

Transportation Advisory Group of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 28, 2025
6:00 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) met for its regular meeting on Tuesday, October 28, 2025, in the Community Room at City Hall. Chairman Paul Schultz called the meeting to order at 6:23 p.m. Others present included Blake Hayes, Brian Bartal, Jesse Wrice, and Josh Hicks, along with ex-officio member Public Works Director Jonathan Miller. Amanda Toronto and Heidi Becker were absent. Public Works Assistant Director DaMarcus Hunter was also present.

Pledge of Allegiance

Announcements

The members who had not previously met introduced themselves.

Presentations

None

Public Comment

There were no public comments, but Wrice asked if there was a particular box where comments were submitted? Schultz said they were in-person comments, with Miller adding that citizens sometimes emailed TAG members, and those comments could be mentioned at a meeting. Schultz said they addressed public comment protocol at the Oct. 21 called meeting.

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

Schultz said he had neglected to put approval of the Sept. 30 called meeting minutes on the agenda. There were some changes that needed to be made regarding attendance and also that former member Keith Larson had submitted. Hayes clarified that the City ordinance permitted the use of low speed vehicles (LSVs) only on roads with speed limits up to 35 mph, and Larson was incorrect in stating it was up to 40 mph. However, if that was what Larson said during the meeting, Hayes had no problem with that being included in the minutes.

There were other corrections that Schultz had in an email from Larson about replacing text regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Hayes moved to adopt the Sept. 30 meeting minutes as amended. Bartal seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Miller said Schultz could forward the amended minutes to him and to Deputy City Clerk Stacey Collins.

Hayes moved to approve the October 21 regular meeting minutes. Wrice seconded.

Motion carried unanimously.

A. October 21, 2025 Minutes

Old Agenda Items

A. City Ordinance Updates

Schultz mentioned that he had asked everyone at the October 21 meeting to review these ordinances so they could make succinct changes and forward it on to Council.

He suggested beginning with Chapter 78 because it was shorter and noted that Council had added verbiage regarding decal placement that he had added. The new language said the decals on the front and rear of the carts should be forward facing and visible at all times. Other than that, he noted, this was the same ordinance they had reviewed at the September 30 meeting. Schultz added that these ordinances were complex, and they should not let perfection be the enemy of good enough.

Bartal asked about the size of the new decals, and Miller said they were smaller but the numbers would be the same height. Once the size was finalized, there would be public communication campaigns so people could prepare their carts if needed.

Bartal then noted that Dividend Drive had higher speed limits, but golf carts were allowed. Hayes stepped in to clarify that golf carts were on a golf course; a cart on a public road was a personal transportation vehicle (PTV), while an LSV was slightly different with additional safety features because it could go up to 25 mph. Because Peachtree City was grandfathered in by the State, Hayes continued, there were no restrictions on PTVs. It was a strange situation in which the vehicle with fewer safety features was permitted, and the one with more safety features was not. The limit for LSVs was 35 mph under State law.

Bartal asked about the definitions of the different types of vehicles. Hayes replied that if it could only do 20 mph or less, it was a PTV, according to the State. Also, LSVs had to have a tag issued by the County tag office. Miller said TAG had decided to re-write the City's definitions to conform with the State's. As long as a cart stayed on private property, such as a golf course, Hayes continued, it did not have to conform to State regulations.

Bartal asked about electric personal assistive mobility devices (EPAMDs), and Schultz said that meant a Segway. Bartal had wondered about using those on Dividend Drive but noted there was a separately striped bicycle lane there, which meant Segways were allowed. However, they were not permitted on Robinson Road, which had a 40 mph speed limit, too, but no bike lane. Robinson was permissible for PTVs in areas where there were no adjacent paths, Miller stated.

While a person 15 years old could drive a PTV, Section 78-93 (m) said an EPAMD operator had to be 16 or older, Bartal commented. Hayes said that was a State law for operation on a roadway, but younger people could operate them on a sidewalk.

Bartal also had questions about (a) and (b) of that section, which said anyone age 16 or older could drive a motorized cart on the paths, unless their driver's license had been suspended or revoked. That meant someone who had never had a driver's license could drive a cart, and Bartal thought it would be a good idea to require some type of safety training for those drivers with no license, acknowledging that it would require much more discussion.

