



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: March 13, 2017

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1702201

TO: Mayor Vince Williams, City of Union City
ATTN TO: Maurice Ungaro, City Planner
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director, ARC
RE: Development of Regional Impact Review

Digital signature
Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed a regional review of the following Development of Regional Impact (DRI). ARC reviewed the DRI with regard to its relationship to regional plans, goals and policies – and impacts it may have on the activities, plans, goals and policies of other local jurisdictions as well as state, federal and other agencies. This preliminary report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the local government.

Name of Proposal: BOC Site (DRI #2656)

Submitting Local Government: City of Union City

Review Type: Development of Regional Impact (DRI)

Date Opened: February 20, 2017

Date Closed: March 13, 2017

Description

This DRI is located in the City of Union City, southeast of the Flat Shoals Road at Buffington Road intersection, bordered by Flat Shoals Road to the north and Buffington Road to the west. The project consists of 1,532,500 square feet of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in two buildings, on approximately 98 acres. Site access is proposed via four driveways: two full-movement onto Buffington Road, and one left in/right in/right out and one right in/right out on Flat Shoals Road. The DRI review trigger for this project is a rezoning application filed with the City of Union City. The projected build-out for the development is 2018.

Comments

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is located in the Developing Suburbs Area of the region. Developing Suburbs are areas that have developed from roughly 1995 to today and are projected to remain suburbs through 2040. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. Recommendations for Developing Suburbs are listed at the bottom of this comment section.

This DRI appears to manifest some aspects of regional policy in that it connects to the existing road network, with site access provided via existing driveways onto multiple adjacent roadways. The project could further support regional policy if it incorporated other aspects of the below, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) in parking areas and site driveways, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.

In addition, ARC encourages the applicant team to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas on site. This framework can offer the potential for safe internal site circulation for employees on foot or by another alternative mode. External connectivity for pedestrians is provided by existing sidewalks on the site's frontages.

-CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE-

The intensity of this DRI generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in Developing Suburbs. In terms of land use, this DRI is located within a larger area that is experiencing demand for the development of light industrial, warehouse/distribution and logistics facilities. The DRI is similar to nearby clusters of existing warehouse/distribution development, including the facility across Buffington Road to the west and facilities farther to the southwest, along I-85. However, much of the area surrounding this site, especially to the east and south, is predominated by existing residential uses. Some of these uses are outside the City of Union City in adjacent unincorporated Fulton County, which is transitioning to the newly created City of South Fulton. Union City's leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should therefore collaborate to balance the goal of new development with the need for sensitivity to neighboring local governments, land uses and natural resources, to the greatest extent possible. Buffering will be an important consideration as a result.

Additional ARC staff comments are attached to this report, including comments regarding the intermittent and ephemeral streams on the property and related Union City stream buffer requirements for the City and applicant to be aware of.

Comments received from parties outside ARC are also attached to this report.

Further to the above, regional policy recommendations for Developing Suburbs include:

- New development should connect to the existing road network and adjacent developments and use of cul-de-sacs or other means resulting in disconnected subdivisions should be discouraged
- Maximize the usefulness of existing recreational facilities in addition to providing new recreational opportunities
- Eliminate vacant or under-utilized parking areas through mechanisms such as out-parceling or conversion to community open space
- Use rain gardens, vegetated swales or other enhanced water filtration design to enhance the quality of stormwater run-off
- Identify other opportunities to foster a sense of community by developing town centers, village centers or other places of centralized location

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
ARC RESEARCH ANALYTICS DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
SOUTH FULTON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
CLAYTON COUNTY

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
CITY OF COLLEGE PARK
FAYETTE COUNTY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY
CITY OF FAIRBURN
FULTON COUNTY

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (404) 463-5581 or asmith@atlantaregional.com. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://www.atlantaregional.com/land-use/planreviews>.

BOC SITE DRI
City of Union City
Natural Resources Division Review Comments
February 14, 2017

Stream Buffers and Watershed Protection

The proposed project is in the Flint River Water Supply Watershed, a water supply source for Fayette and Clayton Counties. 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 in such watersheds 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 water supply watershed criteria apply.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no perennial streams on the project property, but a tributary to Morning Creek is shown immediately south of the proposed project property. The submitted site plan shows an intermittent and an ephemeral stream with wetlands between the proposed Buildings A and B as well as an intermittent stream and wetlands south of the detention pond on the southern end of the property. No buffers are shown along these streams. There is a 75-foot buffer shown along the southwestern property lines, however, although wetlands and floodplain are identified, no stream is clearly identified. The streams on the property are subject to requirements of the Union City Stream Buffer Ordinance. All waters of the state, including the streams and wetlands identified on the site plan, are subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation buffer. Any proposed activity within the City's stream buffers will be subject to the requirements of the Union City Stream Buffer Ordinance and may require variances. Activities within the 25-foot State Sediment and Erosion Control buffer are subject to state requirements and may also require a variance. Any unmapped state waters on the property are also subject to the requirements of the State 25-foot Erosion and Sedimentation buffer.

