
APPENDIX C

**SCENARIO 2 INDIRECT EFFECTS ANALYSIS
COORDINATION**

November 28, 2007

**STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
BUREAU OF HIGHWAY DESIGN**

DRAFT CONFERENCE REPORT

PROJECT: SALEM-MANCHESTER
10418C & 14053
I-93 SEIS

DATE OF CONFERENCE: November 20, 2007

LOCATION OF CONFERENCE: Planning Conference Room

ATTENDED BY:

NHDOT Pete Stamnas, Subramanian Sharma
NHDOJ Mark Hodgdon
NHOEP: Tom Duffy
FHWA: Bill O'Donnell, Leigh Levine, Brigitte Mandel, Jamie Sikora
Louis Berger Group: Dane Ismart, Larry Pesesky (phone)

SUBJECT: I93 SEIS – Population Projection Discussion with Tom Duffy

The purpose of this meeting was to have the SEIS Team gain a better understanding of the process and assumptions used by the NH Office of Energy and Planning (OEP) to develop state population projections. Questions were prepared by L. Pesesky and posed by D. Ismart.

1. Confirm that the population projections on the OEP website are the most current. When does OEP anticipate publishing the next update to these numbers?

Tom Duffy Reply==> The information posted on the OEP website www.nh.gov/oep for 2007 are the most current. Projections are completed 3 to 4 times per decade. There are no new projections anticipated in 2008.

2(a). Discuss the driving assumptions behind the projections (both the numbers and their geographic allocation), e.g., economic forecasts, employment projections, etc. & How can one best explain any changes between projections published in 2000-2001 and the current projections (both the numbers and the allocation)?

Tom Duffy Reply==> A number of data sources are utilized including employment security data, census data, economist forecasts, etc. His projections are driven by trends. The growth rate in NH has been very consistent between 1960 to 2000. In that period it averaged between 13,000 to 15,000 increase per year. This trend has been remarkably resilient. There have been times where there have been growth spurts and declines but the average has stayed true until the year 2002. This marked the first year where the growth rate declined. The revised rate is lower than usual, in the 11,000 range. This declining rate occurred during good economic times. That point is significant because the downward trend is expected to continue well into the future. It is not expected to return to the previous rate.

A "top down" approach is used to develop the projections. Starting at the state level to the county then to the municipalities. This approach is universally accepted. This capped total provides discipline to the projections. A "bottom up" approach will typically return projections that are too high. The bottom up approach is what was used in the Delphi Study.

2(b) Are the numbers vetted with regional planning commissions, counties, or towns before they are published?

Tom Duffy Reply==> Yes. .The projections are coordinated with the local planning communities.

2(c) Is there documentation of the population projection methodology that could be shared with us?

Tom Duffy Reply==> There is some measure of explanation in the most current population projection report posted on the web entitled "N.H. Population Projections for State and Counties, 2010 to 2030, Update: November 2006."

3. Where can the previous years projections be accessed?

Tom Duffy Reply==> The data is available and will be forwarded to P. Stamnas for distribution.

4. What effect, if any, do changes in relative accessibility from projects like the I-93 Widening or availability of water and sewer have on the projections? In other words, how critical are these factors to population growth in New Hampshire where in NH that growth occurs.

Tom Duffy Reply==> Projections assume that there is adequate infrastructure to support the population predictions. Time and cost of travel remain relatively consistent. The projections can be considered the build scenario. For example, if he was told that proposed capacity improvements to I93 were not made as anticipated, he might consider lowering his population projections.

5. How does population migration from Massachusetts impact the projections?

Tom Duffy Reply==> 65% of NH's growth is due to migration trends. 40% of that migration is from Massachusetts. The next highest state contributes 8% of the total. These rates have also been very stable over the long term. This migration data is derived from decennial census and IRS reports.

Action Items.

- 1) Tom Duffy will forward previous years population projection data to P. Stamnas for distribution to all in attendance. (Item complete)
- 2) P. Stamnas will forward summary comparison of previous population projections (FEIS & Delphi Panel) with the most recent (2007) OEP projections to all attendees. (Item Complete)
- 3) L. Pesesky/D. Ismart will review the 2007 population projection report to determine if additional information on methodologies is needed. They will prepare a list of additional information required and forward to P. Stamnas for action.

Submitted by:

Peter E. Stamnas, P.E.
Project Manager

cc: all attendees, Bill Cass, project files

Meeting #2 with Tom Duffy, State Demographer for NHOEP
December 18, 2007
NHDOT Offices

Attendees:

NHDOT: Jeff Brillhart, Bill Cass, Pete Stamnas, Marc Laurin, Subramanian Sharma
NH AG's Office: Mark Hodgdon, Edith Pacillo
FHWA: Leigh Levine, Bill O'Donnell, Brigitte Mandel, *Tracy White, *Mike Culp, *Marlys Osterhues
Louis Berger Group: *Doug Lucius
*phoned in

The purpose of this meeting was to obtain additional information regarding the characterization of OEP population projections as a "Build" condition as they specifically relate to the I93 project. This is the position stated by Tom Duffy during a November 20, 2007 meeting.

Background: Using the OEP projections as a "build" condition is counter to the traffic modeling approach detailed in Table 2 - scenario 2 on page 5 of Part 1 of the SEIS scope of work. This "no build" approach would require the traffic model to initially be run with 4 lanes. Four additional lanes would then be added to the model (8 lanes total) to determine the change. The group was reluctant to modify the proposed "no-build" approach, prior to having a second meeting with Mr. Duffy.

Discussion: Mr. Duffy was asked whether he considered the proposed improvements to I93 when making population projections for the state. He stated that the OEP population projections assumed that no infrastructure constraints exist. When asked if the projections would change if I93 improvements were not constructed as proposed, he explained that the state population projections would likely be lowered by some amount in communities along the I93 corridor and the overall state population projection would be lowered similarly. This response confirmed the interpretation that OEP population projections represent a "build" scenario.

Mr. Duffy elaborated by saying the I93 corridor is unique in this instance because it's a direct connection between the population and employment centers of Boston and Manchester. It should be noted that this corridor presently operates in a constrained fashion. The overall impact on state population projections would likely be treated differently if constraints were induced on one of the other major corridors in NH (I95 and Everett Turnpike). Population projections, in such a case, would not necessarily be treated in a fashion similar to the I93 corridor given the uniqueness of the corridor.

Determinations:

Given this unique situation, the group decided it was prudent to revise the modeling approach detailed in part 1 of the scope of work and use the state population projections as a "build" condition. The initial model run would be with 8-lanes and then the proposed improvements would be removed to induce constraint. This scenario would replace current scenario 2. There would be no changes to scenario 1 (Delphi). It was also decided that it would be prudent to analyze the "no-build" approach to evaluate the sensitivity of the model. All of the results would be presented for public comment.

Submitted By: Peter E. Stamnas