REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

Atlanta Regional Commission • 40 Courtland Street NE, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 • fax:404.463.3105 • www.atlantaregional.com

DATE: 8/20/2004

ARC REVIEW CODE: R407211

TO:Mayor Ralph MooreATTN TO:Ann Lippmann, Director of Rlanning & Economic Development
Charles Krautler, DirectorFROM:Charles Krautler, Director

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). Below is the ARC finding. The Atlanta Regional Commission reviewed the DRI with regard to conflicts to regional plans, goals, and policies and impacts it might have on the activities, plans, goals, and policies of other local jurisdictions and state, federal, and other agencies. The finding does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

<u>Submitting Local Government</u>: City of Union City <u>Name of Proposal</u>: Goodson Distribution Center

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact

Date Opened: 7/21/2004

Date Closed: 8/20/2004

<u>FINDING:</u> After reviewing the information submitted for the review, and the comments received from affected agencies, the Atlanta Regional Commission finding is that the DRI is in the best interest of the State.

<u>Additional Comments:</u> As demonstrated by the traffic impact analysis, resulting traffic from this development is not enough to warrant any recommended improvements due to the project's direct impacts. This will minimize the impact of the new truck traffic on the local roads used primarily by automobiles. Though overall congestion is low in this area, GDOT, Union City, Shannon Mall, and the South Fulton Community Improvement District are currently developing and interchange justification report for I-85 at State Route 138 (Jonesboro Road). The developer should work with these organizations regarding long-term infrastructure improvements in the area. Grading of the site should be kept to a minimum where possible. In refining the site plan, it is recommended that significant consideration be given to grading and potential runoff, and kept to a minimum where possible. The developer should keep wetland impacts to a minimum. Consideration should be given to the type of materials used for construction of the parking lots and buildings to help reduce the urban heat island effect. The Best Environmental Practices listed below should be reviewed and applied to the development where possible.

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES RECEIVED NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING ARC DATA RESEARCH GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FULTON COUNTY FAYETTE COUNTY ARC Transportation Planning ARC Aging Division Georgia Department of Transportation Fulton County Schools City of College Park ARC Environmental Planning Georgia Department of Community Affairs Georgia Regional Transportation Authority City of Fairburn

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Mike Alexander, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3302. This finding will be published to the ARC website.

The ARC review website is located at: <u>http://www.atlantaregional.com/qualitygrowth/reviews.html</u>.

Page 1 of 14

PRELIMINARY REPORT SUMMARY

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

The Goodson 1 Distribution Center is a warehouse/distribution development with a single 757, 200

square foot structure. Dock access will be provided along the northwestern and southeastern sides of the building. The proposed site will have 410 automobile parking spaces and 152 trailer parking spaces. The total site acreage is 68.11 acres. The development is located in Union City to the west of I-85 near the intersection of Jonesboro Road (Hwy 138) and I-85. Primary road access will be provided from Shannon Parkway.

PROJECT PHASING:

The developer proposes to complete the development in one phase by 2007.

GENERAL

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

Is the proposed project consistent with the host-local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

The project site is currently zoned (M-1) light industrial. No rezoning is necessary for the development to proceed. Information submitted with the review states that the development is consistent with the union City Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.

Is the proposed project consistent with any potentially affected local government's comprehensive plan? If not, identify inconsistencies.

No impacts were determined during the review.

Will the proposed project impact the implementation of any local government's short-term work program? If so, how?

No. The site is located in the City of Union City in southern Fulton County. It is contiguous to Fulton County to the south and west. The City of Fairburn is $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile from the property to the west.

Will the proposed project generate population and/or employment increases in the Region? If yes, what would be the major infrastructure and facilities improvements needed to support the increase?

Based on national averages, the development will create 151 jobs. No additional major infrastructure will be necessary to support the increase in employment.





| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

What other major development projects are planned near the proposed project?

The ARC has reviewed other major development projects, known as Area Plan (1984 to1991) or as a DRI (1991 to present), within a mile radius of the proposed project.

| Year | Name |
|------|--------------------------------|
| 1985 | SOUTH PARK |
| 1986 | ROYAL 85 SOUTH |
| 1999 | FLAT SHOALS MUD |
| 2001 | OAKLEY TOWNSHIP |
| 2002 | ADESA AUTO AUCTION |
| 2003 | SOUTH PARK MIXED USE |
| 2003 | SOUTHPARK, BUILDING 2, PHASE 3 |
| | |

Will the proposed project displace housing units or community facilities? If yes, identify and give number of units, facilities, etc.

