk and mitigation delays and measures are being addressed in the Environmental Assessment (EA). INDOT intends to adhere to the recommendations outlined in the EA and conditions of each federal approval received to construct the project.	Medium	Medium
<b>Permits and Approvals</b>			
Delays in the receipt of permits and approvals may delay the start of construction.	The state has initiated activities necessary to secure major permits. The DB will assume responsibility to obtain all other permit approvals. Compliance will be the DB’s responsibility and will be addressed directly in the relevant contract documents. The state has a track record of success in acquiring similar permits.	Low	Low
<b>Unanticipated Site Conditions</b>			

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
<p>Unanticipated geotechnical conditions could be encountered, potentially delaying the schedule, or increasing costs. The Project site may include "urban fill" in existing embankments, consisting of portions of buildings (e.g. bricks and concrete) removed in the original interstate construction. The Project site may also include in situ basement or foundation elements only partially removed during original interstate construction.</p>	<p>Extensive geotechnical investigations have been conducted on the Project. While preliminary results do not indicate significant problems, there is potential for urban fill and obstructions. The DB will be responsible to identify and resolve obstructions to the state's satisfaction per contractual requirements in the PPA.</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Low</p>
<b>Endangered Species</b>			
<p>If endangered species (e.g., Indiana bat, mussels, etc.) are encountered, construction work may be disrupted, leading to schedule delays and/or additional costs.</p>	<p>Mitigation is an established process that minimizes delay with dedicated staffing to address surprise findings. Similar mitigation has been used on four previous corridor projects successfully to avoid construction delays.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Low</p>
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>			
<p>Both known and unknown hazardous materials could delay the Project and/or lead to additional costs.</p>	<p>Extensive research and analysis are being undertaken as part of the EA process. Additionally, investigations are underway on identified sites.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<b>Schedule Coordination</b>			
<p>Due to the size and complexity of the Project, poor project scheduling and coordination could delay the Project schedule.</p>	<p>The DB is required to develop and submit for review a start-up schedule per contract requirements, identifying early activities to avoid early risks. The DB is also required to develop and submit for review a full project schedule of all activities. These schedules transfer risk from the public to the DB. A DB or progress payment concession structure helps transfer much of this risk from the public to the private sector DB or concessionaire.</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<b>Maintenance of Traffic</b>			
<p>Traffic impacts and loss of access could adversely affect communities / businesses, negatively impacting support for project.</p>	<p>A detailed maintenance of traffic (MOT) plan will be required of the DB. The DB is also required to develop a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to coordinate traffic during construction with impacted entities and the public. The DB is also required to develop a Public Involvement Plan that provides regular updates on road closures and restrictions, develops an emergency notification system, includes public meetings during construction, and develops informational maps or exhibits. Commitments to the community will be included in the project requirements, such as bicycle route detour notifications, and avoiding closure of two adjacent cross streets at the same time. Additional coordination with local projects and ongoing stakeholders is also required.</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>
<b>Project Start-up/Execution</b>			

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
Delays in mobilizing required resources at project kick-off could delay the project at inception, requiring the DB to perpetually play catch-up with their schedule.	Detailed requirements in the Technical Provisions and PPA define the DB's responsibilities and keep schedule risk predominantly with the DB. Vigilant oversight by the project team will protect INDOT from unexpected delay claims.	Low	Medium
<b>EA Schedule</b>			
Delays in the EA determination process and schedule could impact the start of construction activities.	Critical path items including development and review are prioritized to avoid delay.	Medium	Medium

## 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

The Project did not have any lawsuits filed within the statutory protest period to challenge the DBBV procurement.

## FINANCING AND REVENUE RISKS AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES

The risks identified in Table 8-3 may negatively affect the Project Sponsor's ability to finance the Project cost-effectively. For each risk, the table provides a summary of potential mitigation strategies.

**Table 8-3 Financing and Revenue – Risks and Response Strategies**

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
<b>Availability of State and Federal Funding</b>			
The state has identified and committed various levels of conventional funding for the Project within the timeframe of its budget planning cycle. Funding beyond this period is subject to appropriation risk.	Within procedural limitations, the state has demonstrated a strong commitment to ensuring that the Project is delivered given the investment of funds to date. INDOT has included the Project in its internal budgeting and financial control systems at the requisite funding levels. In addition, all anticipated funding amounts are reflected in Indiana's fiscally constrained STIP and the TIP for the metropolitan region.	Low	Medium
<b>Availability of Federal Financing Tools</b>		Retired; did not materialize.	
<b>Availability of State Highway &amp; Tolling Funding</b>		Added	2020 FPAU
Uncertainty surrounding the availability of state highway and tolling revenues due to public health crisis and/or recession will have an impact on the risk level of the finance plan for the Project.	Strategies to mitigate changes include but are not limited to; acquisition of additional funds and modifying other project's timelines to manage cash flows, utilize available cash management techniques, including but not limited to AC and TM, to manage the timing of cash needs against the availability of federal and state funds. These techniques provide INDOT authority to "concurrently advance projects ...."	Medium	High

