



Transportation Advisory Group

Paul Schultz - Chair, Heidi Becker - Vice Chair, Brian Bartel,
Blake Hayes, Jesse Wrice, Josh Hicks, Jonathan Miller

Meeting Agenda

July 28, 2026 | 6:30 PM

Convention & Visitor's Bureau, 191 McIntosh Trail

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Public Comment**
4. **Announcements**
 - A. Updates on Local Transportation from other Municipalities/Organizations Based on Publicly Available Information
 1. Fayette County Transportation Committee- Heidi Becker and Jesse Wrice
 2. Fayette Forward- Heidi Becker
 3. Tyrone- Blake Hayes
 4. ARC- Josh Hicks
5. **Presentations**
6. **Agenda Changes**
7. **Minutes**
 - A. July 14, 2026
8. **Old Agenda Items**
 - A. Intersection Treatments and Policy Recommendations- Blake Hayes
 - B. Path System Integration with Surrounding Communities and Reciprocity- Continue Discussion
 - C. Village Marking Signs (SPLOST project) - Site Visits.
9. **New Agenda Items**
 - A. Navigate PTC App Improvements
10. **Member/Staff Topics**
 - A. Upcoming TAG Meeting Dates
 1. August 11, 2026
 2. August 25, 2026
11. **Adjourn**

This agenda is subject to change at any time up to 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

It is the policy of the City of Peachtree City that all city-sponsored public meetings and events are accessible to people with disabilities and are in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If you need assistance in participating in this meeting or event due to a disability as defined under the ADA or need assistance per Title VI, please contact the City's Title VI and ADA Coordinator, Dr. Teaa Allston-Bing at (770) 632-4276 or e-mail tallston-bing@peachtree-city.org at least three (3) business days before the scheduled meeting or event to request an accommodation.

This agenda is subject to change at any time up to 24 hours prior to the scheduled meeting.

This meeting will be held in Council Chambers at City Hall

Transportation Advisory Group of Peachtree City
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, July 14, 2026
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 14, 2026, at the Peachtree City Welcome Center. Chairman Paul Schultz called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Other members present were Vice Chair Heidi Becker, Blake Hayes, Josh Hicks, and Jesse Wrice. Assistant Public Works Director DaMarcus Hunter and Street Supervisor Andrew Spencer also were present.

Pledge of Allegiance

Announcements

A. Updates on Local Transportation from other Municipalities/Organizations based on Publicly Available Information

1. Fayette County Transportation Committee - Heidi Becker and Jesse Wrice

Wrice said he attended the Fayette County Transportation Committee meeting, and they discussed the single trash hauler proposal and the annexation plan that were under consideration in Peachtree City. Councilman Clint Holland attended, but Wrice observed that Peachtree City no longer had an official representative on the Committee.

He said County Engineer advised them that the proposed County Transportation Plan would be available to the public on the County website. The Committee also talked about Redwine Road, along with new paths, enforcing speed limits, and traffic safety.

Schultz observed that it seemed the annexation study was focusing on the potential of annexing already developed properties in the county. Some of the areas on the southside already had a certain degree of path access.

2. Fayette Forward- Heidi Becker

Becker said Fayette Forward had met that morning. She explained that these meetings were not open to the public but had representatives from each of the municipalities. She said she talked to Caroline Creel, who was recently hired as the group's vice chair, and she had provided some maps that showed the conceptual path connectivity plan.

Also, Connect Fayette had been chosen as a name for the path network, and

Becker said Creel said they were trying to set up a foundation of 140 miles of multi-use paths.

3. Tyrone- Blake Hayes

Hayes said most of Tyrone's conversation now was taken up with a proposal for a data center. However, he did note that Tyrone would be erecting some "Share the Road" signs on local roads to make them more bicycle-friendly.

He said a citizen mentioned that Tyrone charged \$60 to non-residents for cart registration, and the citizen thought that was not fair because

Peachtree City charged non-residents \$250 per year. The citizen asked Tyrone's leaders to reach out to Peachtree City to renegotiate.