No, the proposed development will not displace any housing units or community facilities. Based on information submitted for the review, the site is currently undeveloped and forested.

Will the development cause a loss in jobs? If yes, how many? No.

Is the proposed development consistent with regional plans and policies?

The site is located near the intersection major state highway and interstate. It will also be located within reasonable proximity to the Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport and the CSX Intermodal Facility, located in Fairburn. However, most of the industrial and warehousing development has in this area is located on the other side of I-85, where most of the infrastructure improvements have been made. As demonstrated by the traffic impact analysis, resulting traffic from this development is not enough to warrant any recommended improvements due to the project's direct impacts. This will minimize the impact of the new truck traffic on the local roads used primarily by automobiles. Though overall congestion is low in this area, GDOT, Union City, Shannon Mall, and the South Fulton Community Improvement District are currently developing and interchange justification report for I-85 at State Route 138 (Jonesboro Road). The developer should work with these organizations regarding long-term infrastructure improvements in the area.

Grading of the site should be kept to a minimum where possible. In refining the site plan, it is recommended that significant consideration be given to grading and potential runoff, and kept to a minimum where possible. The developer should keep wetland impacts to a minimum. Consideration should be given to the type of materials used for construction of the parking lots and buildings to help reduce the urban heat island effect. The Best Environmental Practices listed below should be reviewed and applied to the development where possible.



PRELIMINARY REPORT

Regional Development Plan Policies

- 1. Provide development strategies and infrastructure investments to accommodate forecasted population and employment growth more efficiently.
- 2. Guide an increased share of new development to the Central Business District, transportation corridors, activity centers and town centers.
- 3. Increase opportunities for mixed-use development, infill and redevelopment.
- 4. Increase transportation choices and transit-oriented development (TOD).
- 5. Provide a variety of housing choices throughout the region to ensure housing for individuals and families of diverse incomes and age groups.
- 6. Preserve and enhance existing residential neighborhoods.
- 7. Advance sustainable greenfield development.
- 8. Protect environmentally sensitive areas.
- 9. Create a regional network of greenspace that connects across jurisdictional boundaries.
- 10. Preserve existing rural character.
- 11. Preserve historic resources.
- 12. Inform and involve the public in planning at regional, local and neighborhood levels.
- 13. Coordinate local policies and regulations to support the RDP.
- 14. Support growth management at the state level.

BEST LAND USE PRACTICES

Practice 1: Keep vehicle miles of travel (VMT) below the area average. Infill developments are the best at accomplishing this. The more remote a development the more self contained it must be to stay below the area average VMT.

Practice 2: Contribute to the area's jobs-housing balance. Strive for a job-housing balance with a three to five mile area around a development site.

Practice 3: Mix land uses at the finest grain the market will bear and include civic uses in the mix.

Practice 4: Develop in clusters and keep the clusters small. This will result in more open space preservation. Practice 5: Place higher-density housing near commercial centers, transit lines and parks. This will enable more walking, biking and transit use.

Practice 6: Phase convenience shopping and recreational opportunities to keep pace with housing. These are valued amenities and translate into less external travel by residents if located conveniently to housing. Practice 7: Make subdivisions into neighborhoods with well-defined centers and edges. This is traditional development.

Practice 8: Reserve school sites and donate them if necessary to attract new schools. This will result in neighborhood schools which provide a more supportive learning environment than larger ones. Practice 9: Concentrate commercial development in compact centers or districts, rather than letting it spread out in



strips.

Practice 10: Make shopping centers and business parks into all-purpose activity centers. Suburban shopping centers and their environs could be improved by mixing uses and designing them with the pedestrian amenities of downtowns.

Practice 11: Tame auto-oriented land uses, or at least separate them from pedestrian-oriented uses. Relegate "big box" stores to areas where they will do the least harm to the community fabric.

BEST TRANSPORTATION PRACTICES

Practice 1: Design the street network with multiple connections and relatively direct routes.

Practice 2: Space through-streets no more than a half mile apart, or the equivalent route density in a curvilinear network.

Practice 3: Use traffic-calming measures liberally. Use short streets, sharp curves, center islands, traffic circles, textured pavements, speed bumps and raised crosswalks.

Practice 4: Keep speeds on local streets down to 20 mph.

