

**New Canada Road**  
**Context Sensitive Solutions**

**CANADA ROAD**  
**ADVISORY TEAM MEETING No. 6**

**September 8, 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  
James Farris  
Mark Hartz  
Paul Houghland  
Tony Neri  
Clayton Rogers  
Jim Schultz  
Pat Smith

### Stakeholder Group

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

### Project Management Team - Present

Robert Wherry  
Philip Stuckert  
Emily Boswell  
J. Higbee  
Nick Bridgeman  
Michael Morrissett  
Joe Matlock  
Tim Flinn  
Ted Fox  
Mike Oakes  
Nisha Powers  
Steve Hill  
John Pankey  
Matthew Waddell

### Stakeholder Group

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

### Others present:

Sajid Hossain  
Carlos McCloud  
Rick Gafford  
Jesse Coley  
Mr. and Mrs. Robert Hamilton  
Gayle Forsythe  
Jim Forsythe

Memphis Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Memphis Metropolitan Planning Organization  
Fisher & Arnold  
Powers Hill Design  
Lakeland Residents  
Lakeland Resident  
Lakeland Resident

## Opening Comments

Philip Stuckert of the City of Lakeland began the meeting at 2:10 p.m. Mr. Stuckert verified that everyone had an agenda and thanked them for coming. He reminded the Advisory Team that they had a long agenda, and a lot of important decisions would be made during the meeting.

Mr. Stuckert introduced Nisha Powers of Powers Hill Design to discuss the results of the previous Public Workshop.

## Public Workshop Results

Ms. Powers welcomed those present, and informed them that a couple of Advisory Team members were running late and would be coming in later. She thanked the visitors in attendance for their interest, and noted that participation is limited to Team members.

Before beginning the presentation of the Public Workshop results, Ms. Powers started with a discussion about some public comments that had been received concerning the CSS Process. Some of the public comments indicated that the CSS Process was not fairly performed, and the decisions regarding alignments were predetermined. Ms. Powers asked the Team for their input regarding the CSS process and the public comments. Most team members affirmed that the process had been fairly conducted. Some noted that they have had an opportunity to go back and forth as a Team and discuss all issues that had been raised, and that was the purpose of the meetings. One team member indicated that some of the Public at the Public Workshop saw the Team as “window dressing.”

Ms. Powers stated that the format for Public Workshops was chosen to optimize the ability to convey information to the Public by encouraging conversations in an intimate setting. This was intended to be more constructive than an open Q&A session. The process was not meant to malign, but to address the Public’s concerns one-on-one. Also, Questionnaires were distributed to receive input and that input has not been disregarded or ignored.

One Team member stated that process was not perceived that way, and instead perception was that the choices had been narrowed too quickly.

Ms. Powers stated that the Team took the lead from input gathered at the first Public Workshop. All input from the public and the Advisory Team has been considered, and all possible options that were presented were explored and discussed in detail. She reminded that it was not the Management Team’s role to make decisions.

The other Advisory Team members agreed that they have looked at all possible options, and that the CSS process has been fair and productive.

Ms. Powers then discussed the information gathered from Public Workshop No. 2. She addressed the packets that were distributed to each Team member containing a copy of the

Questionnaire that was presented to the public, a summary of the results from the Questionnaires, and comments from the public.

Responses came from both paper copies of the questionnaire that were either returned at the Public Workshop or mailed in to Powers Hill Design, as well as from the online version of the questionnaire that was available on the project website. There were 115 valid responses in all.

Question 1: Are you a Lakeland resident?

98.3% of responders said yes.

Question 2: Do you own a business or undeveloped property near the Project Limits?

95.7% said no.

Question 3: How often do you travel this section of Canada Road in a week?

81.7% of responders indicated that they travel it more than 10 times in a week. 13.9% said 5 to 10 times per week, and 4.3% of responders travel the section less than 5 times per week.

Question 4: Based on information presented at the Canada Road Public Workshop No.2, which alternative do you prefer?

52.2% of the responders preferred Alternative A; 47.8% preferred Alternative C. Ms. Powers and the Team acknowledged the close margin.

Question 5: Based on information presented at the Canada Road Public Workshop No.2, which Bicycle/Pedestrian path do you prefer?

