

REGIONAL REVIEW FINDING

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

DATE: March 20, 2020

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2002021

TO: Ch ATTN TO: Mi FROM: Do RE: De

Chairman Harry Johnston, Cherokee County Michael Chapman, Zoning Manager Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

Drayh R. Hok

Digital signature Original on file

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has completed 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 final report does not address whether the DRI is or is not in the best interest of the host local government.

Name of Proposal: Baldwin Cherokee County Asphalt Plant Site (DRI #3078) <u>Submitting Local Government</u>: Cherokee County <u>Review Type</u>: Development of Regional Impact <u>Date Opened</u>: March 2, 2020 <u>Date Closed</u>: March 20, 2020

Description: A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposed asphalt mixing and distribution facility on East Cherokee Drive in unincorporated Cherokee County, about 2 miles southeast of the intersection of East Cherokee Drive and Ball Ground Highway. The nearest access to Interstate 575 is at the Airport interchange. The project is repurposing the footprint of a former timber processing facility. The local trigger is a land disturbance permit. Expected buildout is 2020.

Comments:

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is in the Developing Rural Area of the region. ARC's Regional Development Guide (RDG) details recommended policies for areas and places on the UGPM. General RDG information and recommendations for Developing Rural areas are listed at the bottom of these comments.

Although the site location is located in a largely undeveloped area defined by the Atlanta Region's Plan as developing rural, it is on the site of a previous timber processing site. There are other industrial and institutional uses nearby, including a landfill and a county water works facility. There are a few scattered rural single-family homes across East Cherokee Drive from the site, but the surrounding area is otherwise undeveloped.

The number of vehicle trips proposed is relatively low and qualifies the project for expedited review. However, because a portion of the trips will be by heavy trucks, care should be taken to consider project driveway design and construction, route choice, turning movements, acceleration and deceleration, railroad crossings, and grades that will be affected by that vehicle type. Coordination is encouraged among Cherokee County, the Georgia Department of Transportation, and the City of Ball Ground on any potential effects from truck travel generated by the project.

The estimated number of truck trips for the DRI site is 200 trips per day, based on the maximum amount of asphalt that can be generated on site. There is currently a restriction on truck traffic on East Cherokee Drive south of the site, which means truck traffic from the site heading to destinations to the south and east will have to find alternate routes. Specific concerns were raised by the City of Ball Ground regarding any additional heavy truck traffic using Ball Ground Road/Gilmer Ferry Road (SR 372) because it is in a deteriorating condition and not designed for heavy trucks, despite being identified by Georgia Department of Transportation as a truck route. While it's beyond the scope of this review to resolve the concerns raised by the City, it's clear that both existing and future uses will require coordination among the City, County, and GDOT to address the long-term stability of SR 372 and how truck traffic is accommodated or redirected in the meantime. Please see the attached comments from the City of Ball Ground for further details on this matter.

The Georgia Department of Natural Resources notes in its attached comments that there are federally protected species in the vicinity of the project and recommends measures to mitigate the impacts. The department further notes that the project is within a high priority watershed and the developer should implement stringent erosion control practices during construction and immediately restore vegetation on disturbed areas. ARC's Natural Resources Group notes in its attached comments that Georgia DNR's Part 5 Water Supply Watershed Minimum Criteria for the Etowah River watershed apply to this project, meaning any operation handling materials defined as hazardous on impermeable surfaces must have spill and leak detection systems in place.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan in general by incorporating other aspects of regional policy, including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design best practices throughout the site in general, in parking areas, on site driveways, in stormwater detention facilities, and as part of any improvements to site frontages.

The intensity of this DRI generally falls within with the ARC RDG's recommended development parameters for density and building height for Developing Rural areas, which are defined as areas that are being planned for new development, with limited infrastructure and services. General policy recommendations for Developing Rural areas include:

- · Maintain rural road characteristics and protect scenic corridors
- Implement conservation design and development as appropriate in new residential neighborhoods
- Develop opportunities for heritage, recreation, and agriculturally-based tourism initiatives
- Identify areas to preserve as future large parks or conservation areas and create partnerships and dedicated funding sources for land conservation activities
- · Identify opportunities for the development of rural broadband technology

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

ARC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES CITY OF BALL GROUND ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION CITY OF CANTON ARC NATURAL RESOURCES GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS GRTA/SRTA

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Greg Giuffrida at (470) 378–1531 or <u>ggiuffrida@atlantaregional.org</u>. This finding will be published to the ARC review website located at <u>http://atlantaregional.org/plan-reviews</u>.

