

Gwinnett County Research and Development Sector Plan

Summary of Stakeholder Interviews

DRAFT March 8, 2011

Overview

This document summarizes a series of stakeholder interviews completed in early 2011 at the front end of the development of Gwinnett County's Research and Development Sector Plan. The information provided represents the composite opinions and perspectives of interviewees. The findings from these interviews are part of a comprehensive assessment of the study area.

Methodology

To allow for greater flexibility and higher participation, interview questions along with a brief description of the project and a study area map, were sent via email to stakeholders identified by the County. Questions were tweaked slightly to reflect the stakeholders' roles in the Research and Development corridor. Stakeholders were provided the option of responding to questions on their own and sending written responses or coordinating a phone or in person interview with project staff. Approximately 1/3 of responders opted for the second option.

Overview of Interviews

Of 20 stakeholders invited to participate in interviews for the Research and Development Sector Plan, 15 people chose to participate. In a couple cases, stakeholders coordinated with coworkers or associated members of the study area to respond to questions. The group interviewed represented a cross section of businesses, area and regional governments, planning commissioners, public agencies, and area educational institutes.

Summary of Responses

Responses are organized by related issue or sub topics including Introductory Questions, Strengths and Weaknesses, and Opportunities and Threats.

Introductory Questions

How familiar are you with the Unified Plan?

Stakeholders interviewed had varying degrees of familiarity with Gwinnett County's 2030 Unified Plan. About 50 percent were very familiar, 10 percent fairly familiar, 30 percent somewhat familiar, and 10 percent not familiar.

Did you participate in the plan, and if so, to what degree?

Interviewees had a range of involvement in the plan: a couple interviewees participated as members of the advisory committee; a few as staff or members of the Planning Commission; and some were not involved in the plan.

How familiar are you with our project, the creation of Unified Development Ordinance and the Research & Development Corridor Sector Plan?

About half of the participants were somewhat familiar with the plan. Another 25 percent were very familiar and another 25 percent were not familiar with the plan. Some participants expressed knowledge of similar efforts pursued in the area previously. Two efforts that were cited included discussion regarding a high tech corridor extending between Georgia Tech in Atlanta and the University of Georgia in Athens and an effort to form bio-tech corridor in an area extending between Gwinnett and Barrow counties.

Do you agree with the vision for the corridor?

Most participants agreed with the vision for the corridor, which was described in the text sent with the interview questions as “Gwinnett’s Research and Development Belt.” One interviewee stated that the corridor has “a lot of potential” and another cited the area as making “solid sense” to attract high-tech development because of the infrastructure and a foundation of advanced education.

One interviewee believed that the length of the study area is too short. It was suggested that the study area should extend through the City of Dacula where there is a concept plan vision to support research, manufacturing, and industrial uses on neighboring properties.

Another participant somewhat agreed with the vision but emphasized that the government should have a supportive rather than dictatorial role over what happens in the corridor.

Participants cited the presence of Gwinnett Technical College, Georgia Gwinnett College, Gwinnett Medical Center, Cisco, the airport, and the Progress Center as a core foundation for achieving the vision for the corridor.

Strengths and Weaknesses

How long has your business or agency been operating in the corridor, and why did it choose to locate or remain here?

Of those that responded to this question, most agencies have been located in the corridor since the mid 1980s or 1990s. Participants cited investment and ownership in land and property as well as location for reasons why they chose to locate or remain in the study area.

Do you coordinate regularly with the County or City? To what degree?

Most interviewees stated that their respective organizations have regular interaction with the County and City of Lawrenceville, either on an as-needed basis or through participation in joint

committees and endeavors. Some representative groups that stakeholders interact with include County and City staff, County Planning and Development Department, Lawrenceville Tourism and Trade Association Board, the County Economic Development Office, and City of Lawrenceville Downtown Development Authority. Areas of coordination include transportation improvements, permitting, quality of life issues, zoning, maintaining a competitive business environment, and obtaining funding assistance. Responses indicated that there may be some latent corridor coordination needs between the County and municipalities intersecting or abutting the study area.

What major challenges has your business or agency faced in the last five years while operating in the corridor? What major challenges has the corridor faced in the last five years?

Stakeholders identified increasing “unmanageable” traffic congestion as a major problem, particularly at “saturated intersections.” At grade intersections and limited connectivity to the Interstate are seen as contributing factors to traffic congestion. Overpasses and making 316 limited access would help alleviate the traffic congestion.