Stormwater/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, as with all development, water quality will be impacted due to polluted stormwater runoff. The amount of pollutants that will be produced after construction of the proposed development are dependent on the type and intensity of the use and the impervious coverage, which will affect the design of stormwater controls for the project.

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 (www.georgiastormwater.com) and meet the stormwater management quantity and quality criteria outlined in the Manual. Where possible, the project should utilize the stormwater better site design concepts included in the Manual.

Development of Regional Impact Assessment of Consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number 2656
DRI Title BOC Site (formerly MAC V)
County Fulton County
City (if applicable) Union City
Address / Location Southeast Corner of Flat Shoals Road and Buffington Road, East of I 85
Review Process ☒ EXPEDITED
☐ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Marquitrice Mangham
Copied David Haynes, Daniel Studdard
Date February 15, 2017

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by Kimley Horn
Date February 1, 2017

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS

01. Did the traffic analysis incorporate all projects contained in the current version of the fiscally constrained RTP which are within the study area or along major transportation corridors connecting the study area with adjacent jurisdictions?

☒ YES (*provide date of RTP project list used below and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified*)

Appendix F of the traffic study lists programmed and planned projects in the or near the study area. The list includes projects contained in the current Atlanta Region's transportation plan. No transportation improvement projects (TIP projects) are identified in the study area.

☐ NO (*provide comments below*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

REGIONAL NETWORKS

02. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Thoroughfares?

A Regional Thoroughfare is a major transportation corridor that serves multiple ways of traveling, including walking, bicycling, driving, and riding transit. It connects people and goods to important places in metropolitan Atlanta. A Regional Thoroughfare's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Thoroughfares serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Thoroughfare, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☒ NO

☐ YES (*identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points*)

The site proposes the use of two existing access points on Flat Shoals Road and two existing access points from Buffington Road. Neither Flat Shoals Road nor Buffington Road are designated Regional Thoroughfares.

03. Will the development site be directly served by any roadways identified as Regional Truck Routes?

A Regional Truck Route is a freeway, state route or other roadway which serves as a critical link for the movement of goods to, from and within the Region by connecting airports, intermodal/multimodal facilities, distribution and warehousing centers and manufacturing clusters with the rest of the state and nation. These facilities often serve a key mobility and access function for other users as well, including drivers, bicyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A Regional Truck Route's operations should be managed through application of special traffic control strategies and suitable land development guidelines in order to maintain travel efficiency, reliability, and safety for all users. In light of the special function that Regional Truck Routes serve in supporting cross-regional and interjurisdictional mobility and access, the network receives priority consideration for infrastructure investment in the Metro Atlanta region. Any access points between the development and a Regional Truck Route, combined with the development's on-site circulation patterns, must be designed with the goal of preserving the highest possible level of capacity and safety for all users of the roadway.

☒ NO

☐ YES (*identify the roadways and existing/proposed access points*)

The site proposes the use of two existing access points on Flat Shoals Road and two existing access points from Buffington Road. Neither Flat Shoals Road nor Buffington Road are designated Regional Truck Routes.

04. If the development site is within one mile of an existing rail service, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest station more than one mile away)

☐ RAIL SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator / Rail Line [Click here to enter name of operator and rail line](#)

Nearest Station [Click here to enter name of station.](#)

Distance* ☐ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile
☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity
☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
☐ Route follows high volume and/or high speed streets
☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Transit Connectivity ☐ Fixed route transit agency bus service available to rail station
☐ Private shuttle or circulator available to rail station
☐ No services available to rail station
☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

05. If there is currently no rail transit service within one mile of the development site, is nearby rail service planned in the fiscally constrained RTP?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and expansion plans are being considered in the general vicinity of the development site, the agency should give consideration to how the site can be best served during the evaluation of alignments and station locations. Proactive negotiations with the development team and local government(s) are encouraged to determine whether right-of-way within the site should be identified and protected for potential future service. If direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) are encouraged to ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and the future rail line. These improvements should be considered fundamental components of the overall transit expansion project, with improvements completed concurrent with or prior to the transit service being brought online.

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (rail service already exists)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (accessing the site by transit is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
- ☐ NO (no plans exist to provide rail service in the general vicinity)
- ☒ YES (provide additional information on the timeframe of the expansion project below)
 - ☐ CST planned within TIP period
 - ☐ CST planned within first portion of long range period
 - ☒ CST planned near end of plan horizon

Atlanta Region Plan Long Range Transit Vision depicts expansion of rail to Union City at the end of the network horizon. No specific details regarding exact location are available.

06. If the development site is within one mile of fixed route bus services (including any privately operated shuttles or circulators open to the general public), provide information on walking and bicycling accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce congestion. If a transit service is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and the nearest station is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the connection a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☐ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest bus, shuttle or circulator stop more than one mile away)

☒ SERVICE WITHIN ONE MILE (provide additional information below)

Operator(s)

Marta

Bus Route(s)

181, 189, 453

Distance*

☒ Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)

☐ 0.10 to 0.50 mile

☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access*

☒ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Pedestrian Facilities currently exist along Flat shoals and Buffington Road adjacent to the project site.