## 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

The Project realized cost increases risk as previously discussed and therefore required increased funding. To minimize the impact to the capital program the additional funding is cash flowed from SFY21 through SFY23. The additional funding need was approved, and the Project was provided additional allocations of conventional highway funds. These changes are also reflected in the TIP and STIP. Therefore, the likelihood of occurrence has changed from low to high in Table 8-3. This Update also brings a change of removing the Availability of Federal Financing Tools regarding the TIFIA program as it did not materialize. The Project is fully funded with conventional federal aid and state highway funds. Lastly, a new risk and response has been added, the Availability of State Highway & Tolling Funding. This risk is added because of the Covid-19 public health crisis which has resulted in a period



of reduced state highway and tolling funding revenues.

**PROCUREMENT RISKS AND RESPONSE STRATEGIES**

The risks identified in Table 8-4 may affect the Project Sponsor’s ability to implement the Project due to risks associated with procurement through a DBBV procurement model using a PPA.

**Table 8-4. Procurement – Risks and Response Strategies**

Risk	Response Strategy	Likelihood of Occurrence	Impact of Occurrence
Delay in Procurement		Retired, did not materialize.	

**2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE**

The Project did have any delay in procurement and therefore this risk has been retired. Commercial close is anticipated to occur on June 3<sup>rd</sup>. This date is eight days later than originally planned. The extension is a direct result of the Covid-19 public health crisis, stay at home orders, and the challenges of obtaining signatures while working remotely.

**IMPACT ON STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS**

The state has made specific commitments to the completion of the Project. Based on expectations of federal funding availability, as well as expectations regarding the availability of corresponding state transportation funds, the Project Sponsor believes the federal-aid highway formula, federal discretionary, and state transportation funds identified in this IFP are reasonably expected to be available, and without adverse impacts on the state’s overall transportation programs or other funding commitments.

Indiana has provided for substantial funding for the Project through a combination of state and federal funding, including the Project in the state’s capital program. Indiana will continue to make specific financial commitments to the Project based on its standard budget procedures and in accordance with the [STIP](#), which takes into account the needs of the overall transportation program and other projects throughout the State. In addition to being reflected in internal budget and financial control systems, all anticipated funding amounts are reflected in the fiscally-constrained [STIP](#) as well as the [IRTIP](#) for the metropolitan region.

## CHAPTER 9. ANNUAL UPDATE CYCLE

### **INTRODUCTION**

*This chapter addresses the annual reporting period for the data reported in the Annual Update to the Financial Plan.*

### **FUTURE UPDATES**

The effective date for this IFP is May 31, 2020. The next FPAU will be submitted to FHWA by August 31, 2021.

# CHAPTER 10. SUMMARY OF COST CHANGES SINCE LAST YEAR'S FINANCIAL PLAN


## INTRODUCTION

*This chapter addresses the changes that have reduced or increased the cost of the Project since last year's financial plan, the primary reasons(s) for the changes, and actions taken to monitor and control cost growth.*

## 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

Since the prior Plan, the IFP, the Project has realized cost increases. The primary reason is construction, the contract awarded amount was greater than had been estimated previously by about \$52 million as shown in Figure 10-1 below. Further, the preliminary engineering and environmental activities also increased by approximately \$33 million. This includes \$26 million in CE services (Design and Construction Oversight) required for the INDOT DBBV procurement delivery method. Lastly, construction engineering inspection and admin activities increased roughly \$13 million since last year's Plan. The reasons for these changes are discussed briefly below.

**Figure 10-1. Project Expenditure & Cost Estimate Comparison by Activity (in \$ millions)**



The actions taken to monitor, and control cost growth include vetting all requested changes internally between the Project team and the respective Department. As part of the vetting process items considered are cost, added value, short and long-term maintenance impacts, Project impacts to schedule, cost, and ability to be implemented. The Project team will look for duplications of any efforts and items to control cost growth. All consulting agreements and amendments are negotiated by INDOT's Professional Services Department in accordance with the 2020 specs.

**Utilities & Railroad** – The nominal increase in costs is related to finalizing the length (duration) of on-site railroad flagging by the railroad company (CSXT). Preliminary estimates for schedule were refined to better reflect the anticipated project schedule.

**CEI & Admin** – Department costs for construction engineering/inspection and administrative agency efforts are based on project size, scope, and cost. With the increased construction cost, CEI and administrative costs have also increased. Additionally, these costs increased due to additional consultant services more than previously planned where this work would be performed by in-house INDOT personnel.

Additional services provided by consultant's amended contract in the CE work phase – Design and Construction Oversight. These services are part of the INDOT DBBV procurement delivery method and are required to ensure conformance with the project requirements and specifications, including the preliminary design, the environmental document and process, FHWA requirements, the PPA and Technical Provisions, and the Standard Specifications. This work represents 78% of the cost increase in PE and Environmental category and was not included in the IFP.

