



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)

Expert Land Use Panel Meetings		
Meeting Date	Attendees	Subject
2/10/2005	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe	Discuss Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) maps for current and projected land use types in Section 5 Study Area
3/24/2005	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Morgan (Sects 5 & 6)	Discuss Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) maps for current and projected land use types in Section 5 Study Area
4/13/2005	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe	Discuss TAZ maps for current and projected land use types in Section 5 Study Area
5/25/2005	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe	Follow-up on data collection and discussion of employment numbers
5/26/2005	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Morgan (Sects 5 & 6)	Follow-up on data collection and discussion of employment numbers
10/4/2011	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe & Morgan	Re-engage; Discussion of household allocation
10/25/2011	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe & Morgan	Presentation of Indiana University's growth plans; discuss TAZ no build and build projected land use maps.
11/9/2011	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe & Morgan	Follow-up for allocation of Monroe County employment continued from last meeting; Morgan Co. did not attend
2/16/2012	Expert Land Use Panel Members - Monroe & Morgan	Continue analysis of growth within (TAZs), induced growth allocations, review of map updates, adjourn group

Expert Land Use Panels are comprised of local professionals intimately familiar with development activity in the communities served by I-69.



**APPENDIX E
EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES**

**Summary of Expert Land Use
Panel Meeting Notes**

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



Meeting Notes

I-69 Section 5 Project Office

One City Centre, Suite 106/108
 120 W. 7th Street
 Bloomington, IN 47404 U.S.A.
 (812) 355 1390

Location	Section 5 Project Office	Project:	I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Section 5
Date/Time	February 10, 2005	Notes Prepared By:	Kurt Weiss, MK Floyd
Subject	Monroe County Land Use Meeting		
Participants	Wendy L. Vachet, Kurt Weiss, Mary Keith Floyd (Baker) Bill Williams, Bob Cowell, Mary Ogle (Monroe County) Tom Micuda, Karyn Ryg Bloomington-Monroe MPO Frank Nierzwicki (Town of Ellettsville) Tom Molt (DLZ Section 4)		

Notes

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m.

Wendy Vachet (WV) opened the meeting and provided some updates on Section 5 progress.

- Traffic Modeling: The PMC is working on this, but it is a complicated process. Today's meeting will discuss TAZ-level information at the statewide level. This panel will help to refine the households and jobs assumed at the statewide level in Monroe County and subdivide to the corridor level model. However, a time frame for this has not been determined. The section consultants are putting together lists of potential members for the panels, from both the public and private sectors. Baker considers today's meeting the first of the land use panel meetings. Two to four additional meetings are anticipated, generally lasting about two hours each. Any suggestions for additional panel members from the private sector?

Tom Micuda (TM) suggested adding Wayne Johnson and Travis Vencel to the list of names. Vencel is on the Plan Commission, and does appraisals for the city. He also suggested Crider & Crider, local developers (NorthPark subdivision), Blackwell Construction, and Bill C. Brown.

- Long Range Plan: TM briefly discussed the MPO's Long Range Plan, which is in the data projection stage, including TAZ's. After that it will move to model runs to produce 2030 forecasts. The MPO is required to get this done in 2005, and is looking at a completion date this fall. A private consultant will be brought in to make sure staff work is going smoothly. Karyn Ryg is developing the model; they have the ES-202 data, but it needs to be georeferenced and they need vehicle registration data from the DMV. MK Floyd suggested BLA may already have the georeferenced ES-202 data. TM indicated he would be interested in how the MPO TAZ data matches up with Baker's I-69 data, particularly in terms of congestion and Level of Service. All agreed they should show similar results. Coordination on interchanges, frontage roads, access points, etc. also will be beneficial to both studies. TM said the MPO is using

Action

Baker will contact private sector representatives for land use panel.

Baker to request ES-202 georeferenced file for MPO. Ask BLA what they assumed for vehicles at the TAZ level.



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 2 of 3

TransCadd software. WV suggested Baker would like to have a good idea of interchange locations by this summer. She also indicated that floodplains and floodways also have become important issues to the I-69 Tier 2 studies, because the latest data is different from that used in the Tier 1 Study.

- **Land Use:** MK said the term Land Use has two meanings in this study: 1) TAZ's level land use (the number of households, people, cars, employment, etc. in each TAZ), and 2) geographic (GIS) land use patterns that reflect the TAZ level assumptions based on acres of land required

MK stated that they would begin with a top down approach making sure that reasonable and foreseeable developments are included first then allocating remaining growth where most likely. BLA has countywide control totals for the model, the land use panel will not be able to change these control totals but will need to adjust and refine land use at the TAZ level. Bob Cowell (BC) requested the methodology for the county control totals.

MK requested updates on development that they had previously discussed (see attached table with updates from meeting in green). Goal is to translate these developments into an additional number of homes or jobs and make sure realistically represented in the GIS land use.

Frank Nierzwicki (FN) requested that land use maps be extended to include all of Ellettsville. The panel agreed and MK will provide that next week. Panel members agreed to review the base and 2030 No Build GIS maps to identify known land use change areas.

MK then presented the statewide TAZ level land use maps for their review. The goal is to confirm or adjust these land use assumptions, then disaggregate to a corridor level model. It was agreed that consistency with the MPO TAZs should be a goal to improve consistency.

- **Models/land use scenarios,** MK indicated that the future No-Build scenario assumes no changes to SR 37 (i.e., no I-69); after that, future land use scenarios will be developed with the aid of the land use panel, and results and impacts will be discussed. Bill Williams (BW) noted that he would like to review the roadway improvements assumed in the 2030 No Build model. Baker will provide a list or a graphic for him to review.

