



APPENDIX T
EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING MINUTES



Meeting Notes

Location: Section 3 Project Office **Project:** I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Sections 2, 3 and 4

Date/Time: May 6, 2005 **Notes Prepared By:** Dave Ripple

Subject: Daviess, Greene and Pike Counties' Expert Land Use Panel Meeting

Participants : Dr. David Ripple (BLA - PMC)
Richard Ray (The Corradino Group – Section 3 EEAC)
Hilary Perkins (Jacobs – Section 2 EEAC)
Brian Shaw (MS Consultants with DLZ – Section 4 EEAC)
Paul Lake (Pike County Growth Council)
Tom Ash (for Steve Meyers, Daviess County Commissioner)
Larry Hasler (Greene County Commissioner)
Charley Dibble (Ex. Dir., Greene County Economic Development Corporation)
Blake Hutchinson (Eastern Greene Township Development Association)
W. Edward Cullison (Greene County Council and local financial institution)
Darla Miles (Daviess County Growth Council)
Jon Craig (Mayor, City of Petersburg)
C Shelby (Daviess County Chamber of Commerce)
David Able (Mayor, City of Washington)

Notes:

The meeting began at 1:00 PM. Richard Ray (RR) welcomed everyone to the Section 3 Office, and reported on the aerial photography displays on the I-69 Corridor and facilities available at the Section 3 Office. Following introductions, Dr. David Ripple (DR) thanked Richard Ray for coordinating the Daviess-Greene-Pike Expert Land Use Panel meeting date and place for the Section 2, 3 and 4 EEAC's. DR reported that the Expert Land Use Panel had two tasks to accomplish this afternoon:

- First, for the No Build Condition/Scenario (without I-69), the panel was to review preliminary year 2030 household and employment forecasts for Daviess, Greene and Pike Counties. These forecasts would be used in the I-69 Corridor Travel Demand Model (TDM) in forecasting year 2030 traffic.
- Second, for the Build Condition/Scenario (with I-69), the panel was to identify possible shifts and increases in households and employment over the No Build Condition resulting from the assumed completion of the I-69 Tier 1 Build Alternative 3C (with its associated interchange locations). These Build Condition household and employment forecasts would be used in the I-69 Corridor TDM in forecasting year 2030 traffic for the Build Condition (with I-69), and would also help to identify land use impacts of proposed I-69.

To assist in this two-step process for each county, DR reported that preliminary forecast tables (showing the year 2000 and preliminary year 2030 household and employment forecasts by Travel Analysis Zone), and preliminary forecast aerial photography (showing the preliminary 30-year household change and employment change by Travel Analysis Zone) are provided for the panel to use.

Action



Meeting Notes (Continued)

Page 2 of 3

DR briefly defined the meaning of Travel (or Traffic) Analysis Zone (TAZ), and described the base year (2000) and preliminary future year (2030) forecasts that will be used in the I-69 Corridor Travel Demand Model being prepared by the PMC. The county-by-county population and employment control totals are from the Indiana Statewide Travel Demand Model (ISTDM) reviewed by the MPO's and RPO's in May of 2004; these control totals are not a subject of panel review. The preliminary housing forecast by TAZ is based on the population change in the TAZ between the years 1990 and 2000 translated to a ten-year absolute change in households. For growing TAZs, the 10-year household rate of change is assumed to continue for the next three decades. For TAZs losing households, the 10-year rate of household loss was assumed to spread over the next 30 years, so that the rate of loss was cut to one-third. (If the same rate of loss were to continue at the same rate for another three decades, older communities would have virtually no households remaining.) The 30-year TAZ household change was then adjusted to the countywide change control maintaining the proportional share of the TAZ change to the total county change. The preliminary employment forecast by TAZ is based on the 30-year total county change allocated to each TAZ by the TAZ's ratio of employment to that of the county in the year 2000. The 30-year change in households and employment by TAZ is subject to panel review.

DR noted that the panel should first predict future growth on the basis of existing development trends and adopted development policies (i.e., local comprehensive plans, industrial parks being developed, etc.) assuming I-69 is never built. This will constitute the No Build Scenario without I-69. Panel members were asked to provide order-of-magnitude estimates, and not to be too concerned with minimal potential differences, such as the exact numbers of lots in proposed subdivisions. The relative relationship of growth between I-69 Corridor TDM TAZs was of greatest importance, and would be maintained in any adjustment to countywide control totals for the No Build Scenario. For the No Build Scenario, household and employment totals will not vary on a countywide basis from the current Statewide and Corridor travel demand models, may vary somewhat at the Statewide TAZ level, and are likely to vary at the Corridor TAZ level compared to the preliminary forecasts being reviewed today.