Bicycling Access*

☐ Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity

☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity

☒ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets

☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Dedicated bike facilities are not currently available.

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

07. Does a transit agency which provides rail and/or fixed route bus service operate anywhere within the jurisdiction in which the development site is located?

Access between major developments and transit services provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If a transit agency operates within the jurisdiction and a comprehensive operations plan update is undertaken, the agency should give consideration to serving the site during the evaluation of future routes, bus stops and transfer facilities. If the nature of the development is amenable to access by transit, walking or bicycling, but direct service to the site is not feasible or cost effective, the transit agency and local government(s) should ensure good walking and bicycling access accessibility is provided between the development and any routes within a one mile radius. The applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make these connections a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☐ NO

☒ YES

Marta currently provides fixed route bus service in Union City. Fixed route service is accessible at this site along Flat Shoals Road.

08. If the development site is within one mile of an existing multi-use path or trail, provide information on accessibility conditions.

Access between major developments and walking/bicycling facilities provide options for people who cannot or prefer not to drive, expand economic opportunities by better connecting people and jobs, and can help reduce traffic congestion. If connectivity with a regionally significant path or trail is available nearby, but walking or bicycling between the development site and those facilities is a challenge, the applicable local government(s) is encouraged to make the route a funding priority for future walking and bicycling infrastructure improvements.

☒ NOT APPLICABLE (nearest path or trail more than one mile away)

☐ YES (provide additional information below)

Name of facility [Click here to provide name of facility.](#)

Distance ☐ Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less)
☐ 0.15 to 0.50 mile
☐ 0.50 to 1.00 mile

Walking Access* ☐ Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity
☐ Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

Bicycling Access* ☐ Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity
☐ Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity
☐ Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets
☐ Not applicable (accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed)

Staff was unable to identify any multi use paths or trail in close proximity to the site.

* Following the most direct feasible walking or bicycling route to the nearest point on the development site

OTHER TRANSPORTATION DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

09. Does the site plan provide for the construction of publicly accessible roadway connections with adjacent parcels?

The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent roadway network can save time and reduce congestion. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☒ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel roadway connections)

The subject site is currently zoned for office uses, and is requesting a rezoning for industrial uses. Adjacent properties currently consist of residential uses and identified as Suburban Neighborhood by Union City Future Development Map which is defined as "Connectivity is moderate for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycle users. Future development should emphasize connectivity and housing diversity. It should also focus on creating a pedestrian-friendly environment by adding sidewalks and creating other pedestrian friendly multi-use trail/bike routes. This complete transportation system should link residential areas to neighboring communities and major destinations such as libraries, neighborhood centers, health facilities, commercial clusters, parks, schools, etc." No future internal connectivity to adjacent land uses is being proposed.

10. Does the site plan enable pedestrians and bicyclists to move between destinations within the development site safely and conveniently?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move within the site safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Development site plans should incorporate well designed and direct sidewalk connections between all key destinations. To the extent practical, bicycle lanes or multiuse paths are encouraged for large acreage sites and where high volumes of bicyclists and pedestrians are possible.

- ☐ YES (sidewalks provided on all key walking routes and both sides of roads whenever practical and bicyclists should have no major issues navigating the street network)
- ☒ PARTIAL (some walking and bicycling facilities are provided, but connections are not comprehensive and/or direct)
- ☐ NO (walking and bicycling facilities within the site are limited or nonexistent)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development does not lend itself to internal walking and bicycling trips)

The site plan depicts four entrance points shared by all modes. No separate travel lanes are depicted for bicycles or pedestrians. Travel lanes internal to the site appear to separate vehicle traffic from truck traffic. Designate parking areas appear to separate trucks from vehicles. Vehicle parking is located closer to the building and sidewalks along the building are provided. According to the traffic analysis, no pedestrian or bike facilities are proposed.

11. Does the site plan provide the ability to construct publicly accessible bicycling and walking connections with adjacent parcels which may be redeveloped in the future?

The ability for walkers and bicyclists to move between developments safely and conveniently reduces reliance on vehicular trips, which has congestion reduction and health benefits. Such opportunities should be considered and proactively incorporated into development site plans whenever possible.

- ☐ YES (connections to adjacent parcels are planned as part of the development)
- ☐ YES (stub outs will make future connections possible when adjacent parcels redevelop)
- ☐ NO (the development site plan does not enable walking or bicycling to/from adjacent parcels)
- ☒ NO (the site plan precludes future connections with adjacent parcels when they redevelop)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (adjacent parcels are not likely to develop or redevelop in the near future)
- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE (the nature of the development or adjacent parcels does not lend itself to interparcel walking and bicycling trips)

The subject site is currently zoned for office uses, and is requesting a rezoning for industrial uses. Adjacent properties currently consist of residential uses and identified as Suburban Neighborhood by Union City Future Development Map which is defined as "Connectivity is moderate for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycle users. Future development should emphasize connectivity and housing diversity. It should also focus on creating a pedestrian-friendly environment by adding sidewalks and creating other pedestrian friendly multi-use trail/bike routes. This complete transportation system should link residential areas to neighboring communities and major destinations such as libraries, neighborhood centers, health facilities, commercial clusters, parks, schools, etc." No future internal connectivity to adjacent land uses is being proposed. According to the traffic analysis, no pedestrian or bike facilities are proposed.