54.8% prefer a varying path (between meandering and straight), while 30.4% prefer a straight path, and 14.8% prefer a meandering path.

Question 6: Rank three different typical sections from 1 to 5 (support or not support)

46.1% of responders support the Residential 108' ROW Typical Section. 45.2% showed support for the Residential 96' ROW Typical Section (through Plantation Hills and Woodbridge). 52.1% did not support the Commercial 116' ROW Typical Section (for commercial zones only).

The Questionnaire also sought comments regarding the Context Sensitive Solutions process, proposed road improvements, alternatives, typical sections, and any other additional comments. The Team members were given the comments that were compiled. The identities of those that completed the Questionnaires were not provided.

The Team asked if there were any Questionnaires that were thrown out. Jesse Coley of Powers Hill Design indicated that there was one survey that did not have a name and had an invalid address. That Questionnaire was discarded as it did not meet the proper requirements. Ms. Powers stated that they were diligent in making certain that all accepted Questionnaires were valid using the Property Assessor's website to crosscheck names and addresses.

Ms. Powers asked for input from the Team regarding the Commercial Typical Section. Since it did not receive a favorable response from the Public, she wanted to know if the Team knew possible reasons why it was not found favorable and if the Team wanted to revise that Typical Section. Team members indicated it was possible that the Public didn't understand that it only applies to the Commercial land use which exists on the south and north ends of the road.

### **Special Area Transportation Study**

Since there was concern from the Public regarding the need for a 4-lane road, Ms. Powers asked Mr. Stuckert to discuss the Special Area Transportation Study. Mr. Stuckert presented the Special Area Transportation Study that was done by Kimley-Horn. The study was not necessarily related to the Canada Road project, but in 2004 it was calling for Canada Road to be a 6-lane road. In the 2006 plan, Canada Road had been reduced to a 4-lane road.

Mr. Stuckert pointed out that the study based its rationale on land use that would influence the roadway and on maintaining a Level of Service (LOS) of "C" or better. The plan was modeled after the traffic planning program and was adopted by the Planning Commission in 2009. Mr. Stuckert then circulated the report for Team members to view. Ms. Powers indicated that the Team would be hearing more about LOS later in the meeting.

A Team member asked if the model assumes constant traffic flow or decaying based on road section. Mr. Stuckert replied that it shows actual volumes at build-out. The report shows 30,000 vehicles per day at I-40 at build-out, and 20,000 vehicles per day at Hwy. 70. He also mentioned that the upcoming traffic lights at the intersection of Canada Road & I-40 would bring increased traffic to the road. The Team asked if there was a timeline for full build-out. Mr. Stuckert replied that it is unknown.

### **Forest Survey and Impacts**

Nick Bridgeman of the City of Lakeland presented the Forest Survey and Impacts and the Canada Road Natural Resources Survey. A map integrating an inventory of natural resources with an assessment, with priority ranking for each section was presented. The full extent of impact will not be known until the end of construction. He indicated that not all natural resources are contained in this sample, and the study is meant to be preliminary and comparative with full details to be included in the upcoming environmental studies.

Mr. Bridgeman noted the problems with the local deer population, and diminishing carrying capacity to the point that disease within the population will become a major concern. When the Team inquired as to how the population may be relocated or controlled, Mr. Bridgeman stated that there is not enough hunting being done to control the herd, and TWRA investigates and enforces matters related to the deer population.

Team members were shown ten inventory plots on each corridor and given their density, priority, value, and amount of specimen trees. A specimen tree is defined as being of good

health quality, having at least a 15 year life expectancy, and free of disease and infestation. For the most part, both corridors' plots were heavily fragmented and of low value.

Mr. Bridgeman contrasted the concepts of conservation and preservation by noting that nothing is static and that it is an ever-changing dynamic. The fragmentation of the natural resources through the corridors has fueled problems, and the areas of small micro-stands can be saved. He noted that no matter what, there will be a loss of trees in the area due to the new codes.

A Team member asked Mr. Bridgeman if he felt that the value of the natural resources along one corridor outweighed the other. Mr. Bridgeman replied that he did not believe one outweighed the other. He explained that Lakeland focuses on the connectivity and functionality of the resource. The area is fairly fragmented and has low connectivity value, and connectivity was of high value to the public based on surveys.

