

TSPLOST 2018 Program
Prince Avenue Corridor Improvements: Project 16

User Group Meeting – Minutes
May 12, 2021 9:00 A.M. - <https://youtu.be/b0DX6VCyxx4>

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

Members Absent: Emily Tatum

Other Staff Present: Jeff Montgomery, Tommy Thurmond, Tim Griffeth, Steve Decker, Joseph D'Angelo, Gavin Hassemer, Derek Doster, Keith Sanders, Diana Jackson

Guests: Ernie Boughman, John Walker, Erik Hammarlund

General Business

Diana Jackson, called the meeting to order at 9:02 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 – Ellen Walker made a motion to approve the edited April 28, 2021 Minutes and Jennifer Rice seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Mark Ebell made a motion that the UG will put forward the entire body of projects that the UG prioritized to commemorate all items that were reviewed. Ellen Walker seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Ellen Walker made a motion that GIO office will begin building out the public engagement survey for the pedestrian improvements. Peter Norris seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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.

TPW Review of Draft Project List

Stephen Bailey stated that TPW reviewed the list as a whole and didn't find anything that they would call immediately infeasible. However, they would like to complete actual traffic studies on some of these to find out the limitations of what might be done.

Tim Griffeth talked through the bullet points. Some of the projects that were identified where TPW would like to see traffic studies would be: center raised medians, 3-lane conversions, speed reductions, intersection upgrades, and turn lane installations.

With intersection improvements, or turn lane installations, TPW would need to know the type of intersection upgrades the UG wanted.

Any signal changes the UG may want, TPW is able to use the state consultant, AECOM, to look at the corridor and examine the signal timing to propose new timing options.

For mid-block crosswalks, the M&C has an adopted policy where a minimum count of 10 pedestrians in any 1 hour within a 24-hour period. TPW would set out a time-lapse camera to determine if it meets the minimum.

Current M&C adopted policy would not allow for any speed table crosswalks on Prince as it is an arterial. Peter asked about how long traffic studies take. Tim said it depends on whether we break it down into smaller segments. For 3-laning, they would like us to consider the natural break much like Benesch & Toole have already done. Benesch agreed. The only section that really does not have any traffic analysis is the section from Pulaski to Milledge. Stephen recommended breaking that segment into two – Pulaski to Barber and Barber to Milledge. He also reiterated that the UG is going to want LOS for not just vehicles but for all users looking at safety.

Ellen asked since GDOT Concept included the 8 intersections, raised medians, and 3 mid-block crossing, did they do traffic analyses to determine the need and one we can use and rely upon? Steve Decker stated that GDOT doesn't do anything without a study and they have very stringent standards. Ellen asked again if ACC needed to do any additional studies if GDOT has studied and recommended it. Steve said they he would still recommend a study to double check, and he would invite someone from District 1 traffic operations center to come in and address that officially, so the UG has it on record.

Diana will work with TPW/Benesch to get confirmation from GDOT that they have completed traffic studies on their recommended improvements and that no further study is necessary for the GDOT portion of the corridor.

One other item for TPW/Benesch to discuss with GDOT is the location for the mid-block crossings. The UG feels like they should be relocated to the locations that the UG has identified, not what is shown in the Concept Report.

Daniel asked if the UG needed to have traffic studies complete before we go out for public engagement. Stephen said that as long as we are not specific about it, then no. If we were specific, we would need to have some traffic studies to make sure that those specific improvements could be made without issues.

The mid-block crossing are really just ADA upgrades at those existing crossings. Erik is not sure if these improvements are based on traffic studies, pedestrian studies, or simply a recommendation from the onsite walk/safety audit.

Finalize List of Potential Projects

Ellen went through the latest condensing of the potential projects. The group has organized them into four categories. TPW would review the list to see what additional studies might be required and add a column to the right.

The UG will submit to the M&C our list of preferred prioritized projects; however, we will give them, in an appendix, the entire body of items that were considered and prioritized lower. That way the work completed by the UG is memorialized for future TSPLOSTs or other sources of capital funding.

Ellen will send an updated condensed list of projects along with a narrative to the UG voting members, so they can vote on it at the May 26th meeting.

Update from Public Engagement Subcommittee

The subcommittee has been meeting to discuss public input questions and types of questions. Emily is working on that now. They are waiting on the project list to build out the questions. She will be building it out on one of the categories of improvements.

Medians

Peter discussed adding medians to a future agenda. Jeanne Connell stated that she has discussed planting the GDOT medians with drought tolerant plants. Peter said he wanted to go a bit further and discuss blue medians – for retention and filtration. Derek reminded the UG that based on the general cross-section of the roadway (water sheds from the road crown to the outer edges) that for a true blue interior median the roadway's crown would have to be inverted and probably be a physical constraint.

Project Schedule

Next step is to finalize the UG's list of Potential Projects and for the Public Engagement subcommittee to work with GIO staff to develop one category of the survey.

Assignment for future meetings

- Next meeting is **May 26, 2021 from 9-10:30 am**
- Finalize List of Potential Projects that the UG is recommending go out for public engagement - June 8th Work Session (along with TPW's recommendation for traffic studies)
- Public Engagement subcommittee updates
- UG recommendations to GDOT
- TPW recommendation to UG to for streetlight recommendation to GDOT
- Other options for speed calming – Ernie and Erik to provide
- Later in June:
 - Blue medians – Stephen Bailey will request Todd Stevenson or Cecile Ryker, ACCGov's Stormwater staff, to introduce that topic
 - Brad McCook to discuss unused utility poles

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.