12. Does the site plan effectively manage truck movements and separate them, to the extent possible, from the flow of pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists both within the site and on the surrounding road network?

The ability for delivery and service vehicles to efficiently enter and exit major developments is often key to their economic success. So is the ability of visitors and customers being able to move around safely and pleasantly within the site. To the extent practical, truck movements should be segregated by minimizing the number of conflict points with publicly accessible internal roadways, sidewalks, paths and other facilities.

- ☐ YES (truck routes to serve destinations within the site are clearly delineated, provide ample space for queuing and turning around, and are separated from other users to the extent practical)
- ☐ PARTIAL (while one or more truck routes are also used by motorists and/or interface with primary walking and bicycling routes, the site plan mitigates the potential for conflict adequately)
- ☒ NO (one or more truck routes serving the site conflict directly with routes likely to be used heavily by pedestrians, bicyclists and/or motorists)

- ☐ NOT APPLICABLE *(the nature of the development will not generate a wide variety of users and/or very low truck volumes, so the potential for conflict is negligible)*

The site plan depicts four entrance points shared by all modes. No separate travel lanes are depicted for bicycles or pedestrians. Travel lanes internal to the site appear to separate vehicle traffic from truck traffic. Designate parking areas appear to separate trucks from vehicles. Vehicle parking is located closer to the building and sidewalks along the building are provided. According to the traffic analysis, no pedestrian or bike facilities are proposed.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13. Do the transportation network recommendations outlined in the traffic study appear to be feasible from a constructability standpoint?**

- ☐ UNKNOWN *(additional study is necessary)*
- ☒ YES *(based on information made available through the review process; does not represent a thorough engineering / financial analysis)*
- ☐ NO *(see comments below)*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

- 14. Is ARC aware of any issues with the development proposal which may result in it being opposed by one or more local governments, agencies or stakeholder groups?**

- ☒ NO *(based on information shared with ARC staff prior to or during the review process; does not reflect the outcome of an extensive stakeholder engagement process)*
- ☐ YES *(see comments below)*

[Click here to enter text.](#)

- 15. ARC offers the following additional comments for consideration by the development team and/or the applicable local government(s):**

In an effort to reduce traffic congestions and provide safe facilities for alternative modes of transportation, it is the policy of ARC to encourage the incorporation of bike and pedestrian facilities internal to the site whenever possible. ARC also encourages the use of future stub outs for roadway connectivity to adjacent parcels, whenever feasible.

Andrew Smith

From: Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 8:59 AM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; lorn.whittaker@atlanta-airport.com
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: BOC Site (DRI #2656)
Attachments: Preliminary Report - BOC Site .pdf

Andrew,

The proposed project consisting of a 1,532,500 square feet of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in two buildings in Union City, on approximately 98 acres, is located within 5 miles of Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport, but is located outside of any of FAA surfaces, and compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, if the proposed project's vertical construction, or equipment exceeds 200ft above ground level, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. That may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, no later than 90 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impact of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

I have copied Lorn Whittaker with Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport on this email.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development.

Alan Hood | Airport Safety Data Program Manager
Georgia Department of Transportation - Aviation Programs
600 West Peachtree Street, N.W. | 2nd Floor | Atlanta, Georgia 30308
T: 404-631-1343 | F: 404-631-1935 | M: 404-660-3394 | E: achood@dot.ga.gov

View our website at <http://www.dot.ga.gov/IS/AirportAid>

From: Andrew Smith [mailto:ASmith@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2017 6:42 PM
To: 'jud.turner@gaepd.org'; VanDyke, Cindy; Fowler, Matthew; Comer, Carol; Hood, Alan C.; Zahul, Kathy; Weiss, Megan J; DeNard, Paul; Regis, Edlin; Woods, Chris N.; Boone, Eric; Humphrey, James; Johnson, Lankston; 'BDennard@grta.org'; Parker Martin; 'DRI@grta.org'; Annie Gillespie; 'Jon West'; gfloyd@itsmarta.com; jgray@southfultoncid.com; Lauren Blaszyk; Jahnee Prince; 'Tarika Peeks'; 'Brendetta Walker'; Patrick Ejike (patrick.ejike@co.clayton.ga.us); brecca.johnson@claytoncountyga.gov; Kimberly Smith; pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov; pmallon@fayettecountyga.gov; Randy Beck (Randy.Beck@fultoncountyga.gov); Michelle.Macauley@fultoncountyga.gov; Ellington, Morgan; mungaro@unioncityga.org; cevans@unioncityga.org; BMcCabe@majesticrealty.com; SBrown@majesticrealty.com; Woody Galloway; Jordan Edwards; John.Walker@kimley-horn.com; elizabeth.johnson@kimley-horn.com; jinwoo.seo@kimley-horn.com
Cc: Community Development; Mike Alexander; David Haynes; Haley Berry; Marquitrice Mangham; Daniel Studdard; Jim Santo; Jim Skinner
Subject: ARC DRI Review Notification: BOC Site (DRI #2656)

Development of Regional Impact (DRI) – Request for Comments

This e-mail serves as notice that the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has begun a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review for **BOC Site (DRI #2656)**.

