Early Scoping Report Appendix

Attachment B-3:

Presentation Materials from Early Scoping Meetings,
July 2014
Early Scoping Phase 2 – Public Meetings

July, 8th, 10th, and 17th, 2014
Tonight’s Agenda

▪ Meeting goals / study purpose
▪ Where we are
▪ What we’ve heard
▪ What we need from you
▪ What’s next
Meeting Goals / Study Purpose
Meeting Goals

- Explain the purpose of the study and where we are in the process.
- Provide information on analysis completed, and public feedback received to date.
- Gather feedback regarding potential alignment, station locations, and technologies.
- Educate on the trade-off considerations and decisions that must be made in order to advance a successful project.
Purpose and Importance of this Study

- Evaluate feasibility of increased transit service
- Identify potential for high-capacity transit project implementation

Differentiation Between Past Studies

- Focused investment along GA 400 corridor
- Assessed land development over past decade
- Considered demographic changes in study area
- Advanced planning process from previous studies
Where We Are
Current study effort started in 2011
Completed Alternatives Analysis in 2012
Initiated Early Scoping in Fall 2013
Continued Early Scoping in Summer 2014 to:
  - Gather more feedback on preferred alignment and community desires
  - Identify preferred technology and station locations
  - Begin environmental documentation
Federal Project Development Process

Project Development: Typically 6 – 12 years

Alternatives Analysis / System Planning: 1 – 2 years
Preliminary Engineering / Finalize Environmental: 2 – 3 years
Final Design: 1 - 3 years
Construction: 2 – 3 years
Operation

We are Here
Early Scoping

- FTA recently updated the New Starts funding program, streamlining the environmental review process.
- Early Scoping is an optional community involvement step during the major planning phase of a transit project.
- Input and comments will be considered as part of the Federal NEPA process, should MARTA prepare an environmental document (EIS) for FTA review.

FTA = Federal Transit Administration
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
EIS = Environmental Impact Statement
Overview of Potential Alternatives

**Georgia 400**

**Alignment**
- 11.9 miles Long
- North Springs Station to Windward Parkway via GA 400

**Transit Technology**
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Light Rail
- Heavy Rail

**Potential Stations**
- Northridge
- Holcomb Bridge
- Mansell Road
- North Point
- Old Milton
- Windward Parkway

* GDOT ROW availability on GA 400 to be determined based on Managed Lanes Study
What We’ve Heard
Outreach Activities

Stakeholder Meetings
- **Stakeholders:** 30+ Meetings
- **TAC:** December 13, 2011; February 28, 2012, October 25, 2012
- **PSC:** January 18, 2012; March 22, 2012; November 14, 2012; February 26, 2013; May 9, 2013; October, 17, 2014; June 12, 2014

Public Meetings
- **2011:** December 13- Minority and Non-English Speaking Leadership Meeting
- **2012:** January 26; May 22; March 21; August 21-El Banco; August 30- North Fulton Chamber of Commerce Breakfast Forum
- **2013:** March 21; September 26
- **Fall 2013:** City Council Briefings

Surveys
- **December 12, 2012 to January 17, 2013**
  - 136 Respondents
- **March 2014 – Scientific Public Opinion Survey**
  - 612 Residents
  - 463 Employees
Early Scoping Phase 1 Outcomes

- Established GA 400 as preferred location of project
  - Alignment detail to be refined
- Suggested heavy rail as preferred technology
  - Initial Survey (136 participants)
- Identified the need to further explore the transit desires of area residents and employees
  - Continue community discussions
  - Conduct a statistically valid survey
Scientific Survey Background

- Recommended as part of Early Scoping – Phase 1
- Initiated in March 2014 with KSU – A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research

- **612** North Fulton **RESIDENTS** responded via phone
  - Cellphone (200)
  - Landline (412)

- **463** North Fulton **EMPLOYEES** responded via internet
  - Online survey
  - Employees within 1-mile of GA 400 Corridor

- Resident and employee responses were very similar
RESIDENT Survey Results Summary

Approve or Disapprove of Potential Expansion of MARTA to Forsyth County Line?

- Strongly Approve: 39%
- Approve: 37%
- Disapprove: 11%
- Strongly Disapprove: 8%
- Don’t Know: 5%

How should MARTA expansion be accomplished?

