



ARC COMMITTEE MEETING FOLLOW-UP

JOINT TCC/LUCC WORK SESSION TRANSPORTATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE / LAND USE COORDINATING COMMITTEE February 19, 2010 Meeting Notes

TCC Members or Alternates Present:

<i>ARC</i>	Jane Hayse	<i>Forsyth</i>	---
<i>Atlanta</i>	Heather Alhadeff	<i>Fulton</i>	Roussan Francois
<i>Barrow</i>	---	<i>GDOT</i>	Tom McQueen
<i>Bartow</i>	---	<i>GRTA</i>	Dania Aponte
<i>Cherokee</i>	Geoff Morton	<i>Gwinnett</i>	Vince Edwards
<i>Clayton</i>	---	<i>Henry</i>	Cheri Hobson-Matthews
<i>Cobb</i>	Laraine Vance	<i>MARTA</i>	Don Williams
<i>Coweta</i>	---	<i>Newton</i>	Kevin Walter
<i>DeKalb</i>	Patrece Keeter	<i>Paulding</i>	---
<i>Douglas</i>	Randy Hulsey	<i>Rockdale</i>	Miguel Valentin
<i>EPD</i>	---	<i>Spalding</i>	Anthony Dukes
<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>Forsyth</i>	Tom Brown
<i>Atlanta</i>	Jessica Lavendier	<i>GRTA</i>	Laura Beall
<i>Cherokee</i>	Margaret Stallings	<i>Gwinnett</i>	Nancy Lovingood
<i>Clayton</i>	Kc Krzic	<i>Henry</i>	Cheri Hobson-Matthews
<i>Cobb</i>	Keehren Richards	<i>Henry/Locust Grove</i>	Tim Young
<i>Coweta</i>	Sandra Parker	<i>MARTA</i>	Don Williams
<i>DeKalb</i>	Sidney Douse	<i>Rockdale</i>	Scott Gaither
<i>Douglas/Douglasville</i>	Michelle Wright	<i>Spalding</i>	Chuck Taylor

LUCC Categorical Members Present:

<i>Civic League of Regional Atlanta</i>	Myles Smith
<i>E. Cobb Civic Association</i>	David Hong
<i>Urban Land Institute</i>	Stephen Arms

Other Attendees

Andrew Antweiler, City of Roswell
Angela Redding, City of Forest Park
Angie Laurie, CAP-ADID
Bill Beckwith, HJAIA
Brian Borden, GRTA
Brian Gist, SELC
Bryan Holloway, GDOT
Cathy Gesick, MARTA
Cedric Clark, City of Sandy Springs
Denise Starling, BATMA
Don Schultz, City of Chamblee
Gail Franklin, GRTA
Henry Green, GDOT
Jamie Bartak, LCC
Jill Flamm, ECCA
John Ford, MARTA
Julie McQueen, GRTA
Knox O'Callaghan, MARTA
Kyethea Clark, City of Marietta

Lee Stuart, City of Stockbridge
Mark Alarcon, City of Stockbridge
Mark Lippert, AECOM
Matt Dickson, City of Suwanee
Melissa Middleton, AIA
Michael Halicki, Ahmann
Michelle McIntosh-Ross, City of Milton
Mike Tuller, City of Dunwoody
Paul Grether, MARTA
Ray Gibson, City of Stockbridge
Richard Fangman, Jacobs
Sabrina Young, City of Marietta
Sally Flocks, PEDS
Steve Cote, RS&H
Steve Green, City of Canton
Steve Roberts, BCA
Tracy Selin, Cambridge Systematics
Wade Carroll, Jacobs-JJG

GENERAL

1. Welcome and Approval of 2/5/10 TCC Meeting Summary

Jane Hayse, TCC Chair, and Dan Reuter, LUCC Chair, welcomed attendees and called the meeting to order. For TCC, Hayse asked that any comments on the February 5th TCC meeting summary be given to Susie Dunn, ARC.