This DRI is located in the City of Union City, southeast of the Flat Shoals Road at Buffington Road intersection, bordered by Flat Shoals Road to the north and Buffington Road to the west. The project consists of 1,532,500 square feet of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in two buildings, on approximately 98 acres. Site access is proposed via four driveways: two full-movement onto Buffington Road, and one left in/right in/right out and one right in/right out on Flat Shoals Road. The DRI review trigger for this project is a rezoning application filed with the City of Union City. The projected build-out for the development is 2018.

As a representative of a nearby local government or potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached Preliminary Report and provide any comments to ARC on or before **March 7, 2017**.

You may also view the Preliminary Report and other project information by visiting the [ARC Plan Reviews webpage](#) and searching for "BOC Site" in the field at the bottom of the page. The report and other information will be permanently available online as of tomorrow, February 21.

Date opened: February 20, 2017

Deadline for comments: March 7, 2017

Close by: March 13, 2017

For more information regarding the DRI process or other DRIs reviewed by ARC, please visit the [ARC DRI webpage](#).

Regards,

Andrew Smith

Senior Planner, Community Development Division

Atlanta Regional Commission
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2538

P | 404.463.5581

F | 404.463.3254

asmith@atlantaregional.com

atlantaregional.com

Pedestrian deaths are surging in Georgia - 206 people were killed while walking in 2015. With pedestrian deaths up 37% in two years, Georgia DOT's SEE & BE SEEN campaign, in partnership with PEDS, aims to make it safer to walk in Georgia. Safety is a shared responsibility. Walkers and drivers: Pay attention. Walkers: make sure you can **SEE & BE SEEN**. Drivers: Slow down (speed kills). Visit www.dot.ga.gov/DS/SafetyOperation/SBS. #ArriveAliveGA

Andrew Smith

From: Weiss, Megan J <MWeiss@dot.ga.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2017 7:58 AM
To: Andrew Smith
Cc: Mertz, Kaycee; Fowler, Matthew
Subject: RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: BOC Site (DRI #2656)

Andrew.

GDOT Planning has reviewed the BOC Site DRI Preliminary report and show no additional GDOT projects, other than those already mentioned in the report. For further information that may be needed concerning this review, please contact Megan Weiss at 404-631-1779 or mweiss@dot.ga.gov.

Thanks.

Megan Weiss, AICP
Transportation Planner II
Georgia Department of Transportation
Office of Planning-5th Floor
P:404-631-1779 E:mweiss@dot.ga.gov

From: Andrew Smith [mailto:ASmith@atlantaregional.com]
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2017 6:42 PM
To: 'jud.turner@gaepd.org'; VanDyke, Cindy; Fowler, Matthew; Comer, Carol; Hood, Alan C.; Zahul, Kathy; Weiss, Megan J; DeNard, Paul; Regis, Edlin; Woods, Chris N.; Boone, Eric; Humphrey, James; Johnson, Lankston; 'BDennard@grta.org'; Parker Martin; 'DRI@grta.org'; Annie Gillespie; 'Jon West'; gflloyd@itsmarta.com; jgray@southfultoncid.com; Lauren Blaszyk; Jahnee Prince; 'Tarika Peeks'; 'Brendetta Walker'; Patrick Ejike (patrick.ejike@co.clayton.ga.us); brecca.johnson@claytoncountyga.gov; Kimberly Smith; pfrisina@fayettecountyga.gov; pmallon@fayettecountyga.gov; Randy Beck (Randy.Beck@fultoncountyga.gov); Michelle.Macauley@fultoncountyga.gov; Ellington, Morgan; mungaro@unioncityga.org; cevans@unioncityga.org; BMcCabe@majesticrealty.com; SBrown@majesticrealty.com; Woody Galloway; Jordan Edwards; John.Walker@kimley-horn.com; elizabeth.johnson@kimley-horn.com; jinwoo.seo@kimley-horn.com
Cc: Community Development; Mike Alexander; David Haynes; Haley Berry; Marquitrice Mangham; Daniel Studdard; Jim Santo; Jim Skinner
Subject: ARC DRI Review Notification: BOC Site (DRI #2656)

Development of Regional Impact (DRI) – Request for Comments

This e-mail serves as notice that the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has begun a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review for **BOC Site (DRI #2656)**.

This DRI is located in the City of Union City, southeast of the Flat Shoals Road at Buffington Road intersection, bordered by Flat Shoals Road to the north and Buffington Road to the west. The project consists of 1,532,500 square feet of high-cube warehouse/distribution space in two buildings, on approximately 98 acres. Site access is proposed via four driveways: two full-movement onto Buffington Road, and one left in/right in/right out and one right in/right out on Flat Shoals Road. The DRI review trigger for this project is a rezoning application filed with the City of Union City. The projected build-out for the development is 2018.

