



I-20 EAST TRANSIT INITIATIVE

# Appendix C: Interim Public Involvement Summary Report

**Prepared for:  
Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority**

**Prepared by:  
AECOM/Jacobs Joint Venture  
Atlanta, GA**

**Version (1.1): August 2012**



## Table of Contents

**1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 1-1**

**2.0 INITIAL PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH..... 2-1**

**3.0 IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES..... 3-1**

**4.0 REFINEMENT OF TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES ..... 4-1**

## List of Tables

Table 1-1: Summary of Public Involvement Activities .....1-1

Table 2-1: Initial Public and Stakeholder Outreach Phase Activities .....2-1

Table 2-2: Initial Public and Stakeholder Outreach Phase Key Stakeholder Interviews .....2-1

Table 2-3: Common Themes Discussed among Stakeholder Interviews .....2-3

Table 3-1: Identification of Transit Alternatives Phase Outreach Activities.....3-1

Table 4-1: Refinement of Transit Alternatives Phase Outreach Activities .....4-1

## Sub-Appendices

**SUB-APPENDIX A: COMMON THEMES REPORT .....A-1**

**SUB-APPENDIX B: STAKEHOLDER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARIES .....B-1**

**SUB-APPENDIX C: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARIES .....C-1**

**SUB-APPENDIX D: PUBLIC MEETING SUMMARIES .....D-1**

**SUB-APPENDIX E: ONLINE SURVEY SUMMARIES.....E-1**

**SUB-APPENDIX F: STAKEHOLDER BRIEFING SUMMARIES.....F-1**



# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Public involvement is a large part of the NEPA process for both the Detailed Corridor Analysis (DCA) and the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). The project study team developed the Public Involvement Plan for this purpose. This document describes in full detail the overall goals of the public involvement program, the strategies employed throughout the project, the policy framework that guided these activities, the committee structure for the study, and descriptions of how these activities were tied to the major project milestones. This report is labeled as interim since it describes and details the public involvement activities associated with DCA. A final Public Involvement Summary Report will be prepared at the end of the I-20 East Transit Initiative study.

The focus of the public involvement strategy was to capitalize on committee input that would guide the process and to have the public participate at key technical milestones throughout the project development process. Various strategies were utilized throughout the study to inform the public of the purpose and progress of the study, invite potentially impacted communities to participate, and to document ideas, perceptions, and opinions expressed throughout the planning process. **Table 1-1** is a chronological summary of all public involvement activities completed during the DCA phase of the study.

**Table 1-1: Summary of Public Involvement Activities**

Involvement Method	Date input received	Organization
Key Stakeholder Interviews	6/29/2010 - 8/19/2010	Various
Committee Meeting	9/9/2010	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	10/7/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Open House	10/26/2010	General Public
Open House	10/27/2010	General Public
Open House	10/28/2010	General Public
Committee Meeting	12/9/2010	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	12/9/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Briefing	4/28/2011	MARTA Board Member
Briefing	4/28/2011	Atlanta Braves
Open House	5/3/2011	General Public
Open House	5/4/2011	General Public
Open House	5/5/2011	General Public
Committee Meeting	5/9/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	5/11/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	5/12/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Online Survey	5/19/2011 - 6/20/2011	General Public, SAC, TAC
Briefing	6/4/2011	DeKalb County Government, Legislative Cabinet Meeting