Practice 5: Keep speeds on arterials and collectors down to 35 mph (at least inside communities).

Practice 6: Keep all streets as narrow as possible and never more than four traffic lanes wide. Florida suggests access streets 18 feet, subcollectors 26 feet, and collectors from 28 feet to 36 feet depending on lanes and parking. Practice 7: Align streets to give buildings energy-efficient orientations. Allow building sites to benefit from sun angles, natural shading and prevailing breezes.

Practice 8: Avoid using traffic signals wherever possible and always space them for good traffic progression. Practice 9: Provide networks for pedestrians and bicyclists as good as the network for motorists.

Practice 10: Provide pedestrians and bicyclists with shortcuts and alternatives to travel along high-volume streets. Practice 11: Incorporate transit-oriented design features.

Practice 12: Establish TDM programs for local employees. Ridesharing, modified work hours, telecommuting and others.

BEST ENVIRONMENTAL PRACTICES

Practice 1: Use a systems approach to environmental planning. Shift from development orientation to basins or ecosystems planning.

Practice 2: Channel development into areas that are already disturbed.

Practice 3: Preserve patches of high-quality habitat, as large and circular as possible, feathered at the edges and connected by wildlife corridors. Stream corridors offer great potential.

Practice 4: Design around significant wetlands.

Practice 5: Establish upland buffers around all retained wetlands and natural water bodies.

Practice 6: Preserve significant uplands, too.

Practice 7: Restore and enhance ecological functions damaged by prior site activities.

Practice 8: Detain runoff with open, natural drainage systems. The more natural the system the more valuable it will be for wildlife and water quality.

Practice 9: Design man-made lakes and stormwater ponds for maximum environmental value. Recreation, stormwater management, wildlife habitat and others.

Practice 10: Use reclaimed water and integrated pest management on large landscaped areas. Integrated pest management involves controlling pests by introducing their natural enemies and cultivating disease and insect resistant grasses.

Practice 11: Use and require the use of XeriscapeTM landscaping. XeriscapingTM is water conserving landscape methods and materials.

BEST HOUSING PRACTICES

Practice 1: Offer "life cycle" housing. Providing integrated housing for every part of the "life cycle". Practice 2: Achieve an average net residential density of six to seven units per acre without the appearance of crowding. Cluster housing to achieve open space.



Practice 3: Use cost-effective site development and construction practices. Small frontages and setbacks; rolled curbs or no curbs; shared driveways.

Practice 4: Design of energy-saving features. Natural shading and solar access.

Practice 5: Supply affordable single-family homes for moderate-income households.

Practice 6: Supply affordable multi-family and accessory housing for low-income households.

Practice 7: Tap government housing programs to broaden and deepen the housing/income mix.

Practice 8: Mix housing to the extent the market will bear.

LOCATION

Where is the proposed project located within the host-local government's boundaries?

The site is located in the City of Union City in southern Fulton County.

Will the proposed project be located close to the host-local government's boundary with another local government? If yes, identify the other local government.

It is contiguous to Fulton County to the south and west. The City of Fairburn is $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile from the property to the west.

Will the proposed project be located close to land uses in other jurisdictions that would benefit, or be negatively impacted, by the project? Identify those land uses which would benefit and those which would be negatively affected and describe impacts.

No.

ECONOMY OF THE REGION

According to information on the review form or comments received from potentially affected governments:

What new taxes will be generated by the proposed project?

Estimated value of the development is \$19,940,970 million with an expected \$60,000 in annual local tax revenues.

How many short-term jobs will the development generate in the Region?

Short-term jobs will depend upon construction schedule.

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?

Yes.

In what ways could the proposed development have a positive or negative impact on existing industry or business in the Region?



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

The proposed development will provide additional employment to the area. The impact of this new employment will be small. No surrounding business should be negatively impacted by this development.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located in or near wetlands, groundwater recharge area, water supply watershed, protected river corridor, or other environmentally sensitive area of the Region? If yes, identify those areas.

Stream and Watershed Protection

The proposed project is in the Flint River Water Supply Watershed, a water supply source for Clayton County. The watershed is greater than 100 square miles above the intake and there is no reservoir directly on the Flint within this watershed area. Therefore, the only criteria applicable to the property under the Georgia Planning Act's Part 5 minimum water supply watershed criteria apply to the handling and storage of hazardous materials and hazardous waste. No other criteria apply. The State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation buffer is shown along Broadnax Creek where it runs through the project property, but none is shown where it appears to run along or near the property line on the east and southeast sides of the property. The 25-foot buffer should be shown wherever it extends onto the property. An approximate 100-year flood plain is shown on the plans, and no development is proposed within the indicated area.

