



Phase 1

Online Stakeholder Briefing
August 16 through 27, 2010

Purpose

The online stakeholder briefing was held to provide stakeholders an opportunity to review information compiled and created in the first phase of the I-70 Dedicated Truck Lanes Feasibility Study, as well as the opportunity to comment on needs and questions to be addressed in Phase 2.

The online meeting, posted at www.i70dtl.org provided an opportunity to ask questions or make comments throughout, and also included an online comment form at the conclusion of the presentation.

Publicity

The online briefing was publicized through a series of e-mails to identified stakeholders, including:

Key Shippers

American Gypsum Company	Hill's Pet Nutrition, Inc.	Owens Corning
Anheuser-Busch	H.J. Heinz Company	PepsiCo
Bon Ami Company/Faultless Starch Company	Holcim	P&G
Compass Minerals	International Paper Company	Red Gold Company
ConAgra Foods	Johns Manville	Ryder Dedicated Logistics
Continental Tire	Leveraged Execution Providers (LXP)	Sysco
Dick's Sporting Goods	Lowe's	The Tecnocap Group
The Dow Chemical Company	Menlo Worldwide - A Con- way Company	Transplace
Ford Motor Company	Midwestern Transit	True Value Company
General Mills	Nestlé	United States Gypsum
Goodyear Tire		

MPOs

Bel-O-Mar	East-West Gateway Council of Governments	Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission (MORPC)
BHJMPO	Indianapolis MPO	Newark (LCATS)
City of Columbia, MO/CATSO	Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission	Richmond-Wayne County
Clark County-Springfield Transportation Coordinating Committee	Mid-America Regional Council (KCMO)	West Central Indiana Economic Development District, Inc.

Stakeholders Contacted at the Start of Phase 1

AAA Auto Club of Missouri	Columbus Chamber	Great West Casualty Company
AAA of Ohio	Columbus Regional Airport Authority	Illinois Department of Economic and Community
Central Ohio Logistics Council	Duke Realty	

Development Agency
(DECA)
Illinois Highway Patrol; Scott
Compton
Illinois Regional Chamber
and Growth Association
Illinois Trucking Association;
George Billows
Indiana Chamber of
Commerce
Indiana Construction
Association

Indiana Economic
Development Corp (IEDC)
Indiana Farm Bureau
Indiana Office of Tourism
Missouri Association for
Industrial Development
Missouri Chamber of
Commerce
Missouri Department of
Economic Development
Missouri Farm Bureau
Missouri Highway Patrol

Missouri Petroleum
Marketers Association
Ohio Contractors Association
Ohio County Engineers
Association
Ohio Department of
Development
Ohio Petroleum Marketers
Association
Transportation MATTERS

Individuals who have asked to be kept informed about the study via the website:

Chuck Davis (jetstarinc.com)
John Regenbogen (Scenic
Missouri)

Julie Wittman (MARC)
Katherine Petros (FHWA)
Michael Berg (Sierra Club)

Michael Purol (PSBA.com)
Steve and Kathy

DOTs/FHWA

Tony Furst
Robert Tally
Norman Stoner
Patrick Bauer
Max Azizi
Frank Burkett
Jay DuMontelle
Dean Mentjes
Bradley McMahon
Leigh Oesterling

Illinois DOT
Britt Edwards
Chris Reed
Indiana DOT
Keith Bucklew
MoDOT
Ernest Perry
Kathy Harvey
Robert Brendel

Ohio DOT
Mark Locker
Steve Campbell
**West Virginia Division of
Highways**
Perry Keller
Robert Pennington

Content

Content included an overview of the study purpose, the use of the business case analysis, key findings and recommendations. A copy of the content follows.

Comments

Because the vast majority of the stakeholders had been involved throughout Phase 1 via regular webinars and updates, new input via the briefing was limited. However, more than 30 stakeholders downloaded the online briefing. Along with specific questions about operations, which cannot be answered until a design is selected, the majority of the feedback was related to the (1) financing, sources and calculations, particularly the role of the private sector and (2) the calculation of costs versus benefits.

Key Comments and Questions:

I can see where the study compares the costs of planned modifications to and maintenance of the I-70 corridor (cost avoidance) with the cost to implement the concept. I don't see the same comparison on

the benefits side. Won't some of the planned improvements provide safety and economic benefits to the corridor? Do the numbers presented here only capture the additional safety and economic benefits that come with the truck only lanes beyond what the already planned improvements would generate? (TREDIS), the Economic Model used for the benefits analysis, incorporates these safety and efficiency benefits into the calculations that are provided as outputs to economic benefits and job growth. So yes, the numbers capture the additional benefits.

What are the different assumptions that make the P3 tolling option results different than the public tolling option results as far as revenue generation, i.e., 74% of project costs from P3, 45% of project costs from public funding model. Is the assumption a government can't run it like a business? P3 financial models tend to result in greater financing capacities than public agency financial models for a number of reasons. The main reason for this is that the private sector brings equity to a project, which is not available in a public agency financial model. The return on equity is the revenue in excess of debt service and operational costs. As a result, the private sector tends to take a more aggressive approach to revenue estimation than public agencies.

Both of those issues will be the topic of further evaluation in Phase 2 of the study.