Memphis Urban Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)
Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) Meeting
Thursday, August 29, 2024, 10:00AM
GoToMeeting Online Meeting

SUMMARY OF MINUTES

The following committee members were present:

Ashley Owens	*TDOT*	Ethan Skaggs	*Germantown*
William Rogers	*TDOT*	Jackson McNeil	*Innovate Memphis*
Thiera Taylor	*TDOT*	Randall Tatum	*Memphis*
Daniel McDonnell	*TDOT*	William Ezzell	*Memphis*
Neil Hansen	*TDOT*	Katherine Webb	*Millington*
Bennie Hopkins	*DeSoto County*	Darren Sanders	*Shelby County*
Sandi Klink	*Disability Connection Mid-South*	Jim Crook	*Shelby County*
		Rhonda Standridge	*W. Memphis MPO*
Jared Darby	*DPD – OSR*	Barbara McClanahan	*Univ. of Memphis*
Robin Richardson	*DPD – OSR*		
Faria Urmy	*DPD – Comp Planning*		

The following Memphis Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Greenprint Plan consultants were present:

Drew Gaskins	*Gresham Smith*	Miles Carter	*Gresham Smith*
Mary Connelly	*Gresham Smith*	Greg Dotson	*Gresham Smith*

The following MPO staff members were present:

Kate Horton	*Memphis MPO*	Keiaron Randle	*Memphis MPO*
Sagorika Zannat	*Memphis MPO*		

T 901.636.7190
125 N Main Street, Suite 450
Memphis, TN 38103
memphismpo.org

1) Welcome

Ms. Kate Horton welcomed the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) members, and the consultant team led by Mr. Drew Gaskins.

2) Memphis Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Greenprint Plan

Mr. Drew Gaskins presented the scope and timeline for the plan along with the primary components including, Plan Review and Network Evaluation, Updated Network and Program Recommendations, and Catalyst Projects. Mr. Gaskins then provided a brief overview of project status, noting that the project is now in Part II: Draft Recommendations with an expected work period spanning from July through the end of October. Additionally, a tentative November date was noted for the preliminary draft of the network revisions.

Mr. Gaskins then briefly shared some of the key findings from the regional plan review, which included multi-modal connectivity and safety.

Mr. Gaskins then discussed key components of the Network Evaluation task including better integration for improved connectivity, considering primary and secondary demand zones, intermodal connections/modal choices, land use and development considerations, and high traffic stress roadway segments.

Committee member discussion related to the existing conditions and network evaluation progress:

> Mr. Will Rogers asked about the team's interest and if there were any questions on TDOT's multimodal priority tool (measuring traffic stress). Ms. Mary Connelly responded that the team has looked at the multimodal priority tool provided by TDOT and as move forward will see how the tool can be of use to the TN portion of the study area.
>
> Ms. Sandi Klink noted that MATA's potential route cuts are disturbing their employees and others ability to get to work. Ms. Klink also noted that with Memphis' massive geographic footprint, commute times are long with personal vehicles and even longer for transit riders. Ms. Klink asked how this will impact the plan and Mr. Gaskins responded that we are aware of the potential route cuts and will continue to follow any changes as we move forward with plan development. Ms. Klink also noted that a wheelchair user was hit by car

recently, noting that we must emphasize the priority of right of way and the entitlement to road space that many automobile drivers display.

Mr. Gaskins provided an overview of the public and stakeholder engagement results. Results included:

1. Safety and Security and Connectivity and Mobility remain the top two goals.
2. Landscape buffers and trees ranked at the top of improvement priorities.
3. Leisure or fitness was the main purpose for walking and biking (but this doesn't mean we should not plan for more connectivity).
4. Majority of respondents said they walk every day or several times a week.

The top challenges noted by participants were a lack of safe infrastructure and not feeling personally safe. One common theme was that lighting certain areas could be useful.

Some of the top voted on destinations for active transportation users were parks and green spaces. Use of active transportation to perform daily activities was noted as well.

Common responses to a question about the current state of active transportation included a reactive vs proactive approach to planning and infrastructure, leisure being the dominant form and utility of active transportation, and a desire to expand active transportation into a meaningful transportation choice for work and daily activities. Finally, respondents noted a desire to see better coordination regionally/locally.

Mr. Gaskins touched on responses to questions about the existing challenges to implementation of active transportation infrastructure. The most common responses were funding and regulatory requirements, design and infrastructure challenges, and interagency coordination.

Responses to a question asking what barriers prevent you or people you know from walking or biking. Answers included safety concerns, lack of consideration/awareness from drivers and the overall infrastructure situation, infrastructure gaps, and missing links to key facilities.

Responses to a question regarding implementation of active transportation infrastructure and best practices included best practices from other regions, proactive

safety measures (rather than reactive), creative use of infrastructure, road diets and utility coordination.

Responses to a question regarding program and policy improvements stakeholders would like to see included better agency coordination for funding, education and purpose-driven culture regarding active transportation, creating a connected network, and cyclist protection and infrastructure.

Mr. Gaskins briefly touched on potential projects noted in the interactive map responses. Responses included sidewalks along major corridors, regional bikeway connectors, intersection safety, regional vs neighborhood focus (large number of responses from participants on frequented areas, which highlights the importance of maintaining a balance of regional and local areas).

Committee member discussion related to the engagement results:

> Mr. Will Ezzell asked about trip data and if we know where cyclists were travelling from and where to? Mr. Gaskins responded that there was a lot of verbal input regarding general experiences on cyclists day-to-day trips, but less empirical data was provided on this.

Mr. Gaskins concluded with next steps including the network development, upcoming Round II – Public Engagement in October, Catalyst Projects, and the Preliminary Draft Plan.

3) Other Business

No other business was discussed.

4) Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.