

# INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

SR 140 ARNOLD MILL RD AT CR 27 NEW PROVIDENCE RD

SR 372 BIRMINGHAM HWY AT CR 27 PROVIDENCE / NEW PROVIDENCE RD

## CAC MEETING #2 MEETING MINUTES



**Date:** February 18, 2010  
**Time:** 6:00 PM  
**Location:** City Hall, Executive Conference Room

### Attendees:

Kevin O'Sullivan	Star Voigt	Andy Anderson: Street Smarts
Brad Robinson	Scott Lutoa	Kari Ward: Street Smarts
Yvonne Latorre	Sara Leaders: Milton	Erika Becker: Street Smarts
Cathy Rhea	Carter Lucas: Milton	John Lewis: Street Smarts

### Minutes:

- The meeting began 6:00 p.m. Self introductions were made by committee members, City of Milton staff and Street Smarts staff.
- Erika Becker presented the updated AM and PM existing conditions simulations for the Arnold Mill Road (SR 140) at New Providence Road (CR 27) intersection.
- Andy Anderson stated that since 2006, when these project first began with Fulton County, GDOT has changed their standards and we are now required to analyze a roundabout at each location.
- Mr. Anderson also stated that GDOT will fund a roundabout at 100%, as opposed to the 80%/20% split that is require for a signal.
- Star Voigt stated that she thought based on the information presented at the last meeting that a roundabout wouldn't work at the Arnold Mill Road (SR 140) at New Providence Road (CR 27) intersection.
- Mr. Anderson stated that we have not yet completed our detailed analysis, but that a roundabout with slip lanes or a multi-lane roundabout would work.
- Yvonne Latorre asked which is more cost effective; a signal or a roundabout?
- Mr. Anderson stated that in many cases a roundabout is more cost effective because it doesn't require as much right-of-way. Roundabouts require a little more land at the

*THE CITY OF MILTON...KEEPING YOU INFORMED*

# INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

SR 140 ARNOLD MILL RD AT CR 27 NEW PROVIDENCE RD

SR 372 BIRMINGHAM HWY AT CR 27 PROVIDENCE / NEW PROVIDENCE RD

intersection, but signals require more land for turn lanes.

- Cathy Rhea asked if a roundabout could be installed faster than a signal, which is projected to take approximately 3 years. Ms. Rhea also expressed concern about vehicle speeds on SR 140 when they enter a proposed roundabout.
- Mr. Anderson stated that the timeframe to complete a roundabout would be the same as a signal. They both have to go through the same environmental review process. He also stated that speeds through a roundabout are typically 15-20 mph and that appropriate signage would be in place to prepare drivers for an upcoming roundabout.
- Ms. Latorre asked if Streets Smarts can prepare a simulation for the roundabouts?
- Mr. Anderson stated that a simulation will be created for the preferred alternative at each intersection. If a roundabout is recommended for these locations then a simulation will be created.
- Kari Ward presented the design alternatives for each intersection. The following alternatives for Arnold Mill were presented: (1) Realign the intersection 140 feet west and signalize, (2) realign the intersection 700 feet west and signalize, (3) no-build, and (4) installation of a roundabout.
- The following alternatives for Birmingham Highway were also presented: (1) realign the intersection 500 feet to the north and signalize, (2) realign the intersection 500 feet to the north and install a roundabout, (3) realign the intersection 500 feet to the north, signalized and reduce the speed to 35 mph, (4) no-build, and (5) installation of a roundabout at the existing intersection location.
- Ms. Ward showed the committee an example of a roundabout that was installed at an intersection with a similar design in Douglasville, GA.
- Ms. Voigt asked if the property around the Birmingham Highway intersection were developed as commercial, would access to the development negatively affect a roundabout?
- Mr. Anderson stated that GDOT requires driveways to be located at least 200 feet from a roundabout.
- Mr. Anderson also stated that the alternative with the least impact would be to install a roundabout at the current intersection location. A small amount of right-of-way would be required to adjust the intersection to a preferred 45 degree skew angle.
- Ms. Ward presented the following alternatives that were identified at CAC Meeting #1: (1) reroute traffic to Cox Road and cul-de-sac New Providence Road and (2) split interchange at Birmingham Highway.
- Carter Lucas then discussed short-term improvements that were identified during CAC Meeting #1. He stated that he had met with GDOT to discuss installation of a temporary signal at Arnold Mill. GDOT stated that they would not approve a

# INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

SR 140 ARNOLD MILL RD AT CR 27 NEW PROVIDENCE RD

SR 372 BIRMINGHAM HWY AT CR 27 PROVIDENCE / NEW PROVIDENCE RD

“temporary” signal. The “temporary” signal would have to go through the normal review process and that permanent materials would be required. Installation of a “temporary” signal would cost approximately \$100,000 to \$150,000. Based on the time required for the signal review process, the “temporary” signal will likely be installed only one year ahead of the projected “permanent” signal installation. In addition, the “temporary” signal could not be removed until the “permanent” signal is installed, which will cost an additional \$100,000 to \$150,000 in materials. In summary, it will cost twice as much to install a signal one year ahead of the projected schedule.

- Mr. Lucas stated that he had also met with City of Roswell staff to discuss the signal timing at the intersection of SR 140 at SR 372 (Crabapple Road). Unfortunately the meeting did not result in any changes to the signal timing, which seems to be playing a role in the queue of AM traffic through the SR 140 at CR 27 intersection.
- Ms. Voigt asked if there was any way to push the Birmingham project through faster than the projected 2013 completion date. She commented that this intersection is very dangerous and that residents shouldn't have to wait that long.
- Mr. Anderson stated that if state and federal funds are used to pay for the project then the project process, including a lengthy environmental review, must be followed. If the sequence of events gets out of order there is a risk of losing funding, so unfortunately the timeline can't really be moved ahead any faster.
- Mr. Lucas stated that the intersections are being designed concurrently. He asked if they could be separated if one runs into problems so that construction at the other intersection would not be delayed.
- Ms. Voigt suggested widening New Providence Road to allow for a dedicated right turn lane.
- Ms. Becker reviewed the upcoming meeting dates: CAC Meeting #3 March 18, 2010, PIOH April 20, 2010, and CAC Meeting #4 May 10, 2010.
- Many committee members stated that they are not available March 18, 2010 for CAC Meeting #3.
- Ms. Becker stated that she would send out an alternate date and let everyone know what works best for the committee as a whole.
- Ms. Becker also presented the project website to the committee and stated that the purpose of the website is to provide users with the materials presented at the CAC meetings and other relevant project information.
- Mr. Anderson stated that Street Smarts will begin the process of developing design details for the preferred alternative at each intersection and that these details will be presented at CAC Meeting #3.
- The meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.