Miller said this had always been a topic of discussion. He noted that there were older people who no longer had licenses but who still drove carts. Bartal said he was more concerned about young drivers who had never had any safety training or driving experience. Hayes mentioned that electric bikes were allowed under State law and could go just as fast as a PTV.

Bartal asked if they could mention this to Council and offer to work further on it. Miller commented that it would take a lot of planning to add a safety course.

Wrice wanted to know where motorized skateboards fit in. Hayes said they were under personal electric vehicle (PEV) category, and Schultz read the definition, which stipulated a maximum speed of 20 mph.

They had a lot of freedom to regulate most types of vehicles, but Hayes said they were limited by the State on LSV regulations, although they could totally ban LSVs. Hayes said that was trading one issue for another: if LSVs were banned on the paths, then people would just drive them at 20 mph on the 35 mph roads, causing traffic backups.

Schultz noted that Bartal had mentioned that LSVs had more safety features, so they would be more protected in a collision with a PTV or a pedestrian.

TAG had debated on whether to allow LSVs, Miller remarked, and Schultz said they also had debated on limiting the width. Hayes pointed out that you could put anything you wanted in an ordinance, but it could be challenged if it conflicted with State law.

They returned to the subject of limiting width for LSVs. Most people would want their vehicle to be considered a cart, Hayes commented, because an LSV did not have to be registered with the County. State law also said an LSV had to be insured.

Bartal suggested stipulating that LSVs be 50 inches wide or less. Hayes noted that

paths were subject to State law, but local governments had authority to regulate by class or vehicle on controlled-access roadways, which the paths could be considered, and on heavily travelled streets. He thought class or vehicle meant broad classifications such as LSV or cart, but not “LSV of a certain width.”

Miller wondered if there were LSVs that would meet that width requirement, saying that usually they were wider because of the additional safety features.

Bartal recalled a photo he had seen of a vehicle on the paths that was so wide no other vehicle could pass it. Hayes remarked that if the Police stopped a vehicle like that, there would be a ticket. If it was deemed a cart, it was subject to a width limit that could be enforced. If it was an LSV and did not have a tag, it was not legal.

Bartal said his concern was that there were so many LSVs that looked like carts, but the vehicle in that photo was clearly different. Bartal said he had seen another one at a local restaurant recently.

They could certainly ban LSVs from the paths, Hayes noted, but Bartal said a width restriction should be sufficient to keep the super-wide ones off the paths. Hayes suggested making it more abstract and say that nothing over a certain width was allowed.

Schultz pointed out that one issue was when people put big tires on the vehicles, causing seven or eight inches to hang over the sides and take up a lot of the path. The City was striving for 10 feet wide when repaving a path, and a typical cart was 48 inches wide, which was allowed for ample room for two passing carts.

Schultz added that he liked Hayes’ idea of not singling out particular types of vehicles, just regulating widths. Bartal noted that they were just trying to get rid of the “unreasonably wide” vehicles. Hayes suggested setting the limit at 55 inches, which would allow for passing room.

Motorized carts were limited to 50 inches wide, Schultz noted. Motorized cart was the old term, and State law said PTVs could be referred to as motorized carts in the ordinances. His goal, Bartal reiterated, was to ensure there was some limitation on width. Miller said it would be easiest for enforcement to just create a single catch-all.

Schultz looked at the list of prohibited uses, and Hayes suggested adding “that except for emergency and authorized maintenance vehicles, no vehicles over 50 inches in width should be allowed on the path system.” The group decided that would be the language used. Wrice confirmed that this included law enforcement vehicles. Miller pointed out that the City allowed encroachment permits for homeowners who needed to allow a tree service access to their yard via a path.

Hicks asked about restricting speeds for personal electric vehicles (PEVs), noting

there were unicycles that could go very fast. Schultz replied that any PEV that went over 20 mph was prohibited. They also prohibited pocket bikes and dirt bikes.

Hayes said he did not believe they had defined the “low-speed neighborhood streets” that had been added in 78-91 (a). He thought it would be best to not define them, because that would block a lot of streets, but to keep the list that already existed of streets where EPAMDs could not be operated.

