



TECHNICAL ANALYSIS TRANSMITTAL

January 16, 2018

Andrew Smith
Atlanta Regional Commission
International Tower
229 Peachtree Street NE, Suite 100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

RE: Technical Analysis of Emerson Center (DRI #2764)

GRTA staff has reviewed the Emerson Center (DRI #2764) DRI Review Package, and pursuant to Section 2-301.C. of the Procedures and Principles for GRTA Development of Regional Impact Review ("P&P"), hereby reports the results of its technical analysis:

PROJECT SUMMARY

Name and Number of DRI:	DRI 2764 Emerson Center
Jurisdiction:	City of Smyrna
Local Development Approval Sought:	Rezoning and Annexation
Location:	This proposed development is located at 2800 and 2810 Spring Road, north of I-285, west of Cobb Parkway (US 41) and south of Spring Road.
Uses and Intensities of Use:	The mixed-use project is proposed to consist of approximately 87,500 SF of office space, 11,000 SF of retail space, a 200-room hotel and 310 multifamily residential units
Project Phase Year(s):	2020
Net Trip Generation (AM /PM/ TOTAL):	465/ 461/ 5,791

The contents of this document are based on a review of the applicant's completed DRI review package received by GRTA on December 12, 2017. The review package includes: (1) the site development plan (Site Plan) dated December 8, 2017 titled "Emerson Center" prepared by Summit Engineering Consultants, Inc with a final draft received on December 19, 2017 (2) the transportation analysis dated December 11, 2017 prepared by A& R Engineering Inc, received by GRTA on December 12, 2017.

Section I. General Criteria Analyses

Accessibility § 3-101.A., P&P

Accessibility. The proposed DRI is designed to provide safe, quality, and convenient access and provides the flexibility of non-vehicular transportation options from the proposed development to existing or planned pedestrian, bicycle, or transit facilities such that there is a likelihood of significant use by residents, employees and visitors to the proposed DRI.

A. Non-motorized

By which non-motorized method(s) is access provided to the project site? Is the access provided adequate to meet the needs of residents, employees, and guests of the site? How is internal accessibility accommodated within the site's boundary? What changes could be made to improve accessibility within the development? The development is proposing pedestrian connections between the mixed uses on the site. The development plan also suggests design elements on the site that include bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The site plan also illustrates two circles labeled "future aerial pedestrian connection" at Spring Road and Interstate 285. No bike paths are present in the study network.

B. Transit

Are transit facilities available to the site? If so, what are the facility types, locations, route numbers, and frequencies of operation? If transit is available, planned, or programmed for the area, does the development conform to transit supportive densities?

CobbLinc and Marta operates bus routes in and around the study network. There is a bus stop on Spring Road east of Cumberland Boulevard and a bus stop on Cumberland Boulevard south of Spring Hill Parkway. The following CobbLinc and MARTA bus routes have operations along the study network.

- MARTA Bus Route 12: Operates from the Midtown Station to the Cumberland Transfer Center along 10th Street, Howell Mill Road, Northside Parkway, and Akers Mill Road.
- CobbLinc Bus Route 10: Operates from Marietta to the Cumberland Boulevard Transfer Center via US 41/SR 3 (Cobb Parkway), then to the MARTA Arts Center Station. The stop on Cumberland Boulevard is serviced by this route.
- CobbLinc (Express) Bus Route 10A: Is a reverse peak-hour service of Route 100. Operates from Atlanta to Delk Road via the Cumberland Boulevard Transfer Center, US 41/SR 3 (Cobb Parkway), and Terrell Mill Road. The stops on Spring Road and Cumberland Boulevard are both serviced by this route.
- CobbLinc Bus Route 25: Operates from Cumberland Boulevard Transfer Center to MARTA H.E. Holmes Station via Hurt Road and Old Alabama Road.

Connectivity § 3-101.B., P&P

Connectivity. The proposed DRI is likely to promote improved regional mobility in terms of new vehicular connections, on-site vehicular movements, and alternate routes that are likely to operate in a safe and efficient manner, increase the public roadway network, and avoid delays during peak periods.

