



I-20 EAST TRANSIT INITIATIVE

**Tier 1 and Tier 2 Alternatives
Screening Report**

**Prepared for:
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority**

**Prepared by:
AECOM/JJG Joint Venture
Atlanta, GA**

February 2013

General Planning Consultant Services RFP P5413
Contract No. 200703566
Work Order No. 2009-06



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... ES-1

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1-1

1.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY1-1

 1.1.1 Tier 1 Screening1-1

 1.1.2 Tier 2 Screening1-2

 1.1.3 Evaluation Criteria and Measures of Effectiveness1-2

2.0 TIER 1 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MOES 2-1

2.1 MAINLINE ALTERNATIVES2-1

 2.1.1 Parallel I-20 Alignment2-1

 2.1.2 Connection to Edgewood Station Alignment.....2-1

 2.1.3 Heavy Rail Extension from Indian Creek2-3

2.2 PANOLA ROAD AREA ALTERNATIVES2-3

 2.2.1 Parallel I-20 Sub-Alignment.....2-3

 2.2.2 Snapfinger Woods Drive Sub-Alignment2-3

2.3 DOWNTOWN CONNECTIVITY ALTERNATIVES.....2-3

 2.3.1 Alternative 1 – Connection to King Memorial Station via Memorial Drive .2-3

 2.3.2 Alternative 2 – King Memorial Station and Downtown via Streetcar2-3

 2.3.3 Alternative 3 – King Memorial via Hill Street.....2-5

 2.3.4 Alternative 4 – Downtown via Streetcar2-5

 2.3.5 Alternative 5 – Garnett and Five Points2-5

 2.3.6 Alternative 6 – MMPT/Five Points.....2-5

 2.3.7 Alternative 7 – West End Station/Atlanta University Station/Ashby.....2-5

 2.3.8 Alternative 8 – Inman Park Station and Midtown via BeltLine2-5

3.0 TIER 1 SCREENING 3-1

3.1 TIER 1 MEASURES OF EFFECTIVENESS3-1

3.2 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION RATINGS AND SCORES3-2

3.3 GOAL 1: INCREASE MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY.....3-3

 3.3.1 MOE: Transit Travel Times from Stonecrest to Five Points Station3-3

 3.3.2 Goal 1 Performance Ratings.....3-3

 3.3.3 Goal 1 Evaluation Results.....3-3

3.4 GOAL 2: PROVIDE IMPROVED TRANSIT SERVICE WITHIN THE CORRIDOR..3-5

 3.4.1 MOE: Total Transit Boardings.....3-5

 3.4.2 MOE: New Transit Riders.....3-5

 3.4.3 Goal 2 Performance Ratings.....3-5

 3.4.4 Goal 2 Evaluation Results.....3-5

3.5 GOAL 3: SUPPORT LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS.....3-7

 3.5.1 MOE: Land Available for Development or Redevelopment3-7

 3.5.2 Goal 3 Performance Ratings.....3-8



- 3.5.3 Goal 3 Evaluation Results3-10
- 3.6 GOAL 4: PROMOTE COST EFFECTIVE TRANSIT INVESTMENTS3-11**
 - 3.6.1 MOE: Total Cost3-11
 - 3.6.2 Goal 4 Performance Ratings3-11
 - 3.6.3 Goal 4 Evaluation Results3-11
- 3.7 GOAL 5: PRESERVE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT3-13**
 - 3.7.1 MOE: Total Potential Residential and Commercial Displacements3-13
 - 3.7.2 Goal 5 Performance Ratings3-13
 - 3.7.3 Goal 5 Evaluation Results3-13
- 3.8 GOAL 6: ACHIEVE A HIGH LEVEL OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT3-15**
 - 3.8.1 MOE: Compliance with SAC Guiding Principles3-15
 - 3.8.2 MOE: Degree of Public Support3-16
 - 3.8.3 Goal 6 Performance Ratings3-16
 - 3.8.4 Goal 6 Evaluation Results3-18
- 3.9 CUMULATIVE TIER 1 EVALUATION RESULTS3-19**
- 3.10 SUMMARY OF TIER 1 SCREENING3-21**
- 3.11 TIER 1 ALTERNATIVES ADVANCED TO TIER 2 SCREENING3-25**
 - 3.11.1 Mainline Alternatives3-25
 - 3.11.2 Panola Road Area Alternatives3-25
 - 3.11.3 Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-25
- 4.0 TIER 2 ALTERNATIVES 4-1**
 - 4.1 TRANSIT TECHNOLOGIES CONSIDERED4-1**
 - 4.2 DESCRIPTION OF TIER 2 ALTERNATIVES4-1**
 - 4.2.1 Heavy Rail Transit Alternative 1 (HRT1)4-1
 - 4.2.2 Light Rail Transit Alternative 1 (LRT1)4-4
 - 4.2.3 Bus Rapid Transit Alternative 1 (BRT1)4-6
 - 4.2.4 Heavy Rail Transit Alternative 2 (HRT2)4-8
 - 4.2.5 Light Rail Alternative 2 (LRT2)4-10
 - 4.2.6 Heavy Rail Transit Alternative 3 (HRT3)4-12
 - 4.2.7 Baseline/TSM Alternative4-14
 - 4.2.8 No Build Alternative4-14
 - 4.2.9 Cost Estimates for Tier 2 Build Alternatives4-16
 - 4.3 ASSUMPTIONS AND DESIGN CRITERIA4-16**
- 5.0 TIER 2 SCREENING 5-1**
 - 5.1 TIER 2 SCREENING EVALUATION CRITERIA AND MOES5-1**
 - 5.2 GOAL 1: INCREASE MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY5-1**
 - 5.2.1 Project Objective 1.1: Improve travel times for east-west travel5-4
 - 5.2.2 Project Objective 1.2: Improve transit accessibility within the corridor5-4
 - 5.2.3 Project Objective 1.3: Improve transit accessibility within the corridor5-5
 - 5.2.4 Project Objective 1.4: Improve travel options within the corridor5-6