- **Monroe Plan Commission:** Bob Cowell (BC) briefly discussed the Monroe County Plan Commission's desire to be involved with the I-69 project. He said they would like to have Baker (possibly with Section 4 rep) at a meeting to present an update of the studies and progress so far. However, WV suggested such a "pre-document" discussion in a public forum might not be appropriate, and suggested that something along these lines might be possibly if it were to dovetail with a public meeting (although there have been no dates planned yet for public meetings in Section 5). WV indicated that it might be possible to provide some preliminary updates on studies such as endangered species (Indiana Bat), wetlands,

Baker to provide latest methodology from Indiana Statewide Travel Demand Model Upgrade to land use panel members.

Baker to provide GIS land use maps (2004 and 2030) to panel members to review (extend to Ellettsville)

KR provided Transcadd file of the MPO TAZ layer after the meeting.

Baker to provide assumed roadway improvements to Bill Williams.



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 3

hazardous waste sites, and historic resources. She noted that some data is considered confidential (Karst, etc.). She reminded all that the purpose of a DEIS is to provide a "draft" document for the benefit of the public.

- **Utilities:** WV briefly mentioned that a joint utility meeting between Sections 5 & 6 is planned for sometime during the next month, and all of the local utility providers from Morgan, Monroe, Johnson and Marion Counties will be represented. Bill Williams said he would provide his list of utilities for comparison.



**APPENDIX E
EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES**

**Summary of Expert Land Use
Panel Meeting Notes**

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 Section 5 Project Office
One City Centre, Suite 106/108
120 W. 7th Street
Bloomington, IN 47404 U.S.A.
(812) 355-1390

I-69 Section 6 Project Office
7550 South Meridian Street, Suite B
Indianapolis, IN 46217
(317) 881-6408

Location	Martinsville	Project:	I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Section 5 and Section 6
Date/Time	March 24, 2005 10:00 am	Notes Prepared By:	HNTB
Subject	Morgan County Land Use Expert Panel Meeting No. 1		

Participants Project Team:

Project Management Consultant: Dean Munn
Section 6: Brock Hoegh, Kwame Awauh
Section 5: Mary Keith Floyd

Participants:

Kenny Hale
Jeff Quyle
Terry Brock
Norman Voyles

Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 10:10 a.m. Brock Hoegh started the introductions and welcomed those in attendance. Brock introduced Dean Munn who then provided the background information for the meeting.

Dean Munn provided the panel with the purpose of the meeting and the development of the land use forecasts. Discussed expert panel land use panel, objectives of the panel, and what information we need from the panel. A handout was provided to provide the methodology of the expert panels. We would like the panel's thoughts on the Statewide and Corridor traffic model that estimates employment, household, and population data for the Build and No Build Alternatives for 2030.

Indiana Statewide Travel Demand Model handout was provided to show population and employment forecasts.

Discussion of Data

TAZ ID 55010 – employment data low

Action



TAZ ID 55001 (employment) – move 2,000 from 55001 to 55010

The 2,000 could be spread out from 55029 to 55017

Population & Household data ok for 55010

Household - Take 400 from 55023 household to TAZ 55017

Landers Farm, NE Corner of County, west of SR 37 – 800 acres of PUD.

TAZ 55012 – Household could increase a little more, there are several lots available yet, could be some more HH in 55037 as well.

TAZ 55017 will get more homes form TAZ 55023

TAZ 55035 may be a little high, could move some from 55035 to 55037 or 55021.

TAZ 55028 needs more HH & Population – 200 lots plus apartments; 1,000 lots in 55028

TAZ 55005 – ok

TAZ 55008 – a little low for the Households

Jeff Quyle – Are the County Wide numbers low?

Dean Munn – Actually, the MPO's numbers are low, our estimates are still conservative, but higher than MPO's.

TAZ 55032 – Could move the Households form this zone to others

TAZ 55014 – Move Households to others

Employment in TAZ 55008 a little low. TAZ 55003 is ok for employment as well as TAZ 55009.

Employment 55028 & 55012 are low for employment

TAZ 55040 – Employment can be taken from this TAZ and added somewhere else.



TAZ 55021, 55037, & 55018 employment numbers are high, could be moved around.

TAZ 55005 – way to high on residential. Save some jobs, but could move some employment around.

TAZ 55002 – move residential, could bump it down to 25

TAZ 55033 – Household may need to be bumped up



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



Meeting Notes

I-69 Section 5 Project Office

One City Centre, Suite 106/108
120 W. 7th Street
Bloomington, IN 47404 U.S.A.
(812) 355 1390

Location	Section 5 Project Office	Project:	I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Section 5
Date/Time	April 13, 2005	Notes Prepared By:	Kurt Weiss, MK Floyd
Subject	Monroe County Land Use Expert Panel Meeting		
Participants	Dr. David Ripple, Dean Munn (PMC) Wendy Vachet, Kurt Weiss, Mary Keith Floyd (Baker) Bob Cowell, Mary Ogle, Toby Turner (Monroe County) Steve Crider (Crider & Crider) Travis Vencel (Vencel Services) Lori Abram (Bloomington Board of Realtors) Patrick Shay (Bloomington-Monroe MPO) Frank Nierzwicki (Town of Ellettsville) Bruce Hudson (DLZ Section 4)		

Notes

The purpose of the meeting was to review preliminary household and employment forecasts for Monroe County to be used in the I-69 Corridor Travel Demand Model in forecasting year 2030 traffic for the No Build Condition (without I-69). If time permitted, the panel would also identify possible shifts in households and employment resulting from the I-69 Build Alternative 3C. The meeting began at 1:00 p.m.

Following introductions, Dr. David Ripple (DR) passed out tables (recording the year 2000 and preliminary year 2030 household and employment forecasts by Travel Analysis Zone), and presented various plots (aerial photography, household change and employment change by Travel Analysis Zone) to be used during the meeting. Mary Keith Floyd described other resource plots showing existing land use, sewer and water service areas, and significant environmental constraints.

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.

At the previous meeting, some of panel members (city, county, and town planners) worked with the Indiana Statewide Travel Demand Model (ISTDM) TAZ household and employment forecast maps. The current meeting will concentrate on a dis-aggregation of the Statewide TAZs to be used in the I-69 Corridor Travel Demand Model which focuses on a more detailed roadway network in counties along the proposed I-69 corridor.