Greg Giuffrida

From:	Eric Wilmarth <ewilmarth@cityofballground.com></ewilmarth@cityofballground.com>
Sent:	Tuesday, March 3, 2020 10:53 AM
То:	Greg Giuffrida
Cc:	gwaldrop@dot.ga.gov
Subject:	RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - Baldwin Cherokee County Asphalt Plant Site (DRI #3078)
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up

Follow Up Flag: Follow u Flag Status: Flagged

Greg:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback regarding this Development.

Please know that my comments are not meant to be personal in nature towards anyone or any group/office. Just restating the obvious issues the City of Ball Ground has in regards to a potential 200 trip a day facility.

To recap – and my dates could be off slightly.

Gilmer Ferry Road and A.W. Roberts Drive were constructed circa 1882 as the "Main Street" in the City of Ball Ground, and constructed by the City of Ball Ground.

In 1933 a water line was installed in Gilmer Ferry Road and A.W. Roberts Drive by the City of Ball Ground. (Again a City Water Line installed in a City Street).

In the late 1950s or early 1960s the City paved Gilmer Ferry and A.W. Roberts Drive for the first time. Just asphalt over the existing dirt surface.

In the late 1970s The State of Georgia took Gilmer Ferry and A.W. Roberts Drive and declared them as "State Route 372".

At some point SR 372 thru Ball Ground was then designated as a "Truck Route".

There is absolutely no base constructed under the asphalt on SR 372 (Gilmer Ferry / A.W. Roberts) and with the truck weights the road quickly deteriorated.

A quick drive over this ½ mile stretch of roadway will prove it to be one of the most embarrassing, dangerous, and vehicle damaging sections of roadway in Georgia – trust me – drive it.

GDOT has agreed to make substantial improvements if the City of Ball Ground will remove its water line from the segment known as A.W. Roberts Drive – an estimated cost of \$150,000. Engineering has been completed. 7 easements are required and legal counsel is working now to develop the easements and staff will begin obtaining them within the next 30 days. However; further complicating the issue is the matter of Service Delivery (SDS). HB 489 punishes all local governments for the short comings of a few. Although the City of Ball Ground has complied with all SDS requirements, and signed all DCA Forms with Cherokee County, The Cities of Canton, Holly Springs, Mountain Park, Waleska and Woodstock have not reached agreements. Therefore Ball Ground has lost its Qualified Local Government (QLG) status. With the loss of our status, even once we have obtained easements we will not be allowed to obtain a GDOT Permit to perform the water line relocation.

The potential of adding nearly 200 trucks per day on this segment of roadway is simply a disaster in the making. This section of roadway has already demonstrated that it is not capable of handling the current traffic volume.

With the extremely high asphalt demand for the Georgia Hwy 20 widening project I think it is fairly obvious that this plant is being located on this site with the intent to provide a substantial amount of asphalt to that project. Given existing truck limitations on East Cherokee Drive, asphalt trucks heading from this proposed plant to Hwy 20 would have come north and use SR 372 thru downtown Ball Ground to access Hwy 20.

PROPOSED ACTIONS:

- 1) GDOT should acknowledge that the proposed water line relocation is in fact a benefit to the State of Georgia Highway System and should therefore issue a permit to the City of Ball Ground, regardless of HB 489 status (especially since Ball Ground individually has complied with all aspects of the law)
- 2) Any asphalt leaving this proposed plant for use on the Hwy 20 widening project should be allowed to use East Cherokee Drive to deliver their product to Hwy 20, and not diverted to SR 372.

Thank you for your consideration, and again want to reiterate that we are not trying to sound petty towards any individual/group/office. We are in fact very pleased with the level of service we are receiving from GDOT District 6; however; without involvement from higher levels they will not be allowed to issue a utility permit for the needed relocation to improve roadway conditions.

Thanks for listening.

