

**RESOURCE TEAM
MEETING #9 REPORT**

**KNOXVILLE
PARKWAY
CONTEXT SENSITIVE
SOLUTIONS**

**“REGIONAL PARKWAY DESIGN
RESOURCE TEAM”**



January 26, 2005

National Transportation Research Center, Knoxville, TN

Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Resource Team Meeting #9

INTRODUCTION

The ninth Regional Parkway Design Resource Team Meeting was held on January 26, 2005, at the National Transportation Research Center in Knoxville, Tennessee. Mr. David Lindeman with Palmer Engineering led the meeting.

AGENDA

8:45 AM Sign-in

9:00 AM Introduction – *David Lindeman, Palmer Engineering*

9:15 AM Resource Team Follow-up from Interchange Issue Group – *Palmer Engineering*

9:45 AM Demonstration of Design Steps and What will be presented at Next Issue Group Meeting – *Palmer Engineering*

10:15 AM *Break*

10:30 AM Resource Team Survey Results – *Mary English, UT*

10:40 AM Group Discussion of Process Status – *Facilitator*

12:00 PM Adjourn

INTRODUCTION

David Lindeman with Palmer Engineering announced that TDOT formed a CSS Policy Group to review and answer the requests the Team made during its October 18 meeting. The CSS Policy Group will handle future such requests from any of the CSS projects that TDOT is involved with. The members of the CSS Policy Committee are:

Paul Degges	Chief Engineer
Chris Christianson	Transportation Administrator
Ed Cole	Chief of Environment and Planning
Dennis Cook	Assistant Chief of Environment and Planning
Jeff Jones	Director of Design
Mark Holloran	Assistant Chief Engineer of Design
Jim Moore	Director, Program Development and Project Management
Chuck Rychen	Assistant Director, Program Development and Project Management

The answers to the Team's requests are:

1) Approval was given for the Team and consultants to look at alternatives outside of the study corridor in three areas.

Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Resource Team Meeting #9

2) The Team members may choose to end consideration of an interchange in Hardin Valley and they can announce this recommendation if they choose to. TDOT does not want to make incremental final decisions on design recommendations from the Team and will wait for one comprehensive recommendation at the end of this CSS process.

The newsletter is to indicate that the Resource Team is no longer considering an interchange in Hardin Valley, but that it is possible that the Team could reconsider it in the future if new information warrants.

In the future, visitors will still be allowed to observe meetings, however, the rule against their speaking out will be more strictly enforced.

Part of the reason for pushing back the schedule is the extra fieldwork being done to map caves and sinkholes in the study corridor. Six additional caves have been found. Surveys will include measurements to determine the extents and also biological and archaeological assessments.

RESOURCE TEAM FOLLOW UP FROM INTERCHANGE ISSUE GROUP

During the Interchange Issue Group meeting on October 18, 2004 the group recommended narrowing down the number of interchange combinations for which TDOT would forecast traffic from 32 to 4. All combinations included interchanges at I-40, SR 162 (Pellissippi Parkway), US 25 (Clinton Highway), and I-75. The four combinations were with and without interchanges at either or both of SR 62 and SR 170.

After some discussion during the January 26 meeting the Resource Team decided to add one additional configuration for traffic forecasting that included interchanges only at I-40, SR 162 (Pellissippi Parkway), and I-75. This will make a total of five interchange combinations for which TDOT will forecast traffic. TDOT agreed to include traffic on I-40 in the forecasts.

A concern was raised that the Resource Team needs to know of other projects in the area in case they would influence decisions made on the Parkway. A newspaper article was circulated that talks about an advance planning report on expanding Edgemoor Road to five lanes. The Team discussed the importance of knowing about other projects considered in the area. TDOT will provide the Team with advance planning reports for projects that may affect the Knoxville Regional Parkway.

As part of the discussion about traffic forecasts, questions were raised about the related issues of induced traffic and land use. Some felt the Interchange Issue Group should address these subjects. Others felt that we need to do whatever it takes to settle one issue before we move on or else we will have many unresolved issues hanging. Since the discussion was related to how the CSS is being conducted on this project, the discussion was postponed until later in the meeting when the process would be discussed.

DESIGN STEPS AND WHAT WILL BE PRESENTED AT NEXT ISSUE GROUP MEETING

David Lindeman gave a short presentation titled "Making of An Alternative" to show the Team the flow of decisions that designers make while developing alternatives.

Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Resource Team Meeting #9

RESOURCE TEAM INTERVIEW RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THIS CSS PROCESS

Mary English with the University of Tennessee presented the results of her interviews of the Resource Team. She explained that a survey of the Team members by Parsons Brinkerhoff was part of a study of all CSS projects in Tennessee while her study was just of this project. Mary English then facilitated a discussion of concerns that Team members have with how the CSS process is working.

