Where We’ve Been

- Current study effort started in 2011
- Completed Alternatives Analysis (2013)
  - Assessed a variety of alignments and technologies
  - Extensive community outreach
- Initiated Early Scoping Phase 1 (Fall 2013)
  - Identified GA 400 as the corridor of focus
  - Advanced HRT, BRT and LRT for further consideration
- Continued Early Scoping Phase 2 (2014)
  - Additional community outreach
  - Eliminated LRT → Advance HRT and BRT
  - Concern of GA 400 east vs. west side alignment options
Community Outreach

Stakeholder Meetings
- **Stakeholders:** 30+ Meetings
- **TAC:** December 13, 2011; February 28, 2012, October 25, 2012

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
- **Summer 2014:** Public Meetings and City Council Briefings
- **Fall 2014:** Public Outreach

Surveys
- **December 12, 2012 to January 17, 2013**
  - 136 Respondents
- **March 2014 – KSU Scientific Public Opinion Survey**
  - 612 Residents
  - 463 Employees
What We’ve Heard

- HRT is the best performing alternative and preferred technology by stakeholders and the public
- Concern over future alignment → East vs. West side of GA 400
- Preference for a “one seat ride”
- Willingness to pay more for HRT service and its benefits
- HRT and BRT ranked highest in New Starts evaluation
- Desire from the community to see MARTA and GDOT coordinate
Project Status

- Re-initiated efforts in Spring of 2014 to:
  - Conduct a second phase of Early Scoping
  - Initiate the preliminary New Starts evaluation
  - **Recommend / adopt a LPA**
  - Begin environmental documentation (DEIS) *(Begins in Winter 2015)*
Background on Analysis for LPA Identification

• Tasked by MARTA management to conduct additional analysis of potential:
  1. Environmental Impacts (quantitative)
  2. Transportation Impacts (qualitative)
  3. Costs (order of magnitude costs based on planning-level assumptions)

• The LPA will define:
  – Technology(s) advanced into the DEIS
  – Refined alignment studied in the DEIS

DEIS = Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Alternatives Considered

- East Only HRT
- East Only BRT
- West Only HRT
- West Only BRT
- East-West-East HRT
- East-West-East BRT
- BRT in Managed Lanes
  - Assumes Joint GDOT/MARTA Implementation

Previously studied stations at North Point Mall and Mansell Rd. were combined
Analysis Process

- Conducted between September and November 2014

Data Collection → GIS Base Mapping → Refine Alignments

Site Selection → Station Footprints → Crossover Identification

Right-of-Way Assumptions → Impact Assessment/Costs → Conclusions
Evaluation Criteria

- Transportation Impacts
  - Accessibility / network impacts
  - Population / employment access
  - Proximity to attractors
  - Consistency with existing plans / Early Scoping feedback

- Environmental Impacts
  - Displacements
  - Wetlands
  - Parklands
  - Community facilities
  - Environmental Justice

- Capital Costs
## Refinements in Evaluation Since the Alternatives Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives Analysis (OLD)</th>
<th>Current Analysis (NEW)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generalized station location</td>
<td>Station footprint located for purposes of impact analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard station cost</td>
<td>Station footprints, type, and parking structures included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard structures cost</td>
<td>Major/minor structure assumptions based on length and typical section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total land acquisition cost</td>
<td>Land acquisition cost based on land value at footprint location and typical section width</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5% Cost Contingency</td>
<td>30% Cost Contingency (30% is based on professional experience for planning level assumptions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2012 Costs</td>
<td>Year of Expenditure Costs (2028 assumed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDOT Managed Lane Information NOT Included</td>
<td>GDOT Managed Lane Information WAS included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Results – HRT Summary

- **Low Range** - assumes GDOT’s managed lane project is NOT constructed
- **High Range** - assumes GDOT’s managed lane project IS constructed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>East Only HRT</th>
<th>West Only HRT</th>
<th>East-West-East HRT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Impacts</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Score</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher score indicates greater relative impacts.*
# Evaluation Results – BRT Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>East Only BRT</th>
<th>West Only BRT</th>
<th>East-West-East BRT</th>
<th>BRT in ML**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Impacts</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impacts</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Score</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Higher score means indicates greater relative impacts.

**Assumes joint project implementation. ML = Managed Lanes
# Capital Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Only HRT</td>
<td>$2.167 B</td>
<td>$2.326 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Only BRT</td>
<td>$807 M</td>
<td>$858 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Only HRT</td>
<td>$2.191 B</td>
<td>$2.262 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Only BRT</td>
<td>$817 M</td>
<td>$889 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West-East HRT</td>
<td>$2.157 B</td>
<td>$2.243 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West-East BRT</td>
<td>$882 M</td>
<td>$1.019 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT in Managed Lanes**</td>
<td></td>
<td>$522 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Year of Expenditure dollars (2028)

** Includes stations and structures (no guideway)
Evaluation’s Key Findings

- Crossovers add about a 1%-2% increase to total project cost.
- HRT alignments are approximately 2.5 times the cost of their corresponding BRT alignment. Impacts are similar.
- East-West-East Alternatives have the lowest level of impacts.
- BRT Managed Lane alternative has lower cost but high impact due to anticipated right of way requirements (based on GA 400 Managed Lanes Feasibility Study).
- Availability of GA 400 ROW from GDOT is uncertain based on existing and future managed lane plans for the corridor.
**Recommended LPA**

- MARTA Staff Recommended LPA
  - East-West-East HRT
    - $2.1 to 2.2 Billion
    - Least impacts
    - Community preferred
- Other Alternatives for Study in DEIS
  - East-West-East BRT
    - $880 Million to $1.0 Billion
    - Minimal impacts
    - Preferred alignment alternative
  - BRT in GDOT Managed Lanes
    - Approximately $520 Million
    - High impacts → Managed Lane footprint
    - Potential coordination with GDOT
  - No Build
Rationale for Selecting the LPA

• Strongest Support from planning partners and general public
• One seat ride → High ridership
• Natural extension of existing red line
• Supports land use, economic development, and future investment goals adopted by local communities and planning partners.
• Performs well against preliminary FTA New Starts criteria
• Minimizes environmental and community impacts.
Next Steps

- Finalize LPA recommendation for MARTA Board (Today/January 2015)
- Recommended LPA to the MARTA Board (February 2015)
- Initiate Draft EIS (March 2015)
Questions?

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

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