Involvement Method	Date input received	Organization
Briefing	6/8/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	6/9/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	6/10/2011	Kirkwood Neighbors Organization
Briefing	6/23/2011	City of Atlanta
Briefing	7/6/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners Planning, Economic Development, & Public Works Committee
Briefing	8/22/2011	City of Decatur Staff
Briefing	8/23/2011	NPU-O Full Body
Briefing	8/24/2011	CSX
Briefing	9/8/2011	DeKalb Chamber of Commerce
Briefing	9/10/2011	Kirkwood Neighbors Organization
Briefing	9/13/2011	East Atlanta Civic Association
Email	9/14/2011	Snapfinger Woods COA
Briefing	9/12/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	9/14/2011	Salem Bible Church
Briefing	9/15/2011	Hillandale Medical
Briefing	9/19/2011	City of Decatur Council
Briefing	9/26/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	9/27/2011	NPU-O Full Body
Briefing	9/28/2011	NPU-W Transportation Committee
Briefing	9/28/2011	NPU-W Full Body
Online Survey	10/3/2011 - 10/30/2011	General Public, SAC, TAC
Briefing	10/4/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	10/4/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Open House	10/4/2011	General Public
Open House	10/6/2011	General Public
Public Kiosk	10/8/2011	General Public
Committee Meeting	10/11/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	10/11/2011	Technical Advisory Committee
Briefing	10/12/2011	Atlanta City Council
Briefing	10/20/2011	U.S. House of Representatives, Georgia Congressional District 4
Briefing	10/24/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	10/27/2011	NPU-N Full Body

All public involvement efforts were supplemented by brochures, newsletters, a project website, and a Facebook page. The sections below describe the tools and techniques used during the DCA in three phases: initial public and stakeholder outreach,



identification of transit alternatives, and refinement of transit alternatives. Summaries associated with all outreach activities can be found in the Appendix.



## 2.0 INITIAL PUBLIC AND STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

During this early phase of public involvement, the emphasis was on educating the public on the history of studies completed in the corridor and the purpose of the new initiative going forward. It was also an opportunity for stakeholders to identify the corridor’s needs and issues. Input was collected through key stakeholder interviews, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC), and the first round of public meetings. Outreach activities held during this period are summarized in **Table 2-1**.

**Table 2-1: Initial Public and Stakeholder Outreach Phase Activities**

Involvement Method	Date input received	Organization
Key Stakeholder Interviews	6/29/2010 - 8/19/2010	Various
Committee Meeting	9/9/2010	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	10/7/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Open House	10/26/2010	General Public
Open House	10/27/2010	General Public
Open House	10/28/2010	General Public

Key stakeholder interviews were one-on-one discussions with individuals recognized as community leaders, elected or appointed officials, agency staff members, and neighborhood activists in the study area. Such interviews were conducted as part of the interagency coordination strategy and led to the identification of project goals and objectives and corridor needs. A total of 29 interviews were conducted and were synthesized and summarized in a Common Themes Report. **Table 2-2** summarizes the interviews held during the initial public and stakeholder outreach phase.

**Table 2-2: Initial Public and Stakeholder Outreach Phase Key Stakeholder Interviews**

Stakeholder	Organization	Date
Teresa Agee	Rainbow Creek Home Owners Association	2/28/2010
Harold Buckley	MARTA	5/21/2010
Patrece Keeter	DeKalb County	5/25/2010
Shawanna Bowles Patrick Ejike Andrew Baker	DeKalb County	6/2/2010
Leonardo McClarty	DeKalb County Chamber of Commerce	6/27/2010
Sabrina Barilone	Grant Park Neighborhood Association	6/29/2010
Marvin Flannigan Brad Sutton	Planning, Engineering, Public Works	7/15/2010



Stakeholder	Organization	Date
Michael Houchard Miguel Valentin	Rockdale County SPLOST	7/20/2010
Kathy Harvey Eddie Shirey	Rockdale Citizens	7/26/2010
Bobbi Sanford	Wesley Chapel Community Overlay Commission	7/27/2010
Kenneth Saunders III	Hidden Hills Civic Association	7/28/2010
Liza Mueller	Glenwood Park Neighborhood	7/28/2010
Toney Blackmon	DeKalb County Board of Education	7/30/2010
Larry Tatz	South DeKalb Senior Center	8/6/2010
Henry Bryant Andy -Schneggenberger Austin Dickson	East Atlanta Community Association	8/6/2010
Lynwood Hurston	Windsor Meade Home Owners Association	8/10/2010
Phil Budensiek	Rockdale County Schools	8/11/2010
Clay Fowler	DeKalb Medical Center-Hillandale	8/17/2010
Donice Bloodworth	Ray of Hope Christian Church	8/18/2010
Congressman Hank Johnson	US House of Representatives	6/4/2010
Harold Walker	Atlanta Public Schools	8/19/2010
Elayne Hunter	Lou Walker Senior Center	8/20/2010