The maps represent a translation of the Monroe County/Bloomington Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) adopted transportation plan TAZ forecasts for approximately 30 years of growth to the Statewide TAZs. Two sets of maps representing two sets of figures are incorporated:

Action



Meeting Notes (Continued)

Page 2 of 3

1) Households: Having translated the MPO TAZ household change (between years 1997 and 2025) forecasts to the Statewide TAZs, the last decade of population growth was used to disaggregate household growth for the next 30 years from each Statewide TAZ to its subset of Corridor TAZs. The panel would be evaluating these figures to estimate how accurate they are, or how they should be adjusted based on their knowledge of development activity and adopted development policies. For example, there may be instances where an area is completely built out, and thus no more development is expected. Or, there could be areas where more growth is likely than originally anticipated.

2) Employment: Having translated the MPO TAZ employment change (between years 1997 and 2025) forecasts to the Statewide TAZs, the portion of total employment of the Corridor TAZ to its parent Statewide TAZ was used to disaggregate the 30-year change in employment from each Statewide TAZ to its subset of Corridor TAZs. Again, the panel would be asked to correct or confirm these figures as appropriate.

DR noted that the panel should predict future growth on the basis of existing development trends and adopted development policies (i.e., local comprehensive plans) 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 Corridor TAZs was of greatest importance, and would be maintained in any adjustment to Countywide control totals for the No Build scenario. If Corridor TAZs within a Statewide TAZ are consistently higher than Corridor TAZs in other Statewide TAZ, the Statewide TAZ forecasts may be adjusted. For the No Build scenario, population 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. However, for the Build scenario, 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.

The project team also presented the data they had collected to date regarding existing land uses, planned developments, environmental constraints, and water and sewer infrastructure. The group discussed how to make sure the TAZ household and employment numbers represented development completed since 2000, and planned and reasonably expected development in the future.

Panel members then began looking at the subset of maps showing the 30-years change in employment by Corridor TAZ, and marking their estimated changes to the preliminary forecast figures for employment. Once this



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 3

was accomplished, they moved on to do the same with the preliminary household 30-year change figures on the other subset of maps.

During the meeting, all the maps displaying the preliminary 30-year change in employment by I-69 Corridor TAZ were reviewed and changes were made in the change by TAZ as deemed appropriate. The review of the preliminary 30-year change in households was begun, but not completed. City and county planners offered to complete the exercise at the household level during the next week and to provide the results to the project office. These No Build land use projections will be incorporated into the I-69 Corridor level travel demand model and the Statewide travel demand model (as appropriate), and presented at the next meeting. The next meeting will also cover changes in land use associated with the Build Alternative 3C corridor and other alternatives that may be developed by that time. The next land use expert panel meeting is tentatively scheduled for the week of May 9 or May 16th.

The meeting ended at approximately 4:00 pm.



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



Meeting Notes

I-69 Section 5 Project Office

One City Centre, Suite 106/108
120 W. 7th Street
Bloomington, IN 47404 U.S.A.
(812) 355 1390

Location	Section 5 Project Office	Project:	I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Section 5
Date/Time		Notes Prepared By:	Kurt Weiss, MK Floyd, Dave Ripple
Subject	Monroe County Land Use Panel Meeting		
Participants	Dr. David Ripple (BLA - PMC) Kurt Weiss, Mary Keith Floyd (Baker) Bob Cowell, Bill Williams (Monroe County) Travis Vencel (Vencel Services) Lori Abram (Bloomington Board of Realtors) Tom Micuda, Patrick Shay (Bloomington-Monroe MPO) Frank Nierzwicki (Town of Ellettsville) Bruce Hudson (DLZ Section 4)		

Notes

The meeting began at 1:00 p.m.

Dave Ripple (DR) and Bruce Hudson (BH) provided information to the expert land use panel regarding the results of the expert land use panel in Greene County on May 6th and an alternative interchange on I-69 at the Greene/Monroe County Line, respectively. BH stated that there would be no abutting property access along the proposed connector from the alternative interchange to SR 45 if the alternative I-69 interchange were built. Thus, the Bloomington-Monroe County expert land use panel should assume that no access is provided in southwestern Monroe County along I-69 inducing new development. BH said that they were currently discussing options to provide emergency access near the Monroe/Green County line. This emergency access would be important for the Van Buren Fire Department to respond to accidents and hazmat spills on I-69. The Van Buren Fire Dept has a higher classification than other departments in the area, and could provide swat team responses to hazardous materials spills in the area (specifically in Section 4 of proposed I-69).

DR provided TAZ maps with the 2030 No Build land use (households and employment) to Baker, the City of Bloomington, the Town of Ellettsville and Monroe County. He stated that based on the previous expert land use panel meeting of April 13th, the household changes identified by the panel were within 36 households of the control total for Monroe County in year 2030. To match the control total, he reduced some household growth in the Ellettsville area. Here, Frank Nierzwicki had identified in-fill residential growth in acres (rather than households) that was similar to a build out level and that likely would continue beyond the 2030 target year. The allocated employment by the expert panel on April 13th was lower than the county control total, so DR had factored up the identified allocations to match the 2030 employment control totals. In conclusion, DR asked that

Action



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 2 of 5

all present review the 2030 land use maps at their leisure so that they could sign-off on the maps as an accurate reflection of the consensus on household and employment growth by TAZ at the April 13th meeting.

DR stated that the purpose of the current exercise was to:

1. Identify any shifts in households or employment from the 2030 No Build as a result of the Build Alternatives (due to improved or reduced access based on interchange locations and/or access roads).
2. Allocate Monroe County's share of induced development (development resulting as a result of the Build Alternative), which was estimated at 330 households and 600 jobs.

