

New Canada Road

Context Sensitive Solutions

CANADA ROAD ADVISORY TEAM

PARTNERING MEETING No. 5

June 30, 2009

International Harvester Managerial Park – Lakeland, TN

Nisha Powers, Facilitator

ATTENDEES

Advisory Team - Present

Dianne Baldi
Tom Benke
Randy Brockwell
Shirlee Clark
Bob Elliott
Alison Ely
Mark Hartz
Paul Houghland
Tony Neri
Clayton Rogers
Jim Schultz

Stakeholder Group

Planning Commission
Windward Slopes HOA
North Property Owner
At-Large Member
At-Large Member
Lakeland Estates HOA
Board of Commissioners
Davies Plantation HOA
Naturals Resources Board
Parks & Recreation Board
Plantation Hills HOA

Project Management Team - Present

Philip Stuckert
Emily Boswell
J. Higbee
Eric Bridges
Nick Bridgeman
Michael Morrissett
Joe Matlock
Cindy Patton
Tim Flinn
Ted Fox
Nisha Powers
Steve Hill
John Pankey
Matthew Waddell

Stakeholder Group

City Engineer
Staff Engineer
Growth Management Director
Natural Resources Board Director
Natural Resources Board Technician
Code Enforcement Inspector
Technical Advisor – TDOT
Technical Advisor – TDEC
Technical Advisor – COE
Technical Advisor – Shelby County
Consultant – Powers Hill Design
Consultant – Powers Hill Design
Consultant – Fisher and Arnold
Consultant – Fisher and Arnold

Others present:

Sajid Hossain, Memphis Metropolitan Planning Organization
Carlos McCloud, Memphis Metropolitan Planning Organization
Rick Gafford, Fisher & Arnold
Jesse Coley, Powers Hill Design

Opening Comments

Philip Stuckert of the City of Lakeland opened the meeting at 3:05 p.m. Nisha Powers of Powers Hill Design welcomed everyone. She reminded them that the previous meeting ran late. With that in mind and the current meeting having a lengthy agenda, she had scheduled this meeting to end at 6:30 p.m. However, she recognized that another meeting was scheduled for 6:30 p.m. that involves the Board of Commissioners, Planning Commission and City Planning Staff, and she advised that anyone involved in that meeting can leave when necessary.

Review consensus for Typical Sections for further evaluation

Ms. Powers reviewed items on which the Advisory Team members had reached consensus during the previous meeting. The Team concluded by consensus that their desire was to utilize 12' lanes through commercial sections of the new road and 11' lanes through the residential sections.

Concerning lane widths, Ms. Powers then presented the Advisory Team members with the typical sections for the two alternatives that they had decided on at the last meeting. The commercial typical section is the same for both Alternatives A & C, and has 12' lane widths. The residential typical section has 11' lane widths for both Alternatives A & C. John Pankey of Fisher & Arnold reminded the Advisory Team members that for a 35 MPH urban boulevard, 10' to 11' lanes are the recommended widths. Advisory Team members liked the wider 12' lanes on commercial portions in order to provide more room for turning movements for trucks.

A concern was shared by a Team member that varying lane widths for commercial and residential sections could be challenging for drivers. Ms. Powers reminded the Team that the commercial/mixed use sections only existed on either end of the project, and lane widths can be transitioned easily to accommodate drivers.

Ms. Powers asked for further indication from the Team of consensus regarding lane widths. Lane widths (12' for commercial and 11' for residential) were unanimously approved by the Team.

Ms. Powers advised that the design speed of the project (not the posted speed limit) is 40 mph. There were no objections from the Team. Ms. Powers noted that a raised median will be used unless drainage requirements, environmental conditions or other factors require the use of depressed medians. The Team members were in agreement with that approach.

The existing Comprehensive Plan for Lakeland includes a scenic corridor along the northern portion of Canada Road. The scenic corridor includes the requirement of a 50' buffer zone along the properties fronting on the road. This will not affect the proposed right of way (ROW) of Canada Road, but will be imposed on the properties that adjoin it. In addition to the

Comprehensive Plan, the design is also taking into consideration Lakeland's pending Land Development Regulations. One such element is a recommended 9' planting zone adjacent to the curb designed to accommodate street trees.

Additionally, Ms. Powers noted that connectivity for bike and pedestrian paths will be provided along the route of the project.

Ms. Powers explained that the Team's recommendations from the last meeting have been taken, tweaked, and incorporated into what will be presented by the design team.

Typical Sections and Photos

Matthew Waddell of Fisher & Arnold presented the various typical sections that had been developed since the previous meeting with the recommendations made by the Team. Handouts of these sections were provided to the Team. The pending regulations show a 108' ROW, with 11' or 12' lanes, a landscape zone, off-street 10' bike/ped paths, and a raised median.

