



ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION

# REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

Atlanta Regional Commission • 229 Peachtree Street NE | Suite 100 | Atlanta, Georgia 30303 • ph: 404.463.3100 fax: 404.463.3205 • atlantaregional.org

DATE: December 6, 2017

ARC REVIEW CODE: R1712062

TO: Mayor Kasim Reed, City of Atlanta  
ATTN TO: Monique Forte, Urban Planner III, Office of Mobility Planning  
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 preliminary 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:** 30 Ted Turner Drive (DRI 2758)  
**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact (DRI)  
**Submitting Local Government:** City of Atlanta  
**Date Opened:** December 6, 2017  
**Deadline for Comments:** December 21, 2017 by 5:00 PM  
**Date to Close:** December 26, 2017\*

*\*If no significant issues are identified during the comment period, the review will close on December 21, 2017 per the LCI Expedited Review process outlined in ARC's DRI Rules.*

**Description:** This DRI is located in the City of Atlanta, roughly bounded by Centennial Olympic Park Drive on the west, Marietta Street on the north, portions of Forsyth Street and Ted Turner Drive on the east, and portions of Martin Luther King, Jr. Drive and Mitchell Street on the south. The proposed development consists of 1,000 residential units, a 1,500-room hotel, 9,350,000 SF of office space and 1,000,000 SF of retail space, on an approximately 27-acre site. The DRI review trigger for this development is a Special Administrative Permit (SAP) application. The projected build-out year is 2027.

**PRELIMINARY COMMENTS:** According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is located in the Region Core. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas on the UGPM. General information and policy recommendations for the Region Core are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest many aspects of regional policy. It generally supports the goals of the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program in that it converts a highly underutilized downtown site to a large-scale, infill, mixed-use development with significant employment, retail and housing components and pedestrian-focused uses and amenities at street level. It will support alternative transportation modes given its proximity to existing MARTA heavy rail service at the Dome/GWCC/Philips Arena/CNN Center and Five Points stations; and given that it proposes better connecting the local street grid, including with substantial streetscaping and multiple pedestrian-only pathways. Many of these characteristics will collectively offer the potential for site residents to work and shop on site, and for workers and visitors to park once or arrive via alternative transportation modes and conduct multiple trips on foot.

Along those lines, care should be taken to ensure that the development promotes a functional, safe, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all streets, paths and parking areas. The development team is also encouraged to ensure that end-of-trip facilities (bicycle racks, etc.) are provided for residents,

workers and visitors at key locations throughout the site. The project could further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general if it incorporated other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design (e.g., rain gardens, vegetated swales, etc.) as part of any improvements to streetscapes, driveways, parking areas, buildings, etc. Based on the project information submitted, it appears that the development team is planning to use a combination of tools in this regard, including green roofs, cisterns, stormwater planters, cooling tower water reuse and infiltration.

The intensity of this proposed project generally aligns with the RDG's recommended range of densities and building heights in the Region Core. The proposed land use mix and design are consistent with the RDG's recommendations in terms of encouraging infill development, housing options and activated ground-floor spaces for pedestrians. While the land uses appear to be generally compatible with those present in the Downtown area, City leadership and staff, along with the development team, should collaborate to ensure sensitivity to nearby neighborhoods, land uses, structures and natural resources.

It is ARC's understanding that the local Community Improvement District (CID), Central Atlanta Progress (CAP), is nearing completion of a roughly year-long process with a consultant team and City participation to produce a major update to the LCI plan for downtown Atlanta (the Downtown Master Plan). The development team should therefore collaborate with CAP and City staff and leadership to ensure that the project, as constructed, is consistent with the recommendations of the newly updated LCI plan. Likewise, ARC asks that CAP and the City incorporate the key attributes of this DRI into the description and recommendations for this part of the study area found in the new LCI plan, or in amendments or revisions to the new plan in the future.

Additional preliminary ARC staff comments, related to transportation and water resources, are included in this report.