Mr. Bridgeman indicated that the full extent of resource impact will not be known until the actual end of construction. Not all natural resources can be obtained in a sample. The study is meant to be preliminary and comparative, with full details to be determined during the environmental studies required on federal projects.

### **Overall Roadway Elements**

Mr. Pankey presented overall roadway elements to the Team. He started by briefly going over the Special Area Transportation Study as discussed by Mr. Stuckert. He said the road is needed because the future build-out shows 30,000 vehicles per day at I-40 and 20,000 at Hwy. 70. He noted that the volume capacity is for the overall roadway segment, and does not include intersections and driveways. The current traffic volume is 7,000 vehicles per day.

Mr. Pankey presented to Team members the differing Levels of Service (LOS) for roadways. The levels range from "A" to "F", "A" through "C" being acceptable and "D" through "F" being unacceptable. The existing Canada Road has a LOS of "C", notably being for volume and capacity only and not the travel time from north to south or delays in getting out of subdivisions. The LOS is lower for side streets currently.

The LOS general definitions are as follows: "A" is free-flow traffic, "B" is reasonably unimpeded, "C" is stable traffic with intersection delays, "D" has small delays, "E" has significant delays, "F" has extremely slow traffic.

He noted that the I-40 interchange is currently hampering traffic flow. The new interchange will bring increased volume, and if no improvements are made to the road, the LOS will fall into the "E" or "F" range.

Mr. Pankey mentioned that if engineers were only 50% accurate, and full build-out is 15,000 vehicles per day, then the 2-lane road's LOS would fall to the "D" or "E" range. The LOS for a

4-lane road rises to “B” at 15,000 vehicles per day, versus “C” for the original build-out estimate of 30,000 vehicles per day.

Team members inquired about when Lakeland expects to reach full build-out. J. Higbee of the City of Lakeland indicated that it would probably not be within the next 10 years. Other members of the team stated their belief that the new interchange will bring noticeable traffic increases. Ms. Powers reaffirmed to the Team that the Project Management Team had discussed volumes at great length to make sure that the numbers are reasonable. She said that even at half the projected volume, a 4-lane road would be recommended.

Mr. Stuckert indicated that there isn’t an estimate on traffic increase due to the interchange, but the Preliminary Design phase is moving forward.

Mr. Pankey and Ms. Powers gave the Team members a brief recap of the two Alternatives and Typical Sections. Ms. Powers sought input from the Team as to whether they wanted to make any changes to the Typical Section for Commercial areas based on public comments.

The Team decided to add language specifying that the Commercial 116’ ROW Typical Section only relates to non-residential, commercial sections of the route.

Mr. Pankey presented to the Team an updated Decision Matrix for the project. To clear up the any miscommunication, the new matrix differentiates “affected homes” from “severely impacted homes”, and lists data for each as well as providing definitions.

Since the Decision Matrix reflected Alternative A, Alternative C and Modified Alternative C, Ms. Powers asked if the original Alternative C could be eliminated since we have made the changes the Team requested in the Modified Alternative C.

The Team agreed to eliminate Alternative C from the matrix and keep Alternative C Modified.

### **Draft Language for Team Recommendation**

After a short break, Ms. Powers reconvened the meeting, and thanked Emily Boswell for bringing hors d'oeuvres for the Team. It was especially appreciated since this meeting would last over 4 hours.

Ms. Powers presented the Team with the draft cover page of the Team Recommendations document that would be submitted to the Board of Commissioners. She then presented the draft second page which contained basic items such as Project Overview, Team Members, Team Mission, Goals and Chronology and Process of the project.

Ms. Powers presented the draft third page of the Team Recommendations displaying both Alternative A and Alternative C Modified. After lengthy discussion regarding the Team’s concerns about each alternative, she worked with the Team to build consensus on a preferred

Alternative. This was based on the understanding that if the Team opted to go with Alternative A, the concerns of those who favored Alternative C Modified would be addressed adequately.

The Team selected Alternative A as their preferred Alternative. They also maintained the 96' Residential, 108' Residential, and 116' Commercial as their preferred Typical Sections.

Ms. Powers presented the third page of the Team Recommendations with Alternative A and basic elements related to Alternative A including Typical Sections.