- Heavy Rail: 40%
- Light Rail: 37%
- BRT in Dedicated Lanes: 11%
- BRT in HOV/T Lanes: 6%
- Don’t Know: 6%

Employees: 45% Strongly Approve / 31% Approve (Consistent 76% Approval)

Employees: 68% Heavy Rail / 25% Light Rail / 6% BRT
What’s Next?
ARC Economic Analysis

- Study initiated in winter 2014.
- Assesses economic impact of proposed expansion projects (I-20 East, Clifton Corridor and GA 400).
- Utilized PLAN 2040 regional planning assumptions.
- Preliminary results indicate positive influence on economy for all projects.
  - Increases in productivity, population, jobs, GDP, and other factors.
- Results finalized by late July 2014.
Federal Funding Opportunities

- **FTA Capital Investment Grant Program**
  - Largest federal funding program for major transit fixed guideway projects ($2 billion per year)
  - Typically funds 50% of capital costs
  - Three categories of projects:
    - New Starts*
    - Small Starts
    - Core Capacity
  - Discretionary program; highly competitive!

* - The GA 400 Alternatives under consideration qualify as New Starts
Preliminary New Starts Evaluation

- Analysis underway to determine project performance with respect to:
  - Mobility improvements
  - Cost effectiveness
  - Congestion relief
  - Environmental benefits
  - Land use
  - Economic development

- Will inform selection of preferred technology as well as overall project approach and timing.
## Preliminary Ratings of GA 400 Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>BRT</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>HRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion relief</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental benefits</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Justification Rating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium-Low</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Projects need *medium* or better rating on criteria to be considered for funding.

* - Project ratings will be refined as the study efforts continue.
Next Steps

- Identify and adopt a Locally Preferred Alternatives (LPA)
  - Exploring technology trade-offs
  - Gathering as much feedback as possible during Early Scoping Phase 2

- Explore funding opportunities
  - Complete FTA New Starts Analysis
  - Develop a realistic financial plan with local funding commitments / work with partners to identify opportunities

- Initiate the environmental process
  - Expected to begin in late 2014, once an LPA is adopted
  - Public outreach to follow in early 2015
How Can You Help?

- Provide your feedback!
  - Tell us your ideas on stations, alignment, and technology
  - Fill out a comment form
  - Join the mailing list and stay involved

- Tell your friends, neighbors, and colleagues about upcoming public meetings.
  - Thursday, July 10, 6:30PM-8PM
    Public Meeting #2 – GSU Alpharetta Center
  - Thursday, July 17, 6:30PM-8PM
    Public Meeting #3 – Hampton Inn Atlanta / Perimeter
Contact Info

Mark Eatman, PE
MARTA Project Manager
404-848-4494
mreatman@itsmarta.com

Website: www.itsmarta.com/north-line-400-corr.aspx

Email: Connect400@itsmarta.com

Follow us at Connect 400 on Facebook!
WELCOME
to the
Georgia 400
Transit Initiative
Public Meeting
6:30PM – 8:00PM
PREFERRED ALIGNMENT AND POTENTIAL STATION LOCATIONS

LEGEND
- Existing MARTA Rail and Stations
- Preferred Alignment and Potential Stations
- Parks/Open Space
- City Boundaries
# Station Design Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marta Transit Oriented Development Guidelines</th>
<th>Sample Land Use Plan</th>
<th>Example Photos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town Center Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major Uses Nearby: Major intersections and existing mixed-use, primarily commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patrons: All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buildings: High-rise &amp; Mid-rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Station Elements: Park-and-ride decks hidden by ground floor retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Height and use intensity transition down with distance from station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Station: Five Points (large) or Decatur (small)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commuter Town Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major Uses Nearby: Offices &amp; Civic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patrons: Commuters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Uses: Housing, retail, and office activity and common spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buildings: Low-rise &amp; Mid-rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Station Elements: Park-and-ride decks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Station: Lindbergh Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Station</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major Uses Nearby: Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patrons: Nearby residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Land Uses: Some mixed-use and housing, can include local amenities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Buildings: Low-rise &amp; Mid-rise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Station Elements: Potentially small park-and-ride or bus turn-around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Station: Ashby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TECHNOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bus Rapid Transit</th>
<th>Light Rail Transit</th>
<th>Heavy Rail Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPITAL COST</strong></td>
<td>$473 Million</td>
<td>$1.8 B (281% Increase)</td>
<td>$1.6 B (238% Increase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME TO IMPLEMENT</strong></td>
<td>5-8 years</td>
<td>7-12 years+</td>
<td>8-15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHASING POTENTIAL</strong></td>
<td>Technology** and Implementation***</td>
<td>Implementation Only</td>
<td>Implementation Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY</strong>*</td>
<td>Best Case</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
<td>Challenging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Funding opportunities will be identified during the environmental process

** Technology (potential to upgrade from BRT to LRT or HRT)

*** Implementation (implement project in segments, i.e. North Springs to Holcomb Bridge, Holcomb Bridge to North Point, North Point to Windward)

