

Stakeholder and Technical Committee Meeting-SUMMARY

December 12, 2013 5pm to 7pm Cobb County DOT Squad Room 1890 County Services Parkway Marietta, GA 30008

Attendees:

Mandy Elliott, Cobb County Planning & Community Development Galt Porter, Planning Commission Joe Brywczynski, Wellstar

Jim Wilgus, City of Marietta Steve Covert, Georgia Tea Party Richard Crim, Dobbins AFB Khy Chestnut, KSU

Project Team Staff

Faye DiMassimo, Cobb County DOT James Hudgins, ARCADIS Haley Berry, ARCADIS Grady Smith, Metro Planners & Engineers Ian Samson, PEDS

Karl Van Hagel, Cobb DOT Sharon Qin, Cobb Comm. Development Jill Flamm, ECCA Wade Carroll, Jacobs (Paulding CTP) Ron Sifen Trevor Leonard, Six Flags Whitewater

Eric Meyer, Cobb County DOT Olen Daelhousen, ARCADIS Pat Smeeton, Jacobs Sally Flocks, PEDS

Steve Byrne, Mauldin & Jenkins Julia Billings, GDOT

Brantley Day, Cumberland CID David Welden Brian Bober, Bike Cobb

Marty Sewell, Cobb County DOT Walker Marshall, ARCADIS Amanda Hatton, Jacobs

Welcome and Introductions

Faye DiMassimo with Cobb County DOT opened the meeting.

Status Update

Haley Berry gave a quick status update on CTP tasks. The Draft Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment Report was under review by the Cobb County project team staff. To date, the project team has completed approximately 40 stakeholder interviews. The Public Opinion Poll is complete and the results are online. The CCT Customer Satisfaction Survey was completed in late November and the results will be available in early January. And finally, the Guiding Principles and objectives have been developed by the project team and will be reviewed tonight by the committee members.

Presentation

Haley Berry started the presentation by reviewing what the CTP team has heard so far from the public: Cobb is a great place to live and call home; there is a need to improve both local and commuter traffic; and all types of improvements are needed from roadway and intersection improvements to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements.

The Guiding Principles were developed with several inputs, including the Listening Tour, stakeholder interviews, public input, public opinion poll, and input from the first Stakeholder and Technical Meeting in

October 2013.Guiding Principles are defined as generalized statements that broadly relate the physical transportation environment to values. The objectives are specific measureable statements related to the attainment of the guiding principles. Performance measures are indicators that capture each objective's fundamental outcomes.



The draft Guiding Principles and objectives are:

- (1) Maximize performance of transportation system
 - a. Operate the transportation system efficiently and effectively
 - b. Give priority to investment that preserves existing infrastructure
 - c. Protect and enhance transportation connections to key destinations
 - d. Protect and enhance existing community character
- (2) Improve access and manage traffic congestion
 - a. Focus on improving travel times rather than reducing congestion
 - b. Provide increased travel choices (routes and modes of travel)
 - c. Focus on key travel patterns
- (3) Achieve traveler safety and security
 - a. Reduce number and/or severity of crashes
 - b. Balance safety considerations across all users (see Complete Street principles)
- (4) Drive economic competitiveness
 - a. Enhance and serve redevelopment areas
 - b. Complement growth sectors and areas (see EDGE Core Clusters)
- (5) Lead with Cost-Effective Solutions
 - a. Seek partnerships
 - b. Seek innovative solutions
 - c. Apply value-engineering principles as appropriate
 - d. Select actions which reduce life-cycle costs, not just capital costs
 - e. Select strategies which allow future flexibility

Amanda Hatton with Jacobs and Haley Berry then led the committee through an exercise to gain feedback on the guiding principles using electronic key pad polling. Each committee member was given an electronic key pad to use in answering a series of questions on the guiding principles and objectives. The results from the voting were recorded and shown to the committee immediately following the voting. The results of the electronic key pad polling are attached at the end of this summary.

Grady Smith then reviewed the evaluation process with the committee that the project team is currently developing. The overall process was summarized into five stages:

- Identify Guiding Principles and Objectives
- Identify and evaluate existing transportation conditions and needs (and establish performance measures)
- Multi-modal Scenarios and Project Evaluation (includes developing an unconstrained list of projects, performance evaluation, and deliverability evaluation)
- Financial Constraints
- Project Recommendations (including short-term, mid-term, and long-term)

Mr. Smith also reviewed SMART objectives with the committee. SMART objectives stand for: **S**pecific (sufficiently descriptive but not dictating approach), **M**easurable (quantitative- number, degree), **A**greed (consensus on meaning and value), **R**ealistic (can be accomplished with expected resources), **T**ime (bound, identifies timeframe).

