



Transportation Advisory Group

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

Meeting Agenda

August 11, 2026 | 6:00 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**
 - A. Fayette Forward Update- Carolyn Creel
6. **Agenda Changes**
7. **Minutes**
 - A. July 28, 2026
8. **Old Agenda Items**
 - A. Path system integration with surrounding communities and reciprocity- draft memo- Paul Schultz
 - B. Village marking signs (SPLOST project)- site visits.
 - C. Intersection treatments and policy recommendations (updated draft)- Blake Hayes
9. **New Agenda Items**
 - A. New shared-used path plans- if any
 - B. Navigate PTC app improvements
10. **Member/Staff Topics**
 - A. Upcoming TAG Meeting Dates
 1. August 25, 2026
 2. September 8, 2026

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

11. Adjourn

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 28, 2026
6:30 PM

Call to Order

The Peachtree City Transportation Advisory Group (TAG) met for a regular meeting on Tuesday, July 28, 2026, at the Peachtree City Welcome Center. Chairman Paul Schultz called the meeting to order at 6:52 p.m. Other members present were Vice Chair Heidi Becker, Blake Hayes, and Josh Hicks. Jesse Wrice was absent. Assistant Public Works Director DaMarcus Hunter and Street Supervisor Andrew Spencer also were present.

Pledge of Allegiance

Public Comment

Claudia Eisenburg said she opposed any plans to connect and expand the multi-use paths across Fayette County and into adjacent areas. One of her concerns was that the paths would be overrun with e-bikes. She noted that the paths in the south end of the city were very close to homes and thought additional traffic could be an invasion of privacy and safety. She asked who would be providing the funding to patrol these interconnected paths and again mentioned that safety was her concern.

Brenda Walton asked why there were not rapid flashing beacons in all school zones? Schultz replied there was an effort between the City and the Board of Education to get them everywhere. Wherever the BOE did not place them, the City would. Spencer told her the Sign Department was planning on getting them placed at all elementary schools before the school year began.

Eisenburg again mentioned that safety for children should be a priority and said path connection to other communities would endanger Peachtree City residents. Walton said she moved to Peachtree City because she wanted to be separate from other cities and cautioned against government overextending.

Jane Trammell was also present and said the other women had covered what she had to say.

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**
None
- 2. Fayette Forward- Heidi Becker**
Becker reported she had invited a Fayette Forward representative to make a

presentation at the next TAG meeting on August 11.

3. Tyrone- Blake Hayes

A citizen requested during Tyrone's last Council meeting that the town install a "No Jake Brake" sign on Dogwood Trail, Hayes commented, and Council said they were looking into it. Tyrone was installing "Share the Road" signs to promote safety for cyclists. Also at the meeting, a Councilmember asked about progress on a new path crossing with a flashing signal. No location was specified. The Town Manager replied that it had been delayed by land acquisition.

4. ARC- Josh Hicks

Schultz said the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) had posted a map of the proposed trail system for metro Atlanta, and he thought it was worth a look.

Presentations

None

Agenda Changes

None

Minutes

A. July 14, 2026

Becker moved to approve the July 14 TAG meeting minutes. Hayes seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Old Agenda Items

A. Intersection Treatments and Policy Recommendations- Blake Hayes

Hayes had created a policy proposal for addressing intersections with path crossings. Schultz said he had read through it and thought it was comprehensive, but he had a few questions. Section 1(m) mentioned the driver of any vehicle on the path system, and Schultz thought "operator" might be a better word. Hayes said "operator" would be fine, but that was already in the ordinance, and he had tried to change as little as possible.

Another part of Section 1(m) said *"this shall not be construed as relieving traffic on said public roadway from complying with any traffic control devices applicable to said traffic,"* and Schultz asked what that meant.

Hayes replied that the City had stressed for many years that golf carts never had the right-of-way, but that was not always true. Drivers were not relieved from obeying signs or signals because there was a cart at the intersection.

Under Section 2 (c)(1), it said, *"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),"* and Schultz suggested changing it to *"all vehicular traffic,"* which Hayes commended as a good catch because traffic legally included pedestrians, and

pedestrians were not legally obligated to stop and yield.