General economic conditions were also seen as a major problem and challenge inclusive of slow land sales, a poor real estate market, and foreclosures. Fewer airport operations and loss of distribution businesses are two associated issues.

Some respondents had issues with policy decisions and direction in the area. A few respondents viewed allowances for increased housing and retail in the area as relaxed planning and zoning policy detracting from the area’s vision by encroaching on land designated for technology and development purposes. Rezoning of industrial land to other uses is viewed as a negative policy decision. The perceived lack of overall planning for transportation in the area is another concern. Some concern was voiced over the limited water supply in the area. It was stated that water conservation tactics and other strategies should be implemented in the area and by the County in general. One person noted that there is lack of coordinated vision for the area among Gwinnett, Barrow, Lawrenceville, Dacula, and other affected jurisdictions.

A general concern with land use was voiced. The build-out of 316 with segregated and disconnected land uses detracts from the unity of the area. Some concern over visual blight was cited, resulting from billboards, poor buffers, and vacant uses along 316.

What are the attractive elements to doing business or otherwise operating in this corridor? (e.g. location, infrastructure, synergies, etc.)

Participants had many positive statements about doing business in the corridor. One person stated, “Gwinnett County is an excellent place for business.” Location advantages were the most commonly cited, including proximity to airport (ease of entering and leaving the area), Gwinnett Government Center, City governments’ centers, and proximity of Sherriff’s office (in creating a sense of safety). Connectivity to Atlanta and Athens was also seen as a plus. Other

attractive elements mentioned included the presence of the hospital (Gwinnett Medical Center) and medical facilities, senior housing, and colleges.

Strong infrastructure and the ability to expand and improve it over time is viewed as a major plus. The area has good sewer, water, gas, electric, and other infrastructure needs to accommodate business and agency expansions. Major transportation investments were also viewed as attractive elements. The study area has good railroads, effective north/south corridors, and the airport. Access to major freeways and the ability to control access on 316 are seen as advantages.

Quality of life and family incomes that support services that in turn provide quality of life are seen as notable advantages. The Sugarloaf Pkwy expansion is also seen as an important investment, which has helped make the area feel more like a vibrant activity center. An educated employee pool provides an important resource for area businesses.

Stakeholders also mentioned several opportunities in the corridor. The corridor's higher education institutes and the overall "university corridor" were repeatedly mentioned as assets to the corridor. The presence of both an innovative, four-year college and flagship technical school provides the opportunity to create linkages between educational institutes and businesses. Other area advantages mentioned included the opportunity for major logistics operations and an established park setting. The availability of much undeveloped land that can be targeted for future high tech, research and development firms was another advantage mentioned. Finally, the ability to plan necessary services for growth is seen as a notable advantage.

What are the disincentives to doing business or operating in this corridor? (e.g. location, infrastructure, synergies, etc.)

The majority of disincentives stakeholders cited are related to congestion and transportation. Traffic leaving Hwy 316, limited access along Hwy 316, and the need for structural road improvements to Hwy 316 were among those mentioned. Delayed construction of badly needed grade separated intersections is a concern. One person stated that, "As it stands, Highway 316 is a deterrent to development in the area." Interviewees also consider congestion on 120, 20, and Collins Hill bad and identify saturated intersections as a disincentive for the area. This congestion creates periods of time during the day during which avoiding major traffic delays is nearly impossible. One stakeholder mentioned the lack of a comprehensive transit system as a problem. Although there is route through the hospital campus that is popular, connectivity with other major population and commercial centers is inadequate.

Land use was another disincentive mentioned. There are fewer undeveloped parcels and relatively higher land prices. Unattractive commercial strip development was cited along with unrelated businesses currently located along the 316 corridor. One stakeholder identified over commercialization, particularly around GA 20, as a concern. Proximity to residential

neighborhoods was considered a disincentive to one stakeholder. Another stakeholder said that their agency is landlocked with nowhere to grow.

Additional disincentives mentioned included recent questionable leadership of the County and water issues.

Do you find synergies with other businesses or agencies located here? What has fostered that relationship?

Those interviewed noted synergies with colleges and businesses in the corridor. One interviewee stated “GGC in particular will serve as the hub of intellectual development and higher education in the future. Research and innovation and naturally will become a byproduct and benefit for the entire community, including the businesses that reside within its proximity.” Proximity of suppliers to businesses was mentioned as an important synergy. The Gwinnett Chamber of Commerce was also identified as an important partner in the area.

Are there any infrastructure and technical support needs that are currently being underserved? What could the County do to improve that?

