



BeltLine

MARTA GENERAL PLANNING CONSULTANT SERVICES

BELTLINE CORRIDOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

MEETING GROUP: Citywide Conversation on Transit and Trails
PROJECT CODE: BEL

ORDER NO: 2008-07
TASK NO: 7.5

DATE & TIME: April 2, 2009 – 6:00 p.m.
LOCATION: All Saints' Episcopal Church, 634 W. Peachtree St. NW

ATTENDEES: (See Attached List)

MEETING NOTES

| | |
|--|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <p>The Citywide Conversation on Transit and Trails began with an introduction and explanation of the purpose for the meeting by Johnny Dunning, Jr., Senior Director of Transit System Planning for MARTA. Presentations were made by Nate Conable (who discussed the overview of the BeltLine Project, the BeltLine Corridor Environmental Study, and the Environmental Study Interface with Subarea Master Planning efforts) and Henry Ikwut-Ukwa (who presented information on the Evaluation Criteria and upcoming public workshops).</p> <p>Following the presentation, the attendees were divided into groups to review the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and associated Performance Measures. The purpose of this exercise was to get a consensus that the right evaluation criteria and performance measures have been developed and to insure that important information has not been left out.</p> <p>Provided below are the list of questions asked and answers provided during the meeting, as well as the feedback received from the break-out session.</p> | None Required |

| | |
|--|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <p>1. <u>Questions and Answers</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: What is the definition of a stakeholder? (David Emory) • Response: A stakeholder is defined as those persons who represent a specific interest or group. (Nate Conable) • Question: We still have not gotten information needed in order to provide you with feedback. A lot of us our concerned about health impacts in our neighborhood but we have not seen anything on the existing conditions. I don't understand how you expect us to participate in a break out session to give feedback on information we have not seen yet. How do you intend to remedy that? (Dianne Olansky) • Response: The purpose of this meeting is to review some the existing conditions information that we have on the boards and that we have talked through in your handouts and during the presentation. It's really to assess that what we have seen out there is accurate. So before we finalize the document we wanted the opportunity to present the information to the people in the community so that they could tell us if we are on the right track. Also, during the presentation Nate mentioned that there would be documents available within the middle of April and May. You may access them via the website or request that a hard copy be provided to you. (Adelee Le Grand) • Question: Are you doing a conceptual design for the entire corridor? (Mike Dobbins) • Response: Yes. (Adelee Le Grand) • Question: I have some concerns with existing and project population and employment with the BeltLine study area. I am skeptical of whether or not the BeltLine has transit supportive densities. What was the study area width? (Mike Dobbins) • Response: Half a mile buffer of the study area. (Adelee Le Grand) | None Required |

