

# **RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

Paulding County Major Corridors Study

12/2024

### Introduction

Through this Major Corridors Study, Paulding County builds on the recent Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Comprehensive Transportation Plan updates in taking a proactive approach to corridor management. Communities that experience rapid growth are often unprepared to react quickly to the development that emerges on once- undeveloped pieces of land, only to then find themselves balancing the tensions between moving people efficiently and providing access. By formalizing a clear plan of action regarding future roadway scale, right-of-way needs, and access management along corridors of varying character types, Paulding County staff and elected leadership are positioning the County for success for decades to come.

### **Schedule**



利雨分

### **Study Purpose and Goals**

The purpose of the Study was to assess the current condition of Paulding's major corridors and to make recommendations for the future of these roadways based on projected changes to population and employment within and around Paulding County. Future recommendations include roadway widenings and right-of-way preservation, large scale operational and safety improvements, and new connection projects that can enhance the roadway network. Policy recommendations are also provided to support the project recommendations. These include proposed updates to functional classification, application of roadway typologies that consider both transportation and land use character, and access management guidelines in light of future roadway and development changes.



## **Major Corridor Overview**

Paulding's major corridors consist of all of the County's arterials, along with most of its collectors and important local connections. They handle most of the volume across the County, serving as the backbone of the roadway network across a variety of contexts, from rural areas to nodes of development to the downtowns of the Cities of Dallas and Hiram. The major corridors traverse 215 miles across the County.

#### Paulding's major corridors include:





#### Paulding's Regionally Serving Roadways

Without any freeways or interstates, principal arterials serve as Paulding County's highest functional classification. Paulding's principal arterials are SR 92, SR 120 (from Cobb County to US 278) and US 278, serving as the County's primary regionally serving roadways.

### Stakeholder and Public Involvement:

#### **Data Gathering and Needs Identification**

Successful planning processes utilize strong technical analysis complemented by robust stakeholder and public engagement.

Public input centered around two parts of the plan: first during assessment of existing network conditions and needs, then second for feedback on draft recommendations.

The stakeholder committee convened at the same steps in the process, offering feedback on project direction, approaches, and preliminary recommendations for refinement before broader public input opportunities. The stakeholder committee included representatives from various County departments, the cities, neighboring counties, both Atlanta Regional Commission and Northwest Georgia Regional Commission, Georgia Department of Transportation, and a Board of Commissioners representative.

In the <u>first round</u> of engagement, information regarding existing conditions was shared alongside a request for input on multimodal, congestion, safety, and new connection considerations.

#### **Round 1 Stats**



17 participants in the stakeholder workshop

















## Recommendations

The <u>second round</u> of public engagement focused on confirming and prioritizing recommendations resulting from technical analyses and the first round of public feedback.

#### **Round 2 Stats**

31 o 35 p 631 s

open house participants

- pop-up participants
- surveys completed
- 14 participants in the stakeholder workshop

Meetings with members of the Board of Commissioners provided insight into the direction of the plan and preliminary recommendations.

### Land Use and Growth Trends

Understanding population and employment distribution and growth trends provides a basis for analyzing and projecting traffic patterns.

Similar to other suburban counties within metro Atlanta, Paulding County's population spiked between 1990 and 2020, growing over 400% from 42,000 to 170,000.

Looking out to 2050, the population is expected to exceed 250,000.



Year

\*future population projections come from the Atlanta Regional Commission, with current and past population statistics coming from the <u>US Census Bureau</u>



As the region continues to grow and expand, Paulding is expected to see continued increases in the coming decades, with an anticipated 67,000 new residents by 2050. Employment is also expected to increase by 9,000 workers by 2050.

Paulding's growth is expected to center around Highway 278 in Hiram, in and near Dallas, in the southeastern portion of the County, and near Cedarcrest/Seven Hills Boulevard.

#### **Population Growth in Paulding County**



Growth will center along certain nodes and along employment corridors, restricted by a lack of sewer west of the suburban growth boundary. The growth boundary is shown below on the future development map coming out of the recently adopted Comprehensive Land Use Plan update, with employment corridors highlighted in light green.

