

TSPLOST 2018 Program
Prince Avenue Corridor Improvements: Project 16

User Group Meeting – Draft Minutes
March 10, 2021 10:00 A.M. - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=clzbtITGS38>

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

Members Absent: Ellen Walker

Other Staff Present: Keith Sanders, Diana Jackson

Guests: Ernie Boughman, John Walker, Erik Hammarlund, Jared Draper

General Business

Diana Jackson, called the meeting to order at 10:03 A.M., welcomed the members in attendance and thanked them for being present. Daniel Sizemore been added top the User Group as an ex-officio member.

Quorum: Established quorum was present.

User Group Actions

Meeting Minutes Review & Approval – Mark Ebell made a motion to approve the February 24, 2021 Minutes and Clint McCrory seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

The following item was added to the Agenda:

- GDOT potential partnership with Street Pedestrian Lighting

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.

Conversations after February 10, 2021 meeting regarding GDOT Medians

- Erik reached out to Jonathan Dechko who is to confirm repaving the entire corridor. Jonathan will provide a response by end of the week.

Benesch/Toole – Review of Milledge to Pulaski Bicycle Lane Options – Erik Hammarlund, Ernie Boughman, Jared Draper

- Toole developed bike facility options holistically from a network standpoint as they are also providing similar work for the adjacent Barber and Chase corridors.
- Toole presented multiple options for more protected bike lane options on the ACCGov-owner portion of the corridor. Two sections – Barber to Milledge; Pulaski to Barber as they have differing cross-section widths.
- Steve Decker from TPW was asked about minimum travel widths for transit. He stated that according to Transit Director that anything less than 11' challenges the bus driver.
- Mark queried AIM as to which option they supported, and it was Option C.
- Clint asked Steve about the drainage issues that exist between Pulaski and Barber – could they be addressed at the same time with the bike lane implementation.

- Steve has a larger concern with Pulaski and Prince. With the 3-laneing of Dougherty, that intersection became a timing issue as traffic was being backed up. Part of the issue is the dedicated right turn lane on Prince. The left turn lane from Pulaski to Prince allows the traffic to queue with out backing up to Broad.
- Peter asked for clarification for Option D as to whether it eliminates sidewalk one side of the street. Jared responded that no, the other sidewalk would remain.
- John Walker says that his firm has completed numerous traffic studies in the area. He supports the need for the 11' travel lanes. Center 2-way left turn lane is usually a bit wider. Steve stated that they typically allow for a minimum of 12' width and try to extend to 13' width.
- Jared agreed the 11' lanes for buses. He stated that FHWA guidance says to narrow travel lanes before narrowing bike lanes.
- Mark asked if we could make it so that there is no left turn onto Pulaski to keep traffic flowing from Prince onto Dougherty.
- Steve responded that because of the 3-laneing of Dougherty that is not an option.
- Ernie reminded the group with the pilot project on Barnett Shoals that the saw speed differentials of a 5 mph drop.
- Peter – expresses his gratitude toward great graphics. His preference is Option C. Feels like Option A&B it might be difficult for cyclists to cross the street or cross to the shared path in Option D.
- Jennifer agreed that 2-way bike lanes are not intuitive and friendly/accessible.
- Ernie says their intention was to get UG feedback and preference. They were now going to lay them out in plan view and provide a schematic about how it would interact with intersections, driveways. As well as maintaining four lanes at the intersection with stacking.
- Keith directed a question to AIM/Toole. M&C has been very adamant about disliking of separated bike lanes vs shared paths. Daniel is going to find out more about whether this is the new preference of AIM? He in the past has been a proponent of shared path, but he sees this corridor of more of a commuter type and that separated bike lanes like Option C is more desirable in this scenario. Perhaps there could be two options with cost breakdown between the two?
- Stephen reiterated that the recent M&C pushback was regarding two-way bike lanes.
- Mark said he would take this information back to AIM for further discussion and a formal response letter.
- Jared also said that across the nation, separated bike lanes on the street is considered a value add to shared paths.
- Erik asked if Steve would want to see supporting traffic analysis to help justify a 3-lane alternative?
- Steve says that's an excellent idea, he is going to have his staff pull some data and do some counts. His biggest concern is the intersection at Pulaski and backing up traffic on Prince. He stated that ACC might have to go to split left turn lanes
- John Walker shared his screen showing daily traffic counts both directions in 24 hours (data from 219/pre COVID). 25,000 cars per day (cpd) from Prince to Milledge. Once you get past Milledge, it drops to 16,400 cpd. He stated that going from 4 to 3 lanes you really want to be below 20,000 cpd. The other item to state is that it is a fairly constant volume throughout the day (0800-1800).
- Mark stated that post COVID the traffic counts might change. He also noted that where counts are up to 17900 (Pulaski Prince intersection) that those numbers are going to increase with 100 Prince development. A dedicated left turn lane might be helpful.

GDOT potential partnership with Street Pedestrian Lighting – Stephen Bailey

- GDOT District Traffic engineer, Jonathan Peavey emailed stating their Safety Group was looking at the Prince Avenue project and is now wondering about pedestrian lighting between Sunset and Pulaski and would ACC be in favor of adding that lighting/cover the installation cost. The only way likely that this could happen is if it becomes part of this TSPLOST project.
- If UG was in favor of this, there'd be a number of questions, what does this cost, what will it look like, etc. As well as recurring cost to TPW.

- Diana asked the UG if they feel like the pedestrian lighting is unsafe. Do you feel like it needs more?
- Stephen made the distinction between streetlight and pedestrian lights. Pedestrian light would be more like those that are along Baxter Street – 15' feet high with Luminaire on top. CES would maintain these and cover the electrical costs.
- Is this a high priority for the UG?
- Bruce stated that years ago when they did the Prince Avenue study and had lots and lots of public engagement and field work (2008-9), one of the comments that came up was the spottiness of the lighting and the dark patches along the sidewalk. What staff found out was that it was not the lack of lighting, it was the vegetation around those areas blocking out the light. Pedestrian lighting was also supposed to be an amenity that defined the corridor; however, it is an expense. Not a new topic. The decision at that time was to manage the canopy first and see what happens.
- Peter stated that there are a lot of needs on this corridor that are a higher priority.
- Clint felt that pedestrian lighting is needed at the 3 streets that enter at an angle - Meigs, Hill and Cobb. There is a tendency for those turning right not to stop.
- The UG was assigned homework to walk at night and see where additional lighting is needed.
- Stephen stated that it is fairly easy to add lamps to poles at intersections. He will try to get a ballpark cost from GDOT.
- Diana asked if there was a break point (Milledge?) for adding street lighting and if Stephen might add that to his questions for GDOT.

Other Projects from Previous Studies:

Continue to pull ideas from other corridor studies, and if there are other options you like that you want to put forth in a list to the public so they can help us prioritize. What other options do you want on the list? You can email those to the group, so we can get them on the table for consideration.

Assignment for future meetings

- Next meeting is March 24, 2021 **from 10-11:30 am**
- Get images and costs on fluted poles for the Prince corridor in order to compare the costs against what GDOT has committed to providing.
- Participate in the Public Engagement sites set up for Lexington Hwy & Atlanta Hwy
- Mark Ebell email Q&A
- Further plan views/schematics for bike lanes along Milledge to Pulaski – Erie/Erik to present updates at April meeting
- 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.