

DATE: May 30, 2022

TO: Mayor J. Clark Boddie, City of Palmetto
ATTN TO: Cindy Hanson, City Clerk, City of Palmetto
FROM: Mike Alexander, Director, ARC Center for Livable Communities
RE: Development of Regional Impact (DRI) Review

ARC has completed a regional review of the below DRI. ARC reviewed the DRI's 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: Microsoft Data Center Palmetto

Submitting Local Government: City of Palmetto

Date Opened: May 12, 2022

Date Closed: May 30, 2022

Description: A DRI review of a proposal to construct a data center with 1,180,000 SF of industrial space and 67,500 SF of associated office space in five buildings on a 133 acre site off of Johnson and Tatum Roads in the city of Palmetto. The site is currently wooded with a stream flowing through the western portion.

Comments:

Key Comments

The project is partially aligned with the applicable Developing Suburbs growth policy recommendations which state: "There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses." It could be better aligned through the retention of additional undisturbed area and the development of a plan for designating and managing the undisturbed area as conservation land.

The project is expected to generate approximately 1,992 daily new vehicular trips; a number of roadway improvements to mitigate these trips are identified in the TIS.

Incorporation of green infrastructure approaches for the impervious surfaces proposed would be supportive of regional environmental and water quality policies.

Addition of an internal sidewalk network connecting to the closets external sidewalk access point on Old Tatum Road would be supportive of regional transportation policies.

General Comments

According to the ARC Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM), part of The Atlanta Region's Plan, the site of this DRI is designated as Developing Suburbs. The Plan details general information and policy recommendations for Developing Suburbs which are provided at the end of these comments.

Transportation and Mobility Comments

ARC's Transportation Access and Mobility Group comments are attached.

The project is expected to generate a total of 1,992 daily new vehicular trips. Opportunities to utilize multi-modal strategies are limited by the site's location away from transit systems. A range of roadway improvements are identified to mitigate the vehicular traffic generated by the project. No sidewalks are shown on the plans.

The GRTA Review Criteria note that: "The Project is designed to maximize bicycle and pedestrian connections within the site as well as promote efficient and direct connections to external bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure." Therefore the buildings should be connected with internal sidewalks which would then connect to the existing sidewalk terminus on Tatum Road.

A total of 280 parking spaces are proposed. No EV charging stations are indicated; inclusion of some EV charging stations would advance regional policies regarding the creation of adequate EV infrastructure.

Care should be taken to ensure that the constructed development provides an interconnected, functional, clearly marked and comfortable pedestrian experience on all driveways, paths, entrances, and parking areas. To the maximum extent possible, new driveways and intersection corners where pedestrians will cross should be constructed with minimal curb radii to reduce speeds of turning vehicles and decrease crossing distances for pedestrians.

ARC Natural Resources Comments

ARC's Natural Resources Group comments are attached.

The USGS coverage for the project area shows wetlands near the western edge of the property but no blue-line streams are shown on or near the project property. The submitted site plan shows a stream running north-to south on the western edge of the property, with the centerline of the creek forming the property boundary for a portion of its length. A small branch off that stream into the property is also shown.

The 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious surface setback required under City of Palmetto Stream Buffer Ordinance are shown on both streams and are clearly identified, as is the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. The only definite intrusion into the buffers is a proposed road crossing at the northern end of the property. Transportation crossings are exempt from the buffer requirements under the City ordinance. In addition, the western edge of Detention Pond B runs close to the edge of the 75-foot impervious setback along the small branch and a portion of the primary stream. While land disturbance is allowed in the 25 feet beyond the 50-foot undisturbed buffer, mass grading and impervious surfaces are not. Any major grading or impervious surfaces intruding into the setback may require a variance from the City.

Any unmapped streams may also be subject to the City buffer ordinance and any unmapped waters of the state may be subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

Environmental Comments

The current site is mostly wooded natural area with a significant stream running through the western side. Intrusions into stream buffers are mostly avoided with a significant area around the streams being preserved. Preservation of any additional wooded area, especially any area within the FEMA flood zone along the stream, would be in keeping with Developing Suburbs recommendations which call for “additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses.”