2. Public Comment Period - No public comment.

3. Plan 2040 Regional Assessment Submittal to DCA for Review

Dan Reuter provided an overview of the draft resolution before LUCC for action - ARC submittal of the draft Plan 2040 Regional Assessment, the draft Plan 2040 Stakeholder Involvement Program and the draft Regionally Important Resources (RIR) map to the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) for review. ARC is one year into developing Plan 2040. 2009 accomplishments include development of a draft Regional Forecast, the draft Regional Assessment, draft Stakeholder Involvement Program and the draft Regionally Important Resources (RIR) map, along with numerous stakeholder interviews.

- Plan 2040 Regional Assessment - The assessment supports development of the RDP and RTP.
- Regionally Important Resources map, a new DCA requirement, was developed with input from local governments and research into existing state plans. Regionally important resources include environmental and culturally significant places whose conservation is important on a regional level.

Reuter expects DCA to take several months to review the draft documents. Local governments are encouraged to review the map (and the other Plan 2040 draft documents) and provide comments that can be addressed before final DCA approval.

The next steps in the Plan 2040 development include meetings with local government officials and stakeholders, an update of the Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), staff coordination of the Regional Assessment findings and the creation of a Regional Agenda. This agenda will outline a five year action plan that ARC and local governments can implement in order to address some of the challenges and issues listed in the Regional Assessment.

Discussion:

- Stephen Arms, Urban Land Institute, noted inclusion of the College Park historic district in the RIR map and asked whether other historic districts should also be included. Brad Calvert, ARC, responded that while the RIR map includes both environmental and historic districts, DCA has encouraged ARC to lean towards the inclusion of environmental resources over cultural/historic resources, as DCA is trying to put together a statewide environmental resources network. Not many historic districts were nominated by local municipalities; most are included in the draft map. Reuter stated staff would work further on this issue in the months to come.
- Don Williams, MARTA, stated he would like to see scenic rail corridors included on the map. Calvert responded that there was a scenic byway nominated in South Fulton.

Reuter then called for a motion from LUCC to approve the draft resolution. A motion was made and carried and the resolution will be forwarded to ELUC for action.

WORK SESSION

4. Plan 2040

Plan Level Goals

Jane Hayse provided an overview of goals for Plan 2040. ARC will target plan-level goals in order to develop performance measures to determine how well Plan 2040 performs. Emphasis is being placed on plan *outcomes* instead of plan *outputs*. Towards this end, in 2009 ARC's Transportation Planning Division coordinated internally with other divisions and held a staff charrette, held two Plan 2040 Retreats¹ and developed the draft Regional Assessment – all of which served as input into the plan level goal development process. From the staff charrette, ARC learned that there is a need to focus on breaking organizational silos, leveraging stakeholder feedback, and linking transportation, land use and plan implementation. Also, the need to address other planning areas (such as public health, climate change, energy, job creation and improvement funding) was emphasized. Lastly, it was deemed important to refine and include existing goals from the Envision 6 RTP/RDP into Plan 2040.

For development of plan level goals, results of a TCC and LUCC survey were incorporated which recommended the following key outcomes of Plan 2040:

- Both access to safe, affordable/efficient transportation and plan/project implementation – 70%
- Economic growth – 45%
- Healthy/active communities – 31%
- Improve environmental and resource protection – 21%

Around 40 regional leadership interviews were conducted to gather input on major topics for inclusion in Plan 2040. These topics included economic and workforce development, growth patterns and project implementation. The key takeaway from leaders was addressing issues efficiently and across sectors.

¹ Retreats were for ARC Board, TAQC and ELUC

At the first Plan 2040 Retreat in April 2009, staff heard about the need for ARC to get involved in education, to increase cooperation/coordination efforts, to craft Plan 2040 into a vehicle for action and change and to consolidate numerous solutions/ actions into a few big ideas. At the November 2009 retreat input reiterated the importance of economic development, the need to communicate issues beyond the ARC Board, for the region to focus on town/activity centers and how to access them, the funding issue, resource prioritization, long term outcomes and breaking organizational silos.