For each interview, a status update of the project was presented that included an explanation of transit technology, the screening analysis and evaluation process to be undertaken, critical issues for transit in the I-20 corridor, and public involvement best practices. In summary, most interviewees were aware or had been involved previously in the study. There were, however, some individuals new to the study as they were either a newly identified group, or replacements of the “Community Partners” group involved during the previous study. They compared the I-20 corridor to other major corridors that were similar in capacity. However, most interviewees had a general perspective on transportation for the I-20 corridor. Issues noted seemed to be of a general nature for MARTA service including convenience, time schedules, sidewalks for better access, and other issues. Elected officials had varying perspectives regarding the study, though all were interested in the updated status of the project. Representatives seemed appreciative of receiving updated information and of knowing that the process was taking into account the demographic changes along with new and abandoned commercial developments.

Some common themes were heard among the interviews. **Table 2-3** shows the specific issues identified during the interviews, the corresponding theme, and the number of times mentioned over the course of the interview period.



**Table 2-3: Common Themes Discussed among Stakeholder Interviews**

Identified issue or item	Theme	Number of times mentioned
Congestion in corridor needs to be fixed	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	8
Congestion on I-20	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
Congestion a problem in Rockdale County	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
Congestion on Evans Mill Road	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
Congestion on I-20 and I-285	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
Congestion on I-20 OTP	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
New Birth Missionary Baptist Church has lots of traffic on Sundays	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
Traffic congestion in study area effects school buses	Congestion in corridor, particularly I-20	
BRT is not preferred	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	7
Rail is preferred	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Rail is preferred	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Rail is preferred	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Rail should be used on I-20	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Would like rail service in the area	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Rail or BRT would be helpful	Rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor	
Mobility for elderly and businesses	Aging population will need mobility options	5
Aging population in the corridor	Aging population will need mobility options	
Aging population in the corridor	Aging population will need mobility options	
Elderly need mobility options	Aging population will need mobility options	
Elderly need mobility options	Aging population will need mobility options	
Connectivity with community facilities	Need improved connectivity within the corridor	5
Connectivity with community facilities such as parks	Need improved connectivity within the corridor	
Connectivity is a major concern	Need improved connectivity within the corridor	
Main issue is getting people north	Need improved connectivity within the corridor	
More connectivity with region	Need improved connectivity within the corridor	
Opportunity to revitalize	Rail would attract economic development	5
Rail line would attract growth	Rail would attract economic development	
Rail line would encourage development	Rail would attract economic development	



Identified issue or item	Theme	Number of times mentioned
Rail will garner more development	Rail would attract economic development	
Rail would spur future economic growth	Rail would attract economic development	
Rail will garner more riders	Rail would attract more riders	5
Rail will have higher ridership	Rail would attract more riders	
Rail would attract large ridership	Rail would attract more riders	
Rail would be very effective	Rail would attract more riders	
Rail would work	Rail would attract more riders	
More transit options for going north of the I-20 corridor	Need improved transit system connectivity	4
MARTA/Beltline/Peachtree Streetcar/I-20 transit should tie in together	Need improved transit system connectivity	
system should tie into existing Park and Ride lots	Need improved transit system connectivity	
Tie into existing system	Need improved transit system connectivity	
BRT Preferred	BRT/Bus preferred for corridor	4
BRT would be more feasible	BRT/Bus preferred for corridor	
bus service preferred	BRT/Bus preferred for corridor	
Rail not wanted in NPU O	BRT/Bus preferred for corridor	
Does not see much opposition	Don't expect much opposition to project	4
Does not see opposition	Don't expect much opposition to project	
Does not see opposition from businesses and homeowners	Don't expect much opposition to project	
does not see opposition to fixed guideway transit	Don't expect much opposition to project	
Rockdale needs transit access	Transit should serve Rockdale County	4
Population concentrated at center of Rockdale County, transit should be available there	Transit should serve Rockdale County	
Rail preferred through Conyers	Transit should serve Rockdale County	
Transit should go to Newton County line	Transit should serve Rockdale County	
Better access to rail	Rail transit needed in corridor	4
Rail is needed	Rail transit needed in corridor	
Rail is needed	Rail transit needed in corridor	
Rail is needed in the corridor	Rail transit needed in corridor	
GRTA Xpress Route 138 is at capacity	Existing express bus service at capacity	3
More Park and Ride locations	Existing express bus service at capacity	
Park and Ride lots full	Existing express bus service at capacity	
Fear of crime from long time residents	Fear of crime could provide opposition to project	3
Fear of crime from MARTA	Fear of crime could provide opposition to project	
May have opposition because of fear of crime	Fear of crime could provide opposition to project	