Storm Water / Water Quality

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality. During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements. After construction, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. ARC has estimated the amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development. These estimates are based on some simplifying assumptions for typical pollutant loading factors (lbs/ac/yr). The loading factors are based on regional storm water monitoring data from the Atlanta Region. Actual loading factors will depend on the amount of impervious surface in the final project design. The following table summarizes the results of the analysis:

| Land Use | Land Area (ac) | Total Phosphorus | Total Nitrogen | BOD | TSS | Zinc | Lead |
|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|----------|--------|-------|
| Office/Light Industrial | 68.10 | 87.85 | 1166.55 | 7763.40 | 48214.80 | 100.79 | 12.94 |
| TOTAL | 68.10 | 87.85 | 1166.55 | 7763.40 | 48214.80 | 100.79 | 12.94 |

Estimated Pounds of Pollutants Per Year:

Total Percent Impervious 70%

In order to address post-construction stormwater runoff quality, the project should implement stormwater management controls (structural and/or nonstructural) as found in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) and meet the stormwater management quantity



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Will the proposed project be located near a national register site? If yes, identify site.

No.

In what ways could the proposed project create impacts that would damage the resource?

Not applicable.

In what ways could the proposed project have a positive influence on efforts to preserve or promote the historic resource?

Not applicable.

INFRASTRUCTURE Transportation

Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Review Findings

This DRI proposal is being considered for review under the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Non-expedited Review. The proposed development will be located on 68.11 acres and consist of 757,200 square feet of warehouse/distribution uses. To be completed in one phase, The Goodson 1 Distribution Center is scheduled for build-out in 2007. Primary site access is proposed via Shannon Pkwy.

How much traffic (both average daily and peak am/pm) will be generated by the proposed project?

Street Smarts performed the transportation analysis. GRTA and ARC review staff agreed with the methodology and assumptions used in the analysis. The net trip generation is based on the rates published in the 7th edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation report; they are listed in the following table:

| Land Usa | A.M. Peak Hour | | | P.M. Peak Hour | | | 24-Hour |
|-------------------|----------------|------|-------|----------------|------|-------|---------|
| Land Use | Enter | Exit | 2-Way | Enter | Exit | 2-Way | 2-Way |
| 150 - Warehousing | 144 | 32 | 176 | 40 | 121 | 161 | 1,568 |

What are the existing traffic patterns and volumes on the local, county, state, and interstate roads that serve the site?

Incorporating the trip generation results, the transportation consultant distributed the traffic on the current roadway network. An assessment of the existing Level of Service (LOS) and projected LOS based on the trip distribution findings helps to determine the study network. The results of this exercise



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>REVIEW REPORT</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

determined the study network, which has been approved by ARC and GRTA. If analysis of an intersection or roadway results in a substandard LOS "D," then the consultant recommends improvements.

Projected traffic volumes from the Regional Travel Demand Model are compared to the assigned capacity of facilities within the study network. This data is used to calculate a volume to capacity (V/C) ratio. The V/C ratio values that define the LOS thresholds vary depending on factors such as the type of terrain traversed and the percent of the road where passing is prohibited. As a V/C ratio reaches 0.8, congestion increases. The V/C ratios for traffic in various network years are presented in the following table. Any facilities that have a V/C ratio of 1.00 or above are considered congested.

V/C Ratios



2025 AM Peak

2025 PM Peak

| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

| Legend |
|--------------------|
| AM/PM Peak Periods |
| V/C Ratio |
| 0 - 0.3 |
| 0.31 - 0.5 |
| 0.51 - 0.75 |
| 0.76 - 0.90 |
| 0.91 - 1.00 |
| 1.01+ |

For the V/C ratio figures, the data is based on 2005, 2010 and 2025 A.M./P.M. peak volume data generated from ARC's travel demand model for the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP, adopted in October 2002. The demand model incorporates lane addition improvements and updates to the network as appropriate. As the life of the RTP progresses, volume and/or V/C ratio data may appear inconsistent due to (1) effect of implementation of nearby new or expanded facilities or (2) impact of socio-economic data on facility types.

What transportation improvements are under construction or planned for the Region that would affect or be affected by the proposed project? What is the status of these improvements (long or short range or other)?