Mrs. Berry briefly discussed the short term improvements recommendations that the team will begin working on as the next major task. The short term improvements are projects to be completed in the first five years of the plan (2015-2020). Potential projects are identified through the existing conditions and needs assessment,

public and agency input, and data analysis. Potential projects will be selected and prioritized by comparison with the guiding principles and analysis of congestion, safety, and high volume locations across the County.



The next steps include finalizing the Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment Report, identifying short term project recommendations, evaluating those short term project recommendations, and continuing public outreach and engagement.

The next meeting for the Stakeholder and Technical Committees will be planned for February 2014.

Mrs. Berry then introduced the final exercise for the meeting. Committee members were asked to provide input on short term recommendations. The first activity was to provide input on maps of specific project recommendations. The second activity was to determine what percentage of the short term improvement budget should be allocated to various types of improvements. The summary of those activities is described below.

Discussion

•

Below is a summary of the discussion and comments received during the presentation:

- **Objective 1d: Define enhancement**
- GP #5- cost effectiveness should also include not limiting funding only to large projects which could limit funding availability down the road
- Funding evaluation •
 - o Balance broad versus specific needs across the county and the region
 - Consider maintenance and life-cycle costs
 - How do you define a corridor? 0
 - There are design guidelines (as well as master study area plans, etc) in place for some 0 areas- how are those included in the performance evaluation?
 - Traffic signal optimization- not good for pedestrians. Adding lanes is not good for pedestrians
- Need mid-block crossings in Cumberland

Note: Ron Sifen submitted an email comment on December 14th regarding the Guiding Principles: Within the guiding principles for the CTP, I recommend including the following language. Prioritize using our transportation dollars to maximize improving mobility throughout Cobb County. Cobb should fund only the most cost-effective projects that will achieve the most to improve mobility throughout Cobb County.

Activity Results:

Mapping for short term project recommendations/considerations:

Southwest Planning Area

- Thornton Road- transit • improvement
- Right turn lane at S. Gorgon at Mableton Parkway
- Add median to Six Flags Drive •
- Six Flags- transit improvement (trams Trails connection along the or BRT stop with connection to Holmes station
- Freeway Access at Factory Shoals
- Six Flags Transit

- Chattahoochee River with connection to the Beltline
- Expand Factory Shoals to Industrial Park/Quality Road
- Right turn lane Floyd Road at Veterans Memorial – grid lock

Northwest Planning Area

- Add 3rd Army exit off I-75 to relieve
 SR 92
- Chastain to I-575 North congestion
- Hopkins Road going south
- Lighting on Barrett Lakes

Northeast Planning Area

- Intersection improvement at Piedmont Road and Canton Road (connector)
- Transit along Johnson Ferry Road (for Braves)
- Roadway improvements with development along Johnson Ferry Road and Old Canton Road/Post Oak Tritt Road

Southeast Planning Area

- More HAWK signals and mid-block crossings at transit stops. Every transit stop should have a safe crossing
- Replace fence on Cumberland
 Blvd with HAWK and crosswalk
- Connect bike/ped from Akers Mill to Silver Comet
- Median along South Cobb Drive
- Intersection improvement at Spring and Cobb Parkway
- Silver Comet Connector (state project)
- Windy Hill at Austell Roadimprove light timing- too long green for Windy Hill
- Connection from Sandtown Road
 over to Dallas Highway
- Dedicated BRT land on Cobb Parkway, upgrading from BRT to LRT
- Windy Hill Blvd concept

- Improve intersection Hwy 92 and SR 92 (Cobb Parkway)
- Lighted sidewalks on Chastain
- BRT to Cumberland

- COBBIN MOTO
- Right turning lane from Frey To George Busbee Road
- Light Frey to Chastain
- Big Shanty: Lighting and sidewalks
- Senior transport to Wellstar
- Need crosswalks on all four corners of Johnson Ferry Road and Woodlawn Drive
- Pedestrian/bicycle improvements at intersection of Lower Roswell Road and Johnson Ferry Road and Johnson Ferry Road and Roswell Road
- Signal timing along Roswell Road at Robinson Road and Johnson Ferry Road
- Intersection improvement at Perkins property along Johnson Ferry Road

