



# ARC COMMITTEE MEETING FOLLOW-UP

## JOINT TCC/LUCC WORK SESSION TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE / LAND USE COORDINATING COMMITTEE April 23, 2010 Meeting Notes

### TCC Members or Alternates Present:

<i>ARC</i>	Jane Hayse	<i>Forsyth</i>	---
<i>Atlanta</i>	---	<i>Fulton</i>	Antonio Valenzuela
<i>Barrow</i>	---	<i>GDOT</i>	Tom McQueen
<i>Bartow</i>	---	<i>GRTA</i>	---
<i>Cherokee</i>	---	<i>Gwinnett</i>	Brian Allen
<i>Clayton</i>	---	<i>Henry</i>	Stacey Jordan
<i>Cobb</i>	Laraine Vance	<i>MARTA</i>	Paul Grether
<i>Coweta</i>	---	<i>Newton</i>	Kevin Walter
<i>DeKalb</i>	---	<i>Paulding</i>	---
<i>Douglas</i>	Randy Hulsey	<i>Rockdale</i>	Miguel Valentin
<i>EPD</i>	---	<i>Spalding</i>	---
<i>Fayette</i>	Phil Mallon	<i>Walton</i>	---

### TCC Advisors (Non-voting):

<i>GDOT I'modal</i>	---	<i>FHWA</i>	---
<i>GHMPO</i>	---	<i>FTA</i>	---

### LUCC Members Present:

<i>ARC</i>	Dan Reuter	<i>Henry</i>	Brecca Johnson
<i>Atlanta</i>	Jessica Lavandier	<i>Newton</i>	---
<i>Barrow</i>	---	<i>Paulding</i>	---
<i>Bartow</i>	---	<i>Rockdale</i>	---
<i>Cherokee</i>	Margaret Stallings	<i>Spalding</i>	Chuck Taylor
<i>Clayton</i>	---	<i>Walton</i>	---
<i>Cobb</i>	Keehren Richard	<i>Buford (GW)</i>	---
<i>Coweta</i>	Sandra Parker	<i>Conyers (RO)</i>	---
<i>DCA</i>	---	<i>Decatur (DK)</i>	---
<i>DeKalb</i>	Sidney Douse	<i>Douglasville (DO)</i>	Michelle Wright
<i>Douglas</i>	Amy Brumelow	<i>Fayetteville (FA)</i>	---
<i>EPD</i>	---	<i>Johns Creek (FN)</i>	---
<i>Fayette</i>	---	<i>Kennesaw (CO)</i>	---
<i>Forsyth</i>	Vanessa Bernstein	<i>Lake City (CL)</i>	---
<i>Fulton</i>	---	<i>Locust Grove (HE)</i>	Tim Young
<i>GRTA</i>	---	<i>Union City (FS)</i>	---
<i>Gwinnett</i>	Nancy Lovingood	<i>Waleska (CH)</i>	---

## LUCC Categorical Members Present

*E. Cobb Civic Association* David Hong  
*Urban Land Institute* Stephen Arms

## Other Attendees

Angela Redding, Forest Park	Kyethea Clark, City of Marietta
Cathy Gesick, MARTA	Larry Kaiser, CIS, Inc.
Chris Chovan, City of Roswell	Melissa Middleton, AIA
Chris Miller, Sandy Springs	Michele McIntosh-Ross, City of Milton
David Green, AIA	Mike Tuller, City of Dunwoody
Denise Starling, BATMA	Phillip Westbrook, Cobb County
Don Williams, MARTA	Roussan Francois, Fulton County
Heather Alhadeff, Perkins & Will	Sabrina Young, City of Marietta
Henry Green, GDOT	Sally Flocks, PEDS
Jamie Cochran, RS&H	Stephen Norman, SAND
Jessica Clarke, Kennesaw State	Steve Coté, RS&H
Jill Flamm, ECCA	Tracy Selin, Cambridge Systematics
Jim Wilgus, Marietta	Vince Edwards, Gwinnett County
John Crocker, MARTA/RTC	

*This work session was for informational purposes only; no actions were taken.*

## **GENERAL**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of 4/9/10 TCC Meeting Summary**

Jane Hayse, ARC, welcomed the committee and called the meeting to order. She asked that any comments on the draft 4/9/10 TCC meeting summary be given to Susie Dunn. Hayse added that the Georgia Legislature passed a T-SPLOST bill the day before, and the ARC staff is still reviewing the details.