Schultz noted that (c)(4) said *“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”* and asked Hayes for an example. He replied there were a couple of crossings like that at Best Buy where a path ran parallel to SR 54, and it was a signalized intersection. This was reiterating the regulation that traffic signals had to be obeyed by drivers on the road, and drivers on the paths had to obey the pedestrian crossing signals. He said he believed most people treated those intersections that way, but it could be confusing because the City posted stop signs. This should make it clear that when the pedestrian signal said “Walk,” path traffic could go, and when it said “Don’t Walk,” path traffic should stop.

Schultz noted that the stop signs could be removed and asked if this would apply to the HAWK signals. Hayes said it did, and he had addressed this in (5). He also pointed out a sentence that said drivers could proceed, after stopping, without activating the HAWK signal if it was safe to do so. The other TAG members agreed that this should be the case.

Were there any provisions for areas where cart stops could become yields? Schultz asked, and Hayes said he did not because he felt that was a separate topic. If it was added, it would be in Section 1 where it currently said cart drivers must stop when leaving the path to enter or cross a public road. He went on to say that a private driveway did not constitute a public roadway.

Schultz said he agreed with how Hayes had handled the escalating treatments.

Hicks questioned how much flexibility was allowed under Section 2 (e)(4), Choice of Intersection Treatments, saying sometimes it might be best to start with a higher-level treatment. Hayes remarked that (e)(1), (2), and (3) had conditions that restricted their use to certain situations. For example, (1) applied only to all-way stops, (2) dealt with school crossing guards, and (3) called for refuge islands, which could only be used on a divided highway.

The progressive remedy system started at (e)(4), which said *“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.”* That was the opposite of what Hicks was saying, Hayes continued, but the last sentence of (5) said that *“Notwithstanding this limitation, the City may redesign its roadways in the normal manner for any reason.”* Hayes suggested moving that sentence to (4).

Hicks agreed that would address what he was talking about, and Schultz clarified that nothing would require the City to go through the list of solutions—they could go straight to the top.

What about if they wanted to redesign a road to accommodate a refuge island? Hicks asked. What would that fall under? Hayes noted that on a divided highway, it would be a minor issue for carts to cross in two trips, with a stop in the median and a stop sign at the second crossing. If a road redesign was needed, he thought it could go under (7), but Hicks suggested (5), which covered path crossings that had no reported collisions, injuries, or deaths in the past five years, or (6), crossings that had at least one but fewer than 10 collisions in the past five years without any deaths.

Hayes added that (7) was for crossings with more than 10 collisions or more than one instance of injuries greater than minor injuries, while (8) was for crossings with deaths. He said the numbers were his, not based on any data.

Schultz said the criteria might be something City staff would have to work out, and Hayes added that they could go back only two years rather than five.

Becker asked Hunter and Spencer if this list would be helpful to Public Works, and Hunter said it would. It provided reasoning for proceeding with certain projects, Hayes noted, and could be useful when asking for authorization from Council.

Becker noted that these were only guidelines, and Hayes acknowledged that was the nature of government. Schultz said future safety-focused Councils would be able to point to this ordinance and its recommendations as leverage against a hypothetical tight-fisted City Manager who did not want to spend money on path improvements.

Council had recently moved a policy into ordinance regarding when to install speed bumps in a neighborhood, Hayes remarked, and he thought this was similar. The speed bump ordinance also contained a series of progressive steps before adding physical barriers.

Schultz said he wanted to start working on an edited version, and Hayes volunteered to write another draft that incorporated their suggestions to be subsumed as part of TAG's annual ordinance updates.

B. Path System Integration with Surrounding Communities and Reciprocity-Continue Discussion

Schultz stated that Senoia, Tyrone, and Fayette County were all making attempts to develop path systems. Peachtree City already had some path integration with the County, he noted, citing the path leading to Starr's Mill High and the Redwine Road paths as examples. Tyrone residents could bring carts into Peachtree City, and Tyrone was continuing plans for their own path system. Senoia also had

paths.

