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:	**Action**

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.

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

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.