Identified issue or item	Theme	Number of times mentioned
Connectivity with Downtown	Need improved connectivity to downtown Atlanta	3
Connection to downtown is important	Need improved connectivity to downtown Atlanta	
Rail from South DeKalb and Stonecrest to downtown	Need improved connectivity to downtown Atlanta	
Better on time performance so employees won't be late	Need more reliable/efficient service	3
Efficiency is a major concern	Need more reliable/efficient service	
Existing bus service appears to be full, needs more service	Need more reliable/efficient service	
Electronic Newsletter	Newsletter a good way to educate the public	2
Newsletters work best	Newsletter a good way to educate the public	
NIMBY	Opposition from 'Not in my back yard (NIMBY)' residents	1
Rail would get more support	Rail transit would receive more public support	1
Lack of east/west options in the study area	There is a lack of east-west transportation options	1
East Atlanta lends itself to transit and a station due to the LCI results	East Atlanta appropriate for station and TOD	1
Historic neighborhoods intown could pose problems for ROW	Historic neighborhoods are an alignment constraint	1
Talk to neighborhoods	Meet with neighborhoods	1
Weekend service to the mall	Need better weekend service at Mall at Stonecrest	1
All widened roads need dedicated transit lanes	Need for dedicated transit lanes on roadways	1
Ride buses in the area and survey needs of riders	Need on-board surveys	1
Educate the public about transit re: ridership and density	Need to educate public about transit	1

The most popular issue heard during the interviews was congestion in the corridor and that rail is the appropriate technology for the corridor. Other themes that resulted from the stakeholder interviews were that the aging population will need mobility options; the need for improved connectivity within the corridor; and that rail would attract economic development as well as more riders. The Common Themes Report can be found in Appendix A in its entirety.

Following the interviews, a subset of stakeholders was appointed by MARTA to comprise the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (SAC). The establishment of the SAC was key in allowing MARTA the opportunity to build partnerships and share information with its major planning partners and stakeholders. Membership on the SAC was comprised of a wide variety of interests along the corridor including elected officials, business and community organizations, churches, and neighborhood associations. The SAC provided a continuing forum for direct input into the planning process, education, exchange, understanding, questioning, and clarification.



The inaugural SAC meeting was held on September 9, 2010. The purpose of this meeting was for the committee to discuss the project Purpose and Need and to rank identified corridor issues. Ranking of corridor issues showed that all concerns are considered “Critical” but among the nine issues presented, three issues received the most support:

- Insufficient transit service
- Traffic Congestion: delay and slow travel times
- Limited planned projects in corridor to accommodate growth

The SAC also ranked study goals at this meeting. Again, the committee ranked most project goals as “Critical” but among the nine issues presented, three issues received the most support:

- Promote economic development, revitalization, job growth
- Encourage transit supportive land use and development patterns
- Enhance regional transit connectivity

A full account of this SAC meeting can be found in Appendix B.

