SR 400 & SR 365 Corridor Studies
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #2

August 11, 2006
10:00 AM
GDOT District 1 Office Conference Room

Attendees:
Jeff Barron, City of Cornelia Planning Department
Danny Simmons, City of Cornelia Public Works Department
Scott Morgan, City of Cumming Planning Department
Lynn Tully, Dawson County Planning & Development Department
Randy Bowen, Dawson County Public Works Department
Tim Allen, Forsyth County Engineering Department
Michelle Beesten, Forsyth County Planning Department
Douglas Armstrong, Forsyth County Roads & Bridges Department
Tim Amerson, Forsyth County Schools
John McHenry, Gainesville-Hall MPO
Srikanth Yamala, Gainesville-Hall MPO
Neil Kantner, P.E., Georgia Department of Transportation, District One
Robert Mahoney, P.E., Georgia Department of Transportation, District One
Carolynn Segers, Georgia Mountains RDC
Brian Borden, Georgia Regional Transportation Authority
Larry Glasco, Habersham County Economic Development Department
Scott Puckett, Hall County Engineering Department
Jody Woodall, Hall County Engineering Department
Charles Trammell, Lumpkin County Public Works
Greg Trammell, Lumpkin County Schools
Martha Martin, Phil-Mart Transportation

Project Team Attendees:
Maureen Gresham, ARCADIS
Tim Preece, ARCADIS
Cedric Clark, Georgia Department of Transportation
Jason Crane, Georgia Department of Transportation
Ulysses Mitchell, Georgia Department of Transportation
Beth Radke, MPH & Associates
Jim Evans, PBS&J
Jen Price, Sycamore Consulting

Handouts:
- Meeting Evaluation Form
- Agenda
- PowerPoint Presentation Slides
- Total Daily Trip Tables
- Corridor Crash Data
- Socio-Economic Data
- Stakeholder Interview Summaries

Welcome
The meeting began at 10:10 am with a welcome by Robert Mahoney, GDOT District Pre-Construction Engineer. Mr. Mahoney thanked everyone for attending and gave an overview of the meeting's purpose.

Meeting Purpose & Introductions
Jason Crane, GDOT Project Manager, introduced the consultant team. Mr. Crane then turned the meeting over to Tim Preece of Arcadis to begin the presentation and to facilitate the meeting.

SR 400 and SR 365 Corridor Studies Presentation/Discussion
The presentation began with a review of the meeting purpose and materials. Mr. Preece discussed the progress achieved to date. Existing conditions, including the level of service methodology, the results of the origin and destination analysis, and trip characteristics were discussed. Mr. Preece siacussed roadway network conditions, collision data and land use for the corridors. He also explained the methodology used for the socio-economic analysis and the key findings for each corridor.

Mr. Preece discussed the next steps for the planning process, which include involving the community, forecasting population and employment, assessing travel needs, and alternatives identification. TAC members asked questions throughout the presentation. A summary of the questions, responses and comments is presented below.

Mr. Preece provided a description of the two activities planned for the remainder of the meeting and asked the group to separate by corridor-interest. At each corridor station, participants were asked to use color-coded dots to denote places along each corridor where users encounter challenges and/or issues in their daily trips. Participants were also asked to decide on the most appropriate corridor improvements to be considered for problem areas. A summary of this activity is included.

Summary of Oral Questions & Comments
Question: How are locations of accidents logged on the highways?
Response: Accidents at intersections are coded by police. It is left to the discretion of the officer to report the location of the accidents. At intersections, the officer may choose a cross street as opposed to the corridor to code the accident which may result in an imprecise portrayal of the intersections.

Question: Where did the accident data numbers come from?
Response: The data is from the GDOT accident database. The consultant team can revisit the data and possibly reconsider the parameters chosen to establish the maximum distance from the corridor where accidents should be logged. Also, additional accident data should be sent to the consultant team for review.

Question: What unit of geography is used to characterize the population/employment estimates?
Response: Data used is at the census block level.

Question: What area is the socio-economic analysis done for?
Response: The analysis is completed for the entire area being modeled, or the super zones.

Question: Is the model used to forecast population and employment a standard 4-step model?
Response: Yes. The projections are based on DCA forecasts. Other suggestions of better approaches to the modeling are welcome.