In an effort to create a safe and efficient, interconnected street system, how are the potential external connections utilized and are new connections proposed? Do the internal roadways provide for connectivity within and through the site? The site provides an internal road that bisects the site, connecting New Spring Road to Spring Hill Parkway. As an alternative to this internal road, traffic can turn into the Motor Court and parking lot adjacent to the hotel. While there are some pedestrian cross walks along the internal roadways, there is not an internal crosswalk that would connect the retail and office space building to the hotel.

Access Management § 3-101.C., P&P

Access Management. The proposed DRI is designed so that vehicular ingress and egress to any on-site parking facilities and all access points to adjacent public roads are likely to operate in a safe and efficient manner and are not reasonably anticipated to result in peak hour ingress and egress congestion on adjacent roads and at nearby intersections.

Are the ingress/egress points of an appropriate amount and location (i.e. spacing, median breaks, traffic signals, roadway hierarchy, etc.)? Do internal connections impact site ingress/egress points? There are

two access points along New Spring Road with an approximately 100-foot decal lane separating the right-in/right-outs. There is a full access driveway at Spring Hill Parkway.

**Regional Policies and Adopted Plans
§ 3-101.D., P&P**

Regional Policies and Adopted Plans. The proposed DRI is likely to promote improved regional mobility because it is located in a center or corridor identified in the Regional Development Plan (RDP) designated by an RDC; or the DRI has included in the proposed site plan components which will assist in the implementation of a transportation project currently in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), or other adopted regional plan designated by an RDC.

Is the development consistent with the Unified Growth Policy Map (UGPM) and the RDP Developments Type Matrix? Per ARC’s preliminary staff report, the DRI is located in a Regional Employment Corridor as well as a Regional Center.

Does traffic from the project primarily impact a roadway classified on the Regional Thoroughfare Network? Is the project consistent with other adopted regional plans, such as the Atlanta Regional Freight Mobility Plan, or Livable Centers Initiative study?

Does not apply.

**Local Standards Supporting Regional Policies
§ 3-101.E., P&P**

Local Standards Supporting Regional Policies. The proposed DRI is located within a local jurisdiction, or other jurisdictional agencies, with adopted codes that support regionally adopted policies, or the development codes and standards do not prohibit or impede the proposed DRI from meeting the GRTA DRI review criteria stated in Sections 3-101, 3-102, and 3-103. **Do the local jurisdiction’s design and development regulations allow the project to meet the intent of regional policies?** Emerson Center is located in the City of Smyrna. No applicable code or standard of the City has been identified through this transportation study that would impede or prohibit the proposed development from meeting regional goals.

**Section II. Non-Expedited Criteria Analysis
Vehicle Miles of Travel
§ 3-103.A.1., P&P**

Vehicle Miles of Travel. The proposed DRI is likely to promote improved regional mobility and regional air quality by reducing vehicles miles of travel, and is designed to encourage the use of alternative transportation modes, or is located within an area with, or is proposing, a mixture of complimentary land uses. Offsite trip generation from the proposed DRI is reduced by at least fifteen percent (15%), or, in the event that a proposed DRI is unable to satisfy the trip reduction standard established in this subsection because of conditions which are beyond the control of the developer or the affected local government, the proposed DRI implements all available trip reduction techniques which are reasonably practical.

	Build-out Total
Gross Trip Generation:	5,791
(-)Mixed-use reductions	380
(-)Pass-by trips	310
(-)Alternative modes	204
Net Trips:	4,897
Reduction Percentage	15.43%

Does the development meet the 15% reduction goal, if not, then what are possible reasons why the goal was not attained? Yes.