5.2.5 Goal 1 Evaluation Results5-6

5.3 GOAL 2: PROVIDE IMPROVED TRANSIT SERVICE WITHIN THE CORRIDOR ..5-9

5.3.1 Project Objective 2.1: Provide transit service with sufficient capacity to accommodate growing demand5-9

5.3.2 Project Objective 2.2: Provide travel time competitive transit service in the corridor.....5-10

5.3.3 Project Objective 2.3: Provide transit service for traditionally underserved populations5-10

5.3.4 Goal 2 Evaluation Results5-11

5.4 GOAL 3: SUPPORT LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT GOALS.....5-13

5.4.1 Project Objective 3.1: Promote economic development and revitalization.5-13

5.4.2 Project Objective 3.2: Support adopted local land use plans5-14

5.4.3 Project Objective 3.3: Encourage transit supportive land use and development patterns.....5-14

5.4.4 Goal 3 Evaluation Results5-15

5.5 GOAL 4: PROMOTE COST EFFECTIVE TRANSIT INVESTMENTS5-17

5.5.1 Project Objective 4.1: Provide transit service that can be implemented, operated, and maintained with available resources.....5-17

5.5.2 Goal 4 Evaluation Results5-18

5.6 GOAL 5: PRESERVE THE NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT5-20

5.6.1 Project Objective 5.1: Provide transit service that can be implemented, operated, and maintained with available resources.....5-21

5.6.2 Goal 5 Evaluation Results5-21

5.7 GOAL 6: ACHIEVE A HIGH LEVEL OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT.....5-23

5.7.1 Project Objective 6.1: Provide Transit Investments that are Supported by Local Stakeholders and the General Public.....5-24

5.7.2 Goal 6 Evaluation Results5-26

5.8 CUMULATIVE TIER 2 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION RESULTS.....5-28

5.9 TIER 2 SCREENING SUMMARY.....5-29

6.0 NEXT STEPS..... 6-1



List of Tables

Table ES-1: Tier 1 Alignment Alternatives..... ES2

Table ES-2: Tier 2 Description of Alternatives..... ES-5

Table ES-3: Tier 2 Comparison of Alternatives ES-7

Table ES-4: Assumptions ES-7

Table ES-5: Tier 2 Evaluation Matrix ES-8

Table 1-1: Evaluation Criteria and Measures of Effectiveness 1-3

Table 2-1: Tier 1 Build Alternatives.....2-1

Table 3-1: Tier 1 Screening3-1

Table 3-2: Sample MOE Ratings3-2

Table 3-3: Sample MOE Ratings3-2

Table 3-4: Sample MOE Ratings3-2

Table 3-5: Performance Ratings for Goal 1 MOE3-3

Table 3-6: Goal 1 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-4

Table 3-7: Goal 1 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-4

Table 3-8: Goal 1 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-4

Table 3-9: Performance Ratings for Goal 2 MOEs.....3-5

Table 3-10: Goal 2 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-6

Table 3-11: Goal 2 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-6

Table 3-12: Goal 2 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-7

Table 3-13: Potential New Stations Associated with Tier 1 Mainline Alternatives3-8

Table 3-14: Potential New Stations Associated with Tier 1 Panola Road Area Alternatives.....3-8

Table 3-15: Acreage of Vacant and Underutilized Land within One-Half Mile of Proposed Stations 3-8