Paulding's rapid growth will require a more robust roadway network, and growth patterns within the County will heavily impact where roadway improvements should be concentrated.



### Existing Conditions and Future Needs Assessment

The characteristics and operations on Paulding's major corridors vary greatly based on surrounding density, environmental constraints, proximity to major destinations, historical context, and various additional factors. An analysis of existing and projected future conditions along the network provides a deeper understanding of what the study corridors look like and how they're operating, therefore providing insight into potential recommendations.

#### Congestion

Congestion results from volume exceeding the capacity of a roadway or operational or safety issues at intersections or segments along the roadway.

The data shown in this map represents observed traffic bottlenecks as experienced by drivers on the roadways today, with the largest and darkest circles representing the areas of greatest overall traffic delay.

Congestion across the County largely tracks traffic volumes – with the greatest congestion near Hiram and along SR 92 and US 278.



#### Safety

Crash trends provide insight into roadway characteristics or conditions that contribute to safety concerns, guiding decisions for roadway safety improvements.

Between 2019 and 2023, Paulding County saw nearly 18,000 crashes along the major corridors.

The highest concentrations of severe and fatal crashes occur along US 278 and throughout the major roads of Dallas and Hiram. Many severe crashes also occur on collector and local roadways in more rural areas of the County.



#### Access Management

Access management refers to the planning, policy, and design of access between the transportation network and development that runs along it. It promotes efficient and safe movement of all road users by reducing conflicts at the interface between roads/driveways, particularly in commercial and large residential developments.

Access management is most effective in areas with medians, welldesigned left-turn lanes, and proper spacing between intersections and driveways.

Areas shown in red on the map indicate areas where access management could be improved, particularly in more developed commercial areas.



Facilities like sidewalks and multi-use trails are fundamental components of a multi-modal transportation network. They provide access to essential destinations for those without a car, opportunities for healthy living, and safer routes for all people walking and bicycling. The Silver Comet Trail serves as the backbone of the multimodal system in Paulding, running from Cobb County to Polk County. Ongoing expansion of the trail and sidewalk network are bringing Paulding closer to a connected network of facilities for walking and biking.

Areas shown deeper red on the map indicate areas with greater likelihood for a pedestrian to be injured by a driver, based on a combination of propensity for people to walk and roadway characteristics.





#### **Travel Patterns**

Through an analysis of where trips are starting and ending, the primary use of a roadway (local versus regional serving) and the need for various types of improvement can be discovered.

In areas with longer, indirect trips between places with limited connectivity, a new roadway making a direct connection may be necessary. In areas with greater concentration of very short trips, additional bicyclist and pedestrian facilities may be warranted. Within Paulding, most trips run between Dallas and Hiram, or to and from both towns to the neighborhoods on their outskirts. Most outflows connect to western Cobb County.



### Road Segment Level-of-Service

The map at right shows modeled roadway level-ofservice (LOS), a primary measure of congestion, at present under the assumption of funded roadway projects being built. Road segment LOS for the major corridor network was developed using the Atlanta Regional Commission's regional Travel Demand Model, calibrated to Paulding County using updated traffic counts from Paulding County DOT and GDOT. In the current scenario, a few roads exceeded level-of-service thresholds set by Paulding County. SR 61, US 278, Dallas-Acworth Highway, and Cedarcrest road each exceeded the threshold and are areas of current concern.

Three scenarios were considered in evaluating each corridor's LOS. The map at right shows congestion under today's volumes. The two maps below show LOS utilizing projected volumes in 2050 across two scenarios. On the left, volumes developed using ARC's base population and employment projections are considered. At the bottom right, volumes were adjusted to consider rezoned or recently permitted developments yet to be fully considered at a regional scale, as well as development restrictions expected to the west of Paulding's suburban growth boundary.



#### 2050 LOS (without DRI Adjustments)

#### **Existing + Committed LOS**



#### 2050 LOS (with DRI Adjustments)





### Recommendations Methodology

Using the information gathered during the Existing Conditions and Needs Assessment phases of the planning process, the team developed a methodology for prioritizing corridor improvements. Road segment level-of-service drove preliminary recommendations for each corridor; however, additional safety, operational, and multimodal data supported the recommendations as well.