Hayse discussed some of the key findings from the Regional Assessment. On the positive side, the regional economy has been strong over the last decade but could have been stronger. The region has numerous resource such as a functional transportation system, several Fortune 500 firm headquarters and a healthy selection of universities. The key issue is how the region leverages these and other assets to secure a prosperous future. Accordingly, the Regional Assessment lists 10 major findings that will need to be addressed in order to move forward.

Hayse then displayed a diagram of the ‘vision’ for Plan 2040 (aggressive leadership on sustainable growth in the economy, the environment and society). The second level is the ‘what’ (*economy* - be the *economic* capital of the south, *environmental* - build healthy communities, and *society* – expand community resources). The third level on the chart, the ‘how’, is to be determined. These are the objectives and performance measures which state how the vision is realized and by what means progress may be measured.

Discussion:

- Heather Alhadeff, Atlanta, stated that although the City has a limited budget to develop new park space, it has been able to increase access to existing parks through strategically placed bike/ped links which are cost effective. She also recommended a strong emphasis on transit in Plan 2040. Hayse added that Atlanta’s work on connecting parks is a great example of providing cost effective solutions to problems.
- Don Williams stated that MARTA has recently completed development of a transit project prioritization framework and found that land use and zoning decisions play a significant role in how well transit works. These decisions need to be examined to assure transit in the plan can be supported.
- Phil Mallon, Fayette County, asked about implementation of plan objectives and measures at the local level, and how the transition will be made from planning to implementation.
 - On the RTP side, Hayse responded that Plan 2040 will serve as the federally required regional transportation plan, containing the list of projects that need to be informed by the measures and objectives set forth in the final Plan 2040 document.
 - On the land use side, Reuter added that this plan update is based on DCA changes to their planning requirements, which do emphasize tracking implementation. Once the plan is adopted, both TCC and LUCC will discuss local planning performance measures and can track how local governments are implementing these goals. Under DCA requirements, ARC has several review and planning roles that will continue to improve as the agency better understands local issues.
- Tim Young, Locust Grove, stated that Atlanta is the capital of the south and the objective should focus on maintaining that status.
- Myles Smith, Civic League, stated that while he agrees with emphasis on transit, he would like to explore sewer expansion as a means to control land use/development.

- Scott Gaither, Rockdale County, asked how counties will be able to support UGPM density priorities and transit if they cannot afford to implement the supporting infrastructure such as sewer service. Hayse answered that the UGPM needs to match these realities.
- Jessica Lavendier, Atlanta, stated that some of the objectives and measures seem to be outside the purview of ARC, cautioning against the perception of unfunded mandates. She also noted that policy drives the location of density, not sewers.
- Paul Grether, MARTA, noted that park and ride lots can support transit in low density areas giving the Indian Creek and Doraville MARTA stations as examples. Commuter bus and commuter rail both work well in areas where local governments wish to maintain lower densities.
- Stephen Arms questioned whether the Atlanta region will actually have 8 million residents by 2040. He recommended ARC focus on fewer goals and objectives to simplify the planning process.
- Miguel Valentin, Rockdale County, suggested ARC could focus on how to incentivize planning outcomes. Reuter agreed and pointed out that ARC does this with existing programs such as LCI.
- Randy Hulsey, Douglas County, stated that tracking the development of new cost effective technologies such as ITS to achieve planning outcomes should be a big focus for Plan 2040. Hayse agreed and mentioned the Fifty Forward technology paper, which will be referred to in the planning process.

Hayse then wrapped up the conversation and asked for continued feedback through March and April.