**Transportation and Traffic Analysis
§ 3-103.A.2., P&P**

Transportation and Traffic Analysis. The proposed DRI is reasonably anticipated to comply with planned or programmed improvements, maintain performance measures for preserving regional mobility, provide safe efficient operations, and minimizes congestion when the proposed development or phase of development is complete. The quality of the proposed and existing infrastructure in the transportation network operates in a safe manner and adequately serves new trips generated by the proposed DRI in the build-out year. The proposed DRI

identifies impacts on existing or programmed infrastructure, and propose mitigation that is feasible and within the control of the applicant or appropriate agencies to implement.

Does the site generated traffic impact regional mobility, safety, or operations on adjacent roadways?

Yes. See the capacity analysis below.

Are there factors that could hinder the implementation of necessary improvements?

Not that staff is aware of at this time.

Relationship to Existing Development and Infrastructure

§ 3-103.A.3., P&P

Relationship to Existing Development and Infrastructure. The proposed DRI is not located in any area where the existing level of development and availability of infrastructure is such that the proposed DRI is reasonably anticipated to result in unplanned and poorly served development which would not otherwise occur until well-planned growth and development and adequate public facilities are available.

Known infrastructure deficiencies at time of project build-out:

GRTA staff is unaware of any non-transportation related infrastructure deficiencies.

Industrial or heavy vehicle use specific related concerns: No.

Other Infrastructural Issues (e.g. schools, water / sewer, greenspace, police / fire service, railroads, airports) None are known at this time.

Section III. Other Analysis

1. Required Improvements Analysis

1a. What is (are) the Level of Service standard(s) for the roadways within the study network? LOS D and LOS E

1b. What are the TIP, STIP, RTP, etc. projects included within the study network?

TABLE 5 – PLANNED AND PROGRAMMED IMPROVEMENTS				
ARC#/GDOT#/ Local#	Project	Type of Improvement	Network Year	Source
AR-ML-200/ 0001758	Top-End Express – Managed Lanes & CD Lanes on I-285 from I-20 (West-End) to I-20 (East-End)	Roadway Corridor (Managed Lanes)	2022 LET	ARC/GDOT
0010008/ X2604	Cumberland Boulevard safety and operational improvements, turn lanes, sidewalks	Operational Improvement	2018	GDOT/ Cobb DOT/ Cumberland CID

1c. What is the “Existing” LOS for the intersections and segments within the study network?

TABLE 3 – EXISTING INTERSECTION OPERATIONS					
	Intersection	Traffic Control	AM Peak	PM Peak	LOS Standard
1	<u>Cobb Pkwy @ Spring Rd/Circle 75*</u>	Signalized	<u>D (50.4)</u>	<u>E (57.4)</u>	<u>D / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach		D (52.4)	D (46.0)	-
	-Westbound Approach		E (67.0)	E (68.3)	-
	-Northbound Approach		D (42.3)	E (57.3)	-
2	<u>Spring Rd @ Cumberland Blvd</u>	Signalized	<u>D (51.2)</u>	<u>F (103.1)</u>	<u>D / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach		D (42.4)	F (192.4)	-
	-Westbound Approach		D (36.5)	E (58.9)	-
	-Northbound Approach		E (75.3)	E (70.9)	-
3	<u>Cumberland Blvd @ Spring Hill Pkwy</u>	Signalized	<u>C (28.4)</u>	<u>D (40.1)</u>	<u>D / D</u>
	-Eastbound Approach		A (0.0)	A (0.0)	-
	-Westbound Approach		F (85.4)	F (112.3)	-

	-Northbound Approach -Southbound Approach		B (19.1) A (7.3)	C (21.5) C (25.0)	- -
4	<u>Spring Hill Pkwy @ Site Drwy 1</u> -Eastbound Left -Southbound Approach	Stop Controlled on SB Approach	A (8.4) B (11.2)	A (0.0) C (16.1)	D / D D / D
5	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 2 (W)*</u> -Northbound Approach -Southbound Approach	Stop Controlled on NB and SB Approaches	B (10.9) A (0.0)	B (10.0) B (11.3)	D / D D / D
6	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 3 (E)</u> -Northbound Approach -Southbound Approach	Stop Controlled on NB and SB Approaches	A (0.0) B (10.2)	B (12.2) C (18.4)	D / D D / D

*Results reported via HCM 2000

What roadway improvements are needed to serve “Existing” conditions?

