

**REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE
SECTION 4
MEETING #1 REPORT**

**KNOXVILLE
PARKWAY
CONTEXT SENSITIVE
SOLUTIONS**

REGIONAL SUBCOMMITTEE 4



October 7, 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 4 was held on October 7, 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 4. The issues identified were as follows:

CRITICAL ISSUES

- Environmental and cultural issues were discussed during the meeting. Noise levels and the best way to abate Noise, light pollution, water supply and cave issues as well as concerns for local wildlife were subcommittee subjects. There was concern for preserving historic sites.
- Subcommittee members were also interested in knowing the overall timeframe for property purchases and property consolidations as well as the timeframe for utility relocation efforts.
- Members of the subcommittee were uniformly opposed to billboards
- Concerns were expressed for anticipated lifestyle changes, which would be necessary due to construction of the parkway.
- The question of how much influence subcommittee members will have over the placement of interchanges was discussed.
- Local roads will need improvements in conjunction with the construction of the parkway. The question of who is responsible for upgrading local roads was posed.
- There was some discussion concerning access and safety issues associated with providing schools in an area experiencing growth and development.
- Subcommittee members were concerned about potential construction cost overruns.

GENERAL COMMENTS

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

Interchange suggestions:

There was a significant amount of discussion concerning interchanges; the need for them or lack of need, and proposed locations.

1. It was noted that there is no opposition to the proposed Clinton Highway Interchange. Some of the subcommittee members felt that an interchange at Clinton Highway makes sense whereas the proposed Raccoon Valley interchange is not needed. However, since some committee members favor the proposed interchange at Raccoon Valley Road, it should be further explored and submitted to future public comment.
2. There were some second thoughts about the Raccoon Valley interchange due to the fact that if it is needed and it is not built when the parkway is constructed, it would be very difficult if not impossible to persuade TDOT to add at a future date.
3. The subcommittee noted that one benefit to having interchanges is that it improves Emergency vehicle access to local residents.
4. One sentiment expressed by a subcommittee member was that interchanges are not needed and that they work against the purpose and need of the project by making the parkway less of a through route.

Other Comments:

1. Issues concerning caves in the area were discussed. In many cases, the caves can be avoided and preserved.
2. Subcommittee members pointed out that the King Cemetery as well as other cemeteries located within this section of the corridor need to be avoided.
3. Additionally, flood studies are needed in the vicinity of the King Cemetery in order to avoid floodways and possible flood plains.
4. Subcommittee members were interested in making the parkway fit within the natural terrain. The scenic nature of the parkway could be enhanced by placing the alignment along a ridge top or on the side of a hill
5. As with other subcommittees, the members of this subcommittee were concerned about maintaining access to individual properties.

CROSS SECTION FOOTPRINT

- Issues concerning the cross section footprint revolved around the need to take up as little land as possible for the parkway and interchanges. It was noted that independent roadways help absorb some noise and are more scenic. It was suggested that the consultant team should look to see if any areas could benefit from independent roadways. In addition, future additional lanes can be built in medians.
- Concerns were expressed that the parkway would be outdated before it's built and that the relative costs of building 4 lanes should be compared to initially building 6 lanes. Another option discussed was that of purchasing 6-lanes of right of way but only building 4 lanes initially. Subcommittee members wanted to know whether it is cheaper to build more lanes initially to avoid rising land costs in the future when additional right of way would be more expensive? At the least, the committee could agree that bridges should be built wide enough for 6 lanes.

DESIGN SPEED

- There were questions concerning what would be the major impacts of a 60 MPH design speed vs. a 70 MPH design speed. One comment from a subcommittee member was that if the parkway is designated a scenic highway, the speeds would be slower. A related question was about how speed affects noise levels. Approximately half of the group thought 70 MPH speeds would be acceptable.

REASONS FOR ALIGNMENT SHIFT @ WOLF VALLEY ROAD

- 1. The alternate alignment could affect fewer residents along Wolf Valley Road.*
- 2. The alternate uses vacant property vs. occupied property.*
- 3. The alternate moves away from Wolf Valley Church and Cemetery.*
- 4. The alternate eliminates 2 curves from the overall project resulting in a potentially safer roadway.*
- 5. The alternate provides a less skewed crossing of Wolf Valley Road, which could result in a shorter, less expensive bridge*

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE PROCESS

- Subcommittee members suggested that it would help to know the opinions of individual property owners in the area.
- It was felt that providing visualizations and perhaps “fly throughs” would be very helpful to subcommittee members prior to making recommendations.
- It was stated that subcommittee members need to keep in mind that they make recommendations but not make decisions.

ATTENDEES

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

Regional Subcommittee 4 Organization

Dan Arp	Regional Subcommittee 4
Stephen Doyle	Regional Subcommittee 4
Jennifer Green	Regional Subcommittee 4
Vicki Long	Regional Subcommittee 4
Don Madgett	Regional Subcommittee 4
Bill Mc Master	Heiskell Community
Mac Post	Powell Community
Robert Shaw	Citizens Against the Beltway Orange Location
Sharon Todd	Claxton Community
David Lambert	Better Roads In North Knoxville

TDOT

	Title
Ataur Rahman	TDOT Design
Mike Russell	Transportation Manager, TDOT, Region 1, Project Management

Consultants

	Company
Gary Bates	Roemaker Bates Group - Facilitator
David Lindeman	Palmer Engineering - CSS Consultant
Bob Kennedy	Palmer Engineering
Stephen Sewell	Palmer Engineering
Pat Alexander	HMB Professional Engineers
Steve Drummer	Allen & Hoshall
Kassie Holmes	Allen & Hoshall
Greg Green	Robert B. Campbell & Associates
Robert Garrett	Robert B. Campbell & Associates
Robert Campbell	Robert B. Campbell & Associates