Framework for Regional Systems

Reuter provided an overview of the regional system included in Plan 2040. Two additional systems are addressed in the plan – sub-regional and local. The regional system refers to the region’s major economic centers and the infrastructure that supports them. The concept of how the regional system ties into evolving federal and statewide planning was considered, as well as the regional’s economic bases and what major infrastructure systems connect these areas.

The current Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) and the Regionally Strategic Transportation System (RSTS) currently defines the regional system. ARC will adopt an updated 2009 UGPM in February and will immediately begin work on a 2010 update.

Reuter then showed a series of maps which highlighted the region’s employment centers. These centers encompass about 2% of the region’s land area but contain about 1/3 of the region’s jobs. Centers tend to be clustered around several ‘megacorridors’ such as the northside of I-285.

Reuter asked the group for input on other criteria to consider when identifying the most important employment areas, on the appropriateness of current thresholds, and if there are other issues.

- Heather Alhadeff noted that only 20% of all trips are home-based work trips. Federal policy is now calling for local governments to look at projects that accommodate the non-work related trip. Jared Lombard, ARC, answered that non-work trips are addressed in the sub-regional and local systems, and that both systems will be discussed in more detail at a later date. Kyung Hwa Kim, ARC added that if a ‘tour’ rather than trip is used as the unit of travel analysis, then employment centers account for about 40% of all trips when taking trip chaining into consideration. She added that ARC is currently developing an activity-based model in addition to its existing trip-based model.²
- Nancy Lovingood, Gwinnett County, asked how suburb-to-suburb travel fits in the plan. Hayse answered that Concept 3 outlines a lot of this movement, which has been an issue studied by ARC

² See www.atlantaregional.com/transportation/travel-demand-model for more information

since the 1980's. While past and current RTP's have many suburb-to-suburb projects, forecasts still show that there still is a demand for travel to the major centers.

- Jessica Lavandier asked about the lack of mention of a freight system in the presentation. Hayse answered that ARC is in the process of creating a major Strategic Truck Route Master plan which will inform both the regional system and the Regional Thoroughfare Plan.
- Margaret Stallings, Cherokee County, suggested the differences in employment center operation schedules be addressed in the plan. Some centers operate on a 24-hour basis, many are completely abandoned by 5 pm.
- Randy Hulseay noted that more attention needs to be given to sub-regional and local systems, as many local streets and arterials are overwhelmed by traffic when the major regional system becomes congested.
- Laraine Vance, Cobb County, asked if travel demand reductions to and from the region's major employment centers have been evaluated if teleworking programs are implemented.
- Chuck Taylor, Spalding County, asked if ARC is considering university employment. Reuter replied that both public and private sector employment were looked at but there was not much focus on major universities.
- Laura Beall, GRTA, agreed it is important to consider the job centers and expected growth and asked ARC to pay attention to the south side of the region, where she thought growth predictions were too optimistic.
- Miguel Valentin expressed concern that the planning process seems to be reactionary focusing on where people and centers are and how the region will accommodate them. He would like to see more emphasis on changing/guiding patterns of development.

OTHER

5. Member introduced topics for future discussion - None

6. Announcements - None

Handouts:

- TCC/LUCC Joint Meeting Agenda, 2/19/10
- Draft meeting summaries:
 - TCC Meeting Summary, 2/5/10
 - LUCC Meeting Summary, 1/28/10
- Presentations
 - Plan 2040 Plan Level Goals
 - Plan 2040 Regional System Development
- Draft LUCC Resolution, Transmittal of Plan 2040 Regional Assessment to DCA
- Plan 2040 Stakeholder Involvement Program
- Draft Regionally Important Resources Map plus Overview of Recommended Areas to Include
- Table, 2008 Employment Counts by UGPM Centers
- Announcements
 - Model Users Group, Draft Agenda for 2/26/10
 - Community Choices Flyer, 2010 Implementation Assistance
 - Georgia Planning Association Flyer, 2010 Spring Conference