In particular, there may be an opportunity to shift some of the stormwater detention function to the SE corner of the site. Ideally opportunities for officially designating the undisturbed area in the northwest section of the site as conservation area and potentially linking it to adjacent preserved/undevelopable areas would also be supportive of regional conservation and water quality policies.

The site plan notes that there will be a Sitewall along Johnson Road presumably to screen the electrical substation from view from the road; adequate screening of this component through a wall, berm, or vegetation or a combination thereof would help preserve the aesthetic character of the site.

The project can further support The Atlanta Region's Plan by incorporating other aspects of regional environmental policy including green infrastructure and/or low-impact design – such as pervious pavers, rain gardens, and vegetated swales – in proposed surface parking areas and site driveways.

Unified Growth Policy: Developing Suburbs

Developing Suburbs are areas in the region where suburban development has occurred, and the conventional development pattern is present but not set. These areas are characterized by residential development with pockets of commercial and industrial development. These areas represent the extent of the urban service area. There is a need in these areas for additional preservation of critical environmental locations and resources, as well as agricultural and forest uses. Limited existing infrastructure in these

areas will constrain the amount of additional growth that is possible. Transportation improvements are needed within these Developing Suburbs, but care should be taken not to spur unwanted growth.

The intensity and land use of the project is partially aligned with Developing Suburbs recommendations and could be made more so by retaining additional natural areas, minimizing wetlands impacts, and developing a plan for managing the significant area of the site not being developed. City of Palmetto leadership and staff, along with the applicant team, should collaborate closely to ensure optimal sensitivity to the needs of nearby local governments, neighborhoods, and natural systems.

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

ATLANTA REGIONAL COMMISSION	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE	GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	GEORGIA REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY	GEORGIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
GEORGIA ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCE AUTHORITY	GEORGIA CONSERVANCY	CITY OF PALMETTO
FULTON COUNTY	COWETA COUNTY	THREE RIVERS REGIONAL COMMISSION
CITY OF SOUTH FULTON	CITY OF FAIRBURN	

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact Donald Shockey at (470) 378-1531 or dshockey@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 #3576

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: Palmetto

Individual completing form: Cindy Hanson

Telephone: 770-463-3377

E-mail: hanson@citypalmetto.com

*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: Microsoft Data Center Palmetto

Location (Street Address, GPS Coordinates, or Legal Land Lot Description): 0 Williams Road, TMS 07-380001320770, 84.6282W 33.5241N

Brief Description of Project: Site clearing and grading in preparation for a future Microsoft Data Center.

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 checked="" 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.): 116 Disturbed Acres

Developer: Microsoft Corporation

Mailing Address: One Microsoft Way

Address 2:

City: Redmond State: WA Zip: 98052-6399

Telephone: (470) 645-6462

Email: mtrader@microsoft.com

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

If yes, property owner:

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

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

Is the current proposal a continuation or expansion of a previous DRI?

(not selected)Yes

No

If yes, provide the following information:

Project Name:
Project ID:

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

Rezoning

Variance

Sewer

Water

Permit

Other

Site Plan & Land Development Plan Permit

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: 2028
Overall project: 2028

Back to Top



Developments of Regional Impact

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

DRI #3576

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: Palmetto
 Individual completing form: Cindy Hanson
 Telephone: 770-463-3377
 Email: hanson@citypalmetto.com

Project Information

Name of Proposed Project: Microsoft Data Center Palmetto
 DRI ID Number: 3576
 Developer/Applicant: Microsoft Corporation
 Telephone: (470) 645-6462
 Email(s): mtrader@microsoft.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: \$500/sf (approx. \$125,000,000 per building)
 Estimated annual local tax revenues (i.e., property tax, sales tax) likely to be generated by the proposed development: \$3.7 million annual average over 10 years for one building
 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)? 0.656 MGD (peak)

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?
1.4 miles of water main

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)? 0.094 MGD (peak)

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? Day 1, no additional line required. for future phases a planned Palmetto regional liftstation will support demand

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.) 24 hour 2 way trips: 1992 trips; AM Peak Hour: 176 entering and 73 exiting; PM Peak Hour: 52 entering and 174 exiting

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 detailed traffic study for a summary of recommendations.

