I-20 East Transit Initiative

Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting

September 9, 2010

4:00-6:00 PM
Meeting Agenda

• Introductions
• Project Background
• Study Overview
• Role of the SAC
• Initial Study Findings
• Stakeholder Interviews – What We Heard
• Input on Corridor Issues
• Input on Project Goals
• Upcoming Public Meetings
Study Team

MARTA
• John Crocker, PhD – Project Manager
• Tameka Wimberley, AICP – Deputy Project Manager
• Don Williams – General Planning Consultant Manager

Jacobs JJG
• Pat Smeeton – Consultant Project Manager
• Jonathan Webster, AICP – Project Planner
• Michelle Erste– Public Involvement

Sycamore Consulting
• Jen Price – Public Involvement

Planners for Environmental Quality
• Inga Kennedy – Public Involvement
• James Davis – Public Involvement
SAC Members

• Federal, State, and Local Elected Officials
• Neighborhood Associations
• Corridor Residents
• Business Leaders
• Civic and Religious Institutions
• Local Government Staff
• Community Groups
Project Background

Timeline of Previous Studies:

- South DeKalb – Lindbergh Corridor Major Investment Study (MARTA)
- I-20 East Corridor Alternatives Analysis (MARTA)
- Concept 3 (Transit Planning Board)
- I-20 East Managed Lanes Corridor Study (Georgia Department of Transportation)
- I-20 East Corridor Transit Feasibility Study (MARTA)
- Envision6 Regional Transportation Plan (Atlanta Regional Commission)
- I-20 East Modified Locally Preferred Alternative Report (MARTA)
- I-20 East Corridor Transit Initiative (MARTA)
Study Area
Study Overview

• **Detailed Corridor Analysis (DCA)** - Update the previous planning efforts to reflect changes in travel trends, land use, and demographics. Result of DCA will be an updated Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA).

• **Draft Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS)** - In-depth, environmentally focused study centered on the natural, social, cultural, and physical impacts and benefits of potential transit investments. Required for all federally funded transportation projects.
I-20 EAST CORRIDOR
FTA PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

1. Feasibility Study and Alternatives Analysis

2. Detailed Corridor Analysis
   - This phase will update the Locally Preferred Alternative for approval by the MARTA board and ARC.

3. Draft Environmental Impact Statement
   - This phase begins an in depth environmental analysis mandated by NEPA.

4. Preliminary Engineering/Final Environmental Impact Statement
   - This phase will require FTA approval for entry into Preliminary Engineering and complete the NEPA process. Duration: 12-18 Months

5. Final Design
   - At this phase local funding must be committed and FTA will evaluate project for Full Funding Grant Agreement. Duration: 2-4 Years

6. Construction
   - Full Funding Grant Agreement in place with FTA. This phase could take 2-4 years depending on the type and length of transit investment.

7. Revenue Operation
## Study Schedule

### I-20 East Transit Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach/Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Public Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection/Baseline Conditions Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of Purpose &amp; Need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Goals and Evaluation Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification/Confirmation of Study Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Study Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Engineering and Evaluation For LPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for FTA New Starts Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Data Collection/Existing Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issuance of Notice of Intent to Prepare DEIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Scoping Meetings (Agency &amp; Public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of DEIS Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIS Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIS Public Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Detailed Corridor Analysis**
- **Draft Environmental Impact Statement**
Range of outreach techniques to be undertaken, such as:

- Newsletters and Project Fact Sheet
- Community stakeholder interviews
- Public meetings
- Speakers’ bureaus
- Web page (http://www.itsmartam.com/I20-east-corr.aspx)
- Facebook page
Role of the SAC

• Provide an assessment of study findings for consistency with community goals and perspectives
• Provide input on:
  – Corridor needs
  – Project goals and objectives
  – Evaluation criteria for alternatives
  – Potential alignments, transit technologies, and station areas
• Committee members will represent their respective constituencies’ views
• Promote community awareness of the I-20 East Transit Initiative
SAC Meetings

DCA Phase:
• SAC Kickoff Meeting (September 2010)
• SAC Meeting #2 (November 2010)
• SAC Meeting #3 (January 2011)
• SAC Meeting #4 (March 2011)

DEIS Phase:
• SAC Meeting #5 (June 2011)
• SAC Meeting #6 (October 2011)
Initial Study Findings

