

DATE: May 24, 2021

ARC REVIEW CODE: R2105071

TO: Mayor Vince Williams  
ATTN TO: Ellis Still, Director of Community Development  
FROM: Douglas R. Hooker, Executive Director  
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review



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:** Union City Commerce Center DRI #3266

**Submitting Local Government:** City of Union City

**Review Type:** Development of Regional Impact    **Date Opened:** May 7, 2021    **Date Closed:** May 24, 2021

**Description:** A Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review of a proposal for an industrial development on 277 acres in the City of Union City east of Roosevelt Highway (US 29/SR 14) at the end of Evans Drive. The project would include three buildings totaling 2,479,626 square feet. The local trigger is a rezoning. Expected buildout is 2024.

**Comments:** According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, this DRI is 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. RDG information and recommendations for Developing Suburbs are listed at the bottom of these comments.

This DRI appears to manifest some aspects of regional policy in that it is in relatively close proximity to existing warehouse/distribution facilities along Jonesboro Road (SR 138) and I-85 to the east and on South Fulton Parkway, offering the potential for efficiencies in freight movement. It also offers connectivity for regional freight movement through its access to SR 92 to the west, Roosevelt Highway/US 29 to the south, and I-285 and I-85 to the east.

Although this site is located between the emerging freight clusters in Union City, this particular site is challenging because it's isolated from Roosevelt Highway by a freight rail track that will require a bridge to be built for its primary access. A secondary access at the southeastern corner of the site was considered

and rejected because of concerns about impacts on property owners. Coordination with the railroad and GDOT's rail division will be necessary to ensure the bridge doesn't impede rail operations.

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 the site. This framework can offer the potential for safe internal site circulation for employees on foot or by another alternative mode. The bridge should also incorporate a sidewalk on at least one side, preferably with a vertical barrier from the roadway. Roosevelt Highway is served by MARTA route #180, but there isn't currently a northbound stop at the intersection of Stonewall Tell Road, nor is there a crosswalk for passengers on the southbound side to cross Roosevelt to access the site. Any intersection improvements at this location must incorporate pedestrian crossings that fully integrate with the sidewalk over the new bridge all the way to the building entrances in the project. Roosevelt Highway generally lacks sufficient pedestrian crossings to safely serve employees in the various business along it.

Additional comments from ARC's Transportation and Mobility Group are attached, including a question regarding a proposed sidewalk project by the City. They also note the need to consider ADA compliance for the bridge spanning the railroad. Georgia Department of Transportation's aviation office notes that the project is outside approaches for Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport but may require a Form 7460-1 to be submitted to the FAA.

The project could further support The Atlanta Region's Plan if it incorporated other aspects of the regional policy detailed at the bottom of these comments, 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. A significant portion of the southeastern corner of the site, 26.83 acres, will remain as undisturbed greenspace and another 18.29 acres adjacent to C.H. Gullatt Elementary School will be donated to the Union City School System. Additional comments from ARC's Natural Resources Group are attached. They note that the site falls within the Flint River Water Supply Watershed and that variances may be required for development within local and state stream buffers.

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, the project is similar to nearby warehouse/distribution space and is in an area of the region that is experiencing demand for the development of these types of facilities. However, many areas around this site are predominated by forested/conservation land or low-density residential uses, including many areas and properties that are outside the City of Union City, e.g., City of South Fulton, among others. Union City leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should therefore collaborate to ensure sensitivity to nearby local governments, land uses and natural resources to the greatest extent possible.

The site appears to conform with the recommendations for industrial areas in Union City's Comprehensive Plan, which recommends the following:

- Building development should be variable within D-I to promote the specific needs of industrial activities or businesses and accommodate large-scale distribution facilities, industrial activities, or office park developments.

- Appropriate landscaping and open space between buildings and adjacent land uses should be provided to help limit negative visual and noise impacts of activity within the district on surrounding areas. Internal transportation should be designed to accommodate heavy and large vehicles associated with industrial or shipping activity.
- Access to the district should be controlled with limited connections to surrounding development and should be located along a major roadway.
- Future development should reflect a campus or unified development pattern that include employment uses such as industrial, commercial and service uses.

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	ARC TRANSPORTATION ACCESS & MOBILITY	ARC NATURAL RESOURCES
ARC RESEARCH & ANALYTICS	ARC AGING & HEALTH RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	FULTON COUNTY
CITY OF SOUTH FULTON	CITY OF FAIRBURN	CITY OF COLLEGE PARK
FAYETTE COUNTY	CLAYTON COUNTY	MARTA
GRTA/SRTA		

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



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #3266

#### 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: Ellis Still  
Telephone: 770-551-7955  
E-mail: [estill@unioncityga.org](mailto:estill@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: Union City Commerce Center  
Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): Latitude: 33.59527 - Longitude: -84.54630  
Brief Description of Project: The site is located east of Roosevelt Highway at the end of Evans Drive. It is an industrial development on 277 acres of land, consisting of 3 buildings that total 2,479,626 square feet.