Eric Wilmarth City of Ball Ground City Manager

From: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:49 PM

To: Bethany Watson - City of Canton (bethany.watson@cantonga.gov) <bethany.watson@cantonga.gov>; Brent Cook -Atlas (brent.cook@oneatlas.com)

brent.cook@oneatlas.com>; Brett Buchanan - Cherokee County (bbuchanan@cherokeega.com) <bbuchanan@cherokeega.com>; Christopher E. Luly - Cherokee County (celuly@cherokeega.com) <celuly@cherokeega.com>; Eric Wilmarth - City of Ball Ground (ewilmarth@cityofballground.com) <ewilmarth@cityofballground.com>; Geoff Morton - Cherokee County (gmorton@cherokeega.com) <gmorton@cherokeega.com>; Jeff Watkins - Cherokee County (jwatkins@cherokeega.com) <jwatkins@cherokeega.com>; Michael Chapman - Cherokee County (mchapman@cherokeega.com) <mchapman@cherokeega.com>; Morgan Mullins - Atlas (morgan.mullins@oneatlas.com) <morgan.mullins@oneatlas.com>; Ryan Teague - Baldwin Paving (rteague@baldwinpaving.com) <rteague@baldwin-paving.com>; Steve Stancil (stancil01@windstream.net) <stancil01@windstream.net>; Christina Barry - GDOT District 6 (cbarry@dot.ga.gov) <cbarry@dot.ga.gov>; Donovan Tucker - GDOT District 6 (dtucker@dot.ga.gov) <dtucker@dot.ga.gov>; Grant Waldrop - GDOT District 6 (gwaldrop@dot.ga.gov) <gwaldrop@dot.ga.gov>; aspiliotis@srta.ga.gov; agillespie@srta.ga.gov; eboone@dot.ga.gov; 'ccomer@dot.ga.gov'; 'chuck.mueller@dnr.state.ga.us'; 'cyvandyke@dot.ga.gov'; 'davinwilliams@dot.ga.gov'; mcanizares@dot.ga.gov; pdenard@dot.ga.gov; afinch@dot.ga.gov; mfowler@dot.ga.gov; hgreen@dot.ga.gov; juhatch@dot.ga.gov; 'Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>; lajohnson@dot.ga.gov; jon.west@dca.ga.gov; 'Kathy Zahul <kzahul@dot.ga.gov>; 'kclark@gefa.ga.gov'; tmatthews@dot.ga.gov; jomcloyd@dot.ga.gov; kmertz@dot.ga.gov; jmontefusco@dot.ga.gov; 'nongame.review@dnr.ga.gov'; 'nrogers@dot.ga.gov'; pmartin@srta.ga.gov; pemmanuel@srta.ga.gov; 'PPeevy@dot.ga.gov'; eregis@dot.ga.gov; chrobinson@dot.ga.gov; mwilson@dot.ga.gov; cwoods@dot.ga.gov Cc: Community Development < CommunityDevelopment@atlantaregional.org>; David Haynes



WILDLIFE RESOURCES DIVISION

MARK WILLIAMS COMMISSIONER RUSTY GARRISON DIRECTOR

March 17, 2020

Greg Giuffrida Plan Review Technician Atlanta Regional Commission 229 Peachtree Street NE Suite 100 Atlanta, GA 30303

Subject: Known occurrences of natural communities, plants and animals of highest priority conservation status on or near DRI 3078 Baldwin Cherokee Asphalt Plant, Cherokee County, Georgia

Dear Mr. Giuffrida:

This is in response to your request of March 2, 2020. The following Georgia natural heritage database element occurrences (EOs) were selected for the current site using the local HUC10 watershed for elements whose range distribution is limited by aquatic systems (AQ) and within 3 miles for all other EOs (TR).