2003-2005 TIP*

| ARC Number | Route | Type of Improvement | Scheduled Completion Year |
|-------------|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| FS-AR-BP035 | Flat Shoals Rd. Transit Oriented Sidewalks | Bike/Ped. | 2004 |
| FS-AR-BP059 | Londonberry Way Bike Lane and Sidewalks | Bike/Ped | 2004 |
| FS-AR-BP060 | Shannon Pkwy. Sidewalks | Bike/Ped. | 2004 |

2025 RTP Limited Update*

| ARC Number | Route | Type of Improvement | Scheduled Completion Year |
|------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| AR-246 | Commuter Rail: Atlanta – Macon | Transit-Fixed Guideway | 2025 |
| FS-004 | Oakley Industrial Blvd. widening (2 – 4 lanes) | Roadway Capacity | 2015 |
| FS-079 | Flat Shoals Rd. @ Feldwood Rd. | Roadway Operations | 2015 |

*The ARC Board adopted the 2025 RTP Limited Update and FY 2003-2005 TIP in October 2002. USDOT approved in January 2003

Impacts of the Goodson 1 Distribution Center Development: What are the recommended transportation improvements based on the traffic study done by the applicant?

According to the findings, there will be no capacity or operational deficiencies because of future year **background** and **total** traffic. The transportation consultant has made no recommendations or indicated requirements for improvements.

Will the proposed project be located in a rapid transit station area? If yes, how will the proposed project enhance or be enhanced by the rapid transit system?

The proposed project will not be located in a rapid transit station area.

Is the site served by transit? If so, describe type and level of service.

The site area is currently not serviced by transit.

Are there plans to provide or expand transit service in the vicinity of the proposed project?



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

No plans currently exist to expand transit service within the vicinity of the development.

What transportation demand management strategies does the developer propose (carpool, flex-time, transit subsidy, etc.)?

The development **passes** the Air Quality Benchmark Test.

| Ain Quality Impacts/Mitigation (based on ADC | Type Yes below if | | |
|--|----------------------|---------|-------|
| Air Quanty Impacts/Mitigation (based on AKC | taking the credit or | | |
| strategies) | blank if not | Credits | Total |
| | Yes | | |
| | No | | |
| Density Target levels | | | |
| Where Retail/Office is dominant, FAR .68 | | 4% | 0% |
| Where Retail/Office is dominant, FAR >.8 | | 6% | 0% |
| Where Residential is dominant, 10-12 units/ac | | 4% | 0% |
| Where Residential is dominant, >15 units/ac | | 6% | 0% |
| | | | |
| Mixed Use Targets (w/sidewalks) | | | |
| Where Office is dominant, 10% Residential or 10% Retail | | 4% | 0% |
| Where Office is dominant, 10% Residential and 10% | | | |
| Retail | | 9% | 0% |
| Where Retail is dominant, 10% Residential or 10% Office | | 4% | 0% |
| Where Retail is dominant, 10% Residential and 10% | | 00/ | 00/ |
| | | 9% | 0% |
| Where Residential is dominant, 10% Retail or 10% Office | | 4% | 0% |
| Office | | 9% | 0% |
| | | 370 | 0/0 |
| Traditional Single-Use | | | |
| Industrial | | | |
| Rail-served | | 10% | 0% |
| Clean-fueled vehicles 2% per ea.10% of fleet | yes | 10% | 10% |
| Percentage of Fleet (Rounded to 10) | 50.00% | | |
| SF Detached Dwellings | | | |
| With all of the below: | | 15% | 0% |
| Has a neighborhood center or one in close proximity? | | | |
| Has Bike and Pedestrian Facilities that include? | | | |
| connections between units in the site? | | | |
| Connections to retail center and adjoining uses with the project | | | |
| limits? | | | |
| | | ╡───┤ | |
| | | | |
| Proximity to Public Transportation | | | |
| w/in 1/4 mile of Bus Stop (CCT, MARTA, Other) | | 3% | 0% |
| w/in 1/2 mile of MARTA Rail Station | | 5% | 0% |
| | | | |