### **2. Public Comment Period**

Steven Norman, president of SAND (South Atlantans for Neighborhood Development, Inc.), a coalition of seven neighborhoods that include 3,400 households located between Grant Park and East Atlanta, and also representing the East Atlanta Neighborhood Association, provided comments on proposed truck routes in the draft ASTRoMaP. Glenwood Avenue is designated as a truck route which would put the traffic through the East Atlanta Village, a busy activity node. This route would conflict with the current neighborhood efforts to provide traffic calming and increase pedestrian presence along the corridor through road narrowing and sidewalk improvements. Peterson Burgess Elementary School would also be on the proposed truck route. As an alternative, Norman proposed use of Memorial Drive and I-20 for truck travel, since those two facilities have higher capacity than Glenwood Avenue (which has only 2 lanes in many places).

## **PLANNING**

### **3. Plan 2040 - Unified Growth Policy Map Land Use Typology**

The focus of the joint work session was development of the updated Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM). *Plan 2040* sets forth a goal of better integration of land use and transportation planning. This

integration was first acknowledged in an ARC Board directive in 2004, and received some support in the *Envision6* RDP/RTP development process. The initial UGPM was adopted in 2006 with a commitment to update each year. The UGPM is meant to serve as an ARC adopted and locally supported representation of how to accommodate future regional growth.

Brad Calvert, ARC, set the framework for discussion. The UGPM update is focused on identifying highest density employment centers, job centers with over 10,000 jobs, and freight centers, in order to ensure that transportation infrastructure is prioritized accordingly. As part of the update, ARC has been identifying current regional employment centers and their boundaries. This also affords the opportunity to check with local governments on a regular basis to ensure that ARC is aware of development and growth trends at the local level.

Calvert noted that the UGPM has taken the middle ground between lower density expectations (from the local governments) and higher density expectations (from the developers). Calvert added that to better communicate the UGPM concepts, ARC realized that two different maps are needed—one more general for external communication, and one more internal and technical with additional details.

Regional Areas - ARC has identified six larger UGPM categories or regional areas:

1. *Regional Employment Areas* – These areas are replacing the previously-identified Mega Corridors and will concentrate those areas to a smaller size. Over 1/3 of the region’s jobs are located in these areas. The airport employment area has been called out separately as an Aerotropolis. This is the primary job center south of I-20.
2. *Maturing Neighborhoods* – The previously used term for these areas, Urban Neighborhoods, was problematic. The 1970 Urbanized Area was used as a starting point. While the residential density is somewhat low in these neighborhoods, the street network is typically in grid format which allows better connectivity. These areas are likely to face significant redevelopment pressure, and can accommodate more density due to the grid system.
3. *Established Suburbs* – These are areas that are 75% developed, mostly built out, and rely heavily on arterial roadway with cul-de-sac residential access roads. Infrastructure capacity and new connections might be important for these types of areas.
4. *Developing Suburbs* – These areas are 30-75% developed, so that the suburban pattern is still in flux. There is opportunity here to provide more connectivity and a different (more dense) pattern of development.
5. *Developing Rural* – This designation (not currently on the draft map) is somewhat difficult to understand at the regional level. These areas are typically less than 30% developed and future development in these areas should be very strategic. Conservation development and preservation of environmentally sensitive areas would be appropriate here. Local government input is needed to identify these areas.
6. *Rural* – These areas are also typically less than 30% developed, but are not targeted for development by local governments. Infrastructure is less available here. Safety and roadway operations might be the most appropriate transportation investment in those areas. Agricultural uses might be appropriate here.

Calvert highlighted areas with potential for development. *Established Suburbs* are 82% developed, and *Developing Suburbs* are 49% developed (approaching the tipping point at which it is difficult to change the development type). *Regional Employment Areas*, on the other hand, are 73% developed, so there is an opportunity to add more jobs and residential in this area, and to provide a better jobs-housing balance.

Stephen Arms, ULI, commented that the UGPM area types resemble New Urbanism transects. Calvert replied that the concepts are very similar, and that ARC was just trying to describe observed patterns.