(-84.386869, 34.289055, WGS84)

- *Campeloma regulare* (Cylinder campeloma) in Etowah River (AQ), approx. 1.8 mi NE of site
- US *Etheostoma etowahae* (Etowah Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 3.0 mi NE of site
- US *Etheostoma etowahae* (Etowah Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.8 mi NW of site
- US Etheostoma etowahae (Etowah Darter) in Smithwick Creek (AQ), approx. 3.2 mi E of site
- GA Etheostoma rupestre (Rock Darter) in Hickory Log Creek (AQ), approx. 5.1 mi W of site
- GA *Etheostoma rupestre* (Rock Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.9 mi N of site
- GA *Etheostoma rupestre* (Rock Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 2.5 mi NE of site
- GA *Etheostoma rupestre* (Rock Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- GA *Etheostoma rupestre* (Rock Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 4.1 mi SW of site
- US Etheostoma scotti (Cherokee Darter) in Riggin Creek (AQ), approx. 0.6 mi S of site
- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Unnamed Tributary to Allatoona Reservoir (AQ), approx. 9.3 mi SW of site

- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Sharp Mountain Creek and Tributaries Huc 10 0315010405 Sharp Mountain Creek | Etowah River and Tributaries Huc 10 0315010406 Etowah River 5 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi N of site
- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Sharp Mountain Creek and Tributaries Huc 10 0315010405 Sharp Mountain Creek | Etowah River and Tributaries Huc 10 0315010406 Etowah River 5 (AQ), approx. 2.0 mi W of site
- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Smithwick Creek Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 3.2 mi E of site
- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Smithwick Creek Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 3.6 mi SE of site
- US *Etheostoma scotti* (Cherokee Darter) in Etowah River Huc10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.8 mi NW of site
- GA Hybopsis lineapunctata (Lined Chub) in Etowah River (AQ), approx. 4.8 mi SW of site Hybopsis sp. 9 (Etowah Chub) in Etowah River Huc10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 2.6 mi SW of site
- GA *Macrhybopsis etnieri* (Coosa Chub) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.6 mi NE of site
- GA *Macrhybopsis etnieri* (Coosa Chub) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- GA *Macrhybopsis etnieri* (Coosa Chub) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 5.1 mi SW of site
- GA *Macrhybopsis etnieri* (Coosa Chub) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 3.0 mi W of site
- GA Noturus munitus (Frecklebelly Madtom) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 1.9 mi E of site
- GA *Noturus munitus* (Frecklebelly Madtom) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 2.5 mi NE of site
- GA Noturus munitus (Frecklebelly Madtom) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- GA Noturus munitus (Frecklebelly Madtom) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 4.1 mi SW of site
 - *Noturus nocturnus* (Freckled Madtom) [Historic] in Etowah River S of Ballground (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NE of site
 - *Noturus nocturnus* (Freckled Madtom) [Historic] in Etowah River (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- US *Percina antesella* (Amber Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 1.8 mi NE of site
- US *Percina antesella* (Amber Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- US *Percina antesella* (Amber Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 5.1 mi SW of site
- GA *Percina lenticula* (Freckled Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 0.7 mi NW of site
- GA *Percina lenticula* (Freckled Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 5.1 mi SW of site

- GA *Percina lenticula* (Freckled Darter) in Etowah River Huc 10 0315010406 (AQ), approx. 7.4 mi W of site
 - Pituophis melanoleucus melanoleucus (Northern Pine Snake) (TR), approx. 3.0 mi E of site
 - *Pituophis melanoleucus melanoleucus* (Northern Pine Snake) (TR), approx. 2.8 mi NE of site
 - *Pituophis melanoleucus melanoleucus* (Northern Pine Snake) (TR), approx. 2.6 mi SE of site
- GA Schisandra glabra (Bay Star-vine) (TR), approx. 1.4 mi NW of site 028-001 [Department of Transportation] (TR), approx. 1.7 mi W of site Bell-Kowalski [Mountain Conservation Trust of Georgia] (TR), approx. 2.9 mi E of site MCGRAW FORD WMA [Georgia Department of Natural Resources] (TR), approx. 1.7 mi E of site *Tilia americana var. heterophylla - Fraxinus americana / Sanguinaria canadensis -*(Aquilegia canadensis, Asplenium rhizophyllum) Forest (Southern Appalachian Cove Forest) (TR), approx. 0.4 mi W of site
 Long Swamp Creek (0315010404) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), approx. 2.8 mi N of site
 Sharp Mountain Creek (0315010405) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), approx. 0.8 mi N of site
 Etowah River 5 (0315010406) [SWAP High Priority Watershed] (TR), on site

Recommendations:

Federally listed species have been documented near the proposed project. To minimize potential impacts to federally listed species, we recommend consultation with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Please email <u>GAES_Assistance@fws.gov</u> for additional information.

