



BeltLine

MARTA GENERAL PLANNING CONSULTANT SERVICES

BELTLINE CORRIDOR ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY

MEETING GROUP: Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting
PROJECT CODE: BEL

ORDER NO: 2008-07
TASK NO: 7.9

DATE & TIME: August 18, 2009 – 6:00-8:00 p.m.
LOCATION: MARTA Headquarters, 2424 Piedmont Road NE

ATTENDEES: Two (2) Breakout Tables – 10

MEETING NOTES

Purpose:	
To provide an update on the progress of the study and the information learned to date, obtain confirmation from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee that the proposed alignments are suitable for evaluation, and discuss the next steps in the process.	
Key Discussion Points/Action Items:	Responsible Party / Action Item
MARTA and ABI held a meeting for the Stakeholder Advisory Committee on August 18, 2009 at MARTA Headquarters. The agenda was as follows: Meeting Agenda <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opening and Introductions • Study Process and Update • GEPA Analysis for the Northeast Zone • Evaluation Criteria and Measures • Development of Alternatives • Alternatives Considered • Information Session • Next Steps <p>Participants signed-in and received handout materials including a Power Point Presentation, Summary of Public workshop Notes, Study Update #3 and a Comment Form. Display boards showed alternative alignments based on input from the public, the Technical Advisory Committee, Stakeholder Advisory Committee, Agency groups.</p>	None Required

Purpose:	
To provide an update on the progress of the study and the information learned to date, obtain confirmation from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee that the proposed alignments are suitable for evaluation, and discuss the next steps in the process.	
Key Discussion Points/Action Items:	Responsible Party / Action Item
<p>The Committee was briefed on the work performed since the last meeting and updated on the topics shown in the agenda. After the presentation, participants formed small groups at two tables, equipped with interactive mapping tools where they discussed additional considerations and recommendations on transit and trail locations, stations, stops and topics not considered. A brief report was made of the comments that came from each table.</p> <p>Following is a summary of additional considerations raised by the participants.</p> <p><u>Alignment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider cumulative impact to Peachtree Corridor (transportation plus development impacts on residential uses) • Minimize right-of-way impacts, particularly residential • Consider connectivity to Connect Atlanta Plan projects • Consider Connectivity at West End Park • Take advantage of existing development (in terms of alignment/station choices) • Transit and Trail alignment should be together for feasibility, but separating at points could be beneficial for connectivity <p><u>Station/Infill Station</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station location discussion around West End • Armour (infill) or Lindbergh Center • Coordinate with Clifton Corridor and I-85 plans <p><u>Trail</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directness of trails (benefitting walkers) (ex. Armour/Ottley) • Accessibility to trail facilities and stations • Follow AASHTO and ADA standards and guidelines for grades, access • Tanyard Trail Connectivity. Will there be a trail to nowhere? • Trail plans north of Ralph D. Abernathy 	None Required

Purpose:	
To provide an update on the progress of the study and the information learned to date, obtain confirmation from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee that the proposed alignments are suitable for evaluation, and discuss the next steps in the process.	
Key Discussion Points/Action Items:	Responsible Party / Action Item
<p><u>Other Considerations</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering issues and costs • Potential for attracting riders • Access to jobs • Tunnel lengths and associated safety needs • Safety considerations when transit in street shared with bicycle paths (ex. Edgewood Ave.) • Railroad coordination capacities with CSX, Norfolk Southern <p><u>Questions and Comments</u></p> <p>1. Question: Is the Transit Planning Board and other transit entities around the area on board to help to feed into the BeltLine?</p> <p>Response: Yes. MARTA has a Director of the Regional Integration who is working with the other transit entities. His office is spearheading the effort to make sure that the regional visions that was developed through Concept 3 is maintained in all of our planning efforts. This also includes the other commuter bus systems.</p> <p>2. Comment: I want to make sure that the language for the evaluation reflects that from the milestone of the winter/spring 2008 to 2009 and now the summer milestone there has been an increase in the input gathering processes for non-technical stakeholders. And that increase in those processes has reflected itself in the overall scope of work. The comments are now much more related to the neighborhood being included, the thoughts being included, the processes being done in a way that neighborhood community leaders could participate without having the barriers of the technical language. So let the evaluation show that those processes have improved over the last benchmark from the winter/spring to now the summer.</p> <p>3. Question: It surprises me that the negotiations for which rail line should happen so late in the game when they change literally the footprint of the project. I have never heard of this Norfolk Southern option. It seems like we're putting the cart before the horse. Is that just because I'm naïve and don't know what I'm talking about?</p>	None Required

Purpose:	
To provide an update on the progress of the study and the information learned to date, obtain confirmation from the Stakeholder Advisory Committee that the proposed alignments are suitable for evaluation, and discuss the next steps in the process.	
Key Discussion Points/Action Items:	Responsible Party / Action Item
<p>4. Response: No. We believe your frustrations are valid; however in our previous planning efforts whether it is MARTA's Detailed Screening or ABI's 5-Year Work Plan where detailed screening was done in the Northwest, we have always recognized that this is a challenging area that requires more study. In this process we are not saying that we are giving up on the CSX alignment, but we need to be careful and rational so that we have some options because we don't want to come out of this process and not have another option to look at if the CSX option falls through for whatever reason.</p> <p>5. Question: I hate to repeat myself but, when you were listing the evaluation criteria that you were thinking about (which is not a part of this packet of information) under the environmental and community impacts, can I encourage you to list health impacts on there.</p> <p>Response: Yes, we did it. We heard you previously and we went back and included it in the Existing Conditions Report and we also added some criteria related to that impact in the environmental section of the analysis.</p>	
<u>Next Steps</u>	
<p>The meeting concluded with a summary of the activities remaining to complete the study. The steps given were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document the alternatives considered for the EIS • Evaluate the alternatives • Complete the Tier 1 EIS • Identify a preferred alternative <p>Nate Conable also mentioned that each attendee would receive an electronic copy of the Evaluation Criteria once the document is finalized.</p> <p>There were no written comments submitted at the meeting. The meeting ended at 8:00 pm.</p>	