#### 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.): 2,479,626

Developer: Strategic Real Estate Partners (Kevin Casteel)

Mailing Address: 3715 Northside Parkway

Address 2: Building 400, Suite 425

City: Atlanta State: GA Zip: 30327

Telephone: 706-573-1549

Email: [kcasteel@strategicpartners.com](mailto:kcasteel@strategicpartners.com)

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

If yes, property owner: Dodson Vision, LLC; David F. Brown; Sheri I. Brown; Mildred Brown; Grid Properties, LLC

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: 2024  
Overall project:

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



## Developments of Regional Impact

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

### DRI #3266

#### 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: Ellis Still  
Telephone: 770-551-7955  
Email: [estill@unioncityga.org](mailto:estill@unioncityga.org)

#### Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Union City Commerce Center  
DRI ID Number: 3266  
Developer/Applicant: Strategic Real Estate Partners (Kevin Casteel)  
Telephone: 706-573-1549  
Email(s): [kcasteel@strategicpartners.com](mailto:kcasteel@strategicpartners.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: 200,000,000

Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: 2,000,000

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):

#### 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)? 0.02 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?  
0.20 miles

---

### 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)? 0.02 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? 0.20 miles

---

### 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.) 3,964 net daily trips, 323 net AM trips, 325 net 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:

---

### Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? 2,500 tons/year

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? 55%

Describe any measures proposed (such as buffers, detention or retention ponds, pervious parking areas) to mitigate the project's impacts on stormwater management: Stormwater management will be handled with several stormwater wet ponds.

---

### 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:  
Floodplain per Firm Panel 13121C0456F. If required, ACOE permit will be obtained prior to any wetland impacts.

[Back to Top](#)



## Greg Giuffrida

---

**From:** Hood, Alan C. <achood@dot.ga.gov>  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 20, 2021 11:31 AM  
**To:** Greg Giuffrida  
**Subject:** RE: ARC DRI Review Notification: Union City Commerce Center DRI #3266  
**Attachments:** ARC Preliminary Report - Union City Commerce Center DRI 3266.pdf

Greg,

The proposed industrial development on 277 acres in the City of Union City east of Roosevelt Highway (US 29/SR 14) at the end of Evans Drive is approximately 6 miles from Hartsfield - Jackson Atlanta International Airport (ATL) and outside any FAA approach or departure surfaces, and airport compatible land use areas, and does not appear to impact any airport.

However, the proposed development is in proximity to a navigation facility and may impact the assurance of navigation signal reception if construction or construction equipment exceeds 80' above the ground level. If construction or construction equipment exceeds 80' above the ground level an FAA Form 7460-1 must be submitted to the Federal Aviation Administration. Those submissions for the buildings and any associated cranes may be done online at <https://oeaaa.faa.gov>. The FAA must be in receipt of the notifications, no later than 120 days prior to construction. The FAA will evaluate the potential impacts of the project on protected airspace associated with the airports and advise the proponent if any action is necessary.

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  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Atlanta, GA, 30308  
404.660.3394 cell  
404.532.0082 office

---

**From:** Greg Giuffrida <GGiuffrida@atlantaregional.org>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 7, 2021 5:35 PM  
**To:** Allison.Laber@kimley-horn.com; David.Clark@fultoncountygga.gov; Ellis Still - Union City (estill@unioncityga.org) <estill@unioncityga.org>; Harrison.Forder@kimley-horn.com; John Walker - Kimley Horn (John.Walker@kimley-horn.com) <John.Walker@kimley-horn.com>; jwise@paulsonmitchell.com; kcasteel@strategicrepartners.com; Tarika Peeks - City of Fairburn (tpeeks@fairburn.com) <tpeeks@fairburn.com>; Shayla Reed - City of South Fulton (Shayla.Reed@cityofsouthfultonga.gov) <Shayla.Reed@cityofsouthfultonga.gov>; Nathan Mai-Lombardo <nathan.mai-lombardo@cityofsouthfultonga.gov>; Marissa Jackson - City of South Fulton (marissa.jackson@cityofsouthfultonga.gov) <marissa.jackson@cityofsouthfultonga.gov>; Thomas Udell - Jacobs (Thomas.Udell@jacobs.com) <Thomas.Udell@jacobs.com>; David.Clark@fultoncountygga.gov; Pete Frisina - Fayette County (pfrisina@fayettcountygga.gov) <pfrisina@fayettcountygga.gov>; Brecca Johnson - Clayton County (Brecca.Johnson@claytoncountygga.gov) <Brecca.Johnson@claytoncountygga.gov>; Lee Kelley - Clayton County

**UNION CITY COMMERCE CENTER DRI**  
**City of Union City**  
**Natural Resources Group Review Comments**

**April 27, 2021**

While ARC and the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District have no regulatory or review authority over this project, the Natural Resources Group has identified County and State regulations that could apply to this property. Other regulations may also apply that we have not identified.

