

TSPLOST 2018 Program
Prince Avenue Corridor Improvements: Project 16

User Group Meeting – Minutes

October 13, 2021 3:00 P.M. <https://youtu.be/6AHvRb9xOBw>

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

Members Absent: Bruce Lonnee

Other Staff Present: Mary Martin, Brad McCook, John Rogeberg, Sam Eberhard, Diana Jackson

Guests: Erik Hammarlund, Jared Draper, John Walker, Olivia Zuvanich

General Business

Diana Jackson called the meeting to order at 3:02 P.M., welcomed the members in attendance and thanked them for being present.

Quorum: Established quorum was present.

No additional items were added to the agenda.

User Group Actions

Meeting Minutes Review & Approval – Clint McCrory made a motion to approve the September 8, 2021 Minutes, as amended by Ellen Walker, and Ellen Walker seconded. The minutes were approved 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.

Identification of proposed projects to incorporate into GDOT Project – Erik

Diana shared a list of the elements currently within the GDOT project scope (copy attached to the minutes). She then shared a table Erik prepared showing the proposed improvements on the left most column and then four columns to the right ranging from currently included, possibly added, not likely to be considered, and not applicable. He used his best judgement when identifying which column to select. A copy of that table is also attached to the minutes. He went through each improvement and discussed their potential.

Erik also stated that GDOT is performing some traffic studies. He will seek to obtain that information from Sam Harris/Johnathon Dekho once it is available.

Concrete medians were further discussed with the option for greening those as a potential amenity to be administered through a maintenance agreement. Jeanne stated that she had already requested with GDOT to landscape those medians.

Three laning all happens on locally controlled portion of the corridor. Diana asked that why they would not consider striping differently than it is now to achieve three laning. Erik stated that it might work if GDT's

studies came back that they could maintain their current/future level of service (LOS), they may. What he's heard so far is that they feel that they need four lanes.

Benesch/Kimley-Horn are collecting traffic data this week and conducting their own analyses for these segments to make sure what they recommend agrees with what GDOT recommends. This includes three laning and bike lanes within the current road footprint. Not just geometrically, but is the resulting LOS and intersection delay acceptable. Erik stated that if it's an increased delay, but for a couple of hours a day, that is something that might be tolerated.

Project Prioritization

Mark went through his survey results table. He used scoring -0.33 to 1.00. To obtain his percentages he looked at in a few ways: like to have or must have with respondents who answered the question in the denominator or total respondents as the denominator. He added ordinal rankings within each category and calculated terciles with conditional formatting. The final column had his judgement for strong to weak ranking.

Diana reminded the UG that we have the dashboard from GIO that we can also use to read actual comments by improvement.

Ellen went through her comment compilation table and explained how she organized the data. There were 1,020 comments from 315 respondents. For those items that received less than four comments, she did not include the items (about 25 in total), except for concrete medians because they only received three total comments. She thought that it was interesting and might show that we may not have enough public comment on them in particular. Bike lanes were the most commented upon. Mid-block crosswalks were generally very popular. Park/Talmadge received a lot of comments; it was second to bicycles.

Mark found the center raised medians interesting as it was one of the more unpopular improvements when it came to voting; yet, not that many comments were associated directly with them.

These will be placed onto the Google Drive.

Jenn added a few comments. She wanted the UG to remember that those people who answer surveys has the capacity and, desire, and interest to do so; however, there are plenty of people who use Prince Avenue that for whatever reason didn't. As a UG, we still need to think about them. Then there are people who provide comment on a survey because they either feel really stronger about it or they're art of a particular user, say bike lanes, but it is our charge, as the UG, to look at the bigger picture. It's not that we should put bike lanes everywhere, but where should we put bike lanes that will be used, where they will interact with pedestrians and vehicles the most effectively. She ended it by saying that we've collected a lot of data that we should use in addition to our own understanding and expertise to develop our set of priorities.

Peter agreed. He stated that the UG was selected for their knowledge and that our opinions do count. Clint added that whatever ranking is competed by this vote is probably preliminary as we do not have cost estimates or traffic studies. Diana stated that yes, the list may change once traffic studies are completed and estimates are developed, and a project might jump a prioritization based on what Derek shared with us last UG meeting.

- (A) leveraging existing public/private partnerships;
- (B) outside grants/funding resources potential;
- (C) multiple project type collaboration;
- (D) initial lower investment of originally identified project; and
- (E) protection/preservation of future project development.

Diana asked Erik if they could put together an order of magnitude cost estimates - \$ 0-\$100k, \$\$ \$100k-\$1M, \$\$\$ \$1M+. Erik will add that to his table. The UG felt like that could be a good starting point. Ellen and Mark will also add the original UG scoring to Mark's table.

Diana went through the scoring table. Each category will be given 3 points per improvement to be divided up however the UG desires by category. The UG will first identify the category they feel is the most important and then score the projects within each category.

First scoring sheets are due to be emailed to Diana by COB by October 22, 2021.

She will score UG voting members only and then all UG attendees respectively.

TSPLOST 2023 Project Submission Updates

TSPLOST 2023 Advisory Committee (TSAC) had asked if any projects wanted to revise their total amounts. The Prince Ave Continuation provided a slightly lower amount and the Park /Talmadge project chose not to revise the amounts. TSAC will have their work session with M&C on November 9th. Peter stated that the M&C predesignated on the October 5th voting session. A CDO was submitted. It was approved 8-2 with MUCH discussion.

Project Schedule

Next step is to begin prioritizing the projects. M&C will vote on the TSPLOST 2023 project list no later than the February vote.

Assignment for future meetings

- Next meeting is **October 27, 2021 from 3-4:30 pm NOTE NEW TIME**
- Project Prioritization
- Preliminary Traffic Study Results?

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.