Concerns:

How will commitments made during the CSS process be maintained in the future?

Kentucky has CAP (Communicate All Promises) – A mechanism to track all commitments made during property negotiations.

Tom Love (TDOT) said that Tennessee is developing a similar system.

How do we define Consensus?

It is sometimes unclear when we are making a decision and when we do, what the final decision is.

We keep moving on before issues are settled. We need to settle one issue before we address another. We also return to issues that were previously settled.

We have strayed outside the border of what was originally defined as the scope of our charge.

Where do emails go? Are they part of the record? What is the record?

All major decisions, such as whether the road should be built and which study corridor to use, have already been made? CSS requires us to start from scratch. What can we decide?

Response from Ed Cole: *This project differs from others in that we started using the CSS process at a later point in the overall project. The objective is clear. The decision has already been made that a road will be built in the Orange Corridor according to the original purpose and need in the DEIS. This is an advisory group using the CSS process to guide the design of the road including the alignment, location of interchanges, and other features.*

Individual Suggestions:

Use ground-penetrating radar to find caves that are not accessible from the surface.

Make objectives for each meeting including what decisions need to be made at that meeting.

Include a detailed description of the meeting objectives in the meeting agenda.

Distribute meeting agenda in advance of the meeting along with information that is pertinent to the objectives.

Allow input from the group on the time allotted in the agenda for various items.

Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Resource Team Meeting #9

Condense presentations into executive summaries.

Make it clear how the information from presentations feeds into the decision making process.

Clearly indicate when we are beyond discussion and making a decision.

Have a fall back mechanism for when consensus cannot be reached.

- Simply vote

- Super majority

- Record both majority view and minority view

- Stand aside

Clearly indicate what decision was just made.

Both Facilitator and members should make sure discussions stay on relevant topics and decisions are finalized before moving on to new subjects.

When time runs out for discussion the Team needs to decide an action including returning to the item later.

Have a formal tracking of questions that will be looked into or decisions that will be returned to.
Idea parking lot.

Record all decisions in the meeting report.

List in the report all the issues that are raised.

Allow the Team to review the meeting reports before they are posted.

Have a method for the Team to review the meeting notes outside of the meetings to save time.

Make sure that ratings from Issue Groups are available to Subcommittees and rankings from Subcommittees are available to the Resource Team at least a week before the next group meets.

Have a Team field trip to gain familiarity with the project area.

Team members can use email to communicate major thoughts outside meeting time. This allows the sender to review and organize their thoughts to be clear and on track.

Make Resource Team email part of the official process record.

Continue this discussion at another meeting and send out a clear set of objectives ahead of time.

ACTION ITEMS

A follow-up meeting will be scheduled to continue the discussion

Send copies of newsletters and meeting reports to Resource Team members for review prior to publishing.

TDOT will provide copies of Advance Planning reports on other projects in the area.

Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Resource Team Meeting #9

ATTENDEES

34 people attended the meeting. The names and organizations of the people who attended the meeting are presented as follows.

Resource Team

Roy Arthur
John Benditz
Edgar Faust
Greg Fay
Steve Fritts
Carolyn Greenwood
Brian Jenks
David Lambert
Bill McMaster
Chip Miller
Karen Nolt
Mac Post
David Reister
Robert Shaw
Wes Stowers
Roland Terrell
Sharon Todd
Bruce Wuethrich

Stakeholder Group

Beaver Creek Task Force
TN Section of the Institute of Transportation Engineers
Hardin Valley Community
East TN Economic Development Agency
Tennessee Technology Corridor Development Authority
Karns Community
Anderson County Government
Better Roads In North Knoxville
Heiskell Community
Loudon County
Knox County Parks & Recreation
Powell Community
Sierra Club
Citizens Against the Beltway Orange Location (CABOL)
Knoxville Area Chamber Partnership
Solway Area Residents Association
Claxton Community
Knox County Government

TDOT

Michael Agnew
John Barrett
Travis Brickey
Ed Cole
Kelsey Finch
Alan Longmire
Tom Love
Mike Russell
David Utley
Bob Woodson

Title

TDOT- Design
TDOT- Project Management
TDOT- Region 1 - Community Relations
TDOT- Chief of Environment & Planning
TDOT – Civil Rights
TDOT – Archaeologist
TDOT – Environmental
TDOT- Region 1- Project Management
TDOT – Bicycle Coordinator
TDOT – Region 1 - Right of Way

Consultants

Mary English
David Lindeman
Eric Fischer
Gary Sharpe
Stephen Sewell

Company

University of Tennessee – Research Leader
Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant
Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant
Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant
Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant

Advisors

Fred Frank

Organization

Knoxville Regional TPO