Solid Waste Disposal

How much solid waste is the project expected to generate annually (in tons)? Solid Waste - 25 tons (landfilled); Cardboard - 12.5 tons (recycled, not landfilled)

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:an underground stormwater conveyance system will receive runoff and direct it to three stormwater basins. These wet basins will settle out suspended solids and attenuate runoff quantity to that of predeveloped conditions.

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:
Wetlands - stream impacts have been permitted by the USACE.

Back to Top

You are logged in to the DRI Website as dshockey . | Change Password | Go to Applications Listing

GRTA DRI Page | ARC DRI Page | RC Links | DCA DRI Page DRI Site Map | Contact

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

DRI INFORMATION

DRI Number #3576
DRI Title Microsoft CCO06 Data Center
County Fulton County
City (if applicable) City of Palmetto
Address / Location Northwest of Johnson Road and Williams Road

Proposed Development Type: It is proposed to develop 1,180,000 sf of data center space and 67,000 sf of administrative space.

Build Out: 2032

Review Process ☐ EXPEDITED
☒ NON-EXPEDITED

REVIEW INFORMATION

Prepared by ARC Transportation Access and Mobility Division
Staff Lead Aries Little
Copied Marquitrice Mangham
Date May 17, 2022

TRAFFIC STUDY

Prepared by A&R Engineering Inc.
Date April 20, 2022

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)*

[Click here to provide comments.](#)

☒ NO *(provide comments below)*

There are no projects identified in the fiscally constrained RTP within the study area.

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 proposal includes one driveway on Tatum Road and the other on Johnson Road which serves an emergency access only. Tatum Road provides access to Regional Thoroughfare US 29/SR 14/Roosevelt Hwy.

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*)

US 29/SR 14/Roosevelt Hwy is identified as a Regional Truck Route and can be accessed by Tatum 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

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* ☐ 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

MARTA offers rail and fixed route bus 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.

☒ 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*)

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):

MICROSOFT DATA CENTER DRI
City of Palmetto
Natural Resources Group Review Comments

May 18, 2022

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 City 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 located within the Line Creek Water Supply watershed, a small (less than 100 square mile) watershed which is a water supply source for both the City of Newnan and Fayette County, both of which are in the Metropolitan North Georgia Water Planning District. The proposed project property is more than 7 miles upstream of both the County and City intakes.

Stream Buffer Protection

The USGS coverage for the project area shows wetlands near the western edge of the property but no blue-line streams are shown on or near the project property. The submitted site plan shows a stream running north-to south on the western edge of the property, with the centerline of the creek forming the property boundary for a portion of its length. A small branch off that stream into the property is also shown. The 50-foot undisturbed buffer and additional 25-foot impervious surface setback required under City of Palmetto Stream Buffer Ordinance are shown on both streams and are clearly identified, as is the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer. The only definite intrusion into the buffers is a proposed road crossing at the northern end of the property. Transportation crossings are exempt from the buffer requirements under the City ordinance. In addition, the western edge of Detention Pond B runs close to the edge of the 75-foot impervious setback along the small branch and a portion of the primary stream. While land disturbance is allowed in the 25 feet beyond the 50-foot undisturbed buffer, mass grading and impervious surfaces are not. Any major grading or impervious surfaces intruding into the setback may require a variance from the City.

Any unmapped streams may also be subject to the City buffer ordinance and any unmapped waters of the state may be subject to the 25-foot State Erosion and Sedimentation Act buffer.

Microsoft Data Center DRI

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) 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.