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was developed to guide the project team on key technical components of the study and to ensure technical proficiency during the process. This group was comprised of MARTA staff, city, county and state transportation engineering and planning staff, and federal agencies. The TAC was instrumental in conducting interagency coordination and provided a collective expertise helpful in developing and analyzing study alternatives. The TAC allowed planning partners an early opportunity to provide input on study issues and solutions. The committee met on October 7, 2010. Input from the committee regarding the corridor issues and study goals mirrored that of the SAC. A summary of the initial TAC meeting can be found in Appendix C.

A series of public meeting opportunities was scheduled at key milestones throughout the study. A combination of traditional open house events and kiosks were utilized as appropriate. Each round of public meetings was held at three (3) locations along the 20-mile study corridor to ensure convenient access for stakeholders. Public meetings also provided stakeholders an opportunity to ask questions of members of the project team. Comment forms were provided at the meetings to collect feedback on specific project-related issues. Public meetings were advertised through email correspondence, flyers placed on MARTA buses with routes along the study corridor, display ads in popular newspapers, announcements on the study webpage and Facebook, media releases, and via SAC and TAC members.

The first round of public meetings was held on October 26, 27, and 28, 2010. The purpose of this first round of meetings was to provide information on the project, present initial study findings, solicit input on the transportation needs within the corridor, present the initial project Purpose and Need, and solicit input into study goals and objectives. At these meetings, the public was engaged in a voting exercise to identify corridor issues. The most critical corridor issues were identified as follows:

- Increasing traffic congestion in corridor (22.6%)



- Limited travel choices - I-20 is the only real corridor that provides east-west mobility between downtown Atlanta and Mall at Stonecrest (33.9%)
- Lack of travel time competitive transit service in corridor (24.2%)
- Areas of the corridor are in need of revitalization (11.3%)
- There are high levels of traditionally underserved populations (8.1%)

The public reacted to project goals as follows:

- Improve East-West Mobility (19.0%)
- Improve Travel Options in Corridor (19.0%)
- Improve Accessibility to Jobs and Housing (14.3%)
- Improve Transit Service for Underserved Populations (4.8%)
- Promote Economic Development/Revitalization (22.2%)
- Encourage Transit Supportive Land Use and Development Patterns (9.5%)
- Minimize Impact to Social and Natural Resources (1.6%)
- Promote Cost Effective Transit Investments (0.0%)
- Enhance Regional Transit Connectivity (9.5%)

The following reasons were given for riding transit:

- Work (40%)
- Shopping (9.2%)
- Airport (3.1%)
- Sporting/cultural events (16.9%)
- Education (6.2%)
- Religious services (1.5%)
- Social/recreational (12.3%)
- Other (10.8%)

Reactions to transit technologies were as follows:

- Bus Rapid Transit (22.7%)
- Light Rail Transit (50.0%)
- Heavy Rail Transit (27.3%)

A full summary of this first round of public meetings can be found in Appendix D.



### 3.0 IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES

This phase allowed stakeholders and the public the opportunity to identify the universe of possible transit alternatives to serve the corridor. During this time the public and stakeholders identified activity centers that should be served by new transit service, and the Tier 1 alternatives were developed and presented. The project team extended community outreach efforts through scheduled stakeholder briefings, which allowed the team to share information to the public in small group settings. Briefings varied in size and audience. During this phase they included ongoing coordination meetings with local, state, and federal elected officials; updates to transportation agencies; and meetings with private entities. A summary of all briefings conducted during this phase can be found in Appendix F. The following meetings were held during this period.

**Table 3-1: Identification of Transit Alternatives Phase Outreach Activities**

Involvement Method	Date input received	Organization
Committee Meeting	12/9/2010	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	12/9/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Online Survey	10/3/2011 - 10/30/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Briefing	4/28/2011	MARTA Board Member
Briefing	4/28/2011	Atlanta Braves
Open House	5/3/2011	General Public
Open House	5/4/2011	General Public
Open House	5/5/2011	General Public
Committee Meeting	5/9/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	5/11/2010	Technical Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	5/12/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Online Survey	5/19/2011 - 6/20/2011	General Public, SAC, TAC
Briefing	6/4/2011	DeKalb County Government, Legislative Cabinet Meeting
Briefing	6/8/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	6/9/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	6/10/2011	Kirkwood Neighbors Organization
Briefing	6/23/2011	City of Atlanta
Briefing	7/6/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners Planning, Economic Development, & Public Works Committee
Briefing	8/22/2011	City of Decatur Staff
Briefing	8/23/2011	NPU-O Full Body
Briefing	8/24/2011	CSX

A second round of meetings was held with the Stakeholder Advisory Committee on December 9, 2010 and the Technical Advisory Committee on December 14, 2010.