There were a variety of responses to this question. Nearly all interviewees believed there were some infrastructure or coordination improvements that would help the corridor or their organization’s bottom line. Identified transportation needs included the following: a comprehensive transit network that better meets the needs of the corridor’s users, including an express bus service to Atlanta and Athens; improvements to and expansion of 316; better utilization of airport; better connectivity between uses and to downtown Lawrenceville; and more local roads.

Some stakeholders appeared unhappy with the level of support they receive from the County on various items. Greater assistance in funding, land acquisition, and road improvements were identified. At least one stakeholder mentioned that government players in the corridor act as silos. There was also some believe that the County could better publicize its plans for improvements to County water, sewer, and roads.

A couple stakeholders highlighted the need for a unified vision in the corridor among all stakeholders: “Everyone must taste it, see it, hear it, feel it, and believe in it.” The underlying consensus based on a few comments was that the County’s vision and plan for areas affecting stakeholders or other communities should involve greater collaboration with affected parties and community members.

Through your professional network are you aware of any development or investment interests in the corridor that may not be generally known?

Most interviewees had no knowledge of any current development or investment interests in the corridor. A few people mentioned there was some interest in building housing within the past five years along the corridor, but it never went through. This discussion included non-affiliated [with colleges] student housing. Stakeholders recalled a proposed Target

development around 316 and US 29 and a mixed-use proposal between Collins Hill Rd and GA 20 along 316. Neither of these developments went through. Expansion of the airport was also mentioned.

Opportunities & Threats

Land Use

What is missing in the University Parkway study area?

Interviewees had diverse opinions of what is missing in the study area. Housing was mentioned by a few people. Suggestions included references to “workforce housing” and affordable housing for young professionals, teachers, etc. in addition to more diverse housing options (varying from garden apartments and single family homes). One person recommended that housing demand be verified by a market study.

Several interviewees identified the need for additional professional jobs, including high paying industries and a true concentration of high-technology companies. Specific missing uses identified included more medical, manufacturing, and industrial uses, upscale offices, and “more developments like CISCO.” One interviewee stated the need for entertainment, restaurants, and lodging for business trips.

Several people commented on development style and aesthetic controls. One stakeholder stated that development does not appear to be very thoughtful and that there are limited development guidelines, so consistent development style is missing. Comprehensive and unified signage, crosswalks, sidewalks, and a pedestrian and traffic plan are missing.

A couple people mentioned the need for greenspace and including passive spaces, yet one person stated that there are plenty of parks.

Transportation improvements and needs were also highlighted, including the following:

- Better mobility and connections
- Rail, should the area continue growing
- Grade separated interchanges.
- Connection of GGC to the City of Lawrenceville
- Bridge at Walther Blvd
- Interchange at Cedars Road
- Arterial road running parallel to SR 316 which connects Sugarloaf Parkway on the West to Hwy 29 on the East

What specific areas should be targeted for development or redevelopment?

Interviewees provided different suggestions for targeted redevelopment. The area in and around the Progress Center was the most popular location identified by interviewees for

redevelopment. The proximity of the airport and the 316 corridor to the Progress Center is seen as a factor that can create opportunities for research and development and presence of a business incubator for small, related businesses. The area in and around the airport and the 20 and 316 intersection (inclusive of the old Ingles site) were also mentioned more than once as areas prime for redevelopment. Below are other locations identified:

- Southwest corner of 120 and Collins Hills exit (should be a top priority, but unfortunately this is in the city limits of Lawrenceville)
- Area around College
- Old Ford dealership
- Any of the vacant commercial lots
- The Collins Hill/Northdale Road corridor
- North side of 316 between SR 120 and SR 20
- The Sugarloaf Extension / 316 intersection
- 316 / Harbins Road intersection
- State Route 29 / 316 intersection
- West Drowning Creek Road / 316 intersection
- Patrick Mill Road / 316 intersection
- Along Duluth Hwy and Maltbie Road

A couple interviewees stated that focusing new development in already developed areas was important to preserving remaining greenspace. Redevelopment should be a priority over greenfield development. Another interviewee pointed out that targeted redevelopment areas should be analyzed as a part of the R&D corridor sector plan.

What aesthetic standards would enhance the corridor?

Several stakeholders identified that overlay zoning standards for the corridor would improve the area's appearance, create a sense of place, and community pride. Among characteristics of the overlay should be controls for signage, walkways and sidewalks, parks, landscape buffers along corridors, street trees, pedestrian lighting along surface streets, and deliberate architectural themes. The standards should advocate pedestrian and bicycle safety without overemphasizing the pedestrian/bicycle element. Another strategy mentioned is to require that the best part of the building face the street.

