Agenda & Introductions

- Environmental study process and update
- Alternatives considered in the Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
- Alternative evaluation results
- Discussion of alternative evaluation
- Next steps
Study Process and Update
Environmental Study Process

- **NEPA**
  - Summer 2008: Notice of Intent
  - Fall 2008/2009: Scoping
  - Purpose and Need Statement
  - Scoping Summary Report
  - Technical Studies
  - Evaluation Criteria Report
  - Public Involvement and Agency Coordination Plan
  - Spring 2009: Tier 1 Draft EIS
  - Summer 2009: Tier 1 Final EIS
  - Fall 2009: Public Hearing
  - Winter 2009/2010: Record of Decision
  - Spring 2010

- **GEPA**
  - Summer 2008: Notice of Decision
  - Fall 2008: Environmental Effects Report (EER)
  - Spring 2009: Final EER
  - Summer 2009: Final Decision Document

- Public Workshops
Accomplishments

- Scoping Meetings and Summary Report
- Purpose and Need
- Northeast Zone Reports
- Existing Conditions Report
- Evaluation Criteria Document
- Public workshop series
- Initial alternative evaluation findings
Development of Alternatives
Development of Alternatives

Detailed Screening Analysis and Recommendation (2007)

Two basic configurations, two connection points
- Northwest segment: Bankhead to Lindbergh or Arts Center
- East Connection: King Memorial or Inman Park via Moreland Ave.

Technologies considered
- Light Rail Transit; Modern Streetcar; Bus Rapid Transit
Public workshop feedback

- Local service for BeltLine transit emphasizing neighborhood accessibility to stations
- Transit & trail alignments should run parallel to maximum extent possible
- Transit should connect to MARTA rail & buses, and Peachtree Streetcar
Public workshop feedback

Complementary planned transit services:

- TPB Concept 3 Regional Transit Vision
- Connect Atlanta Comprehensive Transportation Plan
Highlights of alignment input

- Alignment south of I-85/ Buford Highway
- Tunnel connection between Inman Park & Reynoldstown
- Alternative connections to West End
- Other streets to connect to Ashby MARTA station
- Alignment serving Atlantic Station and Amtrak
Development of Alternatives

Feasibility screening factors

- Public and stakeholder input
- Physical constraints, utilities, & right-of-way
- Service effectiveness and efficiency
- Environment and community impacts
- Cost
- Traffic and parking conflicts
- TAD & Redevelopment Plan
- Safety and security
Transit Alternatives
Transit Technology

- Light Rail Transit
- Modern Streetcar
Service Characteristics

What Type of Transit Service is Best for the BeltLine?

Express service

Expanded service
Freight Railroad Issues

Issues:

- Need for additional freight capacity
- Shared ROW
- Regional solution needed
Method:

- Assesses alternatives against goals
- Applies performance measures (over 50)
- Evaluates transit and trails alignment alternatives
- Evaluates transit technology
Results

Distinguishing Performance Measures for Transit

Evaluations focus on northwest area
Results

Trails

Evaluations focus on northwest area
Alternative Evaluation

Goal 1: Contribute to an integrated regional multi-modal network

- Increase transit ridership
- Increase access to existing regional transit system
- Improve transit and trail connections to existing transit system*
- Minimize travel times to points accessible from existing transit system
- Improve accessibility and connectivity among neighborhoods and to major destinations / employment centers*
- Minimize transfers and mode changes per trip
- Increase transit options for transit-dependent, low-income, and minority populations*

* Indicates a distinguishing performance measure with more in depth discussion to follow
Performance Measure
Maximize number of activity centers within ½-mile of proposed transit stations

- CSX - Marietta Blvd.
- CSX - Howell Junction

Transit Alignment
Goal 2: Manage and encourage growth and economic development through transit and transportation improvements

- Support redevelopment and revitalization efforts in the BeltLine TAD*
- Support regional and local economic development initiatives / growth management policies*

* Indicates a distinguishing performance measure with more in depth discussion to follow
Performance Measure

Maximize service to acres of underutilized industrial land within ½-mile of proposed stations.