4. ARC- Josh Hicks

Hicks said the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) meeting was cancelled.

Presentations

Public Comment

Schultz explained that anyone present could make their comments during the designated time, but once they had finished would not be allowed to speak again.

Rich Ganz and his wife, Allison, were present, and said they had lived here for two years, and the cart paths were their favorite thing about Peachtree City. His teenage daughter had just completed a cart safety course taught by Police Officers at McIntosh High.

He said there was a section of Flat Creek Road in front of the country club that he felt was unsafe and wondered if a safety assessment had been done there. There was a high volume of cart traffic there, a lot of them students, and a blind corner added to the danger. If no study had been done, he suggested that it should be and mitigants put in place.

Hunter said Public Works had not had any complaints about that area, but he encouraged Ganz to officially report it, and they would take a look. Becker said TAG's mission was to improve safety. Ganz said he was looking at this with new eyes and thought a look was needed. Hunter said they were always glad to have help from citizens, and Spencer explained who Ganz could email about this.

Schultz explained that TAG reviewed the path master plan every year, and their usual direction was to keep paths on the same side of road, not requiring a crossing such as

Ganz had described.

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

A. June 23, 2026

Hicks moved to approve the June 23, 2026 meeting minutes. Becker seconded. Motion carried unanimously, with Hayes abstaining due to his absence from the meeting.

Old Agenda Items

A. Requiring Motorized Cart Insurance: Review Josh Hick's slides on PD statistics

At the previous meeting, Hicks had offered to consolidate data on cart crashes provided by the Police Department. It showed 28 crashes in a four-month window, with a 25% injury rate and a 20% ejection rate. Four people required medical transport.

Becker mentioned an article on path safety in The Fayette Citizen that said there had been 299 crashes in a five-year period, with 122 resulting in an injury. These statistics were close to what the Police had provided to TAG.

Hicks had created a map that showed hotspots for accidents. The two most common spots were on Huddleston Road and North Fulton Court and on Peachtree Parkway and Walt Banks. He also presented a chart that distinguished between car vs. cart crashes, cart-only crashes, and crashes involving two carts or a cart and a bicycle.

He included ages of the drivers, and those statistics showed that most crashes by far involved teenage drivers, followed by young adults aged 19 to 34. Seniors had a higher number of crashes than middle-aged drivers. Statistics showed that out of 1,000 teens in Peachtree City, 3.73 were the at-fault drivers in a crash, compared to .66 in the young adult category, .35 for seniors, and .22 for middle-aged adults.

The biggest factors were misjudged clearances and failure to yield. Reckless driving was also a major cause of crashes. Hicks said 32% of the crashes came during the school rush hours in the mornings and afternoons. About 25% of the crashes were on the weekend, and 11% from 8 p.m. to 6 a.m.

They again reviewed who could drive a cart. If a 15-year-old had a learner's permit,

they could drive and have one unrelated passenger or up to three passengers who were immediate family members. If a 15-year-old wanted to drive more people, they had to have a parent or guardian along.

Hicks' observation from this data was that both named hotspots (Walt Banks and Huddleston Roads) shared a commonality in that they were high volume path crossings interacting directly with major motor vehicle roadways. He also pointed out that drivers aged 15 and younger accounted for 10 of the at-fault accidents reported, and that 86% of teen passenger crashes had other teens with them, compared to just three incidents across all adult demographics combined.

Hayes asked if the accidents occurred at the Huddleston/Fulton Court intersection or just on Huddleston Road in general. Hicks said he believed it was at the intersection.

Hicks also included some recommendations that TAG might want to discuss. They included requiring all authorized users to be listed on cart registration, and that safety classes be required for all teen drivers. Also, the cart registration stickers could identify teen drivers. Other protections to explore could be mandatory liability insurance for teen drivers (preferably all drivers) and requiring a valid driver's license or learner's permit to drive a cart.

He suggested some infrastructure improvements that could help prevent crashes, including path crossing improvements at the two hotspots he had identified.