DR then explained how the additional development related to the Build Alternative was determined. In Tier I of the I-69 EIS, a Regional Economic Models, Inc. (REMI) economic model was used to quantify the regional cost savings benefits of the Build Alternatives. Improved accessibility to an area results in travel-time savings, which translate into cost savings benefits for businesses (both in terms of freight movement and employee travel). Businesses can then expand into other areas, including increased employment, which translates to new population and employment growth for the region. Compared to other regions like rural southwest Indiana, Monroe County had a much smaller share of predicted new population and employment growth.

DR stated that, as with the No Build land use allocations, the Build allocations would be translated into acres of residential and commercial land uses to determine indirect and cumulative land use impacts of the project. The panel would identify any potential shifts in land use and the location(s) of the additional development for the 3C alternative at each interchange location north to south in Monroe County. Two additional alternatives are being developed for Section 5 that will provide different access at some locations than the the 3C alternative. When different access is a possibility, alternative land use scenarios will be discussed.

Members of the expert land use panel noted that, in general, there would be relatively insignificant land use changes between the No Build and Build because access is currently provided and induced development levels are relative low to the overall growth projected to 2030. (According to the panel, the induced growth approximated that of one typical year.) They noted that shifts would most likely occur where access *is not* provided as opposed to where access *is* provided – and that specifically, access would likely speed up the rate of development, but not necessarily increase the total amount of development.

Chambers Pike/Sample Road Interchange:

- Within the county, this area has the greatest potential for “unexpected” growth compared to the No Build due to the high number of one-acre lots available for development near Crossover Road west of SR 37.
- An interchange at either location would encourage more



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 3 of 5

household growth to the west of SR 37. The area west of SR 37 between Crossover Road and Sample Road might have an increased absorption rate of up to 10 dwelling units per year.

- 40 acres of commercially zoned land is available near the Star of Indiana site; this would be more attractive with an interchange at Sample. However, due to lack of water and sewer it is less attractive overall compared to the Acuff/Kinser and Tapp/Fullerton areas.

North Walnut Street Interchange:

- Due to the floodplain, this area is as developed as it can be.
- A western connection with a new road between West Maple Grove Road and Bottom Road would encourage residential growth (about 20 dwelling units) at the northeastern edge of Ellettsville in TAZ5300905 (bounded by North Maple Grove Road, West Maple Grove Road and Stout Creek).

Kinser Pike/Acuff Road Interchange:

- The area between these two roads east of SR 37 is already slated for a TIF district for a business park; the main impact would be development at a faster rate with an I-69 interchange. An interchange at either Kinser Pike or Acuff Road would not increase total employment levels.
- If interchange were located between Kinser Pike and Acuff Road, the result would be lower employment levels because developable land would be lost.
- With any interchange, the same type of development (office) is anticipated. A shift to highway-related retail development is not anticipated.

SR 46 Interchange:

- The Build Alternative may encourage development at a faster rate, particularly in the North Park development.
- The No Build still assumes full build-out of North Park and surrounding areas.
- The build alternatives would not change the type or amount of development, just potentially the rate of development.

SR 48 and SR 45 Interchanges:

- No change from No Build is anticipated for the Build Alternative.
- These areas are currently approaching build-out already.
- A ramp for Whitehall Crossing (between Vernal Pike and 3rd Street) from SR 37 was provided in 1996. The removal of this connection will be opposed by some people, but would not change land use.

Tapp Road Interchange:

- Having just an overpass will slow the rate of development near Tapp Road, but the amount of employment would be similar,



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 4 of 5

based on a frontage road system connecting Tapp Road northward to 3rd Street and southward to Fullerton Pike.

- If there is an interchange here, employment will creep northward from Fullerton Pike (which would not have an interchange). This would result in:
 - An additional 100 employees in the northeast quadrant of SR 37/Tapp Road interchange (TAZ 5300426).
 - An additional 300 employees in the southeast quadrant of SR 37/Tapp Road interchange (TAZ 5300728).

If an interchange is provided at Tapp Road, Tapp Road is likely to be extended from North Leonard Springs Road to SR 45. This would encourage residential growth (100 to 200 dwelling units) in TAZ 5301503 (bounded by SR 45, Duncan Road, West Leonard Spring Road and North Leonard Springs Road).

Fullerton Pike Interchange:

- Having just an overpass will slow the rate with of development, but the amount of employment would be similar, based on a frontage road system connecting northward to Tapp Road.
- If there is an interchange here, employment will creep south from Tapp Road. This will result in:
 - An additional 100 employees in the northeast quadrant of the interchange (TAZ 5300728).
 - An additional 50 employees in the southeast quadrant of the interchange (TAZ 5300729).
 - An additional 250 employees in the southwest quadrant of the interchange (TAZ 5303311).
- An interchange at Fullerton Pike will also stimulate residential growth (100 to 200 dwelling units) in the area bounded by Rockport Road, Fullerton Pike, West Branch of Clear Creek and That Road (TAZ 5300721).
- In either scenario, the planned hospital (on the southwest corner of SR 37 and Fullerton Pike) would already be developed, but other development (hotel, restaurant, etc.) would likely expand more with an interchange than an overpass.
- The Expert Panel preferred access at Fullerton Pike compared to Tapp Road.

Connection with Section 4:

- If a connector roadway (Southeast Arterial) were to be provided from the I-69/SR 37 system interchange (just north of Victor Pike) to Business 37, the Fullerton Pike interchange would likely not be built. However, the Expert Panel thought that such a connection would be difficult because of the splitting of properties and adverse impact on a prominent church. No induced growth changes were identified along the connector.

Southwestern Monroe County:

- Without an interchange at the Monroe/Greene County Line, no growth change from the No Build is expected.



Meeting Notes

(Continued)

Page 5 of 5

-
- With an interchange at the Monroe/Greene County Line, residential development would “leap” to Greene County due to lower cost of land and similar travel-time savings.

An additional meeting may be required to review possible land use impacts of build alternative variations not addressed today. . This meeting would likely occur in late summer – early fall. Similar to the sign-off requested on the No Build growth allocation maps provided today for review, the Build Alternative growth patterns will mapped and provided to the panel for review and signoff.

