

**REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE
SECTION 2
MEETING #1 REPORT**

**KNOXVILLE
PARKWAY
CONTEXT SENSITIVE
SOLUTIONS**

REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE 2



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 2 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

12:45 PM Sign-in

1:00 PM Introduction of Members – *Facilitator*

1:10 PM Partnering and Teamwork – *Facilitator*

1:20 PM Project Overview – *Palmer Engineering*

1:40 PM Design Parameters – *Palmer Engineering*

2:00 PM Discussion of Section 1 Critical Issues - *Facilitator*

2:20 PM Break

2:30 PM Brainstorm Possible Solutions – *Palmer Engineering*

2:45 PM Future Steps and Issue Group Selection – *Palmer Engineering/Facilitator*

4:00 PM Adjourn

David Lindeman opened the meeting with a review of the previous meetings on the project as well as presenting design parameters. Gary Bates facilitated a discussion of the critical issues in Section 2. The issues identified were as follows:

CRITICAL ISSUES

- Environmental issues and methods of reducing or mitigating the impacts of noise and air pollution potentially produced by the parkway were critical issues. In addition, the subcommittee discussed the presence of animals that would be crossing the corridor and how to accommodate those movements.
- A key issue faced by the subcommittee is the question about how many interchanges are needed
- Archeological sites and Historic preservation were identified as issues needing attention within the section.
- The importance of land use controls was discussed within the context of controlling the types of development typically associated with interchanges.
- The use of the term “Parkway” as opposed to “Beltway” was discussed. The name “Parkway” implies that there will be more attention paid to matters of an aesthetic nature and therefore has changed local expectations concerning the ultimate appearance of the corridor.
- Right of way acquisition and just compensation to property owners were discussed, as was the related issue of using retaining walls to minimize the impact to adjacent property owners and to reduce the project footprint.
- There was discussion concerning maintaining the connectivity and continuity of local roads in order to maintain reasonable and convenient access to residential properties. Maintaining a sufficient amount of traffic flow and circulation during and after construction is also important.
- A significant amount of discussion centered around the performance of the parkway (level of service), its cost, whether the speed limit could be lower than 70 MPH, and whether any weigh stations would be located along the alignment.

GENERAL COMMENTS

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

1. There were questions concerning how to provide a combination of design characteristics that would reduce noise levels and at the same time fit into the local environment with minimal impact to adjacent properties. Minimizing the footprint of the corridor is important to lessen the impact upon adjacent property owners. This is somewhat dependent upon the topography. The use of independent roadways can improve aesthetics but must be weighed against the amount of right of way necessary to support depressed medians.
2. Truck traffic is seen as a problem. Trucks increase air pollution, increase noise and reduce safety for motorists using the parkway and for local residents.
3. The parkway should be designed for complete access control allowing no stoplights on the facility to impede the free flow of traffic.

4. Within the corridor, moving the alignment one way or the other merely shifts the impact of the project from one subdivision to another. The parkway alignment should follow property lines whenever possible and avoid homes. Property owners would prefer that if some of their property is to be taken, then all of it should be taken or move the alignment to the other side of the hill.
5. There currently is significant community opposition to the Hardin Valley Interchange but growth and development in Hardin Valley will ultimately generate more traffic that may necessitate a request for it. Without a Hardin Valley interchange there will be no convenient route for emergency vehicles. Even without an interchange, the alignment of the Marietta Church Road should be improved

CROSS SECTION FOOTPRINT

- The subcommittee members were of the opinion that aesthetics should play a role in the parkway design and that minimizing the parkway footprint to reduce impact upon adjacent properties was preferable. However, they did have questions concerning whether independent roadway benefits might somewhat offset the need to minimize the parkway footprint and would independent roadways improve or worsen noise levels.

DESIGN SPEED

- The subcommittee had several questions concerning whether there are any merits to the possibility of lowering the design speed to reduce parkway impacts. Lower design speeds can influence operating speeds. There is a need to look at 60 MPH vs. 70 MPH to compare impacts.
- There was discussion surrounding the possible impacts of going from a design speed of 70 MPH and then to a lower design speed within the parkway and then back to 70 MPH.
- Some concern was expressed concerning whether lowering the design speed would change the access control scheme. It was stated that the design speed has no impact on access control and would not necessitate using at-grade intersections as opposed to full access control.

REASONS TO LOOK AT YELLOW ALTERNATIVE CORRIDOR

1. *The original corridor was selected before a subdivision was constructed off of Couch Mill Road, which placed several new homes within the study corridor. This additional proposed alternate has the potential of reducing the number of relocations by utilizing farmland, which could result in lower right of way costs*
2. *It is shorter and could reduce construction costs*
3. *The alternate could require only one bridge crossing of Couch Mill Road instead of two.*
4. *It avoids a previously identified archeological area located within the delineated corridor.*
5. *This proposed alternative has been brought up at several public meetings in the past.*
6. *The proposed alignment could affect fewer sinkholes.*

- 7. The proposed alignment could reduce run-off into Beaver Creek.*
- 8. It is not a significant deviation from the original alignment.*

REASONS TO ELIMINATE PROPOSED HARDIN VALLEY INTERCHANGE

- 1. Overwhelming opposition to the proposed interchange at this location as expressed by area residents attending the public workshop held at Hardin Valley Elementary School. There were 165 (86%) citizens who were opposed to the interchange contrasted with 17 who were in favor and 9 additional citizens who indicated that they could live with it.*
- 2. Cost savings realized from removing the ramps*
- 3. The Pellissippi Parkway and Watt Road Interchanges are within 5 – 6 minutes of the proposed interchange site and the local access is very good.*
- 4. It might reduce noise and air pollution.*
- 5. The area is not in need of a development incentive; it is already developing without it.*
- 6. Existing roads could not handle additional traffic*
- 7. Potential impacts to a culturally sensitive church and cemetery near the proposed interchange location.*

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PROCESS

1. Subcommittee members were glad to finally get started with something substantive.
2. The comment was made that If TDOT doesn't use the input and act on it, after all of the public input via the CSS process, they stand to lose all credibility.

ATTENDEES

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

Regional Subcommittee 2 Organization

Nancy Bond	Regional Subcommittee 2
Edgar Faust	Hardin Valley Community
Steve Fritts	TN Technology Corridor Development Authority
Bob Morris	Regional Subcommittee 2
Clyde Ragle	Regional Subcommittee 2
Dale Roberto	Regional Subcommittee 2
Don Shell	Regional Subcommittee 2
Bruce Wuethrich	Knox County Government
Fred Young	Regional Subcommittee 2

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
Luke Eggering	Parsons Transportation
Jon Meadows	TRC International
Jerry Leslie	HW Lochner
Michael Pelphry	HW Lochner

Advisors

Organization

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