- Population and Employment Growth
- Travel Patterns
- Increasing Transit Demand
- Transit Dependant Populations
- Increasing Congestion Levels
**Population and Employment Growth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 East Corridor</td>
<td>449,000</td>
<td>566,000</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Region</td>
<td>4,944,939</td>
<td>7,377,951</td>
<td>2,433,012</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-20 East Corridor</td>
<td>213,000</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>99,000</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta Region</td>
<td>3,003,487</td>
<td>3,835,118</td>
<td>831,631</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2005 - 2.6 million daily person trips to and from the study area.
- 2030 - up 36% to 3.5 million daily trips.

Source: Atlanta Regional Commission, Travel Demand Model
Increasing Corridor Congestion

- Between 2005-2030 the percentage of daily travel in congested conditions on major corridor roadways is expected to increase by 63%.
- Congested conditions on I-20 are projected to increase 100%, from 5 to 10 hours per day.
- The average travel speeds on I-20 are expected to decline from 39-31 mph in AM peak and 37-27 mph in PM peak.
Increasing Corridor Congestion

2005 Congested Roadways
Increasing Corridor Congestion

2030 Congested Roadways
Travel Patterns

- Majority of persons utilizing I-20, travel to and from Downtown/Midtown Atlanta in the peak hours.
- The Downtown and Midtown Business Districts represent the most concentrated employment destination for commuters who live in the corridor.
- Employment destinations in north DeKalb County (Emory-CDC, Perimeter) and north Fulton County (Buckhead, Perimeter, GA 400) are also major draws for corridor residents.
Travel Patterns

Peak Hour Interstate Travel
Increasing Transit Demand

- MARTA rail boardings at eastern Blue Line stations up 9% from 2001-2008.
- GRTA express bus ridership up 118% from 2006-2008.
- MARTA bus boardings for study area routes up 12% from 2006-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trips</td>
<td>143,700</td>
<td>253,000</td>
<td>109,300</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Trips</td>
<td>2,585,700</td>
<td>3,515,800</td>
<td>930,100</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Atlanta Regional Commission, Travel Demand Model; MARTA; GRTA; I-20 East Corridor Study (2001)
Transit Dependent Populations

- Percentage of zero-car households in the corridor is more than twice the regional average.

- High concentrations can be found adjacent to I-20 East surrounding the Atlanta CBD, in Reynoldstown, Edgewood, and East Atlanta neighborhoods.

- Outside the perimeter concentrations can be found adjacent to I-20 along Wesley Chapel Road, and in the Lithonia and Conyers areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Zero Car Households</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-20 East Corridor</td>
<td>147,311</td>
<td>22,542</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta MSA</td>
<td>1,504,871</td>
<td>110,401</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Georgia</td>
<td>3,006,369</td>
<td>248,546</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census 2000
Stakeholder Input: What We Heard

- Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20 10%
- Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor 9%
- Aging population will need mobility options 6%
- Need improved connectivity within the corridor 6%
- Rail would attract economic development 6%
- Rail would attract more riders 6%
- Rail transit needed in corridor 5%
- Don’t expect much opposition to project 5%
Stakeholder Input: What We Heard

- Need improved transit system connectivity 5%
- Transit should serve Rockdale County 5%
- Need improved connectivity to downtown Atlanta 4%
- Existing express bus service at capacity 4%
- Fear of crime could provide opposition to project 4%
- Need more reliable/efficient service 4%
- Newsletter a good way to educate the public 3%
- East Atlanta appropriate for station and TOD 1%
Stakeholder Input: What We Heard

• Historic neighborhoods are an alignment constraint 1%
• Need better weekend service at Mall at Stonecrest 1%
• Need for dedicated transit lanes on roadways 1%
• Need on-board surveys 1%
• Need to educate public about transit 1%
• Opposition - 'Not in my back yard (NIMBY)' residents 1%
• Rail transit would receive more public support 1%
• There is a lack of east-west transportation options 1%
• Provide transportation options to improve east-west mobility in the corridor
• Improve accessibility to downtown Atlanta and other activity centers
• Support plans for economic development, transit-oriented development, and community revitalization
SAC Input on Corridor Issues