The panel was first asked to correct or confirm the 30-year employment change figures by TAZ for their county on the aerial photography (showing the TAZ boundaries, TAZ identification numbers, and 30-year change number), and then to do the same for the 30-year household change figures. For Daviess and Pike Counties, the panel members marked changes in the number of households and jobs by TAZ from the preliminary forecast. The Daviess County panel members paid particular attention to the change in employment in Washington resulting from the new Super Wal-Mart store being built on the northwest corner of the intersection of SR 57 and the US 50 Bypass. They assumed the existing Washington Wal-Mart store on east Business US 50 would be reoccupied by another tenant, but at a slightly lower employment density. For Greene County, the panel members marked the changes in the number of jobs by TAZ and the percent change in households by township. In Greene County, the 30-year household growth was focused in the three eastern townships bordering Monroe County. Once corrections had been made to the 30-year household and employment change by TAZ for the No Build Scenario, the panel was asked to identify shifts in growth or an increase in growth induced by the assumed completion of I-69 on the basis of Tier 1 Alternative 3C for the Build Scenario.

For the Build Scenario, DR stated that there could be a slight increase in countywide growth (i.e., better transportation accessibility frees up more money to be spent for other business



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 3

purposes, which leads to expansion of businesses, more jobs, more employees and thus more people) over the No Build Scenario, and there are likely to be shifts in future growth as a result of changes in accessibility from a limited number of interchanges created in the Build Scenario. If I-69 were built, there would be an increase above the No Build Scenario of about 300 households and 500 jobs in Daviess County, 300 households and 400 jobs in Greene County, and 100 households and 100 jobs in Pike County. The panel members were asked to mark shifts in growth and allocate the additional I-69 growth to TAZs in their county. Again, the Daviess County and Pike County representatives marked the change in the number of households and jobs by TAZ over the No Build Scenario. The Greene County representatives marked the change in the number of jobs by TAZ over the No Build Scenario, and identified a change in the percent of household growth for the three eastern townships in Greene County for the Build Scenario.

DR concluded the meeting by reporting that the PMC would factor up or down the TAZ refinements for the No Build and Build Scenarios to match the established countywide household and employment control totals. The meeting ended at approximately 4:00 PM.



Meeting Notes

I-69 Project Management Consultant Office
6200 Vogel Road
Evansville, IN 47715 U.S.A.
(812) 479-6200

Location: Section 2 Project Office **Project:** I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Sections 2, 3 and 4

Date/Time: March 22, 2006 **Notes Prepared By:** John McCarthy and David Ripple

Subject: Daviess and Pike Counties Expert Land Use Panel Meeting

Participants: --David Able (Mayor, City of Washington—812/254-5575—mayor@washingtonin.us)
--Tony Wichman (Daviess County Commissioner; PO Box 206; Washington, IN 47501—1stfedtw@rtccom.net)
--Ron Arnold (DCEDC; 812/254-1500— rarnold@dcedc.net)
--Larry McLin (Daviess County Highway—812/444-5798)
--Charles Selby (Daviess County Chamber of Commerce—812/254-5262—cselby@dcchamber.com)
--Jon Craig (Mayor, City of Petersburg—704 E. Main St.; Petersburg, IN 47567—812/354-8511—pbmayor@blueriver.net)
--Paul Lake (Pike County Growth Council—812/354-2271—pikegrowth@verizon.net)
--Mark Flint (Pike County Commissioner—812/789-6397—mark.flint@aes.com)
--Dr. David Ripple (BLA - PMC)
--John McCarthy (Jacobs – Section 2 PM)