Schultz said he thought connecting to these communities would benefit Peachtree City residents. He mentioned that people living near Wilshire Village Shopping Center were connected to Publix, Chick-fil-A, and a few other businesses, but a four-mile path to Senoia would allow them to shop and dine there. Likewise, people from Senoia might want to take a 20-minute cart ride to Peachtree City businesses.

A traffic study showed that carts from Tyrone entered Peachtree City at a rate of about 15 a day. Schultz noted that those residents had to pay Peachtree City's \$15 cart registration fee, plus an additional \$235 non-resident fee. He said the point was reciprocity, which called for development of a path network in the County and in Tyrone. New paths would keep carts from entering the city on residential streets.

Schultz said he would like to put together a memo to circulate to staff and Council to say that as a high-level thought going forward, Peachtree City could promote reciprocity by eliminating the additional \$235 fee for non-residents. Becker wondered how many non-resident carts were cited for improper registration each year. Hayes noted that failure to register carried a \$1,000 fine.

He went on to remark on Schultz's newspaper article published that week. Becker had posted it on Facebook, and it had garnered a lot of comments, with several Tryone residents saying they understood the reasoning behind them having to pay an additional fee. However, a few Peachtree City residents thought non-residents should be barred from the City's paths. Hayes had responded that these outsider carts did pay an additional \$235 and also paid a portion of the Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST) that totally funded the path network. No property tax money went to the paths.

Hayes pointed out, however, that existing State law said local ordinances could not require cart registration fees of more than \$15 a year. If the City wanted to continue charging an additional \$235, they needed to get the local State Representatives to introduce legislation allowing them to do so, Hayes said. He said the City justified the \$235 by saying it was a user fee, not a registration fee.

Becker wondered when the fee came about and why and what was the money used for? Hayes said several years ago, staff calculated what the City spent on the paths per resident and added that amount onto the non-resident fee. The City Attorney had approved this, Hayes remarked, but he had also approved Senoia charging a \$60 a year registration fee, which was well outside State law.

Fee conversation aside, Hayes commented that he supported reciprocity with neighboring communities as long as those communities were working to develop their own path systems.

Hicks asked if Tyrone residents had different registrations from Peachtree City, and Schultz said they did. Hayes said reciprocity would mean that if you registered your car where you lived, you had permission to drive it to other areas that shared the reciprocity agreement without paying an additional fee. It was the same thing as registering your car in Fayette County but being able to drive it to Fulton County with no additional requirements.

Eisenburg asked who would patrol these paths, and Hayes responded that the Paulding County Sheriff's Office patrolled the Silver Comet Trail. Eisenburg said the Peachtree City Police did not have enough manpower to adequately do the job.

She and Walton then left the meeting, with Eisenburg saying she was very impressed with TAG's work.

Schultz said he would put the memo together and bring it to the next meeting.

Hayes moved to table Old Agenda item 8B until the next meeting. Hicks seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Village Marking Signs (SPLOST project) - Site Visits.

The group discussed arranging a date to visit potential locations for village marking signs and decided to coordinate it through emails.

Becker also told Hunter and Spencer that the neighborhood marking sign was down at the Bellenden subdivision.

New Agenda Items

A. Navigate PTC App Improvements

With time running short, Hayes moved to table New Agenda item 9A until the next meeting. Hicks seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Member/Staff Topics

A. Upcoming TAG Meeting Dates

They agreed there would be a quorum available for both those meeting dates.

Becker asked about the timeline for getting new members. Schulz explained that the seven members were appointed to three-year staggered terms. The final meeting of September would be the final meeting for two or three members. They would vote on a new chair at the first meeting in October but would have to vote again in January because the ordinance said the terms ended with the fiscal year, but the officers had to be elected at the start of the calendar year.

Schultz said he would send Hayes an email with the ordinance updates they had discussed, including insurance and licenses.

The City Manager had asked to come to the next meeting to talk about cart width regulations, Spencer reported. Schultz said he would put that on the agenda.

Becker asked about the North Hill path project on Peachtree Parkway, which had resulted in the removal of many large trees. Spencer said there were a lot of problems with the original design, and once they had a new design, they would be reaching out to the contractor.

