

REGIONAL REVIEW NOTIFICATION

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

DATE: Apr 3 2008 ARC REVIEW CODE: N804031

TO: Potentially Affected Local Governments and Other Interested Parties

FROM: Charles Krautler, Director

NOTE: This is digital signature. Original on file.

The Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC) has received the following proposal and is initiating a regional review to seek comments from potentially impacted jurisdictions and agencies. The ARC requests your comments related to the proposal not addressed by the Commission's regional plans and policies.

Name of Proposal: Recreational Trails Program-Garland Mountain Trails

Review Type: Other/Miscellaneous

Description: Application for Federal Assistance to construct a Recreational Trail in Cherokee County.

Submitting Local Government: Cherokee County

Date Opened: Apr 3 2008

Deadline for Comments: Apr 18 2008

Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Apr 18 2008

THE FOLLOWING LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND AGENCIES ARE RECEIVING NOTICE OF THIS REVIEW:

ARC LAND USE PLANNING
ARC DATA RESEARCH
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ARC TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
ARC AGING DIVISION
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ARC Environmental Planning
GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Attached is information concerning this review.

If you have any questions regarding this review, Please call Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, at (404) 463-3311. If the ARC staff does not receive comments from you by Apr 18 2008, we will assume that your agency has no additional comments and we will close the review. Comments by email are strongly encouraged.

The ARC review website is located at: http://www.atlantaregional.com/landuse .

ARC STAFF NOTICE OF REGIONAL REVIEW AND COMMENT FORM

DATE	: Apr 3 2008	ARC REVIEW CODE: N804031
	-	
TO:		ransportation, Research, and Aging Division Chiefs
FROM: Haley Fleming, Review Coordinator, Extension: 3-3311		
Reviewing staff by Jurisdiction:		
	Use: Lombard, Jared	Transportation: Hammond, Regan
	onmental: Santo, Jim	Research: Skinner, Jim
<u>Aging</u>	<u>:</u> N/A	
Name of Proposal: Recreational Trails Program-Garland Mountain Trails Review Type: Other/Miscellaneous Description: Application for Federal Assistance to construct a Recreational Trail in Cherokee County. Submitting Local Government: Cherokee County Date Opened: Apr 3 2008 Deadline for Comments: Apr 18 2008 Earliest the Regional Review can be Completed: Apr 18 2008		
Response:		
		Response:
1)	☐ Proposal is CONSISTENT with the f	
1) 2)	-	Response: following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
	☐ While neither specifically consisten guide listed in the comment section.	following regional development guide listed in the comment section.
2)	 □ While neither specifically consisten guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consisten guide listed in the comment section. 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible.
2)3)4)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.
2)3)4)5)	 □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ While neither specifically consistent guide listed in the comment section. □ The proposal is INCONSISTENT with the proposal does NOT relate to any 	following regional development guide listed in the comment section. t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development t nor inconsistent, the proposal relates to the following regional development th the following regional development guide listed in the comment section. y development guide for which this division is responsible. cant for the reasons listed in the comment section.