- Reduce block length and increase connectivity in Cumberland area
- Adjust route for Cobb Connect and add a loop to put stop at stadium
- Pedestrian access and direct path from Cumberland transfer center to mall
- Complete Silver Comet (to Atlanta/Beltline)
- BRT loop through downtown
 Marietta
- Allgood at US 41- through lane on Allgood to Fairground
- BRT on Windy Hill
- Intersection improvement at Allgood and Cobb Parkway
- Roadway improvements at Leland
 Drive

Install mid-block crossings, HAWKS signals on Cobb Parkway. Pedestrian bridges are 20th Century and do not work for pedestrians

• Support Alternative 6-A on revive 285

Improve traffic flow through

•

- intersection of Cumberland Blvd and Cumberland Parkway
- BRT/LRT to Arts Center, Perimeter Center and Town Center
- Improve ped/bike access and safety along Cobb Parkway and major feeders
- Nickjack Creek Trail from Silver Comet to Riverline/Riverview park
- Windy Hill Trail

Intersection improvement Cobb Parkway and 120 Loop

- Roadway improvements along Cobb Parkway and Windy Hill Road (intersection improvements as well)
- More lanes along South Cobb Drive

- Too many road crossing along South Cobb Drive
- Preserve residential character along South Cobb Drive
- Camp Highland Road- right turn lane eastbound on East- West
- Interchange improvement at Atlanta Road at I-285
- Bike/ped improvements along Atlanta Road

- More turn lanes needed along South
 Cobb Drive
- More turn lanes and signal timing outside of Smyrna and south of Ridge Road along Atlanta Road
- Traffic signal timing along
 Cumberland Parkway
- Intersection improvement at Spring and Cobb Parkway



- South Cobb Drive Trail
- Camp Highland Road u-turn on East-West- move it west of Camp Highland to avoid excess congestion from turning vehicles
- Median on South Cobb Drive

Funding:

The Table below summarizes how participates divided the short term improvement budget among major project categories.

	Existing Roadway	New Roadway	Traffic Signal Optimization/ Intersection Improvement	Bike/Ped	Transit	Maintenance/ Preservation
1		10%	10%	10%	20%	50%
2	30%	10%	20%		10%	30%
3	20%	30%	10%	10%	10%	20%
4	10%			20%	40%	30%
5	20%	20%	20%	20%	10%	10%
6	30%	20%	20%		10%	20%
7	30%	10%	30%	20%		10%
8	10%		20%	30%	30%	10%
9	30%	30%	30%			10%
10	20%	10%	40%		10%	20%
11	20%	10%	20%	10%	10%	30%
12	30%	20%	10%	10%	20%	10%
13	35%	20%	20%		10%	15%

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned.

Follow-up

- The meeting summary will be forwarded to the Stakeholder and Technical Committees
- Guiding Principles will be finalized and emailed to the Stakeholder and Technical Committees
- The evaluation process will be emailed to the Stakeholder and Technical Committees once it has been finalized
- The draft list of short term improvement recommendations will be emailed to the Stakeholder and Technical Committees before the next meeting

- The next meeting will be scheduled for February 2014 and will focus on the short term improvement recommendations
- Committee members are encouraged to contact Haley Berry with any questions or comments



Cobb In Motion Committee Meeting 12/12/2013

Polling Results

Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Response Count	Response Pct
		Q1: How well do you like Guiding Principle		
		#1? d'Maximize Performance of		
1		Transportation System		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.3%
	4	Like	4	28.6%
	5	Strongly like	7	50.0%
		Ν	14	
		Q1a: How well do you like Objective		
		1a?d'Operate the transportation system		
2		efficiently and effectively		
	1	Dislike	0	0.0%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.3%
	4	Like	1	7.1%
	5	Strongly like	11	78.6%
		Ν	14	
		Q1b: How well do you like Objective		
		1b?d Give priority to investment that		
3		preserves existing infrastructure		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	3	21.4%
	3	Somewhat like	5	35.7%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	2	14.3%
		Ν	14	
4		Q1c: How well do you like Objective 1c?d'Protect and enhance transportation connections to key destinations		
	1	Dislike	1	7.7%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	15.4%
	4	Like	6	46.2%
	5	Strongly like	4	30.8%
		Ν	13	