The decision tree depicts the general framework used to evaluate corridors, though the process incorporated substantial flexibility. New connection impacts, community context, and input from staff, stakeholders, and the public all played a role in the corridor recommendations. In addition to the widening considerations shown here, corridors also include recommendations regarding operations, safety, and multimodal components.



New connection opportunities were considered during LOS discussion for positive or negative volume impacts

### **Roadway Widening and Right-of-Way Preservation**

Roadway widening projects include the addition of travel lanes to the roadway to expand capacity. All roadway widening projects also include operational improvements, such as access management improvements, safety considerations, or multimodal infrastructure. Short-term widenings are the highest priority projects and those that have the greatest congestion today. Midterm projects are expected to be over capacity by the year 2050 whether not the additional projected development takes place.



/////



While opinions on roadway widening projects varied, public feedback demonstrated the necessity of widening Dallas-Acworth Highway and the two-lane portions of Cedarcrest Road. Over the long-term, many of Paulding's roadways may need to be widened, barring significant changes in development patterns, street connectivity, or travel trends.

Advancing any widening project will require additional study and concept development. In the near-term, the County can proactively protect the right-of-way needed to eventually widen these roads so that if, and when, the widening is needed, the space will be available for the improvements to take place.

#### **Short-Term Widening**

ID	Road Name	Extents	Ownership	Cost Estimate
C_04A	Cedarcrest Road	SR 92 (Dallas Acworth Highway) to Oak Glen Drive	County	\$28,000,000
C_05	East Memorial Drive	Industrial Boulevard N to SR 6 Bus (Merchants Drive)/Lester Drive	City	\$26,000,000
C_06A	Dallas-Acworth Highway	Frey Road to Industrial Boulevard N	County	\$63,000,000
C_06B	Dallas-Acworth Highway	SR 92 (Hiram-Acworth Highway) to Frey Road	County	\$37,000,000
C_17	US 278 (Wendy Bagwell Parkway)	Cobb County Line to Metromont Road	GDOT	\$12,000,000
C_18	US 278 (Jimmy Lee Smith Parkway)	Metromont Road to Palisades Parkway	GDOT	\$42,000,000
C_19	US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway E)	Palisades Parkway to SR 61 (Nathan Dean Boulevard)	GDOT	\$24,000,000

#### Mid-Term Widening

ID	Road Name	Extents	Ownership	Cost Estimate
C_07	East Paulding Drive	SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway) to Dallas- Acworth Highway	County	\$92,000,000
C_29A	SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway)	Wateredge Drive (Douglas County Line) to Dallas Nebo Road	GDOT	\$127,000,000
C_30D	SR 61 (Nathan Dean Boulevard)	SR 6 Bus (Merchants Drive) to US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway)	GDOT	\$14,000,000
C_51_1	Old Cartersville Road	Dallas Acworth Highway to SW of Electric Dam Road	County	\$59,000,000

Community context and the safety of all roadway users informed evaluation of each corridor. Alongside capacity improvements, multimodal connections to parks, schools, or other community facilities were considered for all corridors and would be constructed as part of many widenings.