Summaries from the SAC and TAC meetings can be found in Appendix B and C, respectively. Each committee was asked to confirm the findings of the corridor needs and the goals of the project. A follow up survey was distributed to the SAC members which allowed them to confirm what they felt were the most important characteristics of transit in the I-20 corridor and to get their input into the initial transit alternatives (see Appendix E). The SAC and TAC input was used to identify all potential alignment alternatives, which formed the Tier 1 alternatives. The resulting set of alternatives to be evaluated at the Tier 1 level included three mainline alternatives, which considered options from the corridor's eastern endpoint at The Mall at Stonecrest to just east of downtown Atlanta in the Grant Park/East Atlanta area; two alternatives for the Panola Road area in eastern DeKalb County; and eight alternatives from the Grant Park/East Atlanta area into downtown Atlanta. These alignment alternatives were further refined and presented to the public, the SAC, and the TAC.

A second round of public meetings was held on May 3, 4, and 5, 2011. The purpose of these meetings was to present the initial transit alignment alternatives identified by stakeholders and solicit input and feedback on the most appropriate solution. Regarding the mainline alternatives, citizens attending the meeting held inside of I-285 preferred Alternative # 1 (parallel to I-20 from Mall at Stonecrest to downtown Atlanta) or Alternative # 2 (connection to MARTA Edgewood Station). Members of the public attending meetings outside the perimeter chose Alternative #3 (extension from Indian Creek Station to the Mall at Stonecrest). The most popular alternative to address connectivity into downtown Atlanta among the public was Alternative #5 (connection to Garnett and Five Points Stations). Lastly, concerning the Panola Road alternative, the majority of those attending the public meetings prefer Alternative #1 (alignment that parallels I-20).

The mainline, downtown connectivity and Panola Road alternatives were presented to the TAC at the May 11, 2011 meeting. TAC members were asked to consider each of the three mainline alignment alternatives and to select the one they felt was the most appropriate. Regarding the mainline options, Alternative #1 (parallel to I-20 from Mall at Stonecrest to downtown Atlanta) received support from the majority of the group. When considering the eight downtown connectivity alternatives, Alternative #5 (connection to Garnett and Five Points Stations) received the most support from TAC. Lastly, the committee was asked to consider the Panola Road Area Alternatives; most preferred Alignment #2 (alignment that parallels I-20). A full summary of this second round of public meetings can be found in Appendix D.

The SAC was presented with these alternatives at their third meetings held on May 9 and 12, 2011 (see Appendix B). Due to limited attendance and response at these meetings, an online survey was developed and launched during the next phase of the project.

To provide an additional opportunity for the public, the SAC, and the TAC to provide feedback, a survey was developed to measure public support for the various alignments under consideration in the I-20 East Corridor. It was made available online from May 19 to June 20, 2011, and could be accessed from links on the project webpage and Facebook page. During that month, 927 survey responses were collected.

A majority of respondents preferred Alternative #1 (parallel to I-20 from the Mall at Stonecrest to downtown Atlanta). Regarding the specific connection into downtown, most preferred Alternative #6 (connection to the Multi-Modal Passenger Terminal/Five Points Station) closely followed by Alternative #5 (connection to the Garnett and Five



Points Stations). A large majority preferred Alternative #1 (alignment parallel to I-20) when considering the Panola Road area alternative. The questions presented in this survey and complete results can be found in Appendix E.



## 4.0 REFINEMENT OF TRANSIT ALTERNATIVES

Finally, transit alternatives were further refined for the Tier 2 evaluation which included an alignment and proposed transit technology. This phase of the study allowed stakeholders and the public an opportunity to give feedback on the Tier 2 alternatives through the outreach opportunities below.