Becker asked if you had to show a driver's license to register a cart, and Hayes said you did not because a license was not required to drive a cart. Hayes said Peachtree City had an exemption to allow unlicensed drivers, but licenses were required in every other city in Georgia. Hayes asked if giving up that exemption was worth it in terms of safety?

Wrice asked if the Police held classes at both high schools, and Becker said she believed they did, several times a year.

Schultz said all these recommendations had merit, but tonight they were looking only at requiring insurance and requiring all 15-year-olds to have a learner's permit to drive a cart. He said he liked the recommendation that if you had a teen driver, you had to have insurance. They had data to show that teens caused most of the accidents.

Becker asked if they had details on injuries, and Hicks said they did not, just if the injuries were major or minor.

Wrice said he was in favor of requiring liability insurance at least, and Becker referred to the injury numbers. Hayes said the Police had a system for rating injuries, and that was probably what they used here. Becker said she thought requiring medical transport would be a major injury. The numbers did not balance,

but that could mean several people were injured in one accident.

She said the ejection rate was interesting, and they talked about why seat belts were not required. Low-speed vehicles required them, but carts did not.

Liability insurance covered damages to other vehicles and other people, not the at-fault driver's cart or the driver. Liability was all the City could require; the State did not require comprehensive coverage on vehicles, Hayes remarked.

Becker asked if all they were doing was voting on whether Council should adopt a cart insurance requirement and was told that was correct.

Schultz said there seemed to be a very low collision rate with only 28 incidents among the 11,000 carts in Peachtree City, which was .25% of all carts. He remarked that cart insurance was inexpensive, and he did not understand why anyone would not want to have it.

Wrice suggested that they query five people about insurance before they took the vote, but the others pointed out that TAG had been talking about this for months. Becker had posted a poll on Facebook, and the response was overwhelmingly in favor of requiring insurance.

Hayes said his opinion was that Peachtree City should either give up its exemption and follow State law like everyone else or keep the exemption. He did not think they should try to create their own regulatory system. A Facebook commenter had said he hoped there would be a provision to self-insure, and Hayes said that could be done for carts like it was for cars.

Hayes moved that TAG recommend to City Council to require motorized cart insurance in accordance with State law. Wrice seconded. Motion carried 4-1, with Hayes, Hicks, Schultz, and Wrice voting in favor, and Becker voted against.

B. Requiring a learner's permit for 15-year-old cart drivers to be included in recommended ordinance updates

Schultz asked about State law regarding 15-year-old cart drivers, and Hayes reported that it said, unless exempted, that cart drivers must comply with the laws that applied to other motor vehicle operators. To drive alone, they had to have a driver's license, not a learner's permit, and comply with insurance requirements. So you had to be 16 to drive a cart alone in other cities? Becker asked, and Hayes said that was correct and you had to be a licensed driver because the law was not

tied to age.

Beckers said she often saw younger kids driving carts, but Wrice pointed out that it was okay if they were with a parent.

Hayes said that is what was odd about it. What would it make for them to allow 12- to 14-year-olds to drive with a parent, then say that 15-year-olds had to have a learner's permit, whether a parent was present or not. He suggested they remove the provision that permitted 15-year-olds to drive by themselves. They could still drive with a parent or guardian.

A lot of 15-year-olds were in high school, Becker said, and were driving to school. Hayes said he thought that is why the exception had been made for immediate family members, the 15-year-old could drive siblings to school, too.

Becker observed that this was a timely topic that they needed to spend more time on. Schultz said he would have been ready to entertain a motion to require anyone eligible to obtain a permit to have one in order to drive a golf cart, but he was fine with tabling it.

Hicks said he would be okay with a 15-year-olds driving without a permit if they were accompanied by an adult.

This was about what they wanted to include in the next round of ordinance updates, Schultz remarked. Insurance would have to be an ordinance update, and probably should not be delayed, but he thought the question of 15-year-old drivers could wait.