As a representative of a nearby local government or potentially affected party, we request that you or your staff review the attached Preliminary Report and provide any comments to ARC on or before **March 7, 2017**.

You may also view the Preliminary Report and other project information by visiting the [ARC Plan Reviews webpage](#) and searching for “BOC Site” in the field at the bottom of the page. The report and other information will be permanently available online as of tomorrow, February 21.

Date opened: February 20, 2017

Deadline for comments: March 7, 2017

Close by: March 13, 2017

For more information regarding the DRI process or other DRIs reviewed by ARC, please visit the [ARC DRI webpage](#).

Regards,

Andrew Smith

Senior Planner, Community Development Division

Atlanta Regional Commission
regional impact + local relevance

40 Courtland Street, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30303-2538

P | 404.463.5581

F | 404.463.3254

asmith@atlantaregional.com

atlantaregional.com

Pedestrian deaths are surging in Georgia - 206 people were killed while walking in 2015. With pedestrian deaths up 37% in two years, Georgia DOT's SEE & BE SEEN campaign, in partnership with PEDS, aims to make it safer to walk in Georgia. Safety is a shared responsibility. Walkers and drivers: Pay attention. Walkers: make sure you can **SEE & BE SEEN**. Drivers: Slow down (speed kills). Visit www.dot.ga.gov/DS/SafetyOperation/SBS. #ArriveAliveGA



REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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



DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT REQUEST FOR COMMENTS

Instructions: The project described below has been submitted to this Regional Commission for review as a Development of Regional Impact (DRI). A DRI is a development of sufficient scale or importance that it is likely to generate impacts beyond the jurisdiction in which the project is located, for example in adjoining cities or neighboring counties. We would like to consider your comments on this proposed development in our DRI review process. Therefore, please review the information about the project included in this packet and offer your comments in the space provided. The completed form should be returned to ARC on or before the specified return deadline.

Preliminary Findings of the RDC: **BOC Site** *See the Preliminary Report.*

Comments from affected party (attach additional sheets as needed):

** PLEASE SEE THE ATTACHED COMMENTS.*

Individual Completing Form:

ZACH MONTGOMERY, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

Local Government:

UNION CITY, GA

Department:

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Telephone: ()

(770) 515-7955

Signature:

Zach P. Montgomery

Date:

3-7-17

Please return this form to:

Andrew Smith, Atlanta Regional Commission
40 Courtland Street NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
Ph. (404) 463-5581 Fax (404) 463-3254
asmith@atlantaregional.com

Return Date: *March 7, 2017*

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION (ARC)
Regional Review Notification
Comments from affected party: The City of Union City, GA

The Body of Christ Church property located on the southeast corner of Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads.

ITEM: The requested rezoning of this 97.7 acre subject property is from O&I Office-Institutional and RM Multi-Family Residential to M1 Light Industrial. This property is currently classified as the Developing Suburbs Area on the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), and Suburban Neighborhood in the City's Comprehensive Plan, which are both in keeping with the surrounding land uses and zoning on three (3) of the four (4) sides of this property, which are zoned and/or developed as Single-Family and Multi-Family Residential, with General Commercial to the north, across Flat Shoals Rd., with the properties west of this subject property, across Buffington Rd., being zoned and/or developed as M1 Light Industrial.

Good planning practices necessitate a buffer between these highly incompatible Industrial and Residential Zoning Districts, which is why this property is currently zoned as O&I Office-Institutional and RM Multi-Family Residential. Approval of the requested zone change will cause an Industrial Zoning District to directly abut numerous properties which are currently zoned and/or developed as residential on three (3) of the four (4) sides of the subject property. ***(Generally, when two (2) incompatible zoning districts like industrial and residential directly abut each other, it tends to have a detrimental effect on the properties in the residential zoning district, where the values of these properties tend to be diminished, and the overall quality and/or marketability of future dwellings built on these properties tend to be diminished as well. This is one of the primary reasons for having different and distinct zoning districts, to prevent this scenario from occurring.)***

ITEM: The Transportation Analysis provided by the applicant does a great job in showing the specific traffic counts, before and after the proposed development, for only that one intersection at Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads, but it does not explain the real-world effects of what the proposed development would do to the area's traffic, once constructed. Nor does the analysis include the 362,000 square foot industrial warehousing/manufacturing development that is under construction just a few hundred yards north of Flat Shoals Rd. in the County, which should become operational in late 2017. Based on the zoning, potential uses, and square footage of that development, it will likely add an additional 500 to 1,000 new trips to the 2,990 new trips being generated by the subject development, into that intersection, when it becomes operational.