### Long-Term Widening

ID	Road Name	Extents	Ownership	Cost Estimate
C_13	SR 6 Business (Buchanan Street)	SR 6 Bus (West Memorial Drive) to US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway)	GDOT	\$10,000,000
C_24A	SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway)	Village Boulevard/Hardy Springs Drive to Cobb County Line	GDOT	\$64,000,000
C_24B	SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway)	US 278 (Jimmy Lee Smith Parkway) to Village Boulevard/Hardy Springs Drive	GDOT	\$13,000,000
C_25	SR 120 (Buchanan Street)	US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway) to West Avenue	GDOT	\$6,000,000
<b>C_26</b>	SR 120 (Buchanan Highway)	West Avenue to Haralson County Line	GDOT	\$200,000,000
C_27	SR 120 Connector (Hiram-Sudie Road)	SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway) to SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway)	GDOT	\$111,000,000
C_32_1	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	Braswell Mountain Road to Burnt Hickory Park	GDOT	\$39,000,000
C_32_2	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	Burnt Hickory Park to Dabbs Bridge Road	GDOT	\$33,000,000
C_32_3	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	Dabbs Bridge Road to Bartow County Line	GDOT	\$64,000,000
C_32_4	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	Westminster Road (Dallas City Limits) to Braswell Mountain Road	GDOT	\$151,000,000
C_39	Dabbs Bridge Road	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway) to Bartow County Line	County	\$151,000,000
<b>C_44</b>	Harmony Grove Church Road	Cedarcrest Road to Dabbs Bridge Road	County	\$74,000,000
<b>C_46</b>	Gulledge Road	Seven Hills Boulevard to Old Cartersville Road	County	\$56,000,000
C_49	Nebo Road	Dallas Nebo Road to SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway)	City	\$120,000,000
C_55D	Seven Hills Boulevard	Serenity Lane to Gulledge Road	County	\$14,000,000
C_55E	Seven Hills Boulevard	Little Pumpkinvine Creek to Serenity Lane	County	\$43,000,000
C_56	Seven Hills Connector	SR 92 (Dallas Acworth Highway) to Cedarcrest Road	County	\$52,000,000



### **Operations and Safety Recommendations**

Approximately half of the roadway mileage on Paulding's major corridor network is not projected to need to be widened in any modeled scenario. In Dallas, on the western half of the County, and in the south, few roadways will need widened based on current projections. Operational and safety enhancements are still warranted on each of these corridors, as on the roadways to be widened. These improvements may include the addition of a median, a signal, facilities for people walking, or simply changes to roadway striping or signage.



Operations/Safety

ID	Road Name	Extents	Ownership	Cost Estimate	Recommendation(s)
C_01	Bill Carruth Parkway	US 278 at Poplar Springs Road (east) to US 278 at SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway) (west)	County	\$13,000,000	Intersection Realignments, Sidewalks, Speed Reduction Measures
C_02	Bobo Road	Dallas-Acworth Highway to SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway)	County	\$13,100,000	Left Turn Lanes, Roundabouts
C_03	Brownsville Road	Cobb County line to SR 92 (Hiram- Douglasville Highway)	County	\$7,500,000	Left Turn Lanes, Raised Median, Shoulders, Safety Measures, Intersection Realignment
C_04B	Cedarcrest Road	Oak Glen Drive to Harmony Grove Church Road	County	\$600,000	Safety Measures
C_08	Ridge Road	SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway) to SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway)	County	\$15,600,000	Left Turn Lanes, Roundabouts, Intersection Realignments, Access Management
C_09	SR 6 Bus (Atlanta Highway)	US 278 (Jimmy Lee Smith Parkway) to WI Parkway	GDOT	\$10,900,000	Intersection Safety, Streetscaping and Median Improvements, RCUTs
C_10	SR 6 Bus (Merchants Drive)	WI Parkway to SR 6 Business (East Memorial Drive)/Lester Drive	GDOT	\$6,400,000	RCUTs, Sidewalks, Safety Measures
C_11	SR 6 Bus (East Memorial Drive)	SR 6 Bus (Merchants Drive)/Lester Drive to Main Street/SR 61 (Confederate Ave)	GDOT	\$2,100,000	Intersection Realignment, Raised Median, Safety Measures and Restriping
C_12A	SR 6 Bus (West Memorial Drive)	Main Street/SR 61 (Confederate Ave) to Justice Center Drive	GDOT	\$5,200,000	Intersection Realignment, Roundabout, Raised Median, Safety Measures and Restriping
C_12B	SR 6 Bus (West Memorial Drive)	Justice Center Drive to Buchanan Street	GDOT	\$2,700,000	Roundabout, Raised Median, Safety Measures and Restriping
C_14A	West Memorial Drive	US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway) to Durham Street	City	\$3,000,000	Roundabout, Raised Median, Safety Measures and Restriping, Guardrail Replacements
C_14B	West Memorial Drive	Buchanan Street to Durham Street	City	\$2,300,000	Intersection Realignment, Raised Median, Safety Measures and Restriping
C_15C	Hardee Street	Main Street to SR 6 Business (Merchants Drive)	City	\$5,800,000	Roundabout, Raised Median and Access Management, Pedestrian Improvements, Intersection Improvements, Sidewalks, Safety Measures
C_16	South Main Street/Main Street	US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway) to Hardee Street	City	\$11,300,000	Safety Measures, Pedestrian Improvements
C_20	US 278 (Jimmy Campbell Parkway W)	SR 61 (Nathan Dean Boulevard) to Dallas City Limit	GDOT	\$1,000,000	RCUTs, Safety Measures
C_21	US 278 (Rockmart Highway)	Dallas City Limit to Polk County Line	GDOT	\$3,800,000	Intersection Realignments, RCUTs, Safety Measures
C_22	SR 101 South	Carroll County Line to SR 120 (Buchanan Highway)	GDOT	\$6,800,000	Left Turn Lanes, Access Management
C_23	SR 101 North	SR 120 (Buchanan Highway) to Polk County Line	GDOT	\$11,900,000	Intersection Realignments, Left Turn Lanes, Safety Measures and Access Management
C_28	SR 120 Connector (Scoggins Road)	SR 120 (Buchanan Highway) to SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway)	GDOT	\$18,600,000	Pavement Resurfacing, Safety Measures and Restriping