Please be aware that state protected species have been documented near the proposed project. For information about these species, including survey recommendations, please visit our webpage at <u>http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations</u>.

This project occurs within a high priority watershed. As part of Georgia's State Wildlife Action Plan, high priority watersheds were identified to protect the best-known populations of high priority aquatic species, important coastal habitats, and migratory corridors for anadromous species. Please refer to Appendix F of Georgia's State Wildlife Action Plan to find out more specific information about this high priority watershed: https://georgiawildlife.com/wildlifeactionplan.

We are concerned about streams and other habitats that could be impacted by the proposed project. We recommend that stringent erosion control practices be used during construction and future operation activities and that vegetation is re-established on disturbed areas as quickly as possible. Silt fences and other erosion control devices should be inspected and maintained until soil is stabilized by vegetation. Please use natural vegetation and grading techniques (e.g. vegetated swales, turn-offs, vegetated buffer strips) that will ensure that the project site does not

serve as a conduit for storm water or pollutants into the watershed during or after construction. These measures will help protect water quality near the project as well as in downstream areas.

Please be aware that the type of erosion control material used during construction can impact wildlife. We strongly recommend using natural, biodegradable materials such as 'jute' or 'coir'. Mesh strands should be movable, as opposed to fixed. Use of plastic fencing frequently leads to wildlife entrapment and death.

Disclaimer:

Please keep in mind the limitations of our database. The data collected by the Wildlife Conservation Section comes from a variety of sources, including museum and herbarium records, literature, and reports from individuals and organizations, as well as field surveys by our staff biologists. In most cases the information is not the result of a recent on-site survey by our staff. Many areas of Georgia have never been surveyed thoroughly. Therefore, the Wildlife Conservation Section can only occasionally provide definitive information on the presence or absence of rare species on a given site. Our files are updated constantly as new information is received. Thus, information provided by our program represents the existing data in our files at the time of the request and should not be considered a final statement on the species or area under consideration.

If you know of populations of highest priority species that are not in our database, please fill out the appropriate data collection form and send it to our office. Forms can be obtained through our web site (<u>http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations</u>) or by contacting our office. If we can be of further assistance, please let us know.

attavina

Laci Pattavina, Wildlife Biologist, Environmental Reviews laci.pattavina@dnr.ga.gov, (706) 557-3228

Data Available on the Wildlife Conservation Section Website

• Georgia protected plant and animal profiles are available on our website. These accounts cover basics like descriptions and life history, as well as threats, management recommendations and conservation status. Visit

http://georgiawildlife.com/conservation/species-of-concern#rare-locations.

- Rare species and natural community information can be viewed by Quarter Quad, County and HUC8 Watershed. To access this information, please visit our GA Rare Species and Natural Community Information page at: http://georgiabiodiversity.org/
- Downloadable files of rare species and natural community data by quarter quad and county are also available. They can be downloaded from:

http://georgiabiodiversity.org/natels/natural-element-locations.html

BALDWIN CHEROKEE COUNTY ASPHALT PLANT SITE DRI Cherokee County Natural Resources Group Comments March 19, 2020

Watershed Protection and Stream Buffers

The project property is in the Allatoona Lake and Etowah River Water Supply Watersheds. Both are large water supply watersheds (more than 100 square miles) as defined in the DNR Part 5 Water Supply Watershed Minimum Criteria (Chapter 391-3-16-.01, Criteria for Water Supply Watersheds). Under the current Criteria, because Allatoona is a Corps of Engineers lake, it is exempt from the Part 5 criteria. However, the Etowah River has two intakes, one for the City of Canton and a second for the Cobb-Marietta Water Authority to supply the Hickory Log Reservoir which is off the Etowah. Therefore, the Part 5 requirements for large water supply watersheds do apply to this project. Based on current maps, the project property appears to be about seven miles from the Canton intake and within seven miles of the Cobb-Marietta Hickory Log intake. Under Part 5, the only criteria for large water supply watersheds with direct river (not reservoir) intakes are that new facilities within 7 miles of a water supply intake which handle hazardous materials of the types and amounts determined by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources (DNR), shall perform their operations on impermeable surfaces having spill and leak collection systems as prescribed by DNR.