As a result, I offer the following traffic considerations when deliberating the approval/denial of the requested zone change of 97.7 acres to M1 Light Industrial:

#1. The Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads intersection has a slight offset on Buffington Rd. which occurs at the intersection, along with elevation deviations through the intersection, and poor sight visibility for traffic entering the intersection. During moderate to heavy traffic times, and/or during bad weather, these problems create confusion, slow traffic considerably, and cause numerous accidents annually for drivers entering the intersection from all directions. *(See accident counts discussed in #4 below)*

#2. Currently, with only moderate to heavy traffic flows, the short left turn lane of northbound Buffington Rd. backs up into the single lane of through traffic travel, creating confusion and congestion at the intersection, which slows and/or stops northbound traffic flow, and it also creates a blind spot for vehicles choosing to drive through the intersection and continue northbound on Buffington Rd. When large trucks are in the left turn lane to go west to I-85, there is also a sight visibility issue for southbound vehicles wanting to turn left onto Flat Shoals Rd.

#3. Also at the Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads intersection, with only moderate to heavy traffic flows, the short northbound left turn lane of Buffington Rd. will back up the single lane northbound traffic south of the Proctor & Gamble and the subject site's southernmost ingress/egress intersection, which blocks access onto Buffington Rd. for trucks and POVs wishing to exit these two (2) sites and go north to get to I-85.

#4. The three (3) signalized intersections located on Flat Shoals Rd. (*Buffington Rd., I-85 northbound, and I-85 Southbound intersections*) which are already congested, and which are all located within the span of one eighth of a mile, will notice a sizeable increase in the amount of congestion at each intersection, after the two (2) new industrial developments in the immediate area become operational, creating traffic gridlock issues in all directions. On the two (2) days I was at this site, 2-22-17 and 2-23-17, there was a traffic accident at one of these intersections on both days, and these were not during peak traffic times or bad weather. The number of accidents reported by the Police Chief for these three (3) intersections equals 146 for the period from 01/01/16 through 03/01/17. Any accident at any of these three (3) intersections either stops traffic completely, or at a minimum, adds excessive congestion and traffic delays flowing through this area in all directions. Adding this proposed new development, the development under construction in the County, and any future proposed developments to this mix would cause even greater problems with traffic flows in all directions, while also increasing accident counts which currently occur at these three (3) intersections.

#5. The next closest I-85 Interchange is located at Jonesboro Rd. to the southwest, and the intersections at this interchange are already experiencing heavier traffic flows and more accidents than the intersections at the Flat Shoals Rd. interchange. When traffic gets heavier at the Flat Shoals I-85 Interchange, and people attempt to find an alternate route, congestion at that Jonesboro Rd. I-85 Interchange will only worsen after the two new industrial developments become operational. Since there are no other viable, alternate ways to access or exit I-85 aside from these two (2) I-85 interchanges, the residents who live in this area east of I-85 in the hundreds of single-family homes and scores of multi-family apartment complexes, will be impacted by the two (2) industrial developments being built near the Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads intersection.

ITEM: Staff understands this has been an expedited review, which is not comprehensive in nature to include the other relevant and affected intersections, or other pending or potential developments in the immediate area. However, with the issues present at this intersection, and the future addition of 2,990 new trips being generated by the subject site, and an additional 500 to 1,000 new trips being generated by the County development which is under construction, City Staff is concerned regarding the Transportation Analysis which repeatedly states the following, *"It should be noted that it is not uncommon to have long delays for stop controlled approaches when there is heavy major street volume."*

Staff is also concerned that the Transportation Analysis does not recommend that any "off-site" improvements should be made to the Buffington and Flat Shoals Roads intersection, or simply to Buffington Rd. itself.

When deliberating the requested zone change to M1 Light Industrial, consideration should be given to the potential effects on this area when all possible properties are built out and become operational in the general area surrounding the subject site, not just the two (2) mentioned herein. That information was not considered in the Transportation Analysis, but it will have real world effects, and once built, could have irreversible impacts on this part of Union City for decades.

Comments on this proposed rezoning from the Union City Police Chief, Cassandra Jones:

See the below statistics on the roadway without all the new developments. The added traffic would be horrendous. Traffic accident information provided by Fulton County, the inquiry count for Motor Vehicle accidents are noted below. The inquiry was completed for the date range of 01/01/2016 thru 03/01/2017.

Buffington Road @ Flat Shoals Road = 38 I85 NB @ Flat Shoals Road = 43 I85 SB @ Flat Shoals Road = 65

Comments on this proposed rezoning from the Public Services Director, Lonnie Ferguson:

The Public Services Department also supports the decision to deny the rezoning request, not only based on the real-world effect that the proposed development would cause, but also other future developments located within a 1.5 mile radius. There are future developments located in the City of Union City as well as Fulton County jurisdiction that were not factored in the traffic analysis.

As a result of the findings listed herein, City Staff recommends that the rezoning request be denied.



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)

DRI #2656

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Initial DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide basic project information that will allow the RDC to determine if the project appears to meet or exceed applicable DRI thresholds. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Union City
Individual completing form: MAURICE UNGARO
Telephone: 770.515.7920
E-mail: mungaro@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: BOC SITE
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 3600 Flat Shoals Rd Union City, GA
Brief Description of Project: 1,532,500 SF of warehouse distribution facility in southeast uadrant of Flat Shoals Rd & Buffington Rd intersection.