It was stated that the overlay should be unique to a research and development area and should consider what has worked in other R&D areas. It was pointed out that both Gwinnett CIDs have taken a "solid lead" in aesthetic standards, including common signage and managed landscaping. These aesthetic standards could serve as a stepping stone for aesthetic standards for the entire corridor. One interviewee suggested that an overlay model be developed as an effective means of bringing everyone to the same page.

One interviewee identified that there is a need for a new style of industrial buildings, which can coexist with other land uses. Another stated that vertical construction of buildings should be

encouraged. A plaza environment should be promoted. Careful use of art sculptures may also be appropriate. Among items that should be done away with, interviewees identified billboards,

Do the current land development regulations encourage or discourage the Unified Plan’s vision for the corridor?

Most interviewees had no opinion on this question. A couple stakeholders believed that the existing regulations encourage desirable development and that these existing regulations will continue to accomplish the desired development along the corridor. A few interviewees did believe that tighter and more focused regulations would greatly increase the likelihood that the corridor’s vision would be realized. One interviewee stated that the County’s land use map has been “effectively disregarded and/or rendered useless” in the past. There is some common belief that there is need for greater leadership and political will by elected officials to accomplish the vision for the corridor.

What types of uses should be encouraged and/or discouraged to maximize the potential of the corridor?

Most stakeholders identified the need to encourage research and development, medical, educational, and high tech and high end office space. Generally speaking, interviewees believe that additional commercial and retail, such as big box stores and fast food restaurants, should not be encouraged. The ultimate goal should be to encourage businesses that bring higher-end jobs to locate in the corridor. One participant identified value in attracting specialized industries. Manufacturing was also identified as an appropriate industrial use. Green manufacturing was identified as more desirable by one interviewee.

It should be pointed out that there were conflicting responses regarding whether high density residential or commercial retail were appropriate for the corridor. One belief is that allowing certain types of land use (additional retail/commercial) would create a lost opportunity for more desirable development in the future. Some participants identified the need for supportive uses for the major employers and educational institutes, particularly adjacent to these major activity centers. These uses might include dense residential (apartments, condos, and single family detached at 3.5+units/acre), retail, and mixed-use developments that promote a live/work environment.

Interviewees identified that strip commercial development along with access roads should be discouraged. It was also identified by one interviewee that the corridor, over time, should move away from distribution and warehousing facilities.

Transportation Investments

While no decision has been made about the expansion of Briscoe Field nor does this study rely on or encourage any expansion, seeking stakeholder input on this high profile issue needs to be taken into consideration for our study. Therefore, is potential expansion of the

airport considered an opportunity or threat to your business or agency? What regulations would facilitate positive impacts?

First and foremost, it was pointed out that this is a controversial issue and that greater community education is needed to help inform community members about the potential impacts of airport expansion. Past efforts to address airport expansion were not communicated well with the community. One interviewee pointed out that citizens of Gwinnett County appear to be misinformed about the potential impacts the airport would have.

About a third of the respondents stated that expansion of the airport was either a threat or unnecessary and it should remain at its current level of use. Supporting arguments for this are that the expansion would negatively impact the community (consider Peachtree DeKalb Airport), the road network is not prepared for expansion, and an unsuccessful commercial airline facility would “result in deterioration of Briscoe Field as general aviation users would have been driven out.” Interviewees also voiced concern about privatization of the airport – stating that such effort would remove necessary regulations.

Several participants identified airport expansion as an advantage for the area citing that the expansion would help area colleges, be an asset to marketing the corridor, tax and development benefits, and serve as an economic development driver. One interviewee summarized expansion supporters well by saying, “If handled properly by Gwinnett County government (e.g. effective land use policies surrounding the airport are put in place), the potential expansion of Briscoe Field is a definite opportunity that would promote economic development, positively impact the quality of life and provide additional opportunity for Gwinnett County residents. Leaders should pay careful attention to the successes and failures that other communities have experienced regarding airport expansions. These, best practices should inform any future decisions.”

Other considerations related to airport expansion that were raised by stakeholders include the following:

- Modernization over expansion
- Disallow cargo traffic with expansion
- Great interstate and transit access is needed for an expanded airport to function well
- FAA regulations would hamper the ability to build around the airport for a certain distance
- A significant increase in traffic with larger aircraft has the potential to be disruptive to our operations and would need to be evaluated in full before an overall impact could be assessed.
- Plans for airport expansion that are detrimental to surrounding residents would lead to a drop in housing prices and likely have a deteriorating effect on surrounding residential areas, which in turn would make it difficult to attract businesses.