Further to the above, the Region Core (Downtown, Midtown, Buckhead), together with Regional Employment Corridors, form the densest part of the Atlanta region. Connected with transit, this area of the region is typically the most walkable, and redevelopment is the main driver of its growth. The Region Core and Regional Employment Corridors together contain 26 percent of the 10-county region's jobs and 8 percent of its population on approximately 2.25 percent of the region's land area. General policy recommendations for the Region Core include:

- Continue to invest in the Livable Centers Initiative (LCI) program to assist local governments in center planning and infrastructure.
- Prioritize preservation of existing transit while increasing frequency and availability of transit options.
- Encourage compact infill development, redevelopment and adaptive reuse.
- Create a range of housing options to accommodate all sectors of the workforce.
- Encourage active, ground floor, pedestrian-scale design, and pedestrian amenities, in new development and the redevelopment of existing sites.

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CENTRAL ATLANTA PROGRESS / ADID

ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS  
GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

ARC NATURAL RESOURCES  
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
METROPOLITAN ATLANTA RAPID TRANSIT AUTHORITY

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Andrew Smith at (470) 378-1645 or [asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org). This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews>.



## 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: **30 Ted Turner Drive** *See the Preliminary Report.*

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

Individual Completing Form:

Local Government:

Department:

Telephone: (     )

Signature:

Date:

***Please return this form to:***

Andrew Smith  
Atlanta Regional Commission  
International Tower  
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 100  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Ph. (470) 378-1645  
[asmith@atlantaregional.org](mailto:asmith@atlantaregional.org)

Return Date:

***December 21, 2017 by 5:00 PM***



**30 TED TURNER DRIVE DRI**  
**City of Atlanta**  
**Natural Resources Division Review Comments**

**December 5, 2017**

**Water Supply Watershed and Stream Buffer Protection**

The proposed project is located on currently developed properties and is entirely within the Proctor Creek watershed, which is part of the Chattahoochee River watershed and enters the river downstream of the Region's water intakes.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows no blue-line streams on or near the project property. No streams or other waters of the State are shown on the submitted site plan and no evidence of streams or other waters is visible in available aerial photo coverage. However, it is likely that open streams were in the general vicinity of the project area and were piped when the area was first developed. Any State waters identified on the property will be subject to the State 25-foot Sediment and Erosion Control buffer.

**Storm Water/Water Quality**

The project should fully 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 of use and the total impervious coverage. This, in turn, will affect the design and type of stormwater controls developed for this project.

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](http://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. In developing stormwater management controls for this project, any on site reuse of stormwater needs to include consideration of its impact on return flows to the Chattahoochee, as well as its impacts on the protection and restoration efforts in the Proctor Creek watershed.

In addition to standard measures, we suggest the following additional measures to help reduce stormwater reduction and provide for its reuse before returning it to the stream system:

- Using green spaces and tree planting beds as stormwater controls. These can be designed to provide maximum aesthetic value while also providing for water quality treatment and run-off reduction, potentially reducing the need for larger stormwater facilities and helping to minimize the negative effects of stormwater runoff on streams and water quality.
- Using pervious concrete or other pervious materials in parking areas. With the proper substrate, such materials can provide a large storage capacity, which will further help to reduce stormwater runoff.
- Including rainwater capture in the project design to provide for landscape irrigation during dry periods.

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

### DRI INFORMATION

**DRI Number** #2758  
**DRI Title** 30 Ted Turner Drive  
**County** Fulton County  
**City (if applicable)** Atlanta  
**Address / Location** The site is located on the East side of Centennial Olympic Park Drive NW, West of Forsyth Drive, South of Marietta Street, North of Nelson Street. Buildout year is 2027

#### Proposed Development Type:

Mixed use redevelopment of a 27 acre site consisting of 1,000,000 sq ft of retail, 9,350,000 sq ft of office, 1500 room hotel and 1,000 residential units.

**Review Process**  EXPEDITED  
 NON-EXPEDITED

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Marquitrice Mangham  
**Copied** [Click here to enter text.](#)  
**Date** December 4, 2017

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** Kimley Horn

Date

December 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 the regional plan referenced and the page number of the traffic study where relevant projects are identified)

The traffic analysis includes an appendix of project fact sheets in the network study area as identified in the Atlanta Region’s Plan on Page 19 of the traffic analysis. A review of TIP Interactive Mapping online identified an additional project excluded from the list : AT 314 Spring Street Bridge Replacement at CSX Railroad

NO (provide comments below)

**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 access is proposed from five driveways along Centennial Olympic Park Drive, four along Ted Turner Drive, two driveways on Forsyth Street, four along Martin Luther King Jr Drive, two along Mitchell Street and one along Marietta Street.