The meeting ended at approximately 3:00 p.m.



**APPENDIX E
EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES**

**Summary of Expert Land Use
Panel Meeting Notes**

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 Section 5 Project Office
One City Centre, Suite 106/108
120 W. 7th Street
Bloomington, IN 47404 U.S.A.
(812) 355-1390

I-69 Section 6 Project Office
7550 South Meridian Street, Suite B
Indianapolis, IN 46217
(317) 881-6408

Location	Martinsville Chamber of Commerce	Project:	I-69 Tier 2 EIS – Section 5 and Section 6
Date/Time	May 26, 2005 1:30 am – 3:00 p.m.	Notes Prepared By:	HNTB
Subject	Martinsville/Morgan County Land Use Expert Panel Meeting No. 3		
Participants	<u>Project Team:</u>		

Project Management Consultant: Dean Munn
Section 6: Brock Hoegh
Section 5: Mary Keith Floyd

Participants:

Ron Mimna, Martinsville Chamber of Commerce
Mike Duke, Duke Companies
Dave Barger, City of Martinsville
Terry Brock, Morgan County Surveyor
John Tayler, MCEDC
Jeff Quyle, Morgan County Commissioner

Welcome

The meeting began at approximately 1:40 p.m. Brock Hoegh thanked those that could make the meeting and gave a brief background of the last meeting, and introduced Dean Munn, who continued the background of the last meeting.

Dean Munn provided the panel with a status of what has been on the I-69 Tier 2 Corridor Land Use Model. A lot of shifts of data were made from the last meeting, and we will review them this afternoon. Dean handed out forecasts for Morgan County for 2030, a review of the REMI Model.

For Morgan County, Induced Population of 103, Households 43, and Employment 36. Expert Panel members thought these numbers were too low.

Dave Barger – City of Martinsville currently working on a revised City Master Plan. Action Item – Brock to contact Dave and get a copy of existing and revised Master Plan

Action



Jeff Quyle – Morgan County does not have a current Interstate. If you look at some of the other counties in Indiana, economic development opportunities, and companies looking for development opportunities, often, or require, Interstate access.

Industrial Park – possible locations?

Northwest part of Martinsville, between levee and White River
Good locations, includes rail facilities, infrastructure, and SR 37 and SR 67.

East of SR 37 and Ohio Street. With proposed interchange at this location, industrial park located east of this interchange would have good access to interstate and the City of Martinsville. Ohio Street may be new entrance to downtown (talk of widening Ohio Street to downtown).

Residential (future) south of SR 37/SR 39 Interchange (within Section 5 Corridor)

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

AGENDA

Tier 2 I-69 Section 5 Expert Land Use Panel Meeting

Tuesday, October 4, 2011 6:00 p.m. EDT

I. Project Update

1. Status of I-69 Section 5
2. Review of previous Expert Land Use Panel meetings

II. Purpose of the Expert Land Use Panel

1. Review preliminary household and employment forecasts
 - i. Monroe County
 - ii. Morgan County
2. Review growth allocations for the Traffic Analysis Zones

III. Preliminary Household and Employment Forecasts

1. Comparison of county level forecasts, build and no-build
2. Comments regarding household and employment forecasts

IV. Allocations to the Traffic Analysis Zones

1. Review latest information on growth at the TAZs from 2010 Census
2. Review of 2030 build and no-build allocation
3. Allocation of 2035 build and no-build growth to the TAZs

V. Next Meeting

1. Late October 2011

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2

Bloomington, Indiana 47403

812.355.1390

www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

Meeting Summary
Tier 2, I-69, Section 5
Expert Land Use Panel Meeting #1
Tuesday, October 4, 2011 6:00 p.m. ET

I. Attendance

Josh Desmond	Bloomington Monroe County MPO
Ron Walker	Bloomington Economic Development Corporation
Connie Griffin	Town of Ellettsville
Lori Abram	Bloomington Board of Realtors
Jack Baker	Bloomington Plan Commission
Richard Martin	Monroe County Plan Commission
Joy Sessing	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Larry Wilson	Monroe County Planning
Bill Brown	Developer
David Isley	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Eric Swickard	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Vince Bernardin, Jr.	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Mary Jo Hamman	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Jim Peyton	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Mary Keith Floyd	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

II. Project Update

1. Status of I-69, Section 5
 - Section 4 Record of Decision (ROD) issued September 8, 2011
 - Section 5 extends from the northern end of Section 4 (approximately Rockport Road) in Monroe County up to just south of Martinsville (approximately Indian Creek) in Morgan County
 - Section 5 continues to complete environmental studies
2. Review of previous Expert Land Use Panel meetings – more data is available since this group last met in 2005 (2010 Census, etc.). The horizon year had been 2030 and will now be 2035.

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2
Bloomington, Indiana 47403
812.355.1390
www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

3. Variety of forecasts available – data from Traffic Analysis Zone is converted into trips. It is important to understand future land use trends so forecasts are as accurate as possible.
4. Group tasks:
 - Look at control totals
 - Look at growth allocations by zone

III. Purpose of the Expert Land Use Panel

1. Review Preliminary Household Forecasts – Monroe County
 - Some forecasts were developed prior to 2010 Census (i.e. STATS Indiana, Woods and Poole). The team was also presented with an adjusted Woods and Poole number, 3 forecasts based on historic growth rates (low, moderate, and high over 40 years)
 - Household forecasts: 145,000 to 177,000 range
 - Richard Martin (RM) – it is critically important to understand growth plans of Indiana University (IU) and Ivy Tech (IT). The community has seen residential growth trends proportional with university growth. The team needs to get a handle on IU and IT expectations of growth (their plans are available for review). Ivy Tech may be looking to transition to residential.
 - Lori Abram (LA) – saw a recent IU presentation by Lynn Coyne, but he did not state that they were planning growth, more that they are looking to catch up on demand from the past.
 - Ron Walker (RW) – suggested that we may not want to go with conservative estimates. Growth also tracks medical development. Suggests that the team consider the higher number to: 1) be prepared and 2) based on most recent history.
 - RM – how did the historic Census estimates get off track? Can we avoid this? Vince Bernardin (VB) indicated the 2005 land use estimate was on track from the previous expert land use panel.
 - Bill Brown (BB) – agrees we should use the higher numbers. IU and IT provide constant growth for the region.
 - RM – number of folks per dwelling unit increased as a result of the latest census – the population density is increasing. This displays a change in trends – first time they’ve seen density increase in a while.
 - LA - seeing generational combinations in single household - more grandparents living with kids and grandkids; kids not having enough

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2
Bloomington, Indiana 47403
812.355.1390
www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

money to move out on their own. The group believes this is a temporary trend.