Becker said she wanted more discussion because there were a lot of nuances, such as the 15-year-olds that drove to school. She said a lot of 12- to 14-year-olds had learned to drive with their parents, so the parents let them take carts out alone when they turned 15. Becker said she did not know what other cities did, but Hayes pointed out that unless the cities had their rules in place before 2012, like Peachtree City did, they had to follow State law.

Schultz agreed there were nuances that merited discussion.

Becker moved to table Old Agenda item 8B for discussion at a future meeting. Wrice seconded. Motion carried unanimously

C. Intersection treatments and policy recommendations- Blake Hayes

Hayes had offered to look more closely at intersection ordinance and policy recommendations and had created a draft ordinance amendment but now said that while he did not hate the idea of a policy that could be adopted as an ordinance, he

had begun to think they could get by with a document that was internal to TAG.

The underlying premise was the list of escalating improvements that TAG had developed. Hayes said he just wanted there to be some sort of reasoning for the recommendations they made for dealing with problem intersections. They had the list, but they needed something to back their decisions.

He distributed copies of the ordinance he had drafted. He wrote it in the format of something that could go before Council and said it was not without precedent—Council recently had moved a policy on when to install traffic calming devices from policy to an ordinance. This proposal was for procedures the City could follow when they were working to correct a dangerous intersection, starting with the simplest and least expensive idea and moving up from there.

Section 1 said stop signs should be obeyed unless there was a conflicting signal, such as a HAWK crossing. Section 2 contained new Section 78-34.1 and gave ideas for what to do at intersections where paths crossed public roadways. What they were trying to fix were intersections where there was a path crossing and also a stop sign or a yield sign or something on the main roadway to control traffic. Hayes included a list of what they were modifying, such as uncontrolled intersections where path traffic stopped; controlled intersections where everyone had stop signs. He again noted that at intersections with traffic signals, everyone had to follow the signal.

The draft ordinance included the escalating list of remedies TAG had developed. It explained each option, such as painted boxes, crossing guards, adding an all-way stop to a nearby intersection, signalization, and the development of alternate paths or a roundabout.

The methodology was stated for how to choose which option was best. The first items were not tied to any particular danger, he explained, such as placing all-way stop signs at those intersections. Crossing guards could only be used near schools, and that also would involve conversations with the Board of Education. Refuge islands had to be on a divided highway that was wide enough to accommodate it.

Hayes said other options could be based on the number of collisions and injuries that had occurred in the past five years or another set period of time. They could sometimes try a lesser treatment before moving on to a heavier one, he remarked, but, of course, they could not do something like putting in a HAWK beacon and if that did not work, adding a roundabout. Other things, like a painted box before reconstructing a path, did have a progressive nature and could be tested.

For intersections that had no incidents in the past five years, the City could choose to do nothing, but Hayes recommended the painted boxes and flashing beacons as options if they felt action was necessary. Adding an all-way stop was a relatively cheap option as well. Intersections with more collisions or minor injuries might

require reconstructing the path or building an alternate path with an all-way stop at the intersection or adding a HAWK crossing. More serious issues, such as a death, might call for extreme improvements, such as a roundabout. He also included a provision that they could install HAWK signals where needed even if there were no collisions.

Hayes again said he was not tied to the specifics but wanted opinions on if this made sense as a data-based framework on how to select treatments for these intersections.

Becker asked if there had ever been a death on the paths? Hayes said a cyclist was killed on Peachtree Parkway, but he did not know about the paths. Schultz recalled a cyclist killed in a head-on collision in a tunnel about a decade ago.

Schultz asked Hunter if this escalating list would be useful to Public Works? Hunter said a lot of the issues they had were already going before an engineer for design. If there was an easy solution, they probably had already tried it. It would not hurt to have this list, but many things would have to go out to engineering, he remarked. Most of these paths were built years ago, more or less, as walking trails, he said, with Becker observing that the paths were now more like a roadway.

Becker then asked about the North Hill path, where numerous trees had been removed, and Spencer said that project was being redesigned in order to avoid a water main and also to preserve as many trees as possible.