Construction – The increase in construction cost reflects changes or additions to the project since the IFP. The changes reflect the continued advancement of the preliminary design of the project, and the accuracy of estimating the costs the project. Changes include the following items.

- Interchange Reconfiguration.
- Environmental Commitments, including widening the Monon Trail, developing the Monon Trail detour as permanent, creating underpass treatments.
- Noise Barrier Construction.
- Vermont Street Underpass – changed from pedestrian/bicycle-only facility to full bridge replacement for vehicular access.
- Aesthetic Treatments – underpasses, retaining walls.
- Landscape and planting program.

Final Design – The nominal increase in final design cost is related to the increased complexity and more-advanced design of the project.

PE, Environmental – The cost increase for PE and Environmental reflects services amended or added to consultant contracts. Amended services are listed below.

- Project Management – amended for project duration and complexity changes.
- Preliminary Engineering – amended for project design changes.
- Survey Data Collection – amended for project area changes.
- Right of Way Engineering – amended for project area changes.
- Interstate Access Document – amended for project changes.
- Environmental Assessment – amended for project changes.

## CHAPTER 11. COST AND FUNDING TRENDS SINCE THE INITIAL FINANCIAL PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter addresses the trends that have impacted project costs and funding since the IFP, the probable reasons for these trends and the implications for the remainder of the Project.*

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

Since the IFP, the Project has realized a \$99.29 million increase, 34.4% as shown below in Table 11-1, in the costs and funding. As discussed previously in Chapters 3 and 4, construction, preliminary engineering and design, and construction engineering inspection activities account for much of the increase. SFY20 did not realize the amount of costs over the IFP and the funding was moved forward to SFY21. This change is reflected below in Table 11-1. Further, as a part of the effort to obtain the additional funding needed, MPD worked with Capital Program Management to cash flow the construction and construction engineer inspection funds. The result is an increase in SFY21 and SFY23, the final year of construction for the Project.

**Table 11-1. Project Expenditures & Cost Estimate Comparison by SFY (in \$ millions)**

State FY	IFP	2020 FPAU	Change from IFP \$	Change from IFP %
2019 & Prior	\$ 9.08	\$ 9.57	\$ 0.49	5.4%
2020	\$ 17.30	\$ 7.57	\$ (9.73)	-56.3%
2021	\$ 72.35	\$ 169.91	\$ 97.56	134.8%
2022	\$ 162.49	\$ 156.96	\$ (5.53)	-3.4%
2023	\$ 27.08	\$ 43.60	\$ 16.52	61.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$288.30</b>	<b>\$ 387.60</b>	<b>\$ 99.29</b>	<b>34.4%</b>

SFY21 funding has increased \$97.56 over the IFP due to the Preferred Proposer's contract price which includes final design as well as an amendment to consultant contract for preliminary engineering, environmental services, and construction oversight services. The increase of costs trend should wane as the Project procurement has completed and a Preferred Proposer selected. The final design and construction phases of work now have a fixed, contracted amount. Therefore, the changes in these phases going forward should be minimal to none. The implications of these trends for the remainder of the Project lead to the expectation in the preliminary engineering and construction engineering inspection services to likely increase as the Project moves into the construction phase.

## CHAPTER 12. SUMMARY OF SCHEDULE CHANGES SINCE LAST YEAR'S FINANCIAL PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter addresses the changes that have caused the completion date for the Project to change since the last financial plan, the primary reason(s) for the change, actions taken to monitor and control schedule growth, and any scope changes that have contributed to this change.*

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

There has been one small change in the Project's schedule since the prior Plan. The award and execution of the PPA (commercial close) was delayed by eight days, from May 26<sup>th</sup> to June 3<sup>rd</sup>, due to the complications of getting signatures while remote working during the Covid-19 public health crisis.

During the procurement phase, proposal review processes had to change due to the public health crisis. Originally the reviews were taking place in secured locations in person. Since the locations were not adequate to accommodate the necessary people involved while following social distancing guidelines, the process had to change, to keep the Project schedule and procurement on track. INDOT and consultants utilized remote options to accomplish the proposal reviews and scoring to mitigate schedule risk from the Covid-19 pandemic.

Actions taken to monitor, and control schedule growth continue. The INDOT project team conducts monthly internal coordination Project meetings with all INDOT involved team members to discuss Project progress. Critical path issues are always discussed first and at this point in the Project's life cycle typically include environmental assessment, utility relocations, and schedule. Further refinement of the schedules will develop as the Preferred Proposer mobilizes and begins design work.



## CHAPTER 13. SCHEDULE TRENDS SINCE THE INITIAL FINANCIAL PLAN

### INTRODUCTION

*This chapter addresses the trends that have impacted the Project schedule since the IFP, the probable reasons for these trends, and the implications for the remainder of the Project.*

### 2020 FINANCIAL PLAN UPDATE

The Project's schedule trends since the IFP have been steady overall with some activities extending to reflect anticipated future work as shown in discussed in Chapter 2 and no further changes have materialized.