- ***Group consensus: to use the higher population forecast (177,360 in 2035 based on the 2000-2010 growth rate) from the handout for Monroe County***

2. Review Preliminary Employment Forecasts – Monroe County

- Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), Woods and Poole, and low, medium, and high for last 40 years.
- Job forecasts: 98,000 to 120,000 range
- RM – all would like to see it as high as possible. Question is how is the community going to get there?
- RW – dynamics between households and employment and out-of-county workers. Will in-commuting trend continue? – likely yes, due to higher residential costs in Monroe County.
- LA – university and health care expansion will continue to grow new jobs
- Losing traditional manufacturing jobs (General Electric), but bio science jobs are growing; hospital expansions, IU building a technology center
- RW - Small business growth trends – mixed, different businesses have different community patterns, lower wages folks will commute into Monroe County
- ***Group consensus: to use the mid-range employment forecast (112,732 in 2035 based on the 1980-2000 historic growth rate) from the handout for Monroe County***

3. Review Preliminary Household Forecasts – Morgan County

- Household forecasts: 74,000 to 96,000 range
- Joy Sessing (JS) – suggests that mid-range is reasonable, no justification for low or high
- LA – Morgan County has experienced a large number of natural disasters over last 10 years. Some families left for that very reason. As a result of the 2008 flooding, there are more areas in the revised floodplain.
- RM – if Morgan County is growing, a significant portion of the growth will occur north of Martinsville
- JS - another attraction for population growth – low property taxes – starting to see trend of increasing elderly residents where property taxes not as important as the employment taxes. Morgan County

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2

Bloomington, Indiana 47403

812.355.1390

www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

- Hospital now part of the IU network and may play a role in population growth.
 - **Group consensus: to use the Woods & Poole population forecast (86,069 in 2035) from the handout for Morgan County**
4. Review Preliminary Employment Forecasts – Morgan County
- Job forecasts: 22,000 - 29,000 range
 - Employment is down in past decade (2009 number)
 - 45% of workforce commutes to outside of Morgan County (commuting to Marion, Hendricks, and Monroe Counties). Consensus assumes that historic trend of out-commuting will continue.
 - Discussion of jobs and household ratios for Morgan versus Monroe Counties
 - **Group consensus: to use the mid-range employment forecast (26,449 in 2035 based on historic growth from 1970-2010) from the handout for Morgan County**

III. Allocations to the Traffic Analysis Zones – Population/Household Growth

1. Review growth allocations for the Traffic Analysis Zones – The group is to look at population/household growth. This is just a starting point with mid-range control totals. As a starting point, the team took growth allocations from previous Expert Land Use Panel (2005) and applied it to the new growth. The team will need to adjust the next 25 years of growth.
- a. Small House = 75 units, Large House = 215 units
 - b. Time to reallocate: Where are things not going to happen (because it has already happened or changed conditions)? Growth patterns from previous 10 years (2000-2010) are shown. Blue and purple represent growth.

General discussion items included:

- Growth areas: SR 46 towards Ellettsville, Stinesville, North Park
- More growth is expected in the northwest quadrant of SR37/SR46 (currently designated as an employment area, but not really seeing employment growth – reasonable to extend residential growth there) North Park bound by Curry Pike on west.
- Growth may occur in the Kinser Pike TIF District.
- Limiting factor is the extension of sewer (annexation policy)
- Outside of Bloomington, no transit exists except for the County shuttle bus.

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2
Bloomington, Indiana 47403
812.355.1390
www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

- How many lots platted and ready to go? Are prices on some of these lots are low enough to skew the patterns?
- Smithville / Sanders /Strain Ridge Road – have sewer and fire, but these are the only roads through Smithville (south of Section 5).
- Real limitations to growth in eastern Bloomington
- Business overlay zone (west side of I69) will probably be residential because no interchange is anticipated at Rockport Road.
- Not too much more development in the city – most of it has already occurred
- Downtown – add some higher density
- Remove development that has occurred in Bloomington

IV. Next Meeting

1. Tuesday, October 25th – 6:00 to 8:00 pm ET, at the I-69 Section 5 Project Office
2. Effort will address employment allocations

V. Action Items:

- Request the presentation from Lynn Coyne since he was unable to attend.
- Obtain copy of IU real estate study

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2
Bloomington, Indiana 47403
812.355.1390
www.i69indyevn.org



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

AGENDA

Expert Land Use Panel Meeting 2

Tuesday, October 25, 2011 6:00 p.m. ET

- I. Review Meeting Summary**
- II. Indiana University Development Plan (Lynn Coyne)**
- II. Review Allocations to the Traffic Analysis Zones for Household Forecasts**
 - 1. 2035 no-build population allocation
 - i. Monroe County
 - ii. Morgan County
- III. Employment Forecasts Allocation**
 - 1. Commercial and Industrial Growth
 - i. Review latest information on growth at the TAZs
 - ii. Review of 2030 no-build allocation
 - iii. Allocation of 2035 no-build growth to the TAZs
- IV. Next Meeting**