The results of existing traffic operations analysis indicate that the intersection of Spring Road at Cumberland Boulevard is operating below a level-of-service standard “D” during the PM peak hour. Existing condition recommendations can be found in the “No-build” section.

1d. What is the future “No-Build” LOS for the intersections and segments within the study network?

TABLE 6 – FUTURE “NO-BUILD” INTERSECTION OPERATIONS						
Intersection		NO IMPROVEMENTS		WITH IMPROVEMENTS		LOS Standard
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	
1	<u>Cobb Pkwy @ Spring Rd/Circle 75*</u>	<u>D (54.7)</u>	<u>E (75.1)</u>	<u>D (54.7)</u>	<u>E (73.1)</u>	<u>D / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	D (41.8)	E (72.3)	D (41.9)	D (54.0)	-
	-Westbound Approach	E (64.8)	E (63.8)	E (64.8)	E (63.8)	-
	-Northbound Approach	D (48.1)	F (85.5)	D (48.1)	F (85.5)	-
	-Southbound Approach	E (69.7)	E (60.4)	E (69.7)	E (60.4)	-
2	<u>Spring Rd @ Cumberland Blvd</u>	<u>E (60.0)</u>	<u>F (110.6)</u>	<u>D (53.3)</u>	<u>E (70.9)</u>	<u>D / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	D (40.7)	F (214.5)	C (30.2)	E (56.4)	-
	-Westbound Approach	D (37.8)	E (64.3)	C (29.4)	E (67.0)	-
	-Northbound Approach	F (110.0)	E (63.3)	F (107.1)	F (88.3)	-
	-Southbound Approach	E (60.6)	F (152.5)	E (62.9)	E (66.1)	-
3	<u>Cumberland Blvd @ Spring Hill Pkwy</u>	<u>C (26.4)</u>	<u>D (35.2)</u>	<u>A (2.6)</u>	<u>A (6.4)</u>	<u>D / D</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	-
	-Westbound Approach	F (88.1)	F (126.8)	E (61.3)	E (61.3)	-
	-Northbound Approach	C (20.1)	C (23.3)	A (6.7)	A (9.8)	-
	-Southbound Approach	A (2.4)	A (4.2)	A (0.8)	A (1.9)	-
4	<u>Spring Hill Pkwy @ Site Drwy 1</u>					
	-Eastbound Left -Southbound Approach	A (8.4) B (11.4)	A (0.0) C (16.7)	A (8.4) B (11.4)	A (0.0) C (16.7)	D / D D / D
5	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 2 (W)*</u>					
	-Northbound Approach -Southbound Approach	B (11.1) A (0.0)	B (10.1) B (11.5)	B (11.1) A (0.0)	B (10.1) B (11.5)	D / D D / D
6	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 3 (E)</u>					
	-Northbound Approach -Southbound Approach	A (0.0) B (10.2)	B (12.4) C (19.4)	A (0.0) B (10.2)	B (12.4) C (19.4)	D / D D / D

Results reported via HCM 2000

What roadway improvements are needed to serve future “No-Build” conditions?

- Replace the existing eastbound protected left turn phase with protected + permissive phasing at the intersection of Spring Road at Cumberland Boulevard.

- Create a channelized island on the southbound right turn lane at the intersection of Spring Road at Cumberland Boulevard.
- A possible improvement at the intersection of Cumberland Boulevard at Spring Hill Parkway is to create a channelized island for the westbound right turn movements.

1e. What is the future “Build” LOS for the intersections and segments within the study network?

