Today’s Meeting Purpose

• Where We Are

• What We’ve Heard

• The Screening Process

• Q&A

• Where Do We Go From 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 tonight will be considered as part of the Federal NEPA process, should MARTA prepare an EIS for FTA review.

FTA = Federal Transit Administration
NEPA = National Environmental Policy Act
EIS = Environmental Impact Statement
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
Connect 400 Alternatives Analysis Schedule

- **DISCOVERY**
  - Goals and Objectives
  - Purpose and Need
  - Existing Conditions

- **DISCUSSION**
  - Evaluation Methodology
  - Definition of Alternatives
  - Refine Ridership Model

- **DEVELOPMENT**
  - Evaluation of Alternatives
  - Refine Alternatives

- **DOCUMENTATION**
  - Early Scoping

2011 Winter
- 2012 Spring
- 2012-2013 Summer
- 2013 Fall

We are Here
Federal Project Development Process

Project Development: Typically 6 – 12 years

1 – 2 years
2 – 3 years
1 - 3 years
2 – 3 years

We are Here
What We’ve Heard
Outreach

Stakeholder Interviews

- **Technical Advisory Committee**
- **Project Steering Committee**

- **Stakeholder**: 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

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

Holiday/Winter Survey

- December 12, 2012 to January 17, 2013

- 136 Respondents
General Themes

- Lack of transportation funding
- Need for ‘last mile’ circulation
- Need feeder system to 400 transit
- Need for transit-oriented development around the stations
- Desire to preserve visual aesthetic, including river buffers and tree buffers
- Phase transit improvements to build market/ridership
- There is no ‘reverse commute’ on 400, both directions bad during peak hours
- Need to improve existing MARTA bus routes and add more
- Georgia 400 corridor is preferred alignment
- Community support for Heavy Rail Transit
The Screening Process
**The Screening Process**

**Fatal Flaw Analysis** considers at a high level:
- Purpose & Need
- Constructability & right-of-way impacts
- Generalized Technology Assessment

**Defined alternatives (combinations of alignment & transit technology) for Screen 1**

**Screen 1** applies both quantitative & qualitative evaluation criteria to reduce the number of alternatives

**Smaller set of alternatives advance into Screen 2**

**Screen 2** involves a more in-depth analysis using additional performance measures

**Screen 2 refines the alternatives**

**Recommendation to MARTA Board**

**Fatal Flaw Analysis**

**Screen 1 Analysis**

**Screen 2 Analysis/Alternatives Refinement**

**Early Scoping**
Overview of Fatal Flaw Analysis

Step 1: Technology Assessment
- Independent review of 6 modes
- Most appropriate - Bus Rapid Transit (BRT); Light Rail/Streetcar (LRT/SC); Heavy Rail (HRT)

Step 2: Universe of Alternatives
- 3 modes + 9 alignments along GA 400 & SR 9

Step 3: Fatal Flaw Analysis
- Reduce ‘universe’ to a smaller set for Screen 1
- High-level based on purpose/need & constructability
Overview of Screen 1

Methodology/Assumptions

- Qualitative and quantitative analysis
- Performance measures based on Purpose and Need, Goals and Objectives
- Station-related measures normalized for number of stations

Results

- Alignments adjacent to or within GA 400 right-of-way
  - Fewer potential impacts
  - More population and employment access
  - East/West feeder connections
- Heavy Rail Transit (HRT) was preferred due to speed and elimination of transfer
- Northridge rather Pitts location
- Windward Parkway - Regional Station
- Community Stations are preferred for:
  - Northridge, Holcomb Bridge, Mansell, North Point and Old Milton
Overview of Screen 2 Alternatives

Georgia 400 – 1 (A)

Alignment
- 11.9 miles Long
- North Springs Station – Windward via GA 400

Transit Technology
- Bus Rapid Transit
- Light Rail/Streetcar
- Heavy Rail

Potential Stations
- Northridge
- Holcomb Bridge
- Mansell Road
- North Point
- Old Milton (LRT/BRT only)
- Windward Parkway

* GDOT ROW availability on GA 400 to be determined based on Managed Lanes Study
## Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 1: Mobility &amp; Access</th>
<th>Heavy Rail (HRT)</th>
<th>Light Rail (LRT)</th>
<th>Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Riders by 2040</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Travel Time Savings</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Corridor Crash Reductions</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 2: Land Use and Economic Development</th>
<th>Consistency with adopted local/regional plans/development potential</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 3: Cost-Effective Transit Service</th>
<th>Annual Estimated O&amp;M Costs</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction Capital Costs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost per Trip</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal 4: Minimize Environmental Impacts</th>
<th>Change in VMT</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in Air Quality Pollutants</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise Sensitive Land Uses</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Alternatives

Summary Results

• **Goal 1: Mobility & Access**
  
  **HRT** provides higher ridership numbers, transit benefits and reductions in vehicular traffic

• **Goal 2: Land Use & Economic Development**

  **All three alternatives** are relatively equal in supporting land use & economic development planning

• **Goal 3: Cost Effective Service**

  **BRT** is much cheaper and cost-effective than the other alternatives

• **Goal 4: Environmental/Community Impact**

  **HRT** presents least environmental impact, and most beneficial to reducing VMT and air pollutants
Benefits & Challenges

Benefits

• Reduction in commute times
• Reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and air pollutant emissions
• Reduction in vehicular crashes
• Increased employment
• Increased property values around station areas
• Reduced impact to environmental and community resources because the alignment utilizes GA 400 right of way

Challenges

• Encouraging higher density, less auto-oriented development
• Funding challenges for capital costs & system operations/maintenance
Where do we go from Here?
Questions or Feedback?

• What are your thoughts in general concerning the implementation of high capacity transit in the corridor?

• What technology options are most appropriate, and why?

• When phasing, what technology should be implemented first? Second?

• What east-west connection are most important?
Next Steps

• Continue community discussions

• Conduct statistically-valid survey

• Make recommendation to MARTA Board on how to proceed
Connect 400 Contact

Janide Sidifall, MARTA Project Manager

Connect400@itsmarta.com

Follow us at Connect 400 on facebook