SECTION 5 PROJECT OFFICE

3802 Industrial Boulevard, Unit 2

Bloomington, Indiana 47403

812.355.1390

www.i69indyevn.org



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

Meeting Summary

Tier 2, I-69, Section 5

Expert Land Use Panel Meeting #2

Tuesday, October 25, 2011 6:00 p.m. ET

I. Attendance

Josh Desmond	Bloomington Monroe County MPO
Ron Walker	Bloomington Economic Development Corporation
Connie Griffin	Town of Ellettsville
Lori Abram	Bloomington Board of Realtors
Jack Baker	Bloomington Plan Commission
Tom Micuda	Bloomington Planning Department
Richard Martin	Monroe County Plan Commission
Joy Sessing	Morgan County Economic Development Corporation
Larry Wilson	Monroe County Planning
Lynn Coyne	Indiana University
Bill Brown	Developer
Steve Walls	INDOT
David Isley	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Eric Swickard	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Vince Bernardin, Jr.	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Mary Jo Hamman	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Jim Peyton	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Jodie Snyder	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

II. Meeting Objectives

1. Lynn Coyne will provide a presentation of Indiana University's (IU) plans relative to real estate expansion and growth.
2. The Expert Land Use Panel (ELUP) will continue advancing analysis to allocate growth within traffic analysis zones (TAZs). Michael Baker staff has GIS files available (see the on-screen projection) to help identify natural features, community resources, and potential constraints that could influence growth allocation.

III. Indiana University Master Plan Presentation

1. Lynn Coyne provided a presentation of IU's Master Plan from IU's website: <http://www.indiana.edu/~mstrplan/>

- The Bloomington Master Plan was published in March 2010
- Intent of the plan is to create a future vision for IU that reinforces the campus's unique environment and supports the University's broader mission



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

- Overall goals include supporting academic excellence and enhancing campus character and quality
- The Campus Master Plan reflects the institution's vision, priorities, culture, and future needs
- The document describes campus history, existing conditions, and a plan for the future
- The plan is grouped by theme, including:
 - Promote Bloomington's Unique Natural Features
 - Preserve and Reinvigorate the Core
 - Embrace the Jordan River
 - Commit to a Walkable Campus
 - Create Diverse Campus Neighborhoods
- The plan also includes recommendations grouped under the following sustainable planning principles:
 - Adopt environmentally sensitive land use practices
 - Move toward a carbon-neutral campus
 - Ensure a range of transportation options
 - Plan for innovative sustainable buildings and landscapes
- The plan makes recommendations for future land uses, densities, capital projects, demolitions, renovations, landscaping, pedestrian mobility and streetscape improvements, circulation, parking, transportation, campus infrastructure, utilities, and architecture.
- The plan also includes recommendations at IU's neighborhood scale. IU includes 10 neighborhoods

IV. Allocations to TAZs – Population/Household Growth

Similar to the October 4 session, the remainder of the meeting consisted of group discussions to update PMC supplied maps depicting no-build, build, population, employment projections by moving representations of current maps were considered a starting point with midrange control totals and the data available on the paper maps and available GIS (projected on-screen) was used to allocate expected growth over 25 years. The GIS data projected onscreen was used to help identify natural features, community resources, and potential constraints that may influence growth allocation.

1. Review growth allocations for TAZs – The group continued efforts from the October 4, 2011 session to finish considering and projecting population/household growth. Allocation of this growth included substantive and frequent back and forth between panel members at both the overall patterns as well as more detailed distribution and balancing between individual TAZs.
2. Adjust for the next 25 years of growth.
 - Small House = 75 units, Large House = 215 units



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

- Consider variables such as where are growth activities not going to happen (because it has already happened or includes changed conditions). Growth patterns from previous 10 years (2000-2010) are shown. Blue and purple represent growth.
3. The panel membership divided into two groups to discuss employment growth in their respective counties.
 4. BLA reviewed the allocations with the panel, the group confirmed the distribution, the data was documented by taking photographs of maps, written map notations, and updating associated BLA tables.

V. Allocations to TAZs – Employment Growth

1. The panel membership continued as two groups with completion of the anticipated employment growth allocations for Morgan County.
2. Due to the amount of time required for the Monroe County population/household growth allocations, the completion of the anticipated employment growth for Monroe County was deferred to an additional meeting; Morgan County membership could attend if desired.

VI. Next Meeting

1. Wednesday, November 9, 2011 – 6:00 to 8:00 pm ET, at the I-69 Section 5 Project Office
2. As household allocations have been completed at the close of this session, the effort will concentrate on employment allocations, specifically in Monroe County.

V. Action Items:

- None



APPENDIX E EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES

Summary of Expert Land Use Panel Meeting Notes

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 Evansville to Indianapolis Tier 2 Studies

AGENDA

Tier 2 I-69 Section 5 Expert Land Use Panel Meeting **Wednesday, November 9, 2011 6:00 p.m. EDT**

- I. Allocation of Employment Forecasts to Traffic Analysis Zones – Monroe County**
 - 1. Industrial – Agricultural Employment
 - 2. Government – Education Employment
 - 3. Retail - Services Employment

- II. Next Meeting**
 - 1. Early 2012



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

Meeting Summary

Tier 2, I-69, Section 5

Expert Land Use Panel Meeting #3

Wednesday, November 9, 2011 6:00 p.m. ET

I. Attendance

Josh Desmond	Bloomington Monroe County MPO
Richard Martin	Monroe County Plan Commission
Larry Wilson	Monroe County Planning
Lynn Coyne	Indiana University
Jack Baker	Bloomington Plan Commission
Tom Micuda	Bloomington Planning Department
Michelle Allen	FHWA
Steve Walls	INDOT
David Isley	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Matt Schriefer	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Vince Bernardin, Jr.	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Mary Jo Hamman	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Jim Peyton	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

II. Meeting Objectives

1. The Expert Land Use Panel (ELUP) will continue advancing analysis to allocate growth within traffic analysis zones (TAZs). This meeting focuses exclusively on allocation of Employment Forecasts in Monroe County. (Morgan County allocation was completed at the previous meeting.)