| | |
|--|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: The EIS is not complete with ridership and modeling. I'm concerned that further modeling is not being done. (Mike Dobbins) • Response: Under Tier 1 we are not doing model runs to tell us the travel patterns. We will use existing data provided in previous studies. (Henry Ikwut-Ukwa) • Question: What is the cost of the contract for the consulting firm on this project? (Mike Dobbins) • Response: The General Planning Contractor is doing work for MARTA. They are doing multiple projects for MARTA but the project value of this contract is up to \$10,000,000.00. The timeline for the work to be completed is June 2010. (Nate Conable) • Question: What is the projected timeline of implementation for various segments of the BeltLine? (Mike Dobbins) • Response: We have not prioritized any segment of the BeltLine for implementation as of yet. (Nate Conable) • Question: The conceptual level of planning raises issues of discontinuity of BeltLine transit with MARTA rail. Will this be addressed in the EIS? (Mike Dobbins) • Response: Yes. As a part of this study we are going to set the foot print and the conceptual alignment so it will include connections to MARTA stations and we will make decisions on alternative connections. (Henry Ikwut-Ukwa) • Question: How is citywide transit projects prioritized in terms of meeting competing transit service needs? (Mike Dobbins) | None Required |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Response: The Transit Implementation Board (formerly Transit Planning Board) is working on these issues. (Henry Ikwut-Ukwa) • Question: I'm here to assess the health impact assessments. Specifically I would like to know: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What was the specific location of the air pollution that was evaluated? Specifically high-volume major roadways that intersect the BeltLine. ○ Did you address issues of noise? Specifically for localized vulnerable populations. Also I did not see connectivity to recreational facilities and employment areas. (Michelle Marcus) • Response: We didn't look at any of those areas. This is a good of example of the importance of tonight's meeting. Our goal is to find out from you what areas we may have missed so that they can be added to our list. This way we will make sure we address all of the impacts – not only to the physical environment but to health as well. So please make sure to identify these areas in the breakout session. (Adelee Le Grand) • Question: Can you elaborate a little more on the related plans and efforts? I would like to know what they were. (Sybil Smith) • Response: I am sure I can't name them all from memory but we looked at the Inner Core Study, the Redevelopment Plan, the MARTA BeltLine Detailed Screening Report, the City of Atlanta's Comprehensive Development Plan, the ARC Division 6 Plan, the TPB Concept 3 Plan, and we coordinated with the Subarea Master Plan that Nate mentioned. (Adelee Le Grand) • Question: Did you look at any specific environmental studies? (Sybil Smith) • Response: We did not have any environmental studies specific to the NEPA process to compare to. However, we did look at some other studies that may have looked at environmental issues as part of a corridor or neighborhood planning effort. | None Required |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Question: Can you address projected ridership concerns in the context of the recent experience in Charlotte and other areas with the preliminary density studies along with the actual ridership? (Mason Hicks) • Response: Again, for a point of clarification the purpose of the Tier 1 is corridor preservation. So we will not be running the regional travel demand model and we won't be gathering new ridership numbers. (Adelee Le Grand) • Question: I would like to know about the process of public engagement in this study. How are the communities going to address the conceptual matters and how are you going to resolve those issues through this process so that the community and your plan work well together? (Frank Somers) • Response: We are going to have several opportunities for the public to participate in the process. There is a handout in your packet that details our upcoming public workshops. Throughout the process when we get to major milestones we will come back to the public and ask for input. Also NEPA is a federal process which requires us to engage the public and validate our activities. NEPA also requires us to have public hearings. There will be many opportunities for the public to get involved and you can always check the MARTA or ABI website to obtain information on upcoming activities. (Adelee Le Grand) • Final Response: I want to make just one general response to the questions and comments that have been asked. First, I want to make sure that everyone is clear that we are doing a Tier 1 EIS and in this process we are identifying the alignment for the transit and the trails in the corridor so that we understand the preservation needs. Secondly, through the scoping process several questions were received from many of you in the room, including Mr. Dobbins. The Scoping | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| Summary Report mentioned during the presentation actually addresses the questions and comments we have received tonight. This report will be available in a couple of weeks so please read through it for more detailed answers to your questions. (Adelee Le Grand) | |
| <p>2. Feedback from the Seven Breakout Groups Evaluation Criteria (Listed in combined order of voting preference by each group)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility and Connectivity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local services and infill stations could be joined for connectivity with pedestrians and bicyclists ○ How do you get people to leave their cars at home? ○ The trail will help serve the need to ‘meander’ while the transit would help get to destinations more directly ○ How do we deal with where the other sub areas join? ○ Neighborhood/shorter trips to destinations ○ Connection points with existing versus future activity ○ Have nodes for regional connectivity -- # of nodes at employment centers ○ Have places where system connects to streets ○ Connections to destinations for employment, retail, grocery shopping ○ Consider multi-modal connectivity ○ Ensure accessibility to jobs ○ Must be a connection between people living and working along the BeltLine ○ Address trips to work and other places, i.e. there is a lack of grocery stores in the Southwest corridor ○ As much as we want people to use public transportation, not having large associated parking lots is still very important ○ Disabled population – include in considerations | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Comprehensive sidewalk development needed, designed and implemented ○ Trail Access Points - how ordinary people will get on the trail ○ Pedestrians and bicycles should be incorporated in this criteria, versus having two separate criteria ○ Put transit and trails where people live ○ ROW Pres.: PATH, TPL, Georgia Conservancy, Zoning ○ Extent of future connectivity brought by transit ○ What are the recreational aspects of the trail | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Community Fit <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Focus on quality of life – the rest will follow ○ Consider compatibility, benefits to community ○ Define impacts – displacements versus benefits, attract future businesses/residents ○ Ensure community cohesion ○ To be compatible with the community, what are the benefits to the people ○ Concern with security, lighting, site specificity, fit of stations ○ Security in using transit and trails ○ Must get public input for community fit ○ Neighborhood Connection (performance measure) ○ We should be mapping as to where people are going ○ Security of adjacent properties ○ Accessibility to 1st responders ○ Prevention of catastrophic incident/impact to adjacent properties | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian and Bicycle Compatibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Experience – get input from people who know about this ○ At-grade access for bikes ○ Safety and lighting need to be considered ○ This category is a duplicate of Connectivity and Mobility ○ Bike-friendly ○ Combine first 4 measures with Accessibility/Connectivity; move last 2 measures to Community | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Displacement from Right of Way needs or development ○ Geographic equity with socio-economic equity ○ Prioritize the need of the people versus looking at how they would 'benefit' ○ Look at cost effectiveness in a different way – connecting people to jobs, grocery stores ○ Serve seniors and disabled – make sure ADA compliant ○ Must be able to accommodate ADA requirements ○ Make sure transit and trails are safe enough to use ○ See how BRT connection by MARTA would work ○ Can Equity be combined with other headings ○ Equity – connections covered under other criteria | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider speed of mobility ○ Combine mobility with accessibility and connectivity ○ Consider frequency of service ○ Should be able to be both a local access and express service ○ Reduction needed in Vehicle Miles Traveled and Vehicle Trips | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consider funding and where it will come from ○ How economically sustainable is the project ○ Should economics be the driving factor; or serving a population – what are the priorities? ○ Consider cost of maintenance ○ Add <i>Preservation of Single Family Neighborhoods</i> and other transit connections | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the impact of the certain kinds of transit technology on the environment? ○ Consider noise, visual impact, pollution, vibration • Land Use and Economic Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should have a different feel and quality than the rest of MARTA ○ Reminder -- BeltLine was originally about connecting neighborhoods rather than spurring development. | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Input <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Let the neighborhoods speak for themselves ○ Think of what they need, not how we think they can benefit ○ Need to aggressively involve the public. • Support of Other Planning Initiatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should be coordination with other planning initiatives ○ Support planned land use. ○ Use previous models for comparison | |