Question: Can the population and employment data be compared against the county comprehensive plans?
Response: It is possible, but some county plans to not project to 2030. However, the consultant team recognizes the need to be sure that the plan is based on demand. Any updated data that the committee members have should be sent to the consultant team.

General comments made by meeting participants were varied with some consistency among comments as summarized below:

- There is a concern that the accident numbers are not accurately portrayed in Lumpkin County
- The consultant team should consider holding two or three public meetings per corridor because many people may want to travel long distances to the meetings

Mr. Preece concluded the meeting at 12:00 and encouraged continued input by TAC members available to stay beyond the meeting conclusion.

Break Out Session Summary

SR 400 Corridor: Challenges & Issues

Location	Challenge/Issue	Comments/Notes
Brown's Bridge Road	Traffic Congestion	Congestion here backs up along Brown's Bridge east and west of SR 400; big box retail anticipated
	Safety on Roadway	N/A
	Safe Access to Businesses	North of intersection between Brown's Bridge and Martin Road
	Other	Collector/Distributor road needed between Keith Bridge and Brown's Bridge Roads
Settingdown Road	Traffic Congestion	Anticipated due to DRI, rezonings
Settingdown Circle	Safe Access to Businesses	Between Settingdown Circle and Bottoms Road.
Hubbard Town Road	Traffic Congestion	Anticipated due to rezonings & DRI plans
	Safety on Roadway	Anticipated due to rezonings & DRI plans
	Safe Access to Businesses	Businesses to the east of SR 400 between Hubbard Town & Jot Em Down Roads
Jot Em Down Road	Safe Access to Businesses	N/A
Carlisle Road	Roadway Signage/Informational Devices	Needed prior to approaching this intersection
	Safe Access to Businesses	N/A
	Bike/Ped Safety	N/A
Dawson Forest Road	Safety on Roadway	N/A
	Safe Access to Businesses	N/A
	Roadway Signage/Informational Devices	N/A
	Bike/Ped Safety	At Lumpkin Campground Road, just north of intersection to connect Wal-Mart & Outlet mall; at T. F. Hughes Road
Kilough Church Road	Roadway Signage/Informational Devices	N/A
	Bike/Ped Safety	N/A
Harmony Church Road	Safety on Roadway	N/A
	Roadway Signage/Informational Devices	N/A
Lumpkin County Parkway	Other	Potential future intersection improvements
Cain Bridge Road	Other	Improve/update local road
SR 60	Bike/Ped Safety	N/A

Other Issues:

- Rezonings are coming in fast now (Forsyth County) which makes costs of limited access 1 year from now huge versus doing it today
- Planned projects in Forsyth County:
    - 2 DRIs and a park near Keith Bridge Rd & SR 400
    - Big box retail near Brown's Bridge Road
    - DRI near Settingdown Road
    - Residential rezonings & DRI (Crossroads) near Hubbard Town Road

SR 400 Corridor: Alternatives Analysis

- Limited Access throughout the entire corridor (though segments are drawn from county line to county line – people seemed to only focus on their municipality).
- Access roads from Browns Bridge Road to Dawson Forest Road; plan for access road from Dawson Forest Road to Highway 136 east & west of SR 400 is currently in County plan.
- Traffic signal at Martin Road in Forsyth County (if limited access does not occur)
- Bike/Ped connectivity just north of Dawson Forest Road (to connect from Wal-Mart to Outlet mall) and at Kilough Church Road
- Interchange at SR 60.

TAC members were given a meeting evaluation form. The following are responses received. A total of 4 responses were collected.

How would you rate this meeting overall?

Response	# Responses
Very Good	1
Good	3
Average	0
Poor	0
Very Poor	0

Was the information presented today understandable? If not, please explain.

Response	# Responses
Yes	4
No	0
N/A	0

Has the study team been helpful in answering your questions? If not, please explain.

Response	# Responses
Yes	4
No	0
N/A	0

What did you like most about the meeting?

- The info about SR 365
- Break out sessions
- Hands on maps & discussion
- Hands on planning project

In what areas do you feel the meeting could have been improved?

- About the wrecks on SR 365

Please provide any additional comments regarding the SR 400 and SR 365 Corridor Studies in the space provided below.

- Need more lights
- 3rd TAC meeting – do not schedule during the 2nd week of October (9 – 13) – fall break for many school systems & GPA conference; consider additional public meeting in Forsyth (Cumming area)
- Please avoid October 2 – 6 for 3rd TAC meeting