Notes:	Action
<p>John McCarthy began the 9 am meeting reviewing the five interchanges under consideration on both the A and B Alternatives in Section 2. The review included details of the two interchanges that will be built as a minimum—Washington US50 and Petersburg SR61, including the differences in the interchanges on the A and B Alternatives. The review then focused on the three optional interchanges, noting changes made since the August 9, 2005 public meeting.</p>	
<p>Dr. David Ripple (DR) then presented a series of large drawings showing the change in households and employment in each travel analysis zone (TAZ) in Daviess County and in Pike County for both the No-Build Condition and the I-69 Induced Growth Condition (additional growth resulting from improved access provided by the interchanges as configured in Tier 1 Alternative 3C). These drawings were prepared based on the panel's allocation of growth at its May 6, 2005 meeting. DR asked the panel to identify any changes in the distribution of household and employment growth they would like to make with the interchanges now proposed for Section 2.</p>	
<p>The Daviess County participants elected to make no changes in the distribution of household or employment growth (as reflected in the existing I-69 Induced Growth Condition) with the addition of a South Daviess County interchange. It was noted that the existing I-69 Induced Growth Condition assumed some household reductions east of SR 57 along the proposed I-69 corridor. The Daviess County representatives felt that the addition of a South Daviess County interchange would not induce further household growth because of the floodplains and lack of utility infrastructure in southern Daviess County. They stated that the South Daviess County interchange would reinforce the current employment development trends (as reflected in the No-Build Condition) at the US50-SR57 intersection where the new Super</p>	



Meeting Notes (Continued)

Page 2 of 3

Wal-Mart shopping center is under construction and where a fast food restaurant, a filling station/convenience store and a Baymont motel are currently located. These representatives also discussed an additional area for industrial growth lying between US50 on the north, SR57 on the east, CR300S on the south, and the existing GBC corn processing facility on the west. Utilities reach the area at US50 on the north, and the land is relatively flat and readily developable. The South Daviess County interchange connects directly with the southeast corner of this area. However, the participants determined that induced employment growth would have to be shifted from areas with utility infrastructure east and west of Washington with higher growth potential to accomplish this. Thus, the representatives concluded that the No-Build Condition best reflected growth in the area of question without I-69 and that the existing I-69 Induced Growth Condition best reflected growth in the area if the South Daviess County interchange were built.

The Pike County representatives felt that no change in household distribution was necessary as a result of the elimination of the proposed interchange at SR356, assumed in existing I-69 Induced Growth Condition. In fact, they agreed that the induced households along SR356 in the vicinity the I-69 corridor was more likely to occur without the proposed SR356 interchange.

With the North Pike County interchange, the Pike County participants would leave the previous Induced Growth household allocation unchanged. However, they would shift some 21 jobs from east of Petersburg on SR 356 (TAZ 6301204) to the TAZ (TAZ 6300301) across from the IP&L/Hoosier energy facility served by the North Pike County interchange. If the North Pike County interchange were not built, there would be no revision to the previous Induced Growth Condition for households and employment.

If the South Pike County interchange is built, the representatives would shift 3 households that they had previously located near Oatsville Road (TAZ 6300802) to the TAZs north of Division Road (TAZs 6301705, 6301706 and 6301709), plus 27 households in proportion to the change in the two heaviest growth areas previously identified east and west of Petersburg (TAZs 6300310 and 6300709). If no interchange is built at Division Road, they would shift 28 households from the Oatsville Road area (TAZs 6300802, 6301712, 6301713, 6301714 and 6300805) to Petersburg, placing one-quarter of them on the east side of town (TAZ 6300310) and three-quarters of them on the west side of town (TAZ 6300709). The existing Induced Growth employment allocation was deemed applicable for an interchange at Division Road because of the change in employment north of Division Street. If the Division Road interchange were not build, this employment growth (TAZ 6301709) would be shifted to south of Petersburg (TAZ 6300711).

DR asked those who had previously attended the May 6, 2005 meeting to sign a sheet confirming that the drawings showing the locations of households and employment as allocated at the previous meeting for the No-Build Condition and the I-69 Induced Growth Condition. The meeting adjourned at about 10:45 am.

Attached is a table recording the revisions to the May 6, 2005 Induced Growth Condition.



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 3

May 6, 2005 Induced Growth Map Revisions (HH = households, jobs = employees)		
Interchange	Amount	Shift
North Pike Interchange		
Yes	21 jobs	From TAZ 6301204 to TAZ 6300301
No	HH and jobs	No change
South Pike Interchange		
Yes	3 HH	From TAZ 6300802 to TAZ 6301705
Yes	7HH	From TAZ 6300310 to TAZ 6301705
Yes	10 HH	From TAZ 6300709 to TAZ 6301706
Yes	10 HH	From TAZ 6300709 to TAZ 6301709
Yes	jobs	No change
No	7 HH	From TAZ 6300802 to 6300310
No	1 HH	From TAZ 6300802 to 6300709
No	5	From TAZ 6301712 to 6300709
No	5	From TAZ 6301713 to 6300709
No	5	From TAZ 6301714 to 6300709
No	5	From TAZ 6300805 to 6300709
No	8 jobs	From TAZ 6301709 to TAZ 6300711