

**Transportation Advisory Group
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, December 10, 2024
6:00 PM**

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) met Tuesday, December 10, 2024, in the Community Room at City Hall. Chairman Paul Schultz called the meeting to order at 6 p.m. Other TAG members present: Vice Chair Keith Larson, Robert Hendry, Alan Reeves, Brian Bartal, and Public Works Director Jonathan Miller. Vincent Bonura had resigned, Schultz noted. City Manager Justin Strickland, Assistant City Manager Christopher Hobby, and Assistant Public Works Director DeMarcus Hunter also attended.

Public Comment

A citizen arrived after the Public Comment portion of the meeting, and Schultz asked if she would like to speak. She said she was Joan Brennan of Kedron Hills and was there to learn more about transportation issues and had a question about the interpretation of a portion of the Municipal Code. Schultz told her she needed to call the City Clerk or Public Works for that information.

Minutes

A. November 12, 2024 TAG Meeting Minutes

Hendry moved to approve the November 12, 2024, meeting minutes. Reeves seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Transportation Updates from Local Municipalities

At the most recent Fayette County Transportation Committee meeting, Larson stated, all municipalities were asked to submit their master path plans to support the County's Comprehensive Plan update. TAG's efforts were timely and would meet that necessary input. The previous Comp Plan included a list of all planned paths.

Larson noted that City Council was deliberating with Tyrone and the County on an intergovernmental agreement to open Crabapple Lane to carts, bikes, and pedestrians in order to get an accurate traffic count. The ultimate goal was for a path to be constructed along Dogwood Trail that would link Tyrone to Peachtree City's path network at World Drive.

He also noted that the Planning Commission was planning to start working on a unified development ordinance that could include requirements that developers include golf cart and bike parking in any new projects. Schultz pointed out that this project would take a couple of years, but Larson noted that Council was going to ask for an update of urgent matters, such as cart parking, at the beginning of the project.

Larson pointed out that TAG was now included in the City ordinance.

He also mentioned that there had been discussion of TAG's purpose and noted that three of the eight tasks assigned enumerated traffic safety or mitigating safety concerns.

Discussion

A. Multi-Use Path System Project Ranking Methodology

Schultz said he wanted to discuss the two methods of ranking multi-use path projects that had been proposed. Bartal had worked out a matrix system, while Larson also had a suggestion of how to weight several priorities.

Miller stated that the paths were not classified as the streets were, such as neighborhood collector or local, and asked if that was something the group would be interested in working on. It would be needed eventually to help prioritize maintenance and construction. Miller suggested using the road format, and he offered to print out a map with the road classifications. He said as they went into the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition, construction would slow down, and the crew would go into more of a maintenance mode, so it would be important to know which were the high-priority paths.

Reeves asked if there was a consideration of naming the paths, and Miller said that something they could look at, too. These were the kind of big picture ideas that this group was expected to produce. Reeves said it was a good idea for public safety. Miller noted that all the paths were numbered, but unless you knew what you were looking for, those numbers were not helpful. Some had markers, but those had degraded over time. Path problems reported over the Navigating PTC app dropped a pin to show the location, Miller stated.

The classification could be a factor in determining maintenance and construction priorities, but other factors were not so obvious. Bartal said safety was key.

Schultz said it seemed everyone agreed that they wanted to classify and name the paths, but though the priority for the next few meetings should be to get a master plan ready for Fayette County. Reeves said he would like Miller to send them examples of paths and how he would classify them. Miller said they could visit the Aberdeen path right now if they wanted to see what the new standard of 14 feet wide looked like.

Larson said he had done a lot of prioritization using multiple criteria in his career and proposed doing that with the paths. He used data from STRAVA to show which paths were most used by runners and walkers. Some areas that were heavily trafficked, such as along SR 54 near Publix, had heavy pedestrian traffic. STRAVA was a useful tool for identifying areas that needed paths, Larson continued.

He also pointed out that 12% of the centerline roads accounted for 90% of all vehicle crashes and said the County and Peachtree City were countering this by building roundabouts in several locations. He showed areas where there had been

collisions involving golf carts. The lower the speeds, the less chance of serious injuries.

He showed how they could apply that information scoring to prioritizing paths, while taking into account factors such as routes to village centers, work and school. He assigned points to each segment and showed what some might score. It gave more separation than just a matrix with one or two factors. Larson showed how a path along SR 54 in front of the cemetery would score because of several factors, such as being on a school route and the speed of the road traffic. He also showed how the proposed paths along Sumner would rank.

Reeves pointed out that the path network was not originally designed to connect the entire city, so some of the existing paths might not make sense now. Larson said the first city plan in 1972 envisioned a connected network but had no full rollout plan. Larson said the priority list and master plan they were working on should be available to the public, and they should be able to justify it.