What concerns or opportunities should be considered in transitioning University Parkway to a limited access parkway?

Stakeholders had a variety of responses to this question. Overall, interviewees seemed to support transition to limit access should it be done properly. Appropriate incorporation of access roads, design of interchanges, and connectivity between interchanges is needed to work towards resolving traffic congestion issues in the study area. One interviewee pointed out that the problem would just be relocated to interior streets if the limited access parkway is not designed properly. Safety is a strong argument for converting the parkway to limited access.

Below are specific considerations identified by stakeholders:

- No toll – this would negatively impact businesses
- Need for additional access points
- The rest of the corridor should be made into limited access
- Need for an arterial road connecting Sugarloaf to Hwy 29 and beyond
- Need for bridge crossings at Walther and High Hope
- Need for interchanges at Cedars and Hwy 29
- Continuous movement lanes should be allowed as much as possible at intersections
- Direct access to the airport will be of significance for future growth and opportunities
- Trying to funnel everyone from SR 20 to the airport via Hurricane Shoals Road, as it currently exists, would not be ideal

One comment was that the 316 corridor should be converted to an Interstate instead of a parkway. The stakeholder stated that an interstate would be better regulated. The interviewee believes that this would not create controversy in the community.

What connectivity issues, if any, need to be addressed to better accommodate your business or agency's needs? Is there sufficient interparcel connectivity?

Responses to this question showed a consensus that there is greater need for connectivity in the corridor:

- Connections across 316 were mentioned. Participants identified the importance of making sure that a river is not created by 316 between the two sides of the road.
- Frontage roads would help with connectivity.
- Connectivity to Lawrenceville was seen as important, particularly from the two colleges.
- Connections to Dacula should also be facilitated.
- Additional routes would alleviate some of the pressure on typically choked intersections and interchanges.
- More local access roads
- An arterial road connecting Sugarloaf to Hwy 29 and beyond
- Bridge crossings at Walther and High Hope
- Interchanges at Cedars and Hwy 29
- HOV lanes and related interchange work at 120 and Lawrenceville Suwanee

Alternative modes were mentioned by a handful of stakeholders in relation to connectivity. Roadway improvements along, over time, will not be enough. One participant identified that bike lanes should be promoted within college areas. Another stakeholder identified the need for transit connectivity from downtown Atlanta to the study area.

All respondents that commented on interparcel connectivity believed this need is not currently being met. This includes both vehicle and pedestrian connectivity. One stakeholder pointed out the need to improve connectivity to key parcels providing related services, and another pointed out that lack of interparcel connectivity is one of the leading contributing factors to congestion in the corridor. It was mentioned that interparcel connectivity should be addressed in master planning and in the development of concept plans. Additionally, it was stated that it “would be a good idea to establish covenants for the corridor to help alleviate interparcel access concerns up-front.”

One stakeholder pointed out that connectivity needs should be included as a part of the study analysis. Connectivity between utilities was also identified as important.

Economic Development

What, if any, incentives would be effective at attracting additional research and development firms to the corridor?

Generally speaking, interviewees believed some incentives in the corridor would be helpful for bringing in desirable firms. Many of the incentives identified are services and facilities that are already in place rather than tax incentives that one may typically think of for economic development.

Those incentives suggested included the following:

- Training programs at area colleges
- The geographic location, i.e. University corridor speaks for itself
- Tax abatements
- Existing tax credits
- Incubators with labs in place
- Opportunity zones
- Transportation improvements (including Sugarloaf Extension and 316 corrections; if designed properly, they will incentivize location of businesses)
- Incentives should be allowed because that is how the area has lost out in the past – not having competitive incentives compared to other communities.

Some interviewees voiced opposition to tax incentives that would take money from taxpayers citing that there are other ways to bring in desirable businesses. One interviewee stated that “the County should consider effective incentive programs that produce a long term return for

the community.” Another stakeholder pointed out that the County should make sure it is promoting incentives that are available at other levels of government in the corridor.

One person thought that subsidies that might otherwise fund an Athens-Atlanta passenger rail should be applied to improve connector roads and interchanges. The passenger rail would be too costly to build and operate.

What additional public investments or regulatory strategies do you believe would facilitate the area becoming a true research and development hub for the region?