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

| Transportation Service Enhancements (choose one) | | | |
|--|-----|----|-----|
| Shuttle service to employment ctr/transit facility | | 3% | 0% |
| TMA or Parking Management Program | yes | 3% | 3% |
| PMP= reserved spaces for carpool vehicles, and monthly | | | |
| discount voucher raffles | | | |
| TMA that includes shuttle service | | 5% | 0% |
| TMA and Parking Management/supply restrictions | | | |
| Program | | 5% | 0% |
| | | | |
| Bicycle or Pedestrian facilities within the site (choose | | | |
| one) | | | |
| Bike/ped networks connecting uses w/in the site | yes | 2% | 2% |
| Bike/ped networks connecting to land uses adjoining the | | | |
| site | | 2% | 0% |
| Bike/ped networks connecting to land uses within and | | | |
| adjoining the site | | 4% | 0% |
| Bike/ped networks that meet Mixed Use or Density target | | 4% | 0% |
| Bike/ped networks that meet Mixed Use or Density target | | | |
| and connect to adjoining uses | | 5% | 0% |
| | | | |
| Total Calculated ARC Air Quality Credits | | | 15% |

What are the conclusions of the ARC Transportation review? Is the transportation system (existing and planned) capable of accommodating these trips?

The location of this distribution center will help to promote easy goods movement and accessibility. It will be located within reasonable proximity to the Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport and the CSX Intermodal Facility, located in Fairburn. Close proximity to the I-85 South is also beneficial in that helps alleviate truck traffic from local streets. As demonstrated by the traffic impact analysis, resulting traffic from this development is not enough to warrant any recommended improvements. However, GDOT, Union City, Shannon Mall, and the South Fulton Community Improvement District are currently developing and interchange justification report for I-85 at State Route 138 (Jonesboro Road). The developer should work with these organizations regarding long-term infrastructure improvements in the area.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Wastewater and Sewage

Wastewater is estimated at 0.015 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

Which facility will treat wastewater from the project?

Fulton County Camp Creek Facility.



What is the current permitted capacity and average annual flow to this facility?

The capacity of the Camp Creek plant is listed below:

| PERMITTED CAPACITY MMF, MGD 1 | DESIGN CAPACITY MMF, MGD | 2001MMF, MGD | 2008 MMF, MGD | 2008 CAPACITY AVAILABLE +/-, MGD | PLANNED EXPANSION | REMARKS |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| 13 | 13 | 13 | 17 | -4 | Expansion to 24MGD by 2005 | Step permit (13/19/24) approved by EPD. |

MMF: Maximum Monthly Flow. Mgd: million of gallons per day.

1 Source: Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District SHORT-TERM WASTEWATER CAPACITY PLAN Final Report

What other major developments the plant serving this project will serve?

ARC has reviewed a number of major developments, as described before in this review report that would add wastewater flow to this plant.

<u>INFRASTRUCTURE</u> Water Supply and Treatment

How much water will the proposed project demand?

Water demand also is estimated at 0.0175 MGD based on information submitted for the review.

How will the proposed project's demand for water impact the water supply or treatment facilities of the jurisdiction providing the service?

Information submitted with the review suggests that there is sufficient water supply capacity available for the proposed project.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Solid Waste

How much solid waste will be generated by the project? Where will this waste be disposed?

Information submitted with the review 1,500 tons of solid waste per year.

Other than adding to a serious regional solid waste disposal problem, will the project create any unusual waste handling or disposal problems?

No.

Are there any provisions for recycling this project's solid waste?

None stated.



INFRASTRUCTURE

Other facilities

According to information gained in the review process, will there be any unusual intergovernmental impacts on:

- Levels of governmental services?
- Administrative facilities?
- · Schools?
- Libraries or cultural facilities?
- Fire, police, or EMS?
- Other government facilities?
- Other community services/resources (day care, health care, low income, non-English speaking, elderly, etc.)?

No.

HOUSING

Will the proposed project create a demand for additional housing?

Yes. Minimal.

Will the proposed project provide housing opportunities close to existing employment centers?

No, residential is not proposed with this project.

Is there housing accessible to the project in all price ranges demanded?

The site proposed for the development is located in Census Tract 105.13 This tract had a 26 percent increase in number of housing units from 2000 to 2003 according to ARC's Population and Housing Report. The report shows that 63 percent of the housing units are single-family; compared to 69 percent for the region. This indicates that the immediate area has a more diverse housing stock by type than the region as a whole.

Is it likely or unlikely that potential employees of the proposed project will be able to find affordable* housing?