The majority of underutilized industrial falls along the CSX line.
Goal 3: Preserve and revitalize neighborhoods and business districts through design, accessibility, and affordable housing

- Minimize displacement of existing residents and businesses
- Encourage high quality, dense, and sustainable residential mixed-use and mixed-income development*
- Enhance human and natural environment through context sensitive design*
- Maintain or enhance the character/cohesion of neighborhoods and historic districts*
Performance Measure
Maximize service to TAD areas with higher development capacity of underutilized or undeveloped land as defined by Subarea Master Plans/Redevelopment Plan within ½-mile of proposed transit stations

- CSX - Marietta Blvd.
- CSX - Howell Junction
- NS
**Performance Measure**
Maximize compatibility with the Subarea Master Plans/Redevelopment Plan

- CSX - Marietta Blvd.
- CSX - Howell Junction
  (the most compatible with the Subarea 7 Master Plan)

NS
(harder to compare as it deviates the most from the Redevelopment plan alignment)
Goal 4: Provide a cost-effective and efficient investment

- Minimize project costs, but not at the expense of quality design and materials
- Support existing and planned transit infrastructure investments
- Maximize operating and cost-efficiency
Goal 5: Provide a bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly environment

- Accommodate bicycles and pedestrians with links to activity centers and recreational resources*
- Develop transit and trails that are safe and attractive*
- Provide bicycle amenities at transit stations in the project corridor

* Indicates a distinguishing performance measure with more in depth discussion to follow
Performance Measure
Maximize miles of exclusive trails separated from automobile traffic

✓ Alternative A

Alternative B shares a number of segments with road right-of-way
Alternative Evaluation

Goal 6: Provide connectivity between communities and recreational opportunities

- Enhance connectivity between communities separated by historic rail corridor*
- Support existing and planned park programming*
- Provide connectivity to schools, community facilities, and cultural/historic destinations*

* Indicates a distinguishing performance measure with more in depth discussion to follow
Performance Measure
Maximize compatibility with the Subarea Master Plans/Redevelopment Plan

(Both subareas use Trails Alternatives A and B as options)

Alternative A

✓ Alternative B
Performance Measure
Maximize number of trail access points

Alternative A

☑ Alternative B

Stretches of Alternative A do not have easy access points
Goal 7: Minimize adverse environmental effects

- Avoid or minimize impacts to cultural/historic resources*
- Avoid or minimize impacts to water resources, protected species, critical habitats and other sensitive resources*
- Provide opportunities to improve the quality of the natural environment*
- Offer a balance between transportation needs and environmental quality
- Develop viable transportation alternatives to the use of cars
- Avoid or minimize impacts to existing park lands*

* Indicates a distinguishing performance measure with more in depth discussion to follow
Performance Measure
Minimize number of stream crossings and size of wetlands potentially affected

CSX - Marietta Blvd.
CSX - Howell Junction

✓ NS

The NS Alignment has fewer potential affects to water resources
Performance Measure
Minimize number of stream crossings and size of wetlands potentially affected

✓ Alternative A

Alternative B

Often times impacts to water resources can be avoided through trail design and engineering
Performance Measure
Minimize acres of existing park land used for transit and multi-use trails facilities

- Alternative A
- Alternative B
Goal 8: Ensure public input in planning and development

- Consider comments pertaining to the proposed alternatives*
Public comments showed a preference for:

✓ Alternative A

Alternative B
Results
### Results

**Transit Technology measures:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modern Streetcar</th>
<th>Light Rail Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood context</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital costs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating costs</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connections with planned transit</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Modern Streetcar Service

- Rapid Streetcar
- City Serving
- City Shaping
- Local Circulator
Types of Modern Streetcar Service

- City Serving
  - Focused on serving existing development

- City Shaping
  - Focused on managing and creating redevelopment and economic development
Summary Findings

Transit Alignment
- CSX alternatives score higher than NS
- CSX - Howell Junction scores highest

Trails Alignment
- Alternative A scores higher than B

Transit Technology and Service Type
- Modern Streetcar scores higher for all CSX and NS alignment alternatives
- Modern Streetcar scores higher than LRT Overall
- Modern Streetcar service type provides balance between non-work trips and commuter trips needs and economic development goals
Summary Findings

Best Performing Alternatives for the northwest zone

**Transit**
- CSX alternatives
- CSX - Howell Junction Connectivity Alignment

**Trails**
- Alternative A
Types of Modern Streetcar Service

Service to Existing Residential Areas
Portland, OR
Discussion of results:

- Transit alignments
- Trails alignments
- Transit technology
- Streetcar service types
Next Steps

- Complete Tier 1 DEIS
  - Measures
  - Documentation of connectivity alternatives
- Public & agency review of DEIS
- Public hearing – February 4, 2010