ID	Road Name	Extents	Ownership	Cost Estimate	Recommendation(s)
C_31	SR 61 (Confederate Ave)	SR 6 Bus (East Memorial Drive/West Memorial Drive) to Kirk Drive	GDOT	\$2,000,000	Left Turn lanes, Safety Measures
C_34	Macland Road	SR 6 Bus (Merchants Drive) to SR 120 (Charles Hardy Parkway)	County	\$3,600,000	Left Turn Lanes, Raised Medians and Access Management, Sidewalks
C_38	Bakers Bridge Road	Ridge Road to Douglas County Line	County	\$7,700,000	Roundabout, Raised Median and Access Management
C_40	Dallas-Nebo Road	Ridge Road to SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway)	County	\$9,200,000	Left Turn Lanes, Safety Measures
<b>C_</b> 41	Due West Road	Dallas Acworth Highway to SR 92 (Hiram Acworth Highway)	County	\$7,100,000	Roundabout, Intersection Realignment, Safety Measures
C_42	Frey Road	Gulledge Road to Dallas Acworth Highway	County	\$3,000,000	Intersection Improvements
C_43	Gold Mine Road	SR 101 N to US 278 (Rockmart Highway)	County	\$19,700,000	Roundabout, Left Turn Lane, Intersection Realignment, Safety Measures
C_45	Gulledge Road	Frey Road to Gulledge Road	County	\$44,400,000	Roundabout, Left Turn Lanes, Intersection Realignments, Safety Measures
C_48	Mulberry Rock Road	SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway) to SR 120 (Buchanan Highway)	County	\$11,700,000	Intersection Realignments, Left Turn Lanes, Safety Measures
C_50	Old Burnt Hickory Road	SR 92 (Hiram Acworth Highway) to Cobb County Line	County	\$5,200,000	Roundabout, Left Turn Lane, Intersection Realignment
C_51_2	Old Cartersville Road	SW of Electric Dam Road to SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	County	\$1,000,000	Left Turn Lanes
C_52	Pine Valley Road	SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway) to Cobb County Line	County	\$6,200,000	Left Turn Lanes, Sidewalks, Safety Measures
C_53	Poplar Springs Road	US 278 (Wendy Bagwell Parkway) to SR 360 (Macland Road)	County	\$12,300,000	Access Management
C_54	Rosedale Drive	SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway) to Cobb County Line	County	\$7,800,000	Roundabouts, Safety Measures
C_57	Sweetwater Church Road	SR 92 (Hiram Douglasville Highway) to Douglas County Line	County	\$10,200,000	Intersection Realignments, Left Turn Lanes, Safety Measures
C_58	Harmony Grove Church Road	Dabbs Bridge Road to SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	County	\$200,000	Safety Measures
C_59	Nebo Road	Dallas Nebo Road to SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway)	County	\$12,300,000	Safety Measures, Guardrail Improvements
C_60	Main Street	Hardee Street to SR 6 Bus (East Memorial Drive/West Memorial Drive)	City	\$6,700,000	Intersection Improvement, Complete Streets Improvements
C_61	Braswell Mountain Road	SR 61 (Cartersville Highway) to Polk County Line	County	\$2,100,000	Intersection Realignment, Safety Measures

