

TSPLOST 2018 Program  
Prince Avenue Corridor Improvements: Project 16

User Group Meeting – Minutes  
April 14, 2021 10:00 A.M. - <https://youtu.be/em7DdwAQAAk>

---

**User Group Members Present:** Jennifer Rice, Ellen Walker, Jeanne Connell, Forrest Huffman, Mark Ebell, Stephen Bailey, Clint McCrory, Emily Tatum, Peter Norris, Ilka McConnell, Bruce Lonnee, Daniel Sizemore

**Members Absent:** Emily Tatum, Steve Decker, Tim Griffeth

**Other Staff Present:** Gavin Hassemer, Derek Doster, Diana Jackson, Candace Mobley

**Guests:** Ernie Boughman, John Walker, Erik Hammarlund

**General Business**

Diana Jackson, called the meeting to order at 10:02 A.M., welcomed the members in attendance and thanked them for being present.

**Quorum:** Established quorum was present.

**User Group Actions**

Meeting Minutes Review & Approval – Mark Ebell made a motion to approve the edited March 24, 2021 Minutes and Jeanne Connell seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

User Group agreed to move meeting time moving forward to 9:00 am -10:30 am.

**The below is a brief summary of the key discussion items, not a transcript. The full video is available at the above noted YouTube link. The below notes are only to identify the items discussed and the general order of those discussion to make finding the information on the video easier.**

---

**Moving Meeting Time**

Daniel & Stephen requested moving User Group Meeting time due to conflict with MACORTS. After discussion, the UG agreed to move time to 9:00 am-10:30 am.

**Conversations after February 10, 2021 meeting regarding GDOT Medians**

Erik confirmed that GDOT will repave the entire corridor; however, it is not part of the GDOT safety project that was presented to the UG. Erik will obtain a schedule from the District, so we can make sure that the timing of the re-paving is coordinated with our potential improvements' implementation.

**Updated Bike Lanes Plan Views/Schematics along Milledge to Pulaski – Benesch/Toole**

Ernie presented updated schematics for the directional, separated bike lanes for Pulaski to Barber and Barber to Milledge. The team focused on intersections, transition from intersection to typical cross section, and alternatives for the Pulaski intersection.

The Milledge intersection cross section has some “wobble room” with the bike lane and buffer widths as well to allow for the possibility that the 57' width is not consistent throughout the corridor.

The Barber intersection has many lots with multiple driveway cuts. Mark Ebell wondered how we might go about closing some of them or restricting access. Diana asked Planning if there were any precedents where ACC might have closed them before? Bruce said that, on a case-by-case basis, ACC has closed some as long as it is equitable with the property owner and still allows them access. Stephen said that the use of medians can also restrict access especially for those turning left into establishments. Ernie said that we can also harden centerlines to accomplish the same idea.

Another item brought up was whether or not a bike box should be added at this intersection. Derek wondered if there should be some sort of justification as to when a bike box is used and when it is not, so as to not appear arbitrary. Toole will develop some rationale. It will also be useful with public engagement and education as to how we use them and why. Stephen stated that the more we use this the more we need motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists to understand how we use this. TPW has applied for funds for educational materials for AIM to develop some PSAs.

The Pulaski intersection has tradeoffs required. One alternative eliminates the dedicated vehicular right turn onto Pulaski. This will cause delays. It also provides a two-stage turn queue box for bicyclists going north bound on Pulaski turning west bound onto Prince. Alternately, if we wanted to retain the right turn lane and keep the intersection basically the same for motorists, the bike lane would transition up onto the wide sidewalk on the southwest corner of the intersection like a multi-use path. A third option would be to route cyclists onto Finley Street and then onto Hancock. Mark suggested Newton Street as it is flat. Diana was concerned with the parklet and the bike/ped conflict. Mark thought the shared path might be good especially if you could use the green stenciling to denote which part of the path is for bike vs ped with bike lane on the outside of the path. Peter reminded that, in the past, ACC tried to divert cyclists off the main roads, and that was met with great resistance from the cycling community. He agreed that the shared path is a good compromise but wants us to remember that there is significant foot traffic on that path.

Daniel shared his screen to show the possible roundabout type option for bike movement from the Dutch. Ernie calls them protected intersections – he says that they are capital intensive. Daniel thought perhaps using two corners of it might be interesting.

The UG agrees that this will be the trickiest intersection given the traffic, 100 Prince development and everything else going on. Key will be slowing down the speeds. The long-term goal is for motorists to understand that this is a neighborhood corridor.

Typical curb widths decrease substantially at this section of the corridor. The Pulaski intersection is the linchpin for this portion.

## **Update from Project Concept Subcommittee**

Ellen shared the tabulation of the improvements that were recommended by the past eight studies. This table was sent to the UG's ten voting members. Eight voters returned their preferences and the tallied results were presented. Those earning the highest ratings were shown in light blue – mid block crossings, continuous crosswalks, RRFBs, intersection upgrades, medians, reduced curb cuts, Complete Streets, 3 lane-ing from Barber to Pulaski, bike lanes, public access to Piedmont garage, upgrading traffic signals, removing unused utility poles, Park/Talmadge intersection, King intersection, Milledge intersection, Barber/Finley intersection, Newton/Meigs intersection.

Mark supported the use of items > 2 getting to be on our list of "Must Haves", perhaps enlarging the values of 2-2.5 or 2.99 might be good for "Nice to Haves". Ellen says perhaps 2-2.3 is a better range. Mark would like for the other two members to vote. Peter felt like the survey results reflect the UG desire to implement solutions that have the most immediate impact towards addressing traffic/traffic speeds along the corridor. He feels that the intersections, as a confluence of motorists and pedestrians, are the things we need to address first.

Clint wants the UG to know how we want to pitch this to the public – if safety is our primary importance, we need to make that clear. We do value historic preservation and greenspace, we need to solve safety first. Mark says that drove his voting too. Daniel wondered if there were dollar signs next to the projects, would that have changed their votes? Ellen and other feels that it would not have changed it. Ilka also agreed that a separate path – like a raised bike lane with buffer – would be better for her with a young child, but she’s willing to sacrifice for now with what’s safest for all and what we can afford.

Stephen reminded the group that our documented priorities will move forward to future TSPLOST lists.

Ellen will get last two surveys and update the results/gradations into top 3 tiers. Diana explained that we are on the June 8<sup>th</sup> work session where we are to present our proposed list. Following with that, we will begin public engagement.

## **Public Engagement Ideas from GIO**

Daniel ran through GIO’s email regarding PE. Do we want to more regarding demographics? GIO will present some options for story map at the next meeting. Be thinking about where we want to be conducting outreach.

Ellen said the public engagement options – GPB, ACC channel, NNI, Nextdoor, ACC Inclusion office – are included on the Google Drive.

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk23ClwCyRr-cl1DJBue6bZb\\_jVZx13a/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Qk23ClwCyRr-cl1DJBue6bZb_jVZx13a/edit)

## **Project Schedule**

Next step is to work towards finalizing the UG’s list of Potential Projects and begin thinking about public engagement.

## **Assignment for future meetings**

- Next meeting is April 28, 2021 **from 9-10:30 am**
- Streetlight preferences – *this has been removed as an assignment and tabled for future discussion*
- Draft list of potential projects – update from Project Concept sub-committee
- Public Engagement Options – intro from GIO
- Traffic Count at Pulaski and Prince from TPW
- Other options for speed calming – Ernie and Erik to provide

*These minutes are not a transcript of the meeting but instead is a general summary of the key points, ideas, or considerations from the discussion.*