SAC Feedback Exercise
Identified Corridor Issues

• Inadequate access to downtown and other employment centers
• Limited east-west roadways: I-20 is the only real choice
• Limited transportation options: car is only option for many
• Insufficient transit service for a growing demand
• Traffic congestion: delay and slow travel times
• Express buses operates in normal traffic
• Limited planned projects in corridor to accommodate growth
• Areas of corridor are in need of revitalization
• Limited transportation options for transit dependent and elderly populations
• Other?
SAC Input on Corridor Issues

• Rank each corridor issue

• Scale of 1 – 5

  1: Not Important
  2: Minor Concern
  3: Important
  4: Major Concern
  5: Critical
Keypad Voting

- You will use this keypad to select your response
- Please press numbers 1-5 only for this exercise
- These are not magic remotes they will not work on anything else...
  Please leave here – Thank you!!
Inadequate Access to Downtown and Other Employment Centers

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.13

Cross-tab label
Limited East-West Roadways: I-20 is the Only Real Choice

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.52
Limited Transportation Options: Car is the Only Option for Many

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.57
Insufficient Transit Service for a Growing Demand

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.74

Cross-tab label
Traffic Congestion: Delay and Slow Travel Times

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.74
Express Buses Operate on Congested Roadways

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.13

Cross-tab label

23 / 23
Limited Planned Projects in Corridor to Accommodate Growth

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.74

Cross-tab label
Areas of Corridor Are in Need of Revitalization

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.48

Cross-tab label
Limited Transportation Options for Transit Dependent and Elderly Populations

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.65
1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 2.19
Break/Refreshments
## Corridor Issues Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient transit service for a growing demand</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited planned projects in corridor to accommodate growth</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic congestion: delay and slow travel times</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited transportation options for transit dependent and elderly</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited transportation options: car is only option for many</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited east-west roadways: I-20 is the only real choice</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of corridor are in need of revitalization</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate access to downtown and other employment centers</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express buses operates in normal traffic</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Goals

• Improve East-West Mobility
• Improve Travel Options in Corridor
• Improve Accessibility to Jobs and Housing
• Improve Transit Service for Underserved Populations
• Promote Economic Development/Revitalization/Job Growth
• Encourage Transit Supportive Land Use and Development Patterns
• Minimize Impact to Social and Natural Resources
• Promote Cost Effective Transit Investments
• Enhance Regional Transit Connectivity
SAC Input on Project Goals

• Rank each corridor goal

• Scale of 1 – 5
  1: Not Important
  2: Somewhat Important
  3: Important
  4: Very Important
  5: Critical
Improve East-West Mobility

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.18
Improve Travel Options in Corridor

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.05
Improve Accessibility to Jobs and Housing

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.10
Improve Transit Service for Underserved Populations

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.38

Cross-tab label
Promote Economic Development/ Revitalization/ Job Growth

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.77

Cross-tab label
Encourage Transit Supportive Land use and Development Patterns

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.43
Minimize Impact to Social and Natural Resources

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 3.29
Promote Cost Effective Transit Investments

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.29
Enhance Regional Transit Connectivity

1. Not Important
2. Minor Concern
3. Important
4. Major Concern
5. Critical

Avg = 4.64
## Project Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote Economic Development/Revitalization/Job Growth</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Regional Transit Connectivity</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Transit Supportive Land Use and Development Patterns</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Transit Service for Underserved Populations</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote Cost Effective Transit Investments</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve East-West Mobility</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Accessibility to Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Travel Options in Corridor</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimize Impact to Social and Natural Resources</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upcoming Public Meetings

• Public kick-off meetings will be held in 3 different locations along the corridor

• Purpose of meeting:
  • Introduce the study
  • Present initial study findings
  • Solicit input on the corridor needs
  • Present initial project Purpose and Need
  • Solicit feedback on study goals
  • Present previously identified alignments

• We need your help informing the public about these meetings!
Questions & Feedback

John Crocker, PhD
MARTA Project Manager
2424 Piedmont Road NE
Atlanta GA 30324
404-848-8292
jtcrocker@itsmarta.com

Pat Smeeton
Consultant Project Manager
400 Colony Square
1201 Peachtree St, Ste 1905
Atlanta GA 30361
678-333-0450
pat.smeeton@jacobs.com