**Table 4-1: Refinement of Transit Alternatives Phase Outreach Activities**

Involvement Method	Date input received	Organization
Briefing	9/8/2011	DeKalb Chamber of Commerce
Briefing	9/10/2011	Kirkwood Neighbors Organization
Briefing	9/13/2011	East Atlanta Civic Association
Email	9/14/2011	Snapfinger Woods COA
Briefing	9/12/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	9/14/2011	Salem Bible Church
Briefing	9/15/2011	Hillandale Medical
Briefing	9/19/2011	City of Decatur Council
Briefing	9/26/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	9/27/2011	NPU-O Full Body
Briefing	9/28/2011	NPU-W Transportation Committee
Briefing	9/28/2011	NPU-W Full Body
Online Survey	10/3/2011 - 10/30/2011	General Public, SAC, TAC
Briefing	10/4/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Briefing	10/4/2011	DeKalb County Board of Commissioners
Open House	10/4/2011	General Public
Open House	10/6/2011	General Public
Public Kiosk	10/8/2011	General Public
Committee Meeting	10/11/2011	Stakeholder Advisory Committee
Committee Meeting	10/11/2011	Technical Advisory Committee
Briefing	10/12/2011	Atlanta City Council
Briefing	10/20/2011	U.S. House of Representatives, Georgia Congressional District 4
Briefing	10/24/2011	NPU-M Full Body
Briefing	10/27/2011	NPU-N Full Body

The project team continued extensive community outreach efforts through scheduled stakeholder briefings, which allowed the team to share information with the public in small group settings. Briefings varied in size and audience. During this phase they included ongoing coordination meetings with local, state, and federal elected officials; updates to



transportation agencies; and meetings with private entities. A summary of briefings conducted during this phase can be found in Appendix F.

Additional rounds of meetings were held with the Stakeholder Advisory Committee (October 11, 2010) and Technical Advisory Committee (October 11, 2011). Complete summaries of these meetings can be found in Appendix B and Appendix C, respectively. Each committee was asked to evaluate the six alignment alternatives for the corridor based on cost, efficiency and transit technology. The alternatives to be ranked at the Tier 2 level include: three mainline alignments connecting Mall at Stonecrest to downtown Atlanta (Garnett and Five Points Station), one alternative connecting to the current MARTA system at the Indian Creek Station, one alternative connecting to the Atlanta Beltline, and a final alternative connecting to the current MARTA system at the Edgewood/Candler Park Station. These alternatives were then presented to the public.

A third round of public meetings was held on October 4, 6, and 8, 2011 (see Appendix D). The purpose of these outreach events was to learn about and provide feedback on the final alternatives being considered as part of the I-20 East Transit Initiative. These six alternatives provided rapid transit service for the I-20 East corridor and combined various rapid transit technologies along the corridor. Participants were asked to provide feedback on which alternatives they felt were most and least appropriate for the corridor. A very low number of comment forms were returned from these meetings.

To provide an additional opportunity for the public, the SAC, and the TAC to provide feedback, a survey was developed to measure public support for the six alignments under consideration. The online survey for the Tier 2 evaluation was available online from October 3, 2011 through October 30, 2011, and could be accessed from links on the project webpage and Facebook page. The survey link was also distributed via email. During that month, 653 survey responses were collected. Survey respondents were asked to rate each alternative on a scale of one to five, with one being least appropriate for the corridor and five being most appropriate. Heavy Rail Transit alternative #1 and Light Rail Transit alternative #1 were most preferred from respondents inside of the perimeter. These alternatives provided a direct line from the Mall at Stonecrest to downtown Atlanta. Bus Rapid Transit alternative #1 along with Heavy Rail Transit alternative #2 were the least supported by all respondents. Participants inside the perimeter believed Heavy Rail Transit alternative #3 was least appropriate and participants outside the perimeter believed this alternative to be most appropriate. The questions presented and a complete summary of survey results can be found in Appendix E.