



**Athens in Motion Commission
Special Called Session**

Tuesday, April 6, 2021 – 4:30-5:30 pm

Online via ACC WebEx:

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wBZPDqGL2_g

PRESENT

Aaron Redman
Mark Ebell
Teresa Friedlander
Lauren Blais
Jake Maas
Craig Topple

Daniel Sizemore (Bike/Ped Coordinator)
Rani Katreeb (TPW)

ABSENT

Roswell Lawrence
James Barlament

- 1. Call to Order**
 - a. Meeting called to order at 4:32pm
- 2. Agenda Additions and Approval**
 - a. Mark asked whether to add the Prince Avenue letter to this agenda. Lauren opted to handle this in the next regular meeting
 - b. Agenda approved (Teresa moved; Mark seconded).
- 3. Public Comment**
 - a. No public comments.
- 4. Barber Street Concept**
 - a. Review of ACC Commission's requests: recommendations re:
 - i. MU Path versus 2-way separated bike facility. Cost came out even, so Staff recommendation is for 2-way separated facility to reduce bike/ped conflict.
 - ii. Priority order for the 4 segments
 - iii. Priority of Barber St. versus other Tier 1 projects
 - b. Timeline: Public comment will be sometime in May. Working on story map and survey. Voting in June. Julie Johnson is spearheading postcard effort, per Rani.
 - c. Teresa presented a Powerpoint she made (16:00 of video).

- i. Melissa Link is concerned that we will run out of money. For her segment 4 is more important than segment 1 to prioritize. Segment 1 could also receive TAD funding.
 - 1. Barber street is the boundary between Commissioner Link's and Commissioner Thornton's districts. Aaron raised this point for equity/transparency.
- d. Daniel stated that most traffic would likely be commuter rather than recreational, which could create more bike/ped conflict if facility is a MU path.
- e. Mark: how effective will bump-outs be at slowing speeds? The raised intersection at Boulevard will definitely slow speeds. Jake: which option does this favor? Daniel: this would favor the cheaper option (no MU path on segment 4), which would save \$1M. The speed limit is currently 35. AiMC thinks it should be lower.
- f. Lauren expressed concern about continuity between segments. Mark is interested in eliminating on-street parking.
- g. Rani: segment 4 has a unique character where ROW is limited. But TPW has not done a comprehensive survey to determine how many retaining walls and other expensive facilities they would need.
- h. The group spent a lot of time discussing and exploring options.
- i. We have money in our budget to fund all 4 segments today. Lauren is less interested in pursuing the project in phases. Lauren wants to connect to Kathwood and Vincent Drive someday. The project will not serve cyclists well if we only build a couple of segments. We should go ahead and spend the money we have; we plan to ask for more money to fund the remaining 30+ tier 1 bike/ped projects. Lauren thinks we should do sharrows for segment 4, and allocate funding for design, ROW, construction for all 4 segments. For priority, it would make more sense to do 1, 2, 3, 4. Mark suggested 3, 2, 1, 4.
- j. We agree that we want 2-way separated bike lanes.
- k. We agree to reduce the 4-lane roadway in segment 1 to 3 lanes.
- l. Craig expressed concerns about using these facilities to get downtown, if children and inexperienced bikers have to use sharrows. Daniel/Aaron: children can use sidewalks to bike, but sidewalk facilities are not good on segment 4. Mark: separated bike lanes would be best, but this is not an option we were presented to vote on. Could sidewalk improvements be a part of this? Rani: no improvements, but maintenance.
- m. Maintain sidewalk between Oneta St. and Loop on east side of road: yes.
- n. Move all segments into preliminary design phase: yes.
- o. Jake: General Time should present opportunities for TAD collection. So maybe section 1 can wait. Lauren: Wayfair is there and GT is there, but this could be used for Greenway connection, extension of bike/ped facilities to Kathwood/Vincent. We are creating momentum for this future phase. Lauren prioritizes section 1. Teresa prioritizes section 4 for connection to high activity on Prince and downtown. Mark agrees that 3 and 4 should be higher priority than 1 and 2. Concerned about connectivity and public acceptance if MU path in segments 1 and 2 is built first and does not connect. Daniel: segment 1 would connect directly to GT's planned development, and they have a desire to connect. If 1 were removed, we could be creating another gap. We are still 3-4 years out with this project; by that time GT may be ready and waiting. Mark: But we're talking about priorities. Need to do the most heavily used. Lauren: but bump-outs and sharrows on section 4 are cheap and will happen. Jake: we should move 4 up since it will be built quickly and people can see that we are prioritizing Barber St.

- p. Lauren moves as follows: AiMC recommends allocating all funds needed for design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction for all 4 segments; we recommend prioritizing the segments in the order 4-3-2-1; we recommend implementing sharrows and bump-outs for segment 4 as proposed; we recommend reducing the segment 1 roadway from 4 to 3 lanes; we recommend a two-way separated bike facility on segments 1, 2, and 3; and we recommend moving the entire project into preliminary design phase. Teresa seconded. **Motion approved unanimously.**
 - q. Jake: we brought up equity. Do we have a disaggregated priority rating system for the AiM Plan? This info is necessary to consider equity in an informed way. Daniel: we have the scores, but not the tools (Daniel needs to review the tools). Jake: final scores by priority element would be very helpful. Daniel will provide a map of priority scores for the next meeting. Aaron was wondering the same thing.
5. Meeting Adjourned at 5:43 pm.