### TRADE OFFS AND DECISION MAKING

- **Intensity:** Impacts, Costs, Cost-Effectiveness, Time to Implement
- **Performance:** Ridership, VMT Reduction, Travel Time Savings

- LOWER
- HIGHER
## WHAT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO YOU?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM OF IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating in next 5 – 7 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low costs to build and operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low cost per rider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest level of impact to communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High ridership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant travel time savings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

**GOAL 1. Improve Mobility and Access**

Heavy Rail Transit (HRT) was the best performing alternative and scored high in the following areas:

- Daily projected transit boardings
- New transit riders
- Annual corridor crash reductions
- Projected 2040 population and employment within a 10-minute drive
- Low-income residents within a 10-minute walk
- Interface with existing future transit (including Concept 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HRT</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Transit Boardings (20-40)</td>
<td>23,700</td>
<td>15,800</td>
<td>13,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Transit Riders</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Crash Reductions</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Travel Time Savings (Hours of User Benefits)</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>6,200</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 2. Support Land Use and Economic Development Planning**

Light Rail Transit was the best performing alternative and scored high in the following areas:

- Consistency with adopted local/regional plans
- Transit-supportive land use/zoning within ½ mile of stations
- Acres of vacant or underutilized land within ½ of stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HRT</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency w/ Local and Regional Plans</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant/Underutilized Land per Station Area</td>
<td>141 acres</td>
<td>159 acres</td>
<td>159 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit-supportive Zoning/ Future Land Use per Station</td>
<td>24 acres</td>
<td>33 acres</td>
<td>33 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 3. Provide Cost-Effective Transit Service**

Bus Rapid Transit was the best performing alternative and scored high in the following areas:

- Annual Operating and Maintenance (O&M) Costs
- Construction Capital Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HRT</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$19 Million</td>
<td>$20 Million</td>
<td>$10 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Capital Costs</td>
<td>$1.6 Billion</td>
<td>$1.8 Billion</td>
<td>$473 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Transit Trip</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 4. Minimize Environmental Impacts**

Heavy Rail Transit was the best performing alternative and scored high in the following areas:

- Ability to reduce vehicle miles traveled and air quality pollutants
- Low impact to water resources, historic resources and vibration sensitive locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HRT</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>BRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>-18,000</td>
<td>-24,000</td>
<td>-16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Air Quality Pollutants</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted Noise-sensitive Land Uses</td>
<td>841 acres</td>
<td>250 acres</td>
<td>73 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>ACTION PLAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEDERAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| FTA New Starts             | Competitive national program for approximately 50% of capital project costs | - Complete environmental review  
- Refine project to ensure it is competitive at the National Level  
- Support transit supportive policies around stations |
| PRIVATE                    |                                                                             |                                                                                                |
| Private Funding Sources    | e.g., Community Improvement Districts (CID), private investment, concessions and station development | - Work with private sector partners to encourage investment                                      |
| LOCAL                      |                                                                             |                                                                                                |
| Local Funding Sources      | e.g., Sales tax revenue, bond revenue                                       | - Work with public sector partners regarding opportunities to allocate funding and/or generate revenue for investment |
Background

- Scientific survey recommended during fall 2013 outreach
- Initiated in March 2014 with Kennesaw State University – A.L. Burruss Institute of Public Service and Research
- Respondent characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cellphone</th>
<th>Landline</th>
<th>Internet</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Fulton Residents</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fulton Employees*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Within 1-Mile of GA400 Corridor

Results Summary

- Strong support for extension to county line
- Preference for rail transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENT SURVEY RESULTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>EMPLOYEE SURVEY RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve or Disapprove of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Expansion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA to Forsyth County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Should MARTA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion Be Accomplished?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Expansion of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTA to Forsyth County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) New Starts Program?

- Federal funding source for major transit fixed guideway projects
- Typically funds 50% of capital costs
- Discretionary program; highly competitive!

What project justification criteria are considered?

- Mobility improvements - annual number of riders
- Cost effectiveness - cost per rider
- Congestion relief - all projects currently rated medium by FTA
- Environmental benefits - changes to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- Land use - population and employment, affordable housing around stations
- Economic development - transit supportive development plans and policies

How do the Georgia 400 Alternatives perform?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Bus Rapid Transit</th>
<th>Light Rail Transit</th>
<th>Heavy Rail Transit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Relief</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Benefits</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium-High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Justification Rating</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium-Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Projects need medium or better rating to be considered for funding. Project ratings will be refined as the study efforts continue.
WHERE DO YOU LIVE AND WORK?