

**REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE  
SECTION 1  
MEETING #1 REPORT**

---

**KNOXVILLE  
PARKWAY  
CONTEXT SENSITIVE  
SOLUTIONS**

**REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE 1**



**October 6, 2004**

**National Transportation Research Center, Knoxville, TN**

**Gary D. Bates, PE, Facilitator**

# **Knoxville Parkway, Context Sensitive Solutions Subcommittee Meeting #1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The first Regional Subcommittee meeting for section 1 was held on October 6, 2004, at the National Transportation Research Center in Knoxville, Tennessee. The facilitator, Mr. Gary D. Bates with Roenker Bates Group, led the meeting.

## **AGENDA**

**8:45 AM** Sign-in

**9:00 PM** Introduction of Members – *Facilitator*

**9:10 AM** Partnering and Teamwork – *Facilitator*

**9:20 AM** Project Overview – *Palmer Engineering*

**9:40 AM** Design Parameters – *Palmer Engineering*

**10:00 AM** Discussion of Section 1 Critical Issues - *Facilitator*

**10:20 AM** Break

**10:30 AM** Brainstorm Possible Solutions – *Palmer Engineering*

**11:45 AM** Future Steps and Issue Group Selection – *Palmer Engineering/Facilitator*

**Noon** Adjourn

David Lindeman opened the meeting with a review of the previous meetings on the project as well as a description of the Interchange Justification Study performed for the I-40/I-75 interchange with SR-475. Gary Bates facilitated a discussion of the critical issues in Section 1. The issues identified were as follows:

## **CRITICAL ISSUES**

The group was interested in focusing upon the most significant 5 or 6 issues as opposed to attempting to address a universe of concerns.

- It was felt by the group that designing a safe parkway facility with safe interchange designs was paramount but that there may be safety issues that cannot be resolved solely through design.
- Secondly, minimizing disruption to residents and the natural environment had to be a top priority.
- Concerns were expressed about the disruption to the free flow of traffic and the local travel patterns that existing residents would have to endure due to the construction of the project. Maintaining traffic flow and dealing with lane closures if Alternative 1 is constructed was specifically mentioned.
- The impact on the total environment was mentioned as a key concern including concerns about noise pollution and noise carrying across the lake if the interchange ramp is to cross a leg of that water resource.
- Melton Hill Lake, and Hope Creek as well as the residents living in that area may be impacted by Alternative 2.
- Both of the alternatives eliminate left exits and some safety concern was expressed for the left exits.
- A portion of the discussion centered on whether or not the construction of noise barriers would be justified given their high cost.
- Since there are cemeteries in the area that may be impacted, how would the impact be mitigated and would it be possible to avoid them?
- There was a discussion concerning interchanges with multiple ramp levels that would be subject to icing if conditions were right. Heating coils are sometimes placed in bridge decks but would probably not be economically justified due to the moderate weather conditions in the area.

## **GENERAL COMMENTS**

David Lindeman led a discussion of possible alternatives to consider. The following general comments were made:

1. There was a significant amount of discussion concerning the possibility of moving the interchange location to the area between present alternatives 1 and 2 or can the new loop be moved closer to the existing interchange. The group determined that it would be beneficial to have all of the traffic movements for alternatives 1 & 2 explained during subsequent presentations.
2. Subcommittee members determined that their purpose was not to be concerned with how the area would be developed beyond 20 to 30 years in the future, but to be concerned with the present and the more immediate future.

3. There was discussion revolving around the change in terminology from beltway to parkway creating the expectation that the parkway will be aesthetically more pleasing than the typical interstate type facility.
4. Major concerns are based upon the impact of the interchange design. If there are safety issues that cannot be accommodated by the design, choose safety first, but minimize the impact to property owners.
5. Subcommittee members did not want to “cut off” access to properties along Buttermilk Road and indicated a general concern for access issues within the corridor.
6. One of the proposed interchange ramps crosses a leg of Melton Hill Lake where noise would travel over water more freely than over other terrain. Noise barriers could be used in many locations but could not be used to mitigate anticipated noise problems on the lake.
7. It was noted that there are several cemeteries located within the limits of the corridor and that efforts should be made to avoid those sites.
8. There was discussion of the fact that land values and construction costs are likely to be much greater by the time the facility is actually constructed. It was further noted that different property types appreciate at varying rates; therefore, it may be very difficult to make accurate cost estimates that remain accurate for future years as commercial & industrial property begins to develop. While discussing the relative costs of the alternatives it was pointed out that in the Interchange Justification Study, there is a \$15 million difference in earthwork between Alternative 1 & Alternative 2 that needs to be checked. New alternatives and cost estimates will be available in January.
9. There was desire on the part of some of the subcommittee members to move the design just to the north of Alternative 1. It may not be possible to shift I-75 to accommodate some alternative designs.
10. Subcommittee members expressed an interest in making the design easy to understand by Tourists but at the same time make it functional to local residents.
11. Perhaps 4 alternatives should be considered. It needs to be built right this time.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

- Subcommittees will be provided with FHWA comments concerning the I-40/75 interchange.
- More engineering information concerning safety issues & cost issues at the alternative 1 interchange will be provided.
- Geometric solutions used for the I-64 & I-295 interchange in Richmond Virginia may provide a good example of what could be done here.
- Gresham Smith and Partners to study a new alternative 3 & revisit cost estimates of Alternatives 1 & 2

## **ATTENDEES**

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

### **Regional Subcommittee 1 Organization**

Mike Fleming	Regional Subcommittee 1
Susan H. Fox	Regional Subcommittee 1
P. J. Halvorsen	Regional Subcommittee 1
Chip Miller	Resource Team, Loudon County
Wes Hines	Regional Subcommittee 1
Cheryl Travis	Regional Subcommittee 1

### **TDOT**

### **Title**

Ataur Rahman	TDOT Design
Mike Russell	Transportation Manager, TDOT, Region 1, Project Management
Cliff Stewart	Transportation Manager 1, TDOT, Design
Bob Woodson	TDOT Right of Way

### **Consultants**

### **Company**

Gary Bates	Roemaker Bates Group – Facilitator
David Lindeman	Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant
Bob Kennedy	Palmer Engineering
Stephen Sewell	Palmer Engineering
Norm Johnson	Gresham Smith and Partners
Cliff Smith	Gresham Smith and Partners

### **Advisors**

### **Organization**

Mary English	University of Tennessee
--------------	-------------------------