A handful of stakeholders did not respond or responded that they are not comfortable answering this question. Specific recommendations that were provided include the following:

- Transportation enhancements
- Overlay district
- Further college expansion
- Construction of reservoirs which could provide water and treatment of stormwater runoff
- Roadway improvements
- Fiber optic enhancements
- Pedestrian route improvements
- Develop specific requirements related to jobs we are trying to attract
- Incentives for higher end jobs, high tech clean

It was also identified that it would be beneficial to the County to take the City of Dacula’s Comprehensive Plan into account as the City’s Future Land Use Map includes areas of the corridor. Another stakeholder highlighted that public investments and regulatory strategies should be analyzed as part of the study.

It was also highlighted that the County should define exactly what types of businesses it wants to attract and then base investments and regulations on the findings.

What challenges if any do your workers (clients, students, patients, etc.) have when coming to/leaving the area?

Congestion and traffic were repeatedly mentioned as challenges facing workers in the corridor specifically during rush hours and between 12:00 pm and 1:30 pm. Specific congested areas referenced were 316 and at Georgia Gwinnett College and 316 and Sugarloaf Pkwy. Other challenges identified included smells from the Publix pre-treatment plant and a lack of corridor identity. Students face issues of affordable rent and childcare.

What additional connections or strategies are needed to link the study area with downtown Lawrenceville?

Downtown Lawrenceville is considered an asset to the area. One stakeholder identified that currently there is no visible connection with Lawrenceville and the corridor. It was highlighted

that this issue needs to be analyzed as a part of the corridor sector plan. An important component of connecting to Lawrenceville, as referenced by stakeholders, is better pedestrian, bicycle, and road connections between parts of the corridor and the downtown. Availability of a trolley for special occasions was also identified as a possible strategy. Transit connectivity between the colleges, medical center, and Downtown Lawrenceville should also be considered.

Greater collaboration is needed not only with the leadership in Lawrenceville but also with the City of Dacula and surrounding community, businesses, and educational institutions.

One person mentioned the workforce housing should be focused in downtown Lawrenceville.

Quality of Life

In your opinion, are there adequate housing options in the County for your workers? How could workforce housing be supported in or outside the corridor?

Many stakeholders said that there are currently plenty of housing options at all price points within a short distance of the corridor that are sufficient to accommodate the corridor's workforce housing needs. One stakeholder identified that there may be some need for housing revitalization as some older neighborhoods have not been maintained as well as they should have been. This has led to a reduction in the number of attractive housing options for workers in the immediate area.

The general consensus, inferred from participants' responses, is that the need for additional housing options to accommodate the workforce should be further studied. In the future, it is believed that it may make sense to add additional housing options within the corridor, such as condos, although one person did identify an immediate need for more quality apartments near GGC and downtown Lawrenceville. Future potential housing needs will depend on the type of businesses that locate in the corridor. One person stated that the recommendations of the Unified Plan do a good job of addressing housing needs for the entire county.

Other Thoughts from Stakeholders

- The corridor should reflect a high-tech character by incorporating forward-thinking technology such as solar panels and electric charging facilities for cars.
- We should consider North Dallas, which has a high tech corridor, as a case study. They are doing some innovative things, and the area has desirable character.

Areas of Conflicting Information

- Need for greater coordination with adjacent municipalities regarding R&D corridor study.
- Opportunity to educate and obtain additional input from community's leaders and citizens on the identified vision for the corridor.

- One stakeholder voiced strong concern about large investments into consulting, advertising, and researching the concept [Research and Development Corridor] without the “hard commitment” from private industry. A catalyst (private developer) needs to be on board to jumpstart the corridor.
- While most people identified the need for additional professional jobs and high tech industries, one interviewee pointed out the likely need to provide visitor facilities in the corridor, including hotels, entertainment, and additional restaurants.
- One interviewee stated that it appears that only half of the airport property is included in the R&D Corridor (the portion within the city limits of Lawrenceville). It would make sense for the entire airport to be clearly shown as within the R&D corridor in some form. It may be clearer, as the airport is a County owned and operated facility to show it as a separate designation without the City limits.
- There are some conflicting opinions regarding what uses should be encouraged in the corridor, specifically as relates to housing and commercial/retail uses.
- There is a need to educate the public on Hwy 316 limited access conversion and potential airport expansion should the decision be made to move either of these proposals forward.
- Tax incentives to promote economic development received mixed support from those that commented on them. Marketing other incentives that simply exist (location, access to area colleges, etc.) may be more effective than financial incentives that take money out of the public coffers.