TABLE 7 – FUTURE “BUILD” INTERSECTION OPERATIONS						
Intersection		NO IMPROVEMENTS		WITH IMPROVEMENTS		LOS Standard
		AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak	
1	<u>Cobb Pkwy @ Spring Rd/Circle 75*</u>	<u>D (54.8)</u>	<u>E (80.0)</u>	<u>D (54.5)</u>	<u>E (78.9)</u>	<u>E / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	D (36.9)	D (53.5)	D (36.4)	D (44.4)	-
	-Westbound Approach	E (63.8)	F (195.6)	E (63.6)	F (195.6)	-
	-Northbound Approach	D (53.9)	D (54.0)	D (53.4)	D (54.0)	-
	-Southbound Approach	E (71.2)	E (65.7)	E (71.2)	E (65.7)	-
2	<u>Spring Rd @ Cumberland Blvd</u>	<u>E (64.4)</u>	<u>F (115.2)</u>	<u>D (54.2)</u>	<u>E (73.5)</u>	<u>D / E</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	D (42.4)	F (80.6)	C (34.6)	E (60.4)	-
	-Westbound Approach	D (38.1)	F (85.7)	C (32.7)	E (57.3)	-
	-Northbound Approach	F (118.1)	F (112.0)	F (101.6)	F (107.2)	-
	-Southbound Approach	E (69.1)	F (186.3)	E (59.1)	E (65.9)	-
3	<u>Cumberland Blvd @ Spring Hill Pkwy</u>	<u>D (44.6)</u>	<u>D (45.2)</u>	<u>A (4.2)</u>	<u>A (8.3)</u>	<u>D / D</u>
	-Eastbound Approach	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	A (0.0)	-
	-Westbound Approach	F (157.1)	F (158.6)	E (61.9)	E (62.1)	-
	-Northbound Approach	B (17.9)	C (24.8)	A (7.7)	B (11.5)	-
	-Southbound Approach	A (2.3)	A (4.9)	A (1.0)	A (2.3)	-
4	<u>Spring Hill Pkwy @ Site Drwy 1</u>					
	-Eastbound Left	A (8.8)	A (8.9)	A (8.8)	A (8.9)	D / D
	-Southbound Approach	C (15.8)	C (22.0)	C (15.8)	C (22.0)	D / D
5	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 2 (W)*</u>					
	-Northbound Approach	B (10.8)	B (10.5)	B (10.6)	B (10.5)	D / D
	-Southbound Approach	A (0.0)	B (11.7)	A (0.0)	B (11.7)	D / D
6	<u>Spring Rd @ Site Drwy 3 (E)</u>					
	-Northbound Approach	D (33.8)	B (14.3)	D (33.8)	B (14.3)	D / D
	-Southbound Approach	B (10.7)	C (20.3)	B (10.7)	C (20.3)	D / D

*Results reported via HCM 2000

1f. What are the “required improvements” to serve the DRI for the full build-out year? (Please note that the required improvements are not improvements associated solely with the impacts generated by the development; nonetheless, these improvements are required to provide a safe and efficient level of service to the visitors, employees, and residents of the proposed development.) The traffic package does not recommend any required improvements beyond the no-build recommendations.

The staff report with recommendations will be issued on or before January 25, 2018. The GRTA Executive Director’s decision is scheduled for issuance on or before February 5, 2018. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me directly at 404-893-6171 or via e-mail at eestes@srta.ga.gov.

GRTA Review by:

Emily Estes
Planner

Cc:

Jon West, DCA
Annie Gillespie, SRTA/GRTA
Andrew Smith, ARC
Marquitrice Mangham, ARC
Paul DeNard, GDOT District 7
Tim Mathews, GDOT District 7
Karyn Matthew, Cobb County DOT
Amy Diaz, Cobb County DOT
Kevin Moore, City of Smyrna
Russell Martin, City of Smyrna
Ken Suddreth, City of Smyrna
Eric Randall, City of Smyrna

Garvis Sams, Sams, Larkin, Huff and Balli LLP
Abdul Amer, A & R Engineering, Inc.
Abby Rettig, A & R Engineering, Inc.
Chris Harrell, Summit Engineering