Regional Places – These are smaller areas that fall within the Regional Areas. For example, *Employment Centers* could fall within the greater boundary of *Regional Employment Areas*. *Regional Attractors* are areas that generate a lot of trips, but not necessarily job trips. Other places are designated at *Industrial/Logistic Areas*, *Regional Town Center*, *Transit Corridors & Stations*, and *Local Places*.

Calvert explained that ARC is currently meeting with local governments to explore the local concerns and suggestions for adjusting the UGPM. Adoption of UGPM is slated for July.

In response to a question from Jessica Lavandier, City of Atlanta, Calvert stated that as part of the Plan 2040 process, ARC will be planning for regional systems and running through investment scenarios. The UGPM will be a way to impact the transportation planning policies. Regan Hammond, ARC, added that the map will help guide the ARC staff in transportation planning that would complement the local and regional land use vision.

Chuck Taylor, Spalding County, asked if ARC has been able to overlay the UGPM and transportation investment corridors, and to locate emerging nodes towards which development should be guided. Calvert answered that is an ongoing process, but the outcome of such analysis is not clear yet and ARC would like some further local input to refine the UGPM.

Antonio Valenzuela, Fulton County, added that once the 6-week period of ARC outreach meetings occur, local governments and ARC will have more detailed information to further refine the map. Although he understands the schedule constraints, he would not want to rush through the UGPM update. Regan Hammond added that ARC staff will be coming back to local governments for further conversation.

Margaret Stallings, Cherokee County, asked if ARC is hoping to influence project design based on the UGPM. Regan Hammond responded that there would be some influence on project type and design, however, at the regional level, ARC can only go into so much detail with specific design issues. The goal will be to provide broader guidance for access management and bicycle and pedestrian design issues.

Paul Grether, MARTA, asked if only rail projects were considered for transit station and transit corridor designations. He suggested that ARC should first consider implementation of bus transit and follow-up with rail. He noted that there have been issues with siting Xpress bus stop locations in areas without supportive land use. Calvert responded that through conversations with local governments and developers, there appears to be a support for incremental density increase which could coincide with incremental improvement in transit service. Grether noted that some suburban areas have no capacity to support transit, and thus there might be a need for a policy to encourage local governments to adopt higher density in areas with future transit potential.

Dan Reuter, ARC, continued the UGPM discussion. He emphasized that sustainability is a key element of *Plan 2040*. The region is struggling with limited transportation funding both on the regional and local level, and local elected officials are supportive of concentrating investment in existing developed areas. There is a pressing need to maintain and support existing infrastructure, and additionally a growing citizen support (and even possibly developer support) for conservation and sensitivity to the environment. Both from the cost of infrastructure and preservation of rural areas, outward expansion of urbanized areas is an ongoing challenge. In the 1970s, it made sense to provide for outward expansion, but today, the region is rethinking that priority. Transportation investment is still seen as an economic growth tool, and this is problematic when other priorities come into play. Reuter highlighted UGA research data that shows single-family homes do not generate sufficient income to pay for the needed services, unless the

housing is high-end. Vacant land actually pays for itself because it does not require services. As the region continues population growth, there will be a need for additional housing. Some local governments may not be aware that they have the legal tools to manage growth; this is something that ARC needs to address. Reuter added that another issue is educating citizens in how much services cost and the financial impact of expansion on a local government.

Reuter noted that many counties are trying to maintain their rural character, and ARC would like to support this. ARC is not seeking to push density into rural areas.

In response to a question from Jessica Lavandier, Atlanta, regarding the large Wolf Creek development in Carroll County, Reuter responded that for that particular development, Carroll County had the authority to approve it from a zoning perspective, and ARC could not prevent it from happening. To address similar situations in the future, ARC is trying to set the stage and provide a scenario for managing expectations for infrastructure. To keep similar situations from happening, local government agreements would have to be in place such as the agreement in place in the Denver area between local governments to manage growth.

Randy Hulsey, Douglas County, stated that one way to manage growth in rural areas could be strong access management policies synched with land use policies. He added that there are a lot of context sensitivity issues and no “one-size-fits-all” access management solution. The current access management study on South Fulton Parkway is a good example, and would probably provide good benefits for the Chattahoochee Hill Country. Hulsey added that he would like to see local government funding in the future to help figure out access management.