Table 3-16: Performance Ratings for Goal 3 MOEs.....3-8

Table 3-17: Goal 3 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-10

Table 3-18: Goal 3 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-10

Table 3-19: Goal 3 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-11

Table 3-20: Performance Ratings for Goal 4 MOE3-11

Table 3-21: Goal 4 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-12

Table 3-22: Goal 4 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-12

Table 3-23: Goal 4 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-13

Table 3-24: Ratings for Performance under Goal 5 MOEs3-13

Table 3-25: Goal 5 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-14

Table 3-26: Goal 5 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-14

Table 3-27: Goal 5 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-15

Table 3-29: Ratings for Performance under Goal 6 MOEs3-16

Table 3-28: Alternatives' Compliance with SAC Guiding Principles.....3-17

Table 3-30: Goal 6 Evaluation of Mainline Alternatives.....3-18

Table 3-31: Goal 6 Evaluation of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-18

Table 3-32: Goal 6 Evaluation of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-19

Table 3-33: Cumulative Tier 1 Evaluation of Alternatives3-20

Table 3-34: Summary Comparison of Mainline Alternatives3-21



Table 3-35: Summary Comparison of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-21

Table 3-36: Summary Comparison of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-22

Table 3-37: Advantages and Disadvantages of Mainline Alternatives3-23

Table 3-38: Advantages and Disadvantages of Panola Road Area Alternatives3-23

Table 3-39: Advantages and Disadvantages of Downtown Connectivity Alternatives3-24

Table 4-1: Cost Estimates for Tier 2 Alternatives4-16

Table 4-2: Major Assumptions4-17

Table 4-3: Design Criteria4-18

Table 5-1: Tier 2 Evaluation5-2

Table 5-2: Performance Ratings for Objective 1.1 MOEs5-4

Table 5-3: Performance Ratings for Objective 1.2 MOEs5-5

Table 5-4: Performance Ratings for Objective 1.3 MOEs5-5

Table 5-5: Performance Ratings for Objective 1.4 MOEs5-6

Table 5-6: Goal 1 Evaluation Results5-7

Table 5-7: Performance Ratings for Objective 2.1 MOEs5-9

Table 5-8: Performance Ratings for Objective 2.2 MOEs5-10

Table 5-9: Performance Ratings for Objective 2.2 MOEs5-11

Table 5-10: Goal 2 Evaluation Results5-12

Table 5-11: Performance Ratings for Objective 3.1 MOE5-14

Table 5-12: Performance Ratings for Objective 3.2 MOE5-14

Table 5-13: Performance Ratings for Objective 3.3 MOEs5-14

Table 5-14: Goal 3 Evaluation Results5-16

Table 5-15: Performance Ratings for Objective 4.1 MOEs5-18

Table 5-16: Goal 4 Evaluation Results5-19

Table 5-17: Performance Ratings for Objective 5.1 MOEs5-21

Table 5-18: Goal 5 Evaluation Results5-22

Table 5-19: Alternatives' Compliance with SAC Guiding Principles5-25

Table 5-20: Performance Ratings for Objective 5.1 MOEs5-26

Table 5-21: Goal 6 Evaluation Results5-27

Table 5-22: Overall Tier 2 Evaluation Results5-28

Table 5-23: Summary Comparison of Tier 2 Alternatives5-29

Table 5-24: Advantages and Disadvantages of Tier 2 Alternatives5-30



List of Figures

Figure ES-1: The DCA Process ES-1

Figure ES-2: Tier 1 Alignment Alternatives ES-3

Figure ES-3: Tier 1 Screening Results ES-4

Figure ES-4: Transit Technologies Considered..... ES-5

Figure ES-5: Map of Tier 2 Alternatives..... ES-6

Figure 2-1: Mainline Alternatives and Panola Road Alternatives2-2

Figure 2-2: Downtown Connectivity Alternatives2-4

Figure 3-1: Proposed Stations for Tier 1 Mainline and Panola Road Area Alternatives3-9

Figure 4-1: Transit Technologies Considered4-1

Figure 4-2: HRT1 Alternative Concept.....4-2

Figure 4-3: HRT1 Alternative Map4-3

Figure 4-4: LRT1 Alternative Concept4-4

Figure 4-5: LRT1 Alternative Map.....4-5

Figure 4-6: BRT1 Alternative Concept.....4-6

Figure 4-7: BRT1 Alternative Map4-7

Figure 4-8: HRT2 Alternative Concept.....4-8

Figure 4-9: HRT2 Alternative Map4-9

Figure 4-10: LRT2 Alternative Concept4-10

Figure 4-11: LRT2 Alternative Map.....4-11

Figure 4-12: HRT3 Alternative Concept4-12

Figure 4-13: HRT3 Alternative Map4-13

Figure 4-14: Baseline/TSM Alternative4-15