Mr. Waddell first presented a 108' ROW with 12' lanes, 8' landscape zones, 10' straight bike/ped paths, and a 16' raised median. Next was a 108' ROW with 11' lanes, 9' landscape zones, 10' straight bike/ped paths, and an 18' raised median. A 10' meandering bike/ped path was also shown that left a minimum of 4.5' between the path and the road. The meandering path was shown to provide a means of planting trees along the path and still meet FHWA clear zone requirements. Also, this would allow the City to seek federal dollars for funding the bike/ped path in the future, as the current funding does not pay for landscaping.

The FHWA policy on having no trees larger than 4" in diameter planted within the clear zone of the road was discussed in detail. For Canada Road, this clear zone extends to 14' from the edge of the lane. When the project is complete, however, the City of Lakeland can use its own money or procure grant money elsewhere to plant trees as it sees fit.

Ms. Powers asked Mr. Pankey for clarification regarding timeline of when the City can plant trees – upon completion of this project. Mr. Pankey indicated they can start work as soon as this project is closed-out and the last check is issued by TDOT.

Next, a 108' ROW was shown with a 96' reduced section. The reduced section allows for flexibility through subdivisions such as Plantation Hills or Woodbridge, where the full 108' section would not be used. It includes a 14' raised median, 11' lanes, 5' landscape zones, and the 10' bike/ped paths. The Team was also shown a 100' reduced section with 12' lanes.

Mr. Waddell then presented a commercial section with a 116' ROW. It includes 12' lanes, a 14' raised median, 20' combined bike/ped and landscape zones, and 3' outside buffers. Another commercial section with 11' lanes and an 18' median was also shown.

As per the Advisory Team's request from the previous meeting, Mr. Waddell had examples of some existing roadway typical sections with photographs. The examples given were: Existing Canada Road, Humphreys Boulevard, Rock Creek Parkway, and Poplar Avenue.

Mr. Stuckert then informed the Advisory Team members that it has been the ad hoc policy of Lakeland staff to recommend a 9' landscape zone along roads to provide room for full-sized street trees adjacent to the roadway to provide shade to the streets. While this contradicts the 14' clear zone policy of FHWA, Mr. Stuckert reiterated that it only means they can't get federal funding for trees.

J. Higbee of the City of Lakeland discussed the importance of street trees in the current city zoning ordinance and current regulations. Mr. Higbee said that Lakeland citizens have given feedback demonstrating a strong interest in trees and unique roadways. The end product of the new road design, according to Mr. Higbee, should be a uniquely Lakeland road.

There were some concerns voiced by the Team about the safety issues and utility impacts of street trees.

Typical Sections Discussion

Ms. Powers led the Advisory Team members in a discussion concerning typical sections that had been presented.

Team members unanimously decided that the 116' ROW commercial typical section with 12' lanes should be further incorporated into the Alternatives.

They then discussed the 96' reduced section that could be used through Plantation Hills/Woodbridge. With only 5' between the road and bike/ped path, there will not be sufficient room to plant street trees. The outside buffer between the reduced section and the full 108' ROW could be used for trees.

The Advisory Team members chose the 108' ROW with 11' lanes to be incorporated into the design for the residential sections. The Team discussed the alignment of the 10' bike/ped path, with some members favoring a straight path, some preferring a meandering path and others suggesting that both options be used at different locations along Canada Road. The meandering path allows the use of federal money for landscaping because it creates opportunities to plant trees outside the 14' clear zone. Mr. Higbee advised that the straight path is in keeping with City Policy because it results in trees being close enough to the road to provide shade to the roadway, which is the intent of having "street trees."

Ms. Powers emphasized to the Team that Lakeland's new development standards have not been finalized, and that the Team can include all options (straight, meandering or a combination of both types of bike/ped path) in the narrative section of their final

recommendations. She suggested that an option can be finalized during the preliminary design of the project after the development standards are approved by the Board of Commissioners. There were some concerns voiced by the Team over the ramifications of having different options at the time the project is bid. Ms. Powers pointed out that the decision between options would be made by the design team during the preliminary design phase (35% complete). The bike/ped issues will be addressed and defined before the project is issued for bids. The Team agreed with the concept of including the narrative as suggested by Ms. Powers.

The Team agreed to include the bike/ped options in the presentation at the upcoming Public Workshop to gauge public opinion on this issue.

The Team members were concerned about planning for utilities along the new road as well as possible interference between utilities and street trees. Ms. Powers noted that the ROW would have to be increased if the Team desires to make provisions for a utility easement within the ROW. The Team members decided to leave the ROW at 108'. Mr. Stuckert advised the Team that developments that occur along Canada Road will be required to make provisions for utilities within each development outside of the ROW of Canada Road. He assured them that there will be no extended utilities within the right of way of the new road. Existing utility lines along Old Canada Road will remain.

Some Advisory Team members asked why there was no street lighting planned for the project. They were informed that the City of Lakeland does not provide street lighting. Although there was some concern about safety at night that was voiced, there was no strong opposition by team members to omitting lighting along the new road.