**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*)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

**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	MARTA
Nearest Station	Georgia Dome, Five Points, Garnett MARTA Stations
Distance*	<input type="checkbox"/> Within or adjacent to the development site (0.10 mile or less)
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.10 to 0.50 mile
	<input type="checkbox"/> 0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete
	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable ( <i>accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed</i> )



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*)

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

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

**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) Route #s 3, 14, 32, 42, 49, 51, 74 and 155

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 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)

\* 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

**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	<input type="checkbox"/> Within or adjacent to development site (0.10 mile or less) <input type="checkbox"/> 0.15 to 0.50 mile <input type="checkbox"/> 0.50 to 1.00 mile
Walking Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks and crosswalks provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Sidewalk and crosswalk network is incomplete <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (accessing the site by walking is not consistent with the type of development proposed)
Bicycling Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated lanes or cycle tracks provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Low volume and/or low speed streets provide connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> 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*)

\* *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 local road or drive aisle connections with adjacent parcels?**

*The ability for drivers and bus routes to move between developments without using the adjacent arterial or collector roadway networks 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*)
- OTHER (*Please explain*)

Internal driveways and local roadways provide internal access to other uses onsite without accessing the external roadways.

**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)
- OTHER ( Please explain)

Pedestrian facilities are currently available along existing roadways allowing for safe accessibility. The site plan does not provide information regarding pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

**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 site plan does not provide specific information or depictions of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**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)

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

**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):**

None





## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #2758

#### 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: Atlanta  
 Individual completing form: Monique Forte  
 Telephone: 404-546-0196  
 E-mail: [mbforte@atlantaga.gov](mailto:mbforte@atlantaga.gov)

\*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: 30 Ted Turner Drive  
 Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 30 Ted Turner Drive  
 Brief Description of Project: A conceptual unified development plan for the redevelopment of the property bordered by Centennial Olympic Park Drive, Mitchell Street, Richard B Russell Plaza, Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, Ted Turner Drive and portions of Marietta Street and Forsyth Street. The property proposes a development over structured parking to create a robust transit-oriented development adjacent to two MARTA stations.

#### Development Type:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> (not selected)                       | <input type="radio"/> Hotels                                | <input type="radio"/> Wastewater Treatment Facilities |
| <input type="radio"/> Office                               | <input checked="" 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 type="radio"/> Industrial                           | <input type="radio"/> Quarries, Asphalt & Cement Plants     |   |

If other development type, describe:

Project Size (# of units, floor area, etc.): 1000 apartment units, 1,500 hotel rooms, 9.35 million SF office, 1,000,000 SF retail

Developer: CIM Atlanta Developer, LLC

Mailing Address: 4700 Wilshire Boulevard

Address 2:

City: Los Angeles State: CA Zip: 90010

Telephone: 323-860-9525

Email: [jccrowell@cimgroup.com](mailto:jccrowell@cimgroup.com)

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

If yes, property owner: City of Atlanta, Fulton County, and misc. other entities

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:  
Project ID:

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?

Estimated Project Completion Dates: This project/phase: 2027  
Overall project:

---

[Back to Top](#)



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #2758

#### 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: Atlanta  
 Individual completing form: Monique Forte  
 Telephone: 404-546-0196  
 Email: mbforte@atlantaga.gov

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: 30 Ted Turner Drive  
 DRI ID Number: 2758  
 Developer/Applicant: CIM Atlanta Developer, LLC  
 Telephone: 323-860-9525  
 Email(s): jccrowell@cimgroup.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: \$ 3 to \$5 billion

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$35 to \$60 million

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): Parking Facilities

#### 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)? 2.55 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? Assumed along proposed streets, but will be determined during design.

**Wastewater Disposal**

Name of wastewater treatment provider for this site: City of Atlanta

What is the estimated sewage flow to be generated by the project, measured in Millions of Gallons Per Day (MGD)? 2.13 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.) 8,947 gross AM trips and 14,584 gross PM trips

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: See traffic study

**Solid Waste Disposal**

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 65,053

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?

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Green roofs, cisterns, stormwater planters, cooling tower reuse, and infiltration

---

### 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:

[Back to Top](#)