			Response	Response
Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Count	Pct
		Q1d: How well do you like Objective		
		1d? Protect and enhance existing		
5		community character		
	1	Dislike	2	14.3%
	2	Neutral	1	7.1%
	3	Somewhat like	5	35.7%
	4	Like	1	7.1%
	5	Strongly like	5	35.7%
		Ν	14	
		Q2: How well do you like Guiding Principle		
		#2?♂Improve Access and Manage Traffic		
6		Congestion		
	1	Dislike	2	14.3%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	1	7.1%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	8	57.1%
		Ν	14	
		Q2a: How well do you like Objective		
		2a?♂Focus on improving travel times rather		
7		than reducing congestion		
	1	Dislike	2	14.3%
	2	Neutral	1	7.1%
	3	Somewhat like	3	21.4%
	4	Like	5	35.7%
	5	Strongly like	3	21.4%
		Ν	14	
		Q2b: How well do you like Objective		
		2b?♂Provide increased travel choices (routes		
8		and modes of travel)		
	1	Dislike	4	28.6%
	2	Neutral	1	7.1%
	3	Somewhat like	0	0.0%
	4	Like	1	7.1%
	5	Strongly like	8	57.1%
		Ν	14	

Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Response Count	Response Pct
	Cilicitie	Q2c: How well do you like Objective		
9		2c?∂ ⁴ Focus on key travel patterns		
	1	Dislike	3	21.4%
	2	Neutral	1	7.1%
	3	Somewhat like	4	28.6%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	3	21.4%
		Ν	14	
10		Q3: How well do you like Guiding Principle #3?♂Achieve Traveler Safety and Security		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	1	7.1%
	4	Like	1	7.1%
	5	Strongly like	11	78.6%
		Ν	14	
		Q3a: How well do you like Objective		
		3a?d Reduce number and/or severity of		
11		crashes		
	1	Dislike	0	0.0%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	0	0.0%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	11	78.6%
		Ν	14	
12		Q3b: How well do you like Objective 3b?♂Balance safety considerations across all users (see Complete Streets principles)		
	1	Dislike	5	35.7%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.3%
	4	Like	0	0.0%
	5	Strongly like	7	50.0%
		Ν	14	

Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Response Count	Response Pct
		Q4: How well do you like Guiding Principle		
13		#4? ^d Drive Economic Competitiveness		
15	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	 2	Neutral	2	14.3%
	 3	Somewhat like	- 1	7.1%
	4	Like	- 4	28.6%
		Strongly like		42.9%
		N	14	,.
		Q4a: How well do you like Objective		
		4a?♂Enhance and serve redevelopment		
14		areas		
14	1	Dislike	2	14.3%
	 2	Neutral		0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.3%
	4	Like	6	42.9%
	5	Strongly like	4	28.6%
	5	N	14	20.070
		Q4b: How well do you like Objective		
		4b?♂Complement growth sectors and areas		
15		(see EDGE Core Clusters)		
12	1		2	14.3%
		Dislike Neutral		
	2	Neutral	1	7.1%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.5%
	4 F	Like	3 6	×21.4%
	5	Strongly like N	6 14	42.9%
		N	14	
		Q5: How well do you like Guiding Principle		
16		#5?d'Lead with Cost-Effective Solutions		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	0	0.0%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	10	71.4%
		Ν	14	

Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Response Count	Response Pct
		Q5a: How well do you like Objective		
17		5a?d'Seek partnerships		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	3	21.4%
	4	Like	3	21.4%
	5	Strongly like	7	50.0%
		Ν	14	
		Q5b: How well do you like Objective		
18		5b?♂Seek innovative solutions		
	1	Dislike	1	7.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	0	0.0%
	4	Like	2	14.3%
	5	Strongly like	11	78.6%
		Ν	14	
		Q5c: How well do you like Objective		
		5c?♂Apply value-engineering principles as		
19		appropriate		
	1	Dislike	0	0.0%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	2	14.3%
	4	Like	2	14.3%
	5	Strongly like	10	71.4%
		Ν	14	
		Q5d: How well do you like Objective		
		5d?♂Select actions which reduce life-cycle		
20		costs, not just capital costs		
	1	Dislike	0	0.0%
	2	Neutral	1	6.7%
	3	Somewhat like	2	13.3%
	4	Like	1	6.7%
	5	Strongly like	11	73.3%
		Ν	15	
		Q5e: How well do you like Objective		
		5e?dSelect strategies which allow future		
21		flexibility		
	1	Dislike	0	0.0%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	1	6.7%
	4	Like	5	33.3%
	5	Strongly like	9	60.0%

Q #	Choice	Choice Text	Response Count	Response Pct
22		Q1: How much do you like pizza?		
	1	Dislike	1	9.1%
	2	Neutral	0	0.0%
	3	Somewhat like	1	9.1%
	4	Like	1	9.1%
	5	Strongly like	8	72.7%
		Ν	11	