There were a couple of other considerations when deciding on path work, Miller said. Was there a method to get to a place through any other method? Citizens also did not want a lot of traffic routed through their neighborhoods.

Bartal said this system added dimension by having more categories, but not all of these categories would be necessary. For instance, he did not think speed along a road mattered. What mattered was if there was a demand for a path there. Bartal said they needed to list and score new paths and make a separate list for maintenance projects. They could prioritize them, then the City would have to make the decisions on what to build.

Miller explained that an evaluation of the path conditions had just been completed, but they did not have the results. He said right now, they did path repairs as "worst, first," but having classifications would help them set priorities.

Maybe there should be several lists, Schultz proposed. They had a list of upcoming path projects, and others wanted to suggest new sections. He also said they had discussed a repair list. Bridges and tunnels should be evaluated separately, he noted, and Larson said money had been earmarked for that.

Larson went over a spreadsheet he had created that showed upcoming projects, with space for comments. Schultz said he thought they could each prioritize project lists, then apply the matrix scoring and see where they came out.

Miller said, if they wanted the plan completed by February, they should take the existing list, get a consensus on what new paths they would like to see and rank those. The final product would be submitted to Council as the new master plan. They discussed factors that they should consider, such as the distance between connections. Miller noted that paths often connected via easements through

commercial parking lots.

Reeves remarked that they all had their own concerns, but some themes would be repeated, and those paths should make up the final list as the consensus of TAG. Larson noted that the high traffic streets already had a priority of one, and they needed to figure out how to weigh other factors.

Schultz said they needed one combined list that documented new sections, too, and they could go through it and assign priorities, then create a list based on the averages. He believed they shared many of the same considerations, and the scores would be fairly close to each other.

Bartal said they needed to be transparent and be sure what was important to them was represented. This list needed to be able to stand the test of time, and the methodology should be something that could carry over into the future. Larson said it should be something citizens should understand and be able to look at it and come to the same conclusions. Bartal agreed.

Schultz again said the city had given them a list of proposed projects, and they had come up with new ideas on their own. He thought they should figure out the most important categories. Miller said if they discussed their priorities, and the reasons behind them, a ranking system would begin to emerge, he believed.

Larson said they should decide on the most important factors. He felt that a category based on volume of traffic, pedestrian as well as road traffic, was important, as was supporting the village concept. The more things a segment did, the higher the score. Bartal said he did not think speed should be a consideration unless it was to create a new type of crossing for safety, but Larson said it was.

Miller then mentioned that Holly Grove and Loring Lane were both 30 mph roads but not similar in any other way. Larson said that was why there were other criteria, but Miller said he felt speed was too heavily weighted because it did not directly correlate to volume of traffic.

Larson suggested they consider service level as a factor, with special points if a path connected to a school. Bartal mentioned they should give points for a path that would take carts off existing roads. Reeves said safety was his number one priority.

The County wanted these rankings by February, Schultz stated, and they would not be perfect. They could make changes later. He said what he heard everyone saying was that there were three categories—safety, volume, and connection. Bartal said safety was a priority, but building proper connections and taking carts off the road would make them safer.

If they put in what they wanted and ranked the paths, they would see how it played

out. Miller commented. Safety would probably get the bulk of the weight. He felt it would be difficult to come up with a ranking system until they had looked at the paths.

Bartal mentioned the new crossing on Robinson Road that he said served eight houses, but Miller said that did not account for all the people from other areas who would use that crossing.

Schultz suggested that every one of Larson's columns get a point, with more points possible if it got people to a school or village center. He was in favor of keeping the scoring simple and just seeing how many boxes were ticked.

Miller reminded them that they could not eliminate personal bias. The next TAG group might have totally different ideas, so what they needed to come up with should work for now.

Safety was baked in, Schultz stated. He thought they should look at volume and connectivity and rank the paths on the list from 1 to 10 each. The higher it ranked, the higher the priority. If it had high volume, Miller said, there was obviously a safety concern.

They should prioritize the new sections paths using the categories of volume and connectivity, Schultz said, and rank them 1 to 10, then add up the points and create a list of these new sections to be added to the existing list. Even the already-planned paths could be ranked.

Larson said he would add all their paths to the master list before the next meeting and designate which member suggested them. They would look at this wholistic idea at the next meeting and talk about the rankings. The end result would be the master plan.

B. Meeting Schedule

They decided to meet again on January 7 and January 21 at 6 p.m. to discuss the rankings and get ready for the February submission of the list to Council.

Adjourn

There being no further business, Hendry moved to adjourn at 7:50 p.m. Bartal seconded, and the motion carried unanimously.


Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary


Paul Schultz, Chairman