Hayes asked if that project was presented to Council, and Hunter said it was in the SPLOST, so it had to be done. They had known it would be a lot of work, but they did not expect all the trees to be removed. The first plan also was on top of a water main, he said, so they just decided to start over. He said work should start soon.

Former TAG member Brian Bartal had suggested that TAG look at path plans, much as the Planning Commission looked at site plans. Schultz thought that might be a good idea, not for engineering specifics, but for things like how many trees would be removed. Hunter said that should be possible, and added that for a project of this scope, he would have taken it to Council and let the citizens hear about plans to clear-cut the trees. Spencer said, ideally, they should have marked out the cutting area so people could see how many trees would be removed. Then the homeowners' association (HOA) could decide what they wanted to do. Hunter observed that it was going to cost the City a lot of money to replace those trees.

1. August 11, 2026

2. August 25, 2026

Adjourn

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

Martha Barksdale, Recording Secretary

Paul Schultz, Chairman

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Transportation Advisory Group Members
FROM:	Paul Schutz, TAG Chair
DATE:	August 6, 2026
RE:	Proposal for Reciprocal Access to Peachtree City's Shared-Use Path System — Senoia, Tyrone, and Fayette County

FOR INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION — TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY GROUP

I. PURPOSE

This memorandum proposes a framework for establishing reciprocal shared-use path access agreements between Peachtree City and the neighboring jurisdictions of Senoia, Tyrone, and Fayette County at large. The goal is to expand regional mobility, correct persistent public misconceptions about path access, and create an equitable cost-sharing model that reflects the actual pattern of multi-jurisdictional path use already occurring. The Transportation Advisory Group is the appropriate body to evaluate this proposal and advance a recommendation to the full City Council.

II. BACKGROUND — PEACHTREE CITY'S SHARED-USE PATH SYSTEM

Peachtree City operates one of the most extensive shared-use path systems in the southeastern United States, comprising approximately 100 miles of paved shared-use paths used by motorized carts, pedestrians, cyclists, and other motorized and non-motorized vehicles. The system is funded locally primarily through SPLOST (Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax) allocations and impact fees collected on new construction projects specifically allocated to construct new paths.

Path maintenance, including resurfacing, is a significant recurring cost. A primary driver of resurfacing needs is tree-root intrusion beneath the path surface, which heaves and cracks

the pavement over time, particularly in older residential sections of the city. This is not a usage-volume issue but a natural infrastructure challenge tied to the urban canopy. This distinction is important when evaluating how to fairly assess costs in a reciprocal access framework: the maintenance burden does not scale with the number of users; it scales with the age and canopy coverage of the path corridor. Any cost-sharing model should reflect this reality rather than defaulting to the assumption that more users necessarily means more cost.

III. CURRENT ACCESS LANDSCAPE

Residents of Peachtree City pay an annual registration fee. Non-residents from Tyrone, Senoia, and unincorporated Fayette County who wish to bring motorized carts onto the Peachtree City path system are currently required to pay both their home jurisdiction's registration fees and Peachtree City's registration and access fee.

This double-fee structure creates a disincentive for legitimate regional use and generates resentment rooted in a misunderstanding of why the fee exists. The fee may not be exclusionary in intent; it is a maintenance-cost recovery mechanism. However, its application to non-residents who may only occasionally use the system, without credit for fees paid elsewhere, undermines progressing on regional cooperation.

IV. REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY BENEFITS

Peachtree City's path system does not terminate at the city limits in any functional sense. Paths near the Tyrone and Senoia borders create natural connectivity points that residents of those communities logically seek to use for recreation, errands, and commuting by motorized cart or bicycle. Establishing formal reciprocal access agreements would produce the following benefits:

- Reduce confusion and administrative enforcement burden at jurisdictional boundaries

- Encourage residents of Tyrone, Senoia, and Fayette County to use non-motorized transportation for trips that currently default to automobile use, contributing to reduced vehicle miles traveled in the corridor
- Strengthen the case for Tyrone, Senoia, and Fayette County to invest in their own shared-use path infrastructure, a condition of this proposal, as addressed in Section VI
- Support regional goals for reducing vehicle miles traveled and improving active transportation options
- Enhance Peachtree City's standing as a regional leader in share-used path transportation policy