Neither the USGS coverage for the project area or the submitted plans show blue-line streams on or near the project property. Any unmapped streams on the property may be subject to Cherokee County's Stream Buffer Ordinance. Any waters of the State on the property will be subject to the requirements of the State 25-foot sediment and erosion 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 (<u>www.georgiastormwater.com</u>) 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.

Greg Giuffrida

From:	Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov></achood@dot.ga.gov>
Sent:	Tuesday, March 3, 2020 11:23 AM
То:	Greg Giuffrida
Cc:	Brian, Steve; Comer, Carol; Edmisten, Colette; Robinson, Joseph; Don Stevens (cptzereo@gmail.com)
Subject:	RE: ARC DRI Review Notification - Baldwin Cherokee County Asphalt Plant Site (DRI #3078)
Attachments:	ARC Preliminary Report - Baldwin Cherokee County Asphalt Plant Site DRI #3078.pdf
Follow Up Flag:	Follow up
Flag Status:	Flagged

Greg,

The proposed asphalt mixing and distribution facility on East Cherokee Drive in unincorporated Cherokee County, is about 2 miles southeast of the intersection of East Cherokee Drive and Ball Ground Highway. It is located approximately 2.5 miles southeast of the Cherokee County Airport (CNI) and is located outside their FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact the airport.

However, if any construction equipment reaches 200' above ground or higher, an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. That may be done online at <u>https://oeaaa.faa.gov</u>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notification, no later than 120 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 Don Stevens with Cherokee County Airport (CNI) on this email.

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

Alan Hood

Airport Safety Data Program Manager



Aviation Programs 600 West Peachtree Street NW 6th Floor Atlanta, GA, 30308 404.660.3394 cell 404.532.0082 office

From: Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>

Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:49 PM To: Bethany Watson - City of Canton (bethany.watson@cantonga.gov) <bethany.watson@cantonga.gov>; Brent Cook -Atlas (brent.cook@oneatlas.com) <brent.cook@oneatlas.com>; Brett Buchanan - Cherokee County (bbuchanan@cherokeega.com) <bbuchanan@cherokeega.com>; Christopher E. Luly - Cherokee County (celuly@cherokeega.com) <celuly@cherokeega.com>; Eric Wilmarth - City of Ball Ground (ewilmarth@cityofballground.com) <ewilmarth@cityofballground.com>; Geoff Morton - Cherokee County (gmorton@cherokeega.com) <gmorton@cherokeega.com>; Jeff Watkins - Cherokee County (jwatkins@cherokeega.com) <jwatkins@cherokeega.com>; Michael Chapman - Cherokee County



regional impact + local relevance

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number	#3078
DRI Title	Baldwin Creek Asphalt Site
County	Cherokee County
City (if applicable)	None / Unincorporated
Address / Location	East Cherokee Drive between SR 20 and Ballground Highway
Review Process	EXPEDITED NON-EXPEDITED

The proposed development is an asphalt plant on 19.6 acres.

REVIEW INFORMATION

- Prepared byARC Transportation Access and Mobility DivisionStaff LeadMarquitrice Mangham
- 1 0
- Copied Click here to enter text.
- **Date** March 19, 2020

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared byAtlas EngineeringDateFebruary 24, 2020

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)

NO (provide comments below)

The project proposes 214 trips per day eliminating the requirement for a traffic study. The traffic memo does not identify programmed projects in the RTP.

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 development will be served by East Cherokee Drive, a collector road.

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.

9

\square	NO

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

The site plan one access point on East Cherokee Drive, a collector road

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)
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
- 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)	Click here to enter name of operator(s).
Bus Route(s)	Click here to enter bus route number(s).
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)
	Sidewalk currently exist along Stanley Road however sidewalk facilities along Cobb International are incomplete adjacent to the proposed development 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)

* 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.



\boxtimes	YES
-------------	-----

Cherokee Area Transit Service

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.

\square	NOT APPLICABLE	(nearest path	or trail more	than one	mile awa	v)
\mathbb{N}	NUT APPLICABLE	(neurest puth	or train more	unun one	mile un	/u

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)
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)

* 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)

Heavy truck traffic will be generated as a part of this development.

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)

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)

Click here to provide comments.

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 development offers one shared access point for vehicles and freight traffic. The development anticipates minimal vehicular traffic.

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?
	\boxtimes 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.