**Water Supply 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.

**Stream Buffer Protection**

The USGS coverage for the project area shows an unnamed blue line tributary of Morning Creek crossing the property, along with a blue-line tributary to the unnamed stream. Both streams are shown on the submitted site plan. Warehouses 1 and 2, associated parking areas and a proposed pond are shown crossing both streams. The City of Union City has adopted a stream buffer protection ordinance that requires a 50-foot undisturbed buffer and an additional 25-foot impervious surface setback on most streams in the City. In addition, Georgia's 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer applies to waters of the state. These buffers should be shown on the project site plans. Development within these buffer will require variances. Any unmapped streams may also be subject to the City buffers and unmapped waters of the state may be subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

**Stormwater/Water Quality**

The project should adequately address the impacts of the proposed development on stormwater runoff and downstream water quality.

During the planning phase, the stormwater management system (system) should meet the requirements of the local jurisdiction's post-construction (or post-development) stormwater management ordinance. The system should be designed to prevent increased flood damage, streambank channel erosion, habitat degradation and water quality degradation, and enhance and promote the public health, safety and general welfare. The system design should also be in accordance with the applicable sections of the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual ([www.georgiastormwater.com](http://www.georgiastormwater.com)) such as design standards, calculations, formulas, and methods. Where possible, the project should use stormwater better site design practices included in the Georgia Stormwater Management Manual, Volume 2, Section 2.3.

During construction, the project should conform to the relevant state and federal erosion and sedimentation control requirements.

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

### DRI INFORMATION

**DRI Number** #3266  
**DRI Title** Union City Commerce Center  
**County** Fulton County  
**City (if applicable)** Union City  
**Address / Location** South of the Roosevelt Highway (US29/SR 14) and Stonewall Tell Road intersection

**Proposed Development Type:**

The project proposes a 277-acre industrial development which includes three buildings totaling 2,479,626 square feet.

**Build Out :** 2024

**Review Process** ☐ EXPEDITED  
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

### REVIEW INFORMATION

**Prepared by** ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division  
**Staff Lead** Aries Little  
**Copied** [Click here to enter text.](#)  
**Date** April 29, 2021

### TRAFFIC STUDY

**Prepared by** Kimley-Horn  
**Date** April 26, 2021

## **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 a list of programmed projects on Table 13 (page 27).

☐ 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)*

There is one proposed full-movement driveway located along Roosevelt Highway (SR 14/US 29), which is identified as a regional thoroughfare.

**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*)

Roosevelt Highway (SR 14/US 29) is designated as a Regional Truck Route.

**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

Nearest Station

[Click here to enter name of operator and rail line](#)

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

[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 180.
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 type="checkbox"/> Sidewalks and crosswalks provide sufficient connectivity <input checked="" 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> )
Bicycling Access*	<input type="checkbox"/> Dedicated paths, lanes or cycle tracks provide sufficient connectivity <input type="checkbox"/> Low volume and/or low speed streets provide sufficient connectivity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Route uses high volume and/or high speed streets <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable ( <i>accessing the site by bicycling is not consistent with the type of development proposed</i> )

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

Currently, there are no existing sidewalks. However, Union City is planning to install sidewalks along the northern side of Roosevelt Highway (SR 14/US 29) between Cottage Grove Place and Stonewall Tell Road. It is proposed to add pedestrian facilities along the proposed driveway. There are no existing and proposed bicycle accommodations.

**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**

**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)

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 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)

**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)

There are no proposed internal facilities for walkers and bicyclists, except for the proposed sidewalks along the proposed driveway.

**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)

- 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)

## **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):**

Section 1.4 references the outlining of Union City's sidewalk project in Section 8.0; however, this section is not available, or it is mis-referenced.

Provide alignment clarification regarding the proposed pedestrian facilities along the proposed driveway. Section 1.2 indicates the driveway will be bridged over two sets of railroad tracks. Since the proposed driveway will not be at grade, due to the railroad, has the team examined the potential needs of ADA compliance?