The Police Department needed to be included in the discussion if they wanted to impose those speed restrictions, Miller remarked. Hayes said he was not opposed to re-visiting this issue, but he did not want that language to just slip by without their being aware of the ramifications.

As the ordinance stood now, it just referred to “all streets,” not “low-speed neighborhood streets.” Bartal said he had noted this issue, too. Hayes recommended they take out that language and revert to what the ordinance currently stated, which was “all streets and shared-use paths.” Schultz said he could agree with that.

Miller again pointed out that there was a separate section that listed streets where these vehicles were prohibited, and Hayes noted that micromobility vehicles was a broad term that even included bicycles. Schultz said there would be very little impact of changing all the 30 mph streets in the City to 25 mph. He thought there was a better way to address safety concerns.

The members agreed that using the term “all streets” would be acceptable.

Section 78-96 (m) said cart drivers should cross any public roadway as if there were a stop sign there. Hayes noted that was not enforceable and that drivers could not be expected to know what was a public roadway and what was private. However, he said he would not fight those battles now, but he did want a phrase added that said this could be ignored at the direction of a police officer who was directing traffic.

Wrice mentioned that he thought the solid white line at an intersection should be a signal to someone on a cart that they should stop before crossing. Miller noted that bars were not enforceable as stop signs, but they were putting up more stop signs as paths were being redone. They all agreed to add “except when directed to proceed by a police officer.”

In the future, they should consider defining “intersection,” Hayes remarked, because there were several areas where there was a stop sign for a roadway, then next to it was a stop sign for a path crossing. Were those two separate intersections or one combined intersection? It was confusing and a safety concern. Schultz agreed this was something they should consider in the future.

As the discussion of the ordinance concluded, Schultz recalled that they had made a presentation to Council about six weeks previously regarding TAG's work. They had not deviated from that plan at all, so he did not see the need for another presentation. Miller could just bring it to Council as an agenda item.

Hayes added that he did not think a presentation was necessary, but he wanted it made clear to Council that their goal had been to start to modernize the ordinance, but it would need periodic reviews.

Hayes noted it could go before the November 6 work session first, then on to a first reading at a regular meeting.

Hayes moved to ask Miller to coordinate the process to get the ordinance revisions for sections 70 and 78 on the November 6 work session agenda. Hicks seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

B. New meeting times

Some members felt that the 6 p.m. meeting time was too early, Schultz said, and he also wanted to discuss a time limit for the meetings. Becker had communicated that Mondays and Tuesdays were good days for her, but 6:30 or 7 p.m. would be better meeting times. Schultz said he thought the meetings should be no more than an hour and a half in length.

Bartal agreed with the length restriction. Hayes proposed a 6:30 start time, which meant the meeting could go no longer than 8 p.m. Wrice said that would be fine. They agreed they would prefer to keep Tuesdays as the meeting day.

Wrice moved to change the meeting time to 6:30 p.m. on Tuesdays for at least an hour and a half. He then withdrew that motion and made a new motion to hold meetings at 6:30 p.m., capped at an hour and a half, on the second and fourth Tuesdays of the month. Hayes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

New Agenda Items

A. Vote of Vice Chairman of Committee

Becker had indicated she was willing to serve as vice chair, Schultz noted. Bartal said he had not met her, but thought her willingness was a good sign. Hayes said he, too, would be okay with serving, but had no opposition to Becker. Hicks said he was still in the learning phase.

Hayes moved to table the election of a vice chair until the next meeting. Bartal seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Hearings

None

Member/Staff Topics

A. Upcoming TAG meetings dates

The next scheduled meeting was on November 11, which was Veterans Day and a City holiday. After some discussion regarding various members' travel schedules, they decided to have a special called meeting on November 18 as their only meeting in November.

Hayes moved to cancel the November 11 and 25 regular meetings and hold a special called meeting on November 18. Wrice seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

1. November 11, 2025

2. November 25, 2025

Adjourn

There being no further business, Bartal moved to adjourn at 7:31 p.m. Hayes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Paul Schultz, Chairman