She then asked for the Team's specific concerns about Alternative A which are listed below:

- Speed along a "straight-away"
- Safety at access points to existing subdivisions
- Property impacts
- Noise impacts
- Pedestrian safety

Ms. Powers summarized that those concerns would be addressed during this meeting in the following ways, and received concurrence from the Team:

- Incorporate traffic calming measures to reduce speed of drivers
- Provide measures to increase safety for pedestrians
- Provide refuge by means of median to address safety
- Mitigate property impacts

In response to the Team's concerns about safety, especially through Plantation Hills and Woodbridge, Mr. Pankey presented a rendering of various traffic calming features. The median serves as a refuge for pedestrians while crossing the road, serves to slow traffic, has a curb to keep drivers' attention, and can vary in width. Pavers differing in color and texture from the roadway can be used for crosswalks so that drivers get the sense that they are entering a residential area. Also, walls or fences on corner properties serve as a buffer to residents as well as prompting motorists that they are in a residential area. The need for noise barriers will be determined during the Environmental Study.

Team members asked if the current budget supported the traffic calming features and if the aesthetics were part of funding. Joe Matlock of TDOT stated that the cost of pavers isn't much different from pavement. In addition, aesthetics is part of the Environmental Process, and he urged the Team to put these things into the document for FHWA consideration for approval. Ms. Powers stated that the Project Management Team had anticipated the traffic calming features and had spoken with TDOT about feasibility. Their response has been positive because the suggestions are a result of the CSS Process.

Items such as speed bumps and stop signs were also discussed, but after further discussion, it was determined that they would not be effective in achieving traffic calming in this instance.

Reduction of the speed limit was also discussed. Mr. Pankey indicated that his recommendation would be to maintain a consistent speed throughout the route and that 35 MPH was a good compromise.

The Team was shown a modified version of Alternative A that included a curved road section between Plantation Hills and Woodbridge with a 35 MPH design speed. It was explained that the curved road would serve to slow traffic through the subdivisions. Some access points in the area would change with this modification.

Team members supported these design changes and agreed to modify Alternative A to reflect the changes. Consensus was reached on moving forward with Alternative A with entrance features, textured intersections, crosswalks and walls.

A Team member indicated that it was the desire of area residents to eliminate the Laurel Hill Drive connection to Canada Road to reduce access points and increase safety. The Team and City staff agreed to eliminate this access point.

The Team discussed the pros and cons of brick fences to serve as a buffer between existing residential lots and the proposed road. The Team reached consensus to recommend a 6' brick fence in compliance with City of Lakeland codes for the existing residential properties at William Little Drive and Owl Hill Drive.

Ms. Powers asked the Team if they concurred with Alternative A with the changes as discussed above. The Team reached consensus on these items.

The Team discussed raised medians versus depressed medians. It was determined that they would prefer raised medians, but would defer the final decision to the design team during preliminary design. The addition or reduction of access points along the roadway were also deferred to the preliminary design phase.

While the team took a break after discussing the Draft Team Recommendations, Ms. Powers made the appropriate revisions as suggested by the Team, and presented the Team Recommendations to the Team for their approval.

The Team reached consensus on the Team Recommendations document, and the 13 members present signed the document.

Some members of the Team expressed concerns over the speed limit and pedestrian crossings, as well as safety in general due to the splitting of a subdivision. Although they concurred with the Team Recommendations, they shared their desire to have their concerns noted as part of the Recommendations. Ms. Powers offered those members the opportunity to include a Minority Report, and worked with them on drafting language.

A Minority Report was drafted and presented to the Team. The Team agreed with the inclusion of this Report with the Team Recommendations.

### **Public Workshop**

Ms. Powers reminded those present that the final Public Workshop of the CSS Process will be held Tuesday, September 29, 2009, at 6 p.m. at IH Managerial Park.

The first half of the Public Workshop will be a presentation of the CSS results and the Team Recommendations. The second half will be the first meeting of the NEPA Process.

Team members will continue to be engaged throughout the ongoing NEPA Process and on through design and construction.

Mr. Stuckert noted that the Team's Recommendations would be going to the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners subject to the NEPA findings.

### **Closing Comments**

The meeting adjourned at 6:41 p.m.