| | |
|--|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| ADDITIONAL COMMENTS | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Criteria categories could be reduced or combined; There is duplicate measure in numerous criteria, i.e. collapse criteria • Add Ridership as category – what is the feasibility for people riding public transit as defined in the redevelopment study. if people don't ride public transit the whole concept disintegrates • Add Timeframe to criteria – when can we have funding and have the BeltLine accessible to the neighborhoods we are connecting | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Options Available for Changing Conditions to criteria • Focus of study area should take into account the TAD, not just the ½-mile buffer. • Do not minimize the importance of safety – if people feel intimidated they won't walk, bicycle, or ride public transit • Consolidate the existing 10 Evaluation Criteria into the 4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Connectivity: Mobility, Accessibility and Connectivity, Pedestrian/Bike Compatibility ○ Community Support: Equity, Planning Initiatives, Community Fit, and Public Involvement ○ Cost Efficiency: Cost effectiveness and Economic Development/Land Use ○ Environmental Quality: As is | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Purpose: | |
| To provide an update on the progress of the study and discuss the Preliminary Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures. | |
| Key Discussion Points/Action Items: | Responsible Party / Action Item |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidate the Performance Measures – These could also be consolidated and weighted accordingly. Add a measure of the costs to acquire land or easements for competing alternatives. Also provide separate measures for acres of wetlands impacted and number of stream crossings. These have different environmental effects. | |
| | |

C: Document Control
 Attachments: PowerPoint Presentation