Chuck Taylor commented that planners face a challenge with examples of good functioning policies such as a transfer of development rights (TDR) program in the region. In the past, ARC has been able to provide good educational examples on proactive planning policies, in order to arm local governments with tools to preserve rural areas. Reuter responded that there is a series of toolkits on the ARC website that have been developed especially for such purpose, and agreed that ARC should continue to provide education and outreach. Reuter added that TDR is one of those tools considered within the toolkits; and that APFO (adequate public facilities ordinance) has not been used in the state in the past, but could be. Reuter noted that such more sophisticated tools require more planning and staff resources. Jane Hayse added that this kind of feedback is important for ARC to appropriately allocate resources through *Plan 2040*.

Jessica Lavandier indicated that the region should find ways to encourage agricultural uses in order to make it worthwhile for owners to preserve rural property. Reuter responded that the region needs to find solutions to incentivize rural preservation.

Phil Mallon, Spalding County, agreed that local governments could use more support for planning tools. He noted that in the draft UGPM, there appear to be some inconsistencies, especially for Fayette County. Calvert responded that ARC defined appropriate attributes for each regional area type, to allow local governments to decide whether each specific part of the county is appropriate for those attributes. Up to now, the UGPM draft has been adjusted with GIS tools, and is now ready for fine tuning based on local input.

Stephen Arms asked how the region could use more transportation operational improvement tools that would preclude road widening. Jane Hayse responded that a Management and Operations Subcommittee of TCC was recently formed. ARC would like to expand the percentage of corridors where operational upgrades are considered first before any widening takes place. Regional equity is a challenge, especially in a situation where one county only needs operational improvements. Arms commented that there are

situations where very simple solutions could help. Randy Hulsey added that this related to his earlier comment, and that access management could incorporate consideration for whether additional small-scale solutions are needed. Hayse answered that she agrees with the suggestion and that the Regional Strategic Thoroughfare Study and the ASTRoMap both have access management components.

Vanessa Bernstein, Forsyth County, noted major road corridors on the UGPM with rural designation up against them. Reuter responded that there are local policy tools that would allow the character of those areas to remain rural, however, in some areas where development along major facilities is expected by the counties, the map might need to be adjusted. Bernstein commented that subdividing for development is often seen as the only way to make a return on investment. Reuter responded that this might be true, but that the region should not let all the land in the 20-county area be subdivided in the near future. Rather, the region should be managing land use and managing expectations.

Jane Hayse commented that there are a lot of issues associated with protected rural areas. There might be follow-up activities (even proposed state legislature) to deal with this. Every county is currently facing fiscal challenges; keeping the local governments solvent requires prioritizing certain types of development. ARC must prioritize transportation investment (for example, not send heavy rail transit into low-density areas). Reuter added that there are good regional examples of keeping rural areas protected from development. In the future, such efforts might need to be better coordinated across the region.

Antonio Valenzuela commented that when local governments are looking at arterial and state roads, no matter what the local government prefers, the state has jurisdiction. GDOT is needed at the table in these discussions. For example, Valenzuela pointed out that the South Fulton Access Management Study is a good example of GDOT being in agreement with local government priorities.

Chuck Taylor encouraged ARC to make sure that transportation and land use planners are both at the table for *Plan 2040* outreach meetings. Reuter noted that Gwinnett County just received a national award for their combined Comprehensive Plan which included the HUD plan, DCA plan and CTP for the county. Now the different departments can speak from the same plan.

## OTHER

### 4. Member introduced topics for future discussion – None

### 5. Announcements - None

#### Handouts:

- Joint TCC/LUCC Agenda, 4/23/10, and TCC Meeting Summary, 4/9/10
- Presentations
  - Unified Growth Policy Map Framework
  - *Plan 2040* Upcoming Milestones
- Draft Unified Growth Policy Map
- Proposed UGPM Regional Areas and Regional Places
- Resolution by the Atlanta Regional Commission to Develop *Plan 2040*, 2/25/09
- Regional Snapshot, April 2010: ARC Employment Estimates: The Recession in Full Bloom
- *Plan 2040* Public Participation Online Meeting Postcard