Wrice wanted an example of an all-way stop and asked if the Peachtree Parkway/McIntosh Trail intersection was one? He was told it was, and those types of stops were indicated on the signs. Hayes said he thought the small signs for the paths should indicate all-way stops, as well. He said that it would be a small investment, but it would show that everyone got a turn, including carts on the paths.

Schultz thanked Hayes for putting this together, saying TAG would start talking about ordinance updates in September, and this was a good beginning. He said they all needed time to read it.

Hayes moved to table item 8C until the next meeting. Becker seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Schultz remarked that time was running short. Wrice moved to table Old Agenda items 8D and 8E, and New Agenda item 9A. Hayes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Path system integration with surrounding communities and reciprocity-continue discussion

E. Village marking signs (SPLOST project) - site visits.

New Agenda Items

A. Navigate PTC App Improvements

Public Hearings

Member/Staff Topics

Schultz remarked that TAG was understaffed and thanked everyone for attending so there could be a quorum. He said he believed the City would begin interviews for new members soon. Everyone said they were good with the dates for the upcoming meetings.

Becker suggested moving the Public Comment to the beginning of the meeting after the Pledge of Allegiance. Schultz said this format came from Council, but the City Manager had allowed some flexibility. He thought Becker's idea was a good one and said he would make that change. Hayes mentioned that he might want to remove Public Hearings from the agenda because TAG would never have one, and Schultz agreed.

Hayes commented that he had seen Public Works re-doing a crosswalk near Peachtree City Elementary, and they needed to use a "stop/slow" sign instead of someone sitting on the path, holding up their hand. Spencer said they had those signs, and he would make sure they were used.

A. Upcoming TAG Meetings Dates

1. July 28, 2026

2. August 11, 2026

Adjourn

There being no further business, Schultz moved to adjourn at 8:01 p.m. Hayes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Paul Schultz, Chairman

Proposed Policy for Addressing Intersections with Path Crossings

(Ordinance number, title, and enacting clause omitted)

Section 1. Chapter 78, Article III, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Peachtree City, Georgia, as amended, is hereby further amended by amending Section 78-96(m) to read and to be codified as follows:

(m) Except when directed to proceed by a police officer, or when another traffic control device directs otherwise as provided for under Section 78-34.1, the driver of any vehicle on the path system shall, prior to leaving the path system to enter or cross a public roadway designed for automobile traffic, stop as though a stop sign were present and, after stopping, shall yield the right-of-way to any traffic on said public roadway that is within the intersection or so close thereto as to create a hazard; provided, that this shall not be construed as relieving traffic on said public roadway from complying with any traffic control devices applicable to said traffic.

Section 2. Chapter 78, Article I, of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Peachtree City, Georgia, as amended, is hereby further amended by adding new Section 78-34.1 to read and to be codified as follows:

Sec. 78-34.1. Path Crossing Operations at Controlled Intersections.

- (a) *Purpose.* The purpose of this section is to define the intended operations of intersections that exist within the City where paths (as defined in Section 78-91) cross public roadways designed for automobile traffic at roadway intersections. In addition, this section sets out the design methods that the City will apply to improve safety and operations at these intersections that have path crossings.
- (b) *Definitions.* The definitions from Section 78-91 shall apply to this section. In addition, the following words, terms, and phrases, when used in this section, shall have the meanings ascribed to them below:
 - (1) *Intersection.* For the purpose of determining if a path crossing is related to a nearby intersection, a path crossing shall be considered part of an intersection if the path crossing is within 30 feet of the intersection. Otherwise, the path crossing shall be considered separate from the intersection.
 - (2) *Controlled intersection.* A controlled intersection is an intersection that has a traffic control device such as a stop sign, yield sign, traffic signal, or traffic beacon controlling any of the roadway approaches to the intersection. For purposes of this definition, any such traffic control device on a path by itself shall not be sufficient to cause the intersection designed for automobile traffic to be considered a controlled intersection.