### **New Connection Projects**

New roadway connections provide more direct routes between destinations, improve redundancy and reliability within a roadway network, and can relieve congestion on existing roadways. Within Paulding, limited connectivity exists between SR 61 (Cartersville Highway) and the rapidly developing northeastern part of the County. Two higher-priority new connection projects were identified to address this issue. Additionally, a bypass to improve mobility around Dallas has long been considered, and an eastern Dallas bypass is expected to draw much more traffic and be less expensive to implement than a western alternative. The map below shows the full list of new connections considered – drawn from previous studies and identified by the study team.



#### Short-Term New Connections

ID	New Connection	Cost Estimate
В	New Roadway Connection between Mt. Moriah Road and Naturewalk Parkway	Developer Funded
D	West Paulding Connection from Old Cartersville Road to SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	\$41,000,000
H	East Dallas Bypass from SR Bus 6 (Merchants Drive) to SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	\$26,000,000

Long-Term New Connections to be Considered

ID	New Connection	Cost Estimate
Α	Dabbs Bridge Road Area Connector	\$25,000,000
E	New Roadway Connection between SR 61 (Cartersville Highway) and Old Cartersville Road	\$13,000,000
G	West Dallas Bypass from SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway) to SR 61 (Cartersville Highway)	\$110,000,000
I	Justice Center Drive connection from Constitution Boulevard to US 278	\$5,000,000
L	New Connection between SR 6/US 278 and SR 120 (Buchanan Highway)	\$36,000,000
М	New Connection South of US 278 between SR 61 (Villa Rica Highway) and Bill Carruth Parkway	\$26,000,000
0	Rosedale Drive/CW Sims Road Realignment	\$8,000,000
Р	Northern US 278 parallel route from SR 92 to Bill Carruth Parkway	\$15,000,000
0	Lake Road Extension to Poplar Springs Road	\$8,000,000
V	Northern US 278 parallel route (west of SR 92)	\$6,000,000

An eastern and a western bypass of Dallas have both been offered as ways to avoid bottlenecks within the City. The eastern bypass showed high public interest throughout the process, but particularly with the second round of public input when the relative cost and estimated volume of each option was shown. Additional east-west connections between SR 61 (Cartersville Highway) and the northeastern part of the County also received major interest throughout the planning process.



## **Policy Recommendations**

The policy recommendations outlined in this section complement the project recommendations and aim to improve mobility and safety for all roadway users along the County's major corridors.

#### **Functional Classification**

Paulding County uses GDOT's roadway functional classification; however, some corridors may be considered for a different classification based on roadway characteristics and function. For example, a major corridor may have higher traffic volumes and travel speeds yet be classified as a local road. This plan evaluated the current functional classification of all major corridors accounting for roadway characteristics and traffic patterns.

An evaluation conducted by the study team resulted in a list of corridors for the County to consider adjustments. The final decisions regarding potential functional classification changes can be found in the Appendix.

### **Roadway Typologies**

While functional classification focuses on a major corridor's vehicular transportation intensity, including traffic volume, number of lanes, and regional significance, it does not directly consider important factors of surrounding land use types, density, and multimodal demand. A key goal of this study was to develop a complementary roadway typology framework that extends beyond traditional functional classification. The following figure presents six distinct roadway typologies that account for vehicular transportation intensity and context intensity. Additionally, conceptual cross sections with appropriate design elements were developed for each roadway typology considering median treatments, number of through lanes, drainage, buffer/clear space, multimodal facilities, street lighting, and other streetscaping treatments. This recommended framework can help guide future roadway improvements.