Development Type:

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected) | <input type="radio"/> Hotels | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office | <input type="radio"/> Mixed Use | <input type="radio"/> Petroleum Storage Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Commercial | <input type="radio"/> Airports | <input type="radio"/> Water Supply Intakes/Reservoirs |
| <input type="radio"/> Wholesale & Distribution | <input type="radio"/> Attractions & Recreational Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Intermodal Terminals |
| <input type="radio"/> Hospitals and Health Care Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Post-Secondary Schools | <input type="radio"/> Truck Stops |
| <input type="radio"/> Housing | <input type="radio"/> Waste Handling Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Any other development types |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Industrial | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants | |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 1,532,500 SF

Developer: BOC Acquisition, LLC

Mailing Address: 3490 Piedmont Road, NE

Address 2: Suite 210

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30305

Telephone: 404.467.5245

Email: bmccabe@majesticcrealty.com

Is property owner different from developer/applicant? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, property owner:

Is the proposed project entirely located within your local government's jurisdiction? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, in what additional jurisdictions is the project located?

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide the following information: Project Name: Majestic Airport Center III
Project ID: 2356

The initial action being requested of the local government for this project:

- ☒ Rezoning
☐ Variance
☐ Sewer
☐ Water
☐ Permit
☐ Other

Is this project a phase or part of a larger overall project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what percent of the overall project does this project/phase represent? 50%

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: 2018
Overall project: 2018

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)



Developments of Regional Impact

[DRI Home](#)[Tier Map](#)[Apply](#)[View Submissions](#)[Login](#)

DRI #2656

DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL IMPACT Additional DRI Information

This form is to be completed by the city or county government to provide information needed by the RDC for its review of the proposed DRI. Refer to both the [Rules for the DRI Process](#) and the [DRI Tiers and Thresholds](#) for more information.

Local Government Information

Submitting Local Government: Union City
Individual completing form: MAURICE UNGARO
Telephone: 770.515.7920
Email: mungaro@unioncityga.org

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: BOC SITE
DRI ID Number: 2656
Developer/Applicant: BOC Acquisition, LLC
Telephone: 404.467.5245
Email(s): bmccabe@majesticrealty.com

Additional Information Requested

Has the RDC identified any additional information required in order to proceed with the official regional review process? (If no, proceed to Economic Impacts.)
☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has that additional information been provided to your RDC and, if applicable, GRTA?
☒ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Economic Development

Estimated Value at Build-Out: \$70,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$800,000

Is the regional work force sufficient to fill the demand created by the proposed project?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Will this development displace any existing uses?
☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe (including number of units, square feet, etc): Existing church structure, which is non-historic and vacant.

Water Supply

Name of water supply provider for this site: City of Atlanta

What is the estimated water supply demand to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.030 MGD

Is sufficient water supply capacity available to serve the proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand the existing water supply capacity:

Is a water line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Wastewater Disposal

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: Fulton County

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 0.0109 MGD

Is sufficient wastewater treatment capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing wastewater treatment capacity:

Is a sewer line extension required to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, how much additional line (in miles) will be required?

Land Transportation

How much traffic volume is expected to be generated by the proposed development, in peak hour vehicle trips per day? (If only an alternative measure of volume is available, please provide.) 2,990, per Traffic Study

Has a traffic study been performed to determine whether or not transportation or access improvements will be needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

Are transportation improvements needed to serve this project? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please describe below: Union City's Engineer is currently reviewing the submitted traffic study. Determination on traffic improvements will be made after City Engineer's review.

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 1,400 tons

Is sufficient landfill capacity available to serve this proposed project? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, describe any plans to expand existing landfill capacity:

Will any hazardous waste be generated by the development? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, please explain:

Stormwater Management

What percentage of the site is projected to be impervious surface once the proposed development has been constructed? 75%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: 75' vegetated buffers will be located on the western and eastern boundaries. Stormwater detention facilities designed for water quality, channel protection and stormwater detention are proposed.

Environmental Quality

Is the development located within, or likely to affect any of the following:

1. Water supply watersheds? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
2. Significant groundwater recharge areas? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
3. Wetlands? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No
4. Protected mountains? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
5. Protected river corridors? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
6. Floodplains? ☐ (not selected) ☒ Yes ☐ No
7. Historic resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No
8. Other environmentally sensitive resources? ☐ (not selected) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you answered yes to any question above, describe how the identified resource(s) may be affected:
Applicant states that: The wetlands on site will be impacted by obtaining a Nationwide Permit or Individual Permit issued by the Army Corps of Engineers. If any fill is graded within the floodplain area, floodplain compensation will be designed so that the flood elevation is not changed.

[Back to Top](#)

[GRTA DRI Page](#) | [ARC DRI Page](#) | [RC Links](#) | [DCA DRI Page](#) | [Site Map](#) | [Statements](#) | [Contact](#)