Only a traffic control device on a roadway designed for automobile traffic will cause the intersection to be treated as a controlled intersection.

- (3) *Uncontrolled intersection.* An uncontrolled intersection is any intersection that is not a controlled intersection as defined above. As provided for above, an intersection can be an uncontrolled intersection even if the path that crosses the intersection has traffic control devices provided that the roadways designed for automobile traffic do not have traffic control devices on any of them.

(c) *Operations of Path Crossings.*

- (1) At uncontrolled intersections, all traffic on the paths must stop and yield as though a stop sign were present as provided for in Section 78-96(m).
- (2) At controlled intersections that are controlled by stop signs on some or all approaches, traffic on the roadways controlled by stop signs and traffic on all paths crossing the intersection must stop and, after stopping, yield in accordance with the rules for a stop sign. Path traffic must stop and yield even if a sign is not posted as provided for in Section 78-96(m).
- (3) At controlled intersections that are controlled by yield signs on some or all approaches, traffic on the roadways controlled by yield signs must yield by slowing down to a speed reasonable for the existing conditions and, if required for safety, stop for traffic on the path crossing. Path traffic must stop and, after stopping, yield in accordance with the rules for a stop sign even if a sign is not posted as provided for in Section 78-96(m). However, after stopping, path traffic may proceed when it is safe to do so, with traffic on the roadways controlled by yield signs being required to yield as noted above.
- (4) At controlled intersections that are controlled by traffic signals, traffic on the roadways controlled by traffic signals shall obey the instructions of said signals, and traffic on the paths shall obey the instructions of the pedestrian crossing signals. Notwithstanding any circular green indication to proceed, traffic on the roadways must yield to path traffic when turning unless the pedestrian crossing signal prohibits crossing at the time the turning movement is being made.
- (5) At controlled intersections that are controlled by pedestrian hybrid beacons ("HAWK" signals), traffic on the roadways shall obey the instructions of said beacons, and traffic on the paths shall obey the instructions of the pedestrian crossing signals. Notwithstanding the above, if path traffic can safely cross without interfering with traffic on the roadways, path traffic may proceed after stopping as though a stop sign

were present as provided for in Section 78-96(m) and yielding the right of way to all traffic on the roadway.

- (6) At any other controlled intersection that is controlled by a traffic control device other than a stop sign, yield sign, traffic signal, or traffic beacon, traffic on the roadways controlled by the traffic control device shall obey the instructions of that traffic control device, and path traffic shall stop as though a stop sign were present as provided for in Section 78-96(m). After stopping, path traffic must yield the right of way to traffic on the roadway in the same manner as if the path traffic were on the roadway and shall not be deprioritized solely because the path traffic is at a path crossing.
 - (7) At any controlled intersection that has directions that operate as through highways, traffic in those directions shall always have the right of way subject only to the duty to exercise due care for the safety of all persons and any other right of way laws that may apply, such as yielding when turning left; provided that other right of way laws may also be modified and preferential right of way may be indicated by stop signs or yield signs.
- (d) *Designs Options to Improve Operations of Path Crossings.* The following treatments may be applied to path crossings at intersections to improve safety and operational characteristics. Descriptions of when the City will apply specific treatments follows in subsection (e).
- (1) *All-Way Stop Plaques.* When a path crossing occurs at a controlled intersection that is already operating as an all-way stop, the path crossing should also be treated as part of the all-way stop by including the all-way (R1-3P) supplemental plaque as required by the MUTCD.
 - (2) *Painted Boxes for Path Traffic other than Pedestrians.* A painted box on the roadway would allow for path traffic to merge prior to the roadway intersection and then navigate the roadway intersection as a regular vehicle. This reduces the number of conflict points at the roadway intersection by shifting the merge point away from the main intersection.
 - (3) *Rapid Flashing Beacons.* Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons (RRFBs) are devices that flash when activated by path traffic to indicate that traffic is attempting to cross. However, RRFBs do not grant right of way or require other vehicles to slow down or stop beyond any existing requirements of law, such as the duty to stop for pedestrians at crosswalks.
 - (4) *Crossing Guards.* For path crossings that have intermittently high levels of path traffic related to nearby schools, crossing guards during appropriate times may reduce the conflicts between path traffic and roadway traffic while also increasing operational efficiency.