#### **Downtown** Street

Median: Optional Lanes: Two, 11' wide Buffer: 4'-6'

Ped/Bike Facility:

Complete Street - wide sidewalks

Other Streetscaping: Benches, trees, bike racks,

Lighting: Pedestrian Scale

street furniture, parking

**Neighborhood** 

Lanes: Two. 11'-12'

Ped/Bike Facility: 6' sidewalk

Other Streetscaping: Shrubs

Connector

Median: None

Lighting: None



#### **Commercial** Corridor

Buffer: Raised with planting Ped/Bike Facility: Sidewalk or sidepath Lighting: Pedestrian Scale

### Suburban Thoroughfare

Median: Raised Lanes: Four, 12' wide

Buffer: 24' clear zone Ped/Bike Facility: Sidepath or sidewalk Lighting: Possibly, near intersections Other Streetscaping: Shrubs in median



Urban/

Suburban

Suburban/

Residential

Rural

Considers Land Use Type, Density, Multimodal Demand

**Context Intensity** 

**County Lane** 

Downtown

Street

Neighborhood

Connector

County

Lane

Local

#### Regional Highway

Median: Depressed Lanes: Four, 12' wide Shoulder: 6'-8' Buffer: 26' clear zone Ped/Bike Facility: None Lighting: None Other Streetscaping: None



**Commercial** 

Corridor

Suburban

Thoroughfare

Regional

Highway

Regional



Other Streetscaping: None



Vehicular Transportation Intensity

Considers ADTs, Lanes, Regional Scale

20

wide

Buffer: 5'



Other Streetscaping: Benches, shrubs, bike racks



Median: Optional Lanes: Two, 11'-12' wide Buffer: 18' clear zone Ped/Bike Facility: None Lighting: None

#### Access Management

Roadway access management is a set of techniques used to control how vehicles enter and exit roadways from adjacent land parcels. It aims to improve traffic operations and safety for all roadway users by proactively managing access points like driveways, intersections, and median openings. Access management treatments along commercial areas result in fewer potential conflict points and improved travel time along the main roadway. Access management treatments along commercial areas will also improve inter-parcel and local roadway network connectivity which removes some localized trips from the main roadway and benefits multimodal mobility. Land use plays a role in access management; denser patterns of development that encourage internal, non-vehicular travel lend to the limitation of driveways and intersections, providing potential improvements to roadway performance.

This plan previously evaluated major corridors along commercial land use areas to determine what major corridor sections may benefit from additional access management improvements. This plan developed a high-level access management guide for arterials and collectors, providing a toolkit of access management strategies, with best practices, applications, anticipated benefits, and potential challenges. Furthermore, two major corridor subsections were evaluated for access management improvements including modifications to intersection spacing, driveway design (i.e., geometry, alignment, spacing, and density), medians, internal site circulation, intersection control, and signalized intersection coordination. The access management guide and pilot study findings are included in the Appendix.

#### **Active Transportation**

The findings of this plan's Existing and Future Conditions Report indicated that Paulding County's major corridor network could benefit from additional multimodal improvements such as new trail connections, pedestrian mid-block and intersection crossings, and more sidewalks. Feedback received from the community through in-person and online engagement activities also confirmed that multimodal improvements are desired along many major corridors.



Source: FDOT



The project recommendations included in this plan indicate which major corridors are candidates for multimodal improvements. These recommendations were identified by evaluating sidewalk gaps, proximity to trails, pedestrian/ bicycle activity from the Strava Metro application, proximity to schools and other community facilities, locations with historical pedestrian/bicycle crashes, ARC Pedestrian Risk Factors data, and feedback from the public and stakeholders.

- Continue to coordinate with GDOT on partnership projects to address vulnerable roadway user (VRU) safety including the two recommended projects (PI# 0016122 and PI# 0019238; 15 off-system locations) in GDOT's Vulnerable Roadway User Safety Assessment (2024).
- Continue to partner with GDOT and Paulding cities to evaluate pedestrian infrastructure near schools through the GA Safe Routes to School Resource Center a statewide program to improve safe multimodal travel for children in grades K-12 by evaluating school walking and biking routes and infrastructure as well as school-focused Road Safety Audits (RSAs).