III. Allocations to TAZs – Employment Growth

Similar to the October 25 session, the current maps were considered a starting point with midrange control totals and the data available on the paper maps and available GIS (projected on-screen) was used to allocate expected growth over 25 years for:

- Industrial
- Governmental, Institutional
- Retail

1. The meeting started with a review of maps as updated with population/household growth allocations from the ELUP Meeting #2 (October 25, 2011) provided and lead by BLA.
2. The panel membership compared the 2035 no-build and 2035 build allocation at the county level and the model unit balancing parameters with BLA modelers.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

3. Monroe County employment growth allocation panel membership discussions included refinement of Monroe County growth centers.
4. The panel membership looked at allocation of the projected Monroe growth within Bloomington, Ellettsville, and County boundaries. Allocation of this growth included substantive and frequent back and forth between panel members at both the overall patterns as well as more detailed distribution and balancing between individual TAZs.
5. BLA reviewed the allocations with the panel, the group confirmed the distribution, the data was documented by taking photographs of maps, written map notations, and updating associated BLA tables.

IV. Next Meeting

1. Date and time will be determined after the information has been incorporated into the I-69 modeling tools. This meeting will focus on the allocation of growth expected to be induced from the I-69 project and include both Morgan and Monroe counties. The meeting will be held in the I-69 Section 5 Project Office.

V. Action Items:

- None



**APPENDIX E
EXPERT LAND USE PANEL MEETING NOTES**

**Summary of Expert Land Use
Panel Meeting Notes**

Meeting Notes (February 10, 2005)

Meeting Notes (March 24, 2005)

Meeting Notes (April 13, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 25, 2005)

Meeting Notes (May 26, 2005)

Meeting Notes (October 4, 2011)

Meeting Notes (October 25, 2011)

Meeting Notes (November 9, 2011)

Meeting Notes (February 16, 2012)



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

Meeting Summary

Tier 2, I-69, Section 5

Expert Land Use Panel Meeting #4

Wednesday, February 16, 2012 6:00 p.m. ET

I. Attendance

Josh Desmond	Bloomington Monroe County MPO
Richard Martin	Monroe County Plan Commission
Larry Wilson	Monroe County Planning
Lynn Coyne	Indiana University
Jack Baker	Bloomington Plan Commission
Lori Abram	Bloomington Board of Realtors
Tom Micuda	Bloomington Planning Department
Ron Walker	Bloomington Economic Development Corporation
Steve Walls	INDOT
David Isley	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Eric Swickard	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Vince Bernardin, Jr.	Bernardin, Lochmueller & Associates
Mary Jo Hamman	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Jim Peyton	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Justin Smith	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.
Tami Milburn	Michael Baker Jr., Inc.

II. Meeting Objectives

The Expert Land Use Panel (ELUP) will continue advancing analysis to allocate growth within traffic analysis zones (TAZs). This meeting focuses on allocation of 1) induced growth from the construction of I-69, Section 5, where it had not been previously assumed; 2) where previously assumed induced growth should not be assumed under a no-build scenario; and 3) the recognition of any other differences which may result from potential access options under consideration.

III. Allocations to TAZs – Induced Growth

Notes have been separated into access locations. If a location is not listed the ELUP members did not feel a reallocation of growth was necessary for that location.

1. Fullerton Pike – An interchange is included at Fullerton Pike in all alternatives under consideration. It is expected employment growth at Fullerton Pike will be office/professional, not commercial.



I-69 EVANSVILLE TO INDIANAPOLIS

2. Tapp Road – Some alternatives provide for only a grade separation at Tapp Road, other include a split diamond interchange with SR 45/2nd Street. The City supports the split diamond interchange. Future growth allocations will change substantially if access is not provided at Tapp Road. It is anticipated that 50% of employment growth will shift north and south; primarily to the North Park development, plus some south near the hospital. Household growth will increase by approximately 360 households. Household growth would come from North Park.
3. SR 48/3rd Street – All alternatives include a SR 48/3rd Street interchange; some retain the existing configuration, some provide for a modification. A request was made to model the SR 48/ 3rd Street interchange with and without a connection at Vernal Pike. It was noted that all Section 5 alternatives include a grade separation at Vernal Pike and a connection at this location is not being advanced.
4. Vernal Pike – All alternatives include the elimination of the existing signal (with SR 37) and provide for a grade separation at this location. No access from Vernal Pike is planned to/from I-69. Traffic circulation will be changed at this location. It is possible employment and household growth could decrease in the vicinity of Vernal Pike under the “no build” scenario. Development is very restricted west of Vernal Pike.
5. Kinser Pike – There are multiple options under consideration at Kinser Pike, ranging from a full interchange, to an overpass, to the possibility of no cross-connectivity (utilizing cul-de-sacs on either side of I-69). Approximately 1,000 jobs are forecasted near the Kinser Pike TIF district. If no access is provided, 800 jobs would move to North Park while 200 would move to north Walnut Street south of the interchange with I-69. Instead of industrial/commercial development approximately 600 households would shift to this area from North Park and the area northwest of Ellettsville. If cross-connectivity is provided (in either the form of a grade separation or an interchange) it would result in a shift of 50 households from Northwest Ellettsville to the area immediately north of Kinser and I-69 and would cause a shift of about 250 households from the west side of Ellettsville to the east side of Ellettsville (SR 46 dividing east and west Ellettsville).
6. Walnut Street – Multiple options are under consideration at Walnut Street as well, ranging from re-use of the existing partial interchange, constructing an interchange with ramps to accommodate all four movements, or potentially limited to a grade separation. As noted in the previous point, some employment may increase along old SR 37 if access is removed at Kinser Pike and provided at Walnut Street.
7. Paragon Road – There are multiple options under consideration at Paragon Road, including an interchange and an overpass. If an interchange is constructed at Paragon Road, household (63) and employment (102) growth should be shifted from TAZ # 55172700. 68 jobs should move to TAZ # 550170600. 34 jobs should be split among TAZ # 550230800 and 550230900. 63 households should be split among TAZ # 550230800 and 550230900.