- (5) *Merging Path into Intersection.* Similar to the painted boxes for path traffic, the path itself could be merged into the roadway. Separate provisions for pedestrians would need to be provided.
 - (6) *Adding an All-Way Stop to a Nearby Intersection.* When one intersection with path crossings reaches traffic levels that exceed safety and operational limits, it may be desirable to reroute path traffic to a nearby intersection that can also have path crossings added. Doing so, and closing some path crossing routes, would split the path traffic among multiple intersections. The additional all-way stop could be justified under Warrant E, item C. However, this would result in additional stopping time on the roadways, and the intersections that would have path crossings be added as a controlled intersection need to be close enough that path traffic will choose to cross there.
 - (7) *Refuge Island.* A refuge island in the middle of a crossing point of a divided highway would allow path traffic to make the crossing in two stages. When this option is chosen, consideration should be made as to whether the second path crossing in each direction can safely operate under yield control to reduce the need for path traffic to make two separate stops if there is sufficient visibility for it to be safe to cross in one movement.
 - (8) *Signalization.* Traffic signalization, including the installation of a pedestrian hybrid beacon (“HAWK” signal), would provide the highest level of safety with respect to the path crossings, though it would affect operational characteristics of the intersection.
 - (9) *Develop Alternate Paths.* Alternate paths could be constructed to reroute path traffic away from high-traffic path crossings at busy roadway intersections.
 - (10) *Construct a Roundabout.* Roundabouts, alone or in conjunction with some of the other options available, can improve operational efficiency and safety at these intersections.
- (e) *Choice of Intersection Treatments.* As used in this subsection, treatment numbers correspond to the list of 10 items above in subsection (d).
- (1) For any all-way controlled intersections with path crossings, treatment #1 should be implemented according to the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

- (2) Where appropriate, the City will consider partnering with the Fayette County Board of Education to implement crossing guards in accordance with treatment #4 at path crossings that have heavy school traffic.
- (3) The City should consider placing refuge islands for treatment #7 at path crossings of divided highways. If it is not feasible to install a refuge island in the current conditions, then this treatment should be retained as an option to address path crossings with collisions, injuries, or deaths.
- (4) For all other path crossings and treatments other than all-way stops, crossing guards, and refuge islands, treatment selection will be based on collisions, injuries, and deaths that have occurred in the past 5 years. The list of treatments is intended to be progressive in nature where feasible. Therefore, a lesser treatment may be attempted prior to a more significant treatment to determine if safety and operational characteristics improve.
- (5) For path crossings that have no reported collisions, injuries, or deaths in the past five years, the City may choose to implement no treatment, treatment #2, or treatment #3. No higher levels of treatment should be implemented if there is no otherwise documented safety risk or operational improvement. Notwithstanding this limitation, the City may redesign its roadways in the normal manner for any reason.
- (6) For path crossings that have at least 1 but less than 10 collisions in the past 5 years without any deaths, the City may choose to implement treatment #5 (lesser treatment option #2) or treatment #6.
- (7) For path crossings that have more than 10 collisions or more than 1 instance of injuries that are greater than minor injuries, the City may choose to implement treatment #5 (lesser treatment option #2), treatment #9 (lesser treatment option #6), or treatment #8 with a pedestrian hybrid beacon (“HAWK” signal).
- (8) For path crossings with deaths, the City may choose to implement treatment #9 (lesser treatment option #6), treatment #8, or treatment #10.
- (9) Notwithstanding any recommendations for a pedestrian hybrid beacon (“HAWK” signal) based on collisions, injuries, or deaths, such a beacon may be considered for installation near schools to support school traffic or other high-traffic areas that would benefit from intermittent traffic control with continuous traffic control for the path crossings.