Likely given the diversity of housing stock in the area.



| Preliminary Report: | July 21, 2004 | DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT | Project: | Goodson 1 Dist. Center |
|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Final Report Due: | August 20, 2004 | <u>Review Report</u> | Comments Due By: | August 4, 2004 |

* Defined as 30 percent of the income of a family making 80 percent of the median income of the Region – FY 2000 median income of \$51,649 for family of 4 in Georgia.

Your DRI ID NUMBER for this submission is: 595 Use this number when filling out a DRI REVIEW REQUEST. Submitted on: 5/27/2004 9:15:56 AM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Fulton County Initial DRI Information (Form1b)

This form is intended for use by local governments within the Metropolitan Region Tier that are also within the jurisdiction of the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA). The form is to be completed by the city or county government for submission to your Regional Development Center (RDC), GRTA and DCA. This form provides basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Local governments should refer to both the Rules for the DRI Process 110-12-3 and the DRI Tiers and Thresholds established by DCA.

Local Government Information

| Submitting Local Government: | Union City |
|--|---|
| *Individual completing form and Mailing Address: | Ann Lippmann, AICP Director of Planning & Economic Development 5047 Union Street Union City, GA 30291 |
| Telephone: | 770-969-9266 |
| Fax: | 770-969-8795 |
| E-mail (only one) : | alippman@unioncityga.org |

*Note: The local government representative completing this form is responsible for the accuracy of the information contained herein. If a project is to be located in more than one jurisdiction and, in total, the project meets or exceeds a DRI threshold, the local government in which the largest portion of the project is to be located is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.

Proposed Project Information

| Name of Proposed Project: | le of Proposed Project: Goodson Distribution Center | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| Development Type | Description of Project | Thresholds | |
| Wholesale & Distribution | 757200 sf cross-dock distribution center w/car and trailer parking | View Thresholds | |
| Developer / Applicant and Mailing Address: | Goodson LLC c/o Panattoni Development Co. 3500 Le GA 30326 Attn: Rose Leypoldt | nox Road NE Suite 501 Atlanta, | |
| Telephone: | 404-921-2003 | | |
| Fax: | 404-921-2010 | | |
| Email: | rleypoldt@panattoni.com | | |
| Name of property owner(s) if different from developer/applicant: | | | |
| Provide Land-Lot-District Number: | LL 55 & 56, 9F District | | |
| What are the principal streets or roads providing vehicular access to the site? | Shannon Parkway South | | |
| Provide name of nearest street(s) or intersection: | Shannon Parkway South and SR 138 (Jonesboro Road | d) | |
| Provide geographic coordinates (latitude/ longitude) of the center of the proposed project (optional): | / | | |
| If available, provide a link to a website providing a general location map of the proposed project (optional). (http://www.mapquest.com or http://www. mapblast.com are helpful sites to use.): | http://www.mapblast.com/(arzfk23epdu5p1u11zr0vav4 L=USA&C=33.56933%2c-84.54142&A=7.16667&P= 3 +Jonesboro+Rd%2c+Union+City%2c+GA+30291 L1 |)/map.aspx? 3.56933%2c-84.54142 1 4700 | |

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|---|--|
| Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? | Y |
| If yes, how close is the boundary of the nearest other local government? | Unincorporated Fulton County - south of I-85 and directly west of the subject property |
| If no, provide the following information: | |
| In what additional jurisdictions is the project located? | |
| In which jurisdiction is the majority of the | Name: (NOTE: This local government is responsible for initiating the DRI review process.) |
| project located? (give percent of project) | Percent of Project: |
| Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? | N |
| If yes, provide the following information | Name: |
| | Project ID: |
| | App #: |
| The initial action being requested of the local government by the applicant is: | Other Pre Development feasibility |
| What is the name of the water supplier for this site? | Union City |
| What is the name of the wastewater treatment supplier for this site? | Union City |
| Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? | Ν |
| If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent? | |
| Estimated Completion Dates: | This project/phase: 2007 (if not sooner) Overall project: 2007 (if not sooner) |

Local Government Comprehensive Plan

| Is the development consistent with the local government's comprehensive plan, including the Future Land Use Map? | Y |
|--|---|
| If no, does the local government intend to amend the plan/map to account for this development? | |
| If amendments are needed, when will the plan/map be amended? | |

Service Delivery Strategy Is all local service provision consistent with the countywide Service Delivery Strategy? Y If no, when will required amendments to the countywide Service Delivery Strategy be complete? Y

Land Transportation ImprovementsAre land transportation or access improvements planned or needed to support the proposed project?NIf yes, how have these improvements been identified:Included in local government Comprehensive Plan or Short Term Work Program?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Term Work Program?Included in other local government plans (e.g. SPLOST/LOST Projects, etc.)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Term?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Projects, etc.)?Included in an official Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Projects, etc.)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Developer/Applicant has identified needed improvements?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Other (Please Describe):Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Other (Please Describe):Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?Image: Comprehensive Plan or Short Plan (TIP)?