V. BUDGET IMPACT — TYRONE CASE STUDY

A concrete illustration of the financial dimension of this proposal involves Tyrone residents who currently pay both Tyrone registration fees and Peachtree City access fees to use the path system. Based on available data, approximately 212 Tyrone residents are currently enrolled in this dual-payment structure. At the applicable fee rates, this population generates approximately \$53,000 annually in Peachtree City path access fee revenue attributable to Tyrone residents alone.

Under the proposed reciprocal access framework, these fees would be waived for residents of participating jurisdictions in exchange for those jurisdictions providing reciprocal no-cost access to their own shared-use path facilities for Peachtree City residents. The \$53,000 annual revenue impact is real and must be acknowledged. It should, however, be weighed against the following considerations:

- The goodwill and regional cooperation value of the reciprocal agreement, which supports ongoing intergovernmental relationships on matters beyond path access
- The fact that Tyrone, Senoia, and Fayette County residents contribute to regional SPLOST revenues that partially fund Peachtree City infrastructure, including the path system

- The reduced administrative burden of managing a dual-registration system for non-resident users
- The potential for formal intergovernmental agreements to unlock state or federal active transportation funding that rewards regional coordination, funding that could offset or exceed the lost-fee revenue
- The reality that the path resurfacing costs driving the fee structure are primarily caused by tree-root infrastructure issues, not by usage volume, meaning that additional non-resident users do not materially increase maintenance costs and that the fee-for-maintenance justification does not scale with non-resident access as straightforwardly as it might appear

The Group should evaluate whether \$53,000 in annual fee revenue is the appropriate metric for this decision, or whether the broader regional mobility and intergovernmental relationship value justifies absorbing this cost, particularly in light of the maintenance-cost analysis above. A full revenue analysis covering all three jurisdictions (see Section VII) is recommended before a final determination is made.

VI. CONDITIONS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS

Reciprocal access is not unconditional. Each jurisdiction seeking to participate in this agreement must meet and maintain the following requirements as a condition of ongoing participation:

- **Active Path Development Obligation.** Each participating jurisdiction must demonstrate an ongoing commitment to developing and maintaining its own shared-use path network. Reciprocal access is not a substitute for local investment; it is a complement to it. Jurisdictions that seek to free-ride on Peachtree City's system without building or maintaining their own infrastructure should not qualify for reciprocal access under this framework.
- **Minimum Network Threshold.** Participating jurisdictions should meet a minimum mileage or connectivity standard to be defined by the Transportation Advisory

Group in consultation with city staff. This threshold prevents the agreement from functioning as a one-sided subsidy and ensures that reciprocity has substantive meaning, not merely formal equivalence.

- **Maintenance Cost-Sharing Review.** The agreement should include a periodic review mechanism — recommended every three years — to assess whether the reciprocal arrangement remains equitable. If usage patterns, maintenance costs, or jurisdictional path investment levels change materially during the agreement period, all terms should be subject to renegotiation by mutual consent.

VIII. RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

The Transportation Advisory Group is asked to take the following actions in sequence:

1. Receive and discuss this proposal at the next regularly scheduled meeting, with opportunity for member questions and input prior to any formal action
2. Request staff to conduct a full fee revenue impact analysis across all three jurisdictions, Tyrone, Senoia, and Fayette County, to establish a complete picture of the financial scope of the proposed waiver
3. Return a formal recommendation to the full City Council no later than the first quarter of 2027, with supporting analysis from staff and legal counsel

IX. CONCLUSION

Peachtree City's shared-use path system is a regional asset. Its value increases when it connects people across jurisdictional boundaries rather than stopping at city limits. This proposal offers a path toward a more rational and regionally connected approach to shared-use infrastructure. The conditions attached to participation ensure that reciprocal access drives investment and accountability, not dependency. The Transportation Advisory Group is well-positioned to evaluate this framework and to bring a considered recommendation forward to City staff and Mayor and Council.