Presentation of Alternatives A & C and South Leg for further evaluation

At the previous Advisory Team Meeting, some members had voiced concern over the removal of a portion of Old Canada Road between Leeward Slopes Drive and Green Spruce Drive in the south leg of Alternative A. Some members expressed a desire to retain neighborhood connectivity (both vehicular and pedestrian) between Windward Slopes and Lakeland Estates. Mr. Waddell explained that leaving this section of Canada Road in place in Alternative A creates an unsafe intersection at Leeward Slopes Drive. He then presented a detailed view of the potentially unsafe intersection.

Mr. Waddell then presented a revised south leg with a single connector road, eliminating traffic concerns while maintaining connectivity between the two subdivisions along Old Canada Road. Ms. Powers noted that one of the Team Project Goals was to address access to neighborhoods. After discussion, the team agreed to adopt the revised south leg for Alternative A.

Mr. Pankey presented the current Alternatives A & C with slope limits defined. Cut and fill lines along and outside of the ROW were also presented. This illustrated impacts to properties

outside the ROW. Alternative A eliminates 2 homes and has no other severe impacts. Alternative C eliminates 2 homes and has 18 severe impacts on other homes.

Alternatives Discussion

Ms. Powers led the Team in a discussion evaluating the information given to them concerning the two Alternatives.

Eric Bridges of the City of Lakeland commented that Fisher & Arnold had made an effort to maximize slopes for optimum road grades, thereby reducing the amount of cut or fill to the greatest extent possible.

The 96' reduced section at Plantation Hills/Woodbridge in Alternative C was discussed by Team members. Due to the requirements of the 10' bike/ped path, and the little difference in impact between an 86' and 96' reduced section, it was decided to continue forward using the 96' reduced section.

A team member asked if the "no-build" alternative was still being considered. Mr. Pankey noted that the NEPA document must include the "no-build" alternative. However, based on traffic projections for Canada Road, this was not a feasible alternative. Joe Matlock with TDOT noted that, if the "no-build" alternative is recommended and accepted by FHWA, then "case-closed". The City could not come back to FHWA later and request to rescind this decision.

Public Workshop No. 2

Ms. Powers indicated that several of the items discussed at this meeting were in an effort to prepare for the next Public Workshop. It was agreed by the Team that an aerial view of Alternatives A & C will be shown on poster boards with impacted properties clearly identified. The Team also indicated their desire to showing the cut & fill lines as presented at the meeting along with the accompanying charts.

For sake of comparison, The Team asked that Fisher & Arnold revise data which would reflect a 96' ROW (not typical section) where existing homes are most impacted to determine whether using the reduced ROW lessens the impact to homes and properties. The Team agreed that Typical Sections will also be shown with additional information on the impacts based on 96' reduced ROW through Plantation Hills/Woodbridge.

Fisher & Arnold will have visualizations (consisting of aerial photos from oblique angles with the Alternatives superimposed on the photos) available for Advisory Team members at Lakeland City Hall in the care of Mr. Stuckert. The anticipated availability of the visualizations is Wednesday, July 22, 2009. Team members felt that it was not mandatory that they see the

visualizations prior to the Public Workshop, but they were encouraged to visit City Hall and look at them prior to the Workshop.

The next New Canada Road Public Workshop will be on **Tuesday, July 28, 2009**. Information about the workshop will be made available to the public via flyers, brochures, handouts, QNET, newcanadaroad.com, etc.

Decision Matrix Presentation

Mr. Pankey presented a decision matrix comparing Alternatives A and C.

Both alternatives have a 40 mph design speed.

Alternative A has 25 access points (including side streets and driveways); Alternative C has 39 access points.

Alternative A is 2.33 miles long; Alternative C is 2.26 miles long.

Considering environmental impacts, the forestry impact of Alternative A is 13.2 acres removed due to roadway, and it has no cultural impacts. Alternative C has 7.3 acres of forestry impact and a possible gravesite as a cultural impact.

The ROW impact of Alternative A is 22.9 acres. The ROW impact for Alternative C is 18.6 acres.

Alternative A has a construction easement impact of 13.1 acres. Alternative C has a construction easement impact of 10.5 acres.

Alternative A eliminates 2 homes, and has no other severe property impacts. Alternative C eliminates 2 homes and severely impacts 18 other homes.

Decision Matrix Discussion

It was suggested by the Team that Fisher & Arnold should add notes to indicate acreage of forestry that will be eliminated (regardless of this project) due to development.

Mr. Joe Matlock assured the Team that if there is a gravesite confirmed in the path of Alternative C, there is a process for dealing with it even if the gravesite is found much later in the project development.

The decision matrix will be available at the Public Workshop, but will not be part of the formal presentation per the will of the Team.

Next Steps and Closing Comments

Mr. Matlock noted that if a cemetery exists, a scope for archaeology will be provided, and there is a TDOT/FHWA process that will be followed. He suggested there be a landscaping scenario included with the NEPA document submitted to FHWA, and this information has been provided to Fisher & Arnold. FHWA will then decide what can be funded. If there are any funding issues, FHWA will notify Lakeland of them. If non-standard design items are included, FHWA will find them during their review. He advised the group that the NEPA process will start in September.

The meeting concluded at 6:15pm.