(MGD)?

Submitted on: 7/15/2004 9:46:37 AM

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT DRI Review Initiation Request (Form2a)

| Local Government Information | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Submitting Local Government: | Union City | | |
| Individual completing form: | Ann Lippmann | | |
| Telephone: | 770-969-9266 | | |
| Fax: | 770-306-6861 | | |
| Email (only one): | alippmann@unioncityga.org | | |

| Proposed Project Information | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| Name of Proposed Project: | Goodson Distribution Center | |
| DRI ID Number: | 595 | |
| Developer/Applicant: | Panattoni Development Company LLC | |
| Telephone: | 404-921-2003 | |
| Fax: | 404-921-2010 | |
| Email(s): | rleypoldt@panattoni.com | |

DRI Review Process

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?

If no, the official review process can not start until this additional information is provided.

Economic Impacts

| Estimated Value at Build-Out: | \$19,940,970 |
|---|--------------|
| Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: | \$60,000 + |
| Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project? | Y |
| If the development will displace any existing uses please describe (using number of units, square feet, etc.): | |

Community Facilities Impacts

Water Supply

| Name of water supply provider for this site: | City of Union City | | |
|--|--------------------|--|--|
| What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? | 0.015 | | |
| Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? | Y | | |
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing water supply capacity? | | | |
| If there are plans to expand the existing water supply capacity, briefly describe below: | | | |
| If water line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line (in miles) will be required? | | | |
| Wastewater Disposal | | | |
| Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: | City of Union City | | |
| What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day | 0.015 | | |

http://www.georgiaplanning.com/planners/dri/view_form2.asp?id=595 (1 of 2)7/20/2004 10:59:40 AM

DRI Record

| Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed projection | ect? | Y | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--------|--|
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity | here any current plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity? | | | |
| If there are plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity, briefly describe below: | | | | |
| If sewer line extension is required to serve this project, how much additional line | (in miles) will be required? | | | |
| Land Transportatio | n | | | |
| How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed developm only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) | nent, in peak hour vehicle trips per | r day? (If | 1,568 | |
| Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or serve this project? | access improvements will be nee | eded to | Y | |
| If yes, has a copy of the study been provided to the local government? | | | Y | |
| If transportation improvements are needed to serve this project, please describe Refer to Traffic Study submitted. | below: | | | |
| Solid Waste Disposal | | | | |
| How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? | | 1, | 200 | |
| Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? | | Y | | |
| If no, are there any current plans to expand existing landfill capacity? | | | | |
| If there are plans to expand existing landfill capacity, briefly describe below: | | | | |
| Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? If yes, please exp | lain below: | N | | |
| Stormwater Managen | nent | | | |
| Vhat percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? | | | | |
| Is the site located in a water supply watershed? | Ν | | | |
| If yes, list the watershed(s) name(s) below: | | | | |
| Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds impacts on stormwater management: Buffers to remain undisturbed at creek; 2 detention ponds shall be provided; bes regular inspecting of silt fencing to occur through out construction. | , pervious parking areas) to mitiga at management practices; turbitity | ate the project | und | |
| Environmental Qual | ity | | | |
| Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following: | | | | |
| 1. Water supply watersheds? | | | N | |
| 2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? | | | N | |
| 3. Wetlands? | | | N | |
| 4. Protected mountains? | | | N | |
| 5. Protected river corridors? | | | N | |
| If you answered yes to any question 1-5 above, describe how the identified reso | urce(s) may be affected below: | | | |
| Has the local government implemented environmental regulations consistent wit for Environmental Planning Criteria? | h the Department of Natural Reso | urces' Rules | Y Y | |
| Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following: | | | | |
| 1. Floodplains? | | | Y | |
| 2. Historic resources? | | | N | |
| 3. Other environmentally sensitive resources? | | | Y | |
| If you answered yes to any question 1-3 above, describe how the identified reso Disturbance within the floodplain as allowed by Union City shall be minimal as point on site. | urce(s) may be affected below: ossible. 25 foot creek buffer shall | be strictly en | forced | |

Л