### **Funding Considerations**

Advancing transportation projects requires resources – especially those of time, money, and staff. This plan, while not financially constrained as in other countywide transportation plans, includes a consideration for funding and project delivery. The financial framework for the Major Corridors Study focuses primarily on road widenings for the short- and mid-term as well as new connections identified to be high priority for implementation. Longer-term projects can still be advanced through right-of-way preservation efforts and policy and code of ordinance updates until such a time when a project is deemed ready to advance to an engineering stage. Other operational and safety projects identified through the study can also be advanced as funding is made available through future SPLOST efforts.

Local revenue generation can come from multiple sources including the current countywide Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax (SPLOST), general fund and property tax allocations, or a new targeted transportation sales tax. The following estimates assume a potential future ½ penny sales tax for transportation, derived from the County's current six-year SPLOST program. This framework is modeled to demonstrate what could be possible with a new transportation-focused revenue source.

#### Local revenue generation





### Implementation

In addition to having a list of projects and policies along with a financial framework, it is valuable to break down shortterm steps in an implementation plan to provide additional guidance and structure to County staff and elected leadership on how to help bring the plan to fruition. The following table outlines steps within the near term that can be done to advance the study results.

ID	Action	Timeframe	Lead				
Gene	General						
1	Adopt the Major Corridors Study as an official County document	December 2024	<b>Board of Commissioners</b>				
Proj	ects						
2	Conduct a scoping study for Dallas Acworth Highway and East Memorial Drive to determine the full scope of the project corridor	Underway	Paulding Transportation				
3	Complete engineering for Cedarcrest Road	2025	<b>Paulding Transportation</b>				
4	Coordinate with GDOT on future improvements to the US 278 corridor	2025-2026	Paulding Transportation				
5	Conduct a scoping study for New Connection D (West Paulding Connection) to determine alignment and right-of-way needs	2025-2026	Paulding Transportation				
6	Conduct a scoping study for New Connection H (East Dallas Bypass) to determine alignment and right-of-way needs	2025-2026	Paulding Transportation				
7	Begin scoping/engineering for Mid-Term projects to determine detailed recommendations and costs	2027-2030	Paulding Transportation				
Polic	cy and Code of Ordinances						
8	Amend the development application process to include update of the review process and the application checklist; include the Adopted Major Corridors Study as part of development reviews; include a link to the document on the reference website	2025	Paulding Community Development				
9	Amend the Comprehensive Plan with the corridors that are identified for widening or right-of-way preservation	2025	Paulding Community Development and Transportation				
10	Update the interactive zoning map to reflect the inclusion of new corridors; consider land development guidelines based on a tiered approach with overlays for widening/right-of-way preservation corridors followed by functional classification for all other roadways	2025	Paulding Community Development and Transportation				

### Acknowledgments

The completion of the Paulding County Major Corridors Study was made possible by the support and participation of numerous individuals and organizations

#### **Paulding County Elected Leadership**

Dave Carmichael, Commission Chairman Keith Dunn, Post I Commissioner Sandy Kaecher, Post II Commissioner Virginia Galloway, Post III Commissioner Dean Schneider, Post IV Commissioner

#### **Project Management Team**

George Jones, P.E., Director Erica Parish, P.E., Deputy Director Jose Pagan-Otero, P.E., Traffic Operations Division Manager

Stephen James, Engineering Division Manager

David Adewoye, Preconstruction Engineer

#### **Stakeholder Committee**

Atlanta Regional Commission Bartow County City of Dallas City of Dallas City of Hiram Cobb County Douglas County Georgia Department of Transportation Northwest Georgia Regional Commission Paulding County Community Development Paulding County Economic Development Paulding County Fire and Rescue Paulding County Fire and Rescue Paulding County Parks and Recreation Paulding County School District Paulding County Sherriff's Office Paulding County Transit

**Consultant Team:** 



