DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: CSSTP-0006-00(862) Cobb
BRST0-0213-01(005)
P.I. Nos.: 0006862 and 731865
SR 92 improvements

OFFICE: Engineering Services

DATE: May 5, 2009

FROM: Ronald E. Wishon, Project Review Engineer

TO: Bobby Hilliard, PE, State Program Delivery Engineer
Attn: David Norwood, Senior Project Manager

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES

The VE Study for the above projecs was held on February 17-20, 2009. Responses were received on April 29, 2009. Recommendations for implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives are indicated in the table below. The Project Manager shall incorporate the VE alternatives recommended for implementation to the extent reasonable in the design of the project.

Roadway (R)				
ALT #	**Description**	**Potential Savings/LCC**	**Implement**	**Comments**
R-1	Add a second right turn lane from southbound Glade Rd. to westbound SR 92 to improve traffic flow.	Proposed: -$11,309 (cost increase) Actual: -$79,309 (cost increase)	Yes	This should be done. The overall intersection delay will benefit from the addition of the right turn lane during all peak periods as well as the reduced delay for this individual right turn movement. The VE report did not include the cost for additional right of way: 5880SF @ $11.50/SF=$68,000
R-2	Add right-in/right-out at STA 618+00 Rt. to accommodate access to local business.	Design Suggestion	Yes	This should be done.
R-3	Use all 11-ft-wide lanes.	$980,804	No	The typical section provided for the VE Team proposed 11' outside and 12' inside lanes. This was not correct – it should have proposed 11' inside and 12' outside lanes. Due to the 7.5% truck volume and the 40,000 ADT on this State Route the outside lanes should remain 12'.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
R-4	Use 24-inch-wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch-wide curb and gutter.	Proposed: $442,344 Actual: $98,122	No	The use of a 24" curb in lieu of the proposed 30" curb will reduce the gutter flow capacity by up to 60%. The design team disagrees with the overall ROW savings shown in the VE Study Cost Worksheet. The overall ROW width will decrease; however, clear zone is 24' for this facility, and will require permanent easement to be maintained regardless of the shoulder width. Assuming permanent easement is 60 % of ROW costs, the savings in ROW costs are actually $60,812 instead of $152,030 and there should be negligible savings in ROW mark up. The savings shown on the VE Study Cost Worksheet for the actual cost of materials and installation of the 24-inch curb and gutter are $65,310. Deduct the $30,000 additional cost of curb inlets; the saving is reduced to $35,310 in actual construction material cost and installation. Adding the savings in ROW cost equals a total savings of $98,122 not $442,344 as shown in the VE Study Report.
R-5	Where 20-foot wide medians are proposed, use 18 foot instead.	$268,356	Yes	This should be done.
R-6	Where 8-foot-wide medians with 30-inch-wide curb and gutter are proposed use 6 foot medians with 24 inch curb and gutter.	$846,066	Yes	This should be done.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
R-7	Eliminate sidewalks from the left side of SR 92 except in busy commercial areas.	$202,909	No	The need and purpose of the project includes non-motorized transportation options and therefore the sidewalk is necessary for the project to meet the intended purpose.
R-9	Add a second left-turn-lane from westbound SR 92 to southbound US 41 to improve vehicle movement.	-$35,598 (cost increase)	Yes	This should be done.
R-10	Locate the high point of the vertical curve at the center of the new 1330-foot bridge to improve drainage.	Design Suggestion	Yes	This should be done.
R-12/ B-2	Convert the old roadway alignment into a multi-use trail in lieu of providing a new multi-use trail from STA 523+00 to STA 555+00 Rt.	$733,791	No	The bike route designated along SR 92 must be continuous and therefore cannot stop at the bridge and pick up on the other side. The multi-use trail will remain on state right of way and adjacent to SR 92.
R-13	Stripe out U-turn "eye-brow" lanes to improve safety.	Design Suggestion	No	The additional paving for U-turn maneuvers shall adhere to the MUTCD guidelines which do not recommend striping for safety. The GDOT Design Guidelines for Signs and Pavement Markings does not recommend this hatching for eyebrows.
R-14	Use HDPE pipe in lieu of RCP pipe for the SR 92 longitudinal storm water drainage system.	$120,396	No	At this time, there is not enough information to accept this recommendation; however, once the Soil Survey Report has been approved, the use of HDPE pipe will be considered.
R-15	Realign Orr Rd. with Kemp Rd. at the median opening.	-$354,966 (cost increase)	Yes	This should be done.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
R-16	Shift the right turn onto North Main St. to the east to eliminate the need for the fifth lane on the bridge over the CSX.	$73,401	No	To provide AASHTO minimum recommended standards, it is necessary to extend the deceleration lane through the bridge.
R-17	Use Geogrid to reduce pavement section requirements.	$508,200	No	OMR has indicated there is no supporting data to encourage the use of Geogrid to reduce pavement section.
Bridges (B)				
ALT #	**Description**	**Potential Savings/LCC**	**Implement**	**Comments**
B-1	Provide 6-foot-wide medians in lieu of 8-foot-wide medians on the 1330-foot bridge.	$305,900	Yes	This should be done.
B-3	Use a storm water filtering system on the project to improve water quality.	Design Suggestion	Yes	This should be done.
B-5	Use 280-foot-long steel through girder spans in lieu of 140-foot-long bulb tees to minimize lake storage loss due to bridge piers.	Design Suggestion	Yes, pending more review as design progresses	The design of the bridge is still in the conceptual stage; however, the use of continuous steel girders will be considered during the design of the bridge. The increased cost of the superstructure elements could possibly be offset by the reduced cost of the substructure elements. If the cost comparisons are favorable and the Office of Bridge Design grants its approval, structural steel girders could be used.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
B-6	Increase abutment and wing wall height to reduce the length of the 1330-foot bridge.	$439,415	No	The bridge length shown in the concept plans was set to provide clearance from the elevation 840' contour line, as requested by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This elevation is the normal pool elevation for Lake Allatoona which cannot be encroached upon without a loss in storage capacity.
B-7	Use cast-in-drill-hole (CIDH) piles on the 1330-foot bridge.	Design Suggestion	Yes, pending more complete geotechnical information	This recommendation will be considered; however, the foundation design for the new bridge will be based on the results of a subsurface geotechnical investigation and analysis.
Walls (W)				
W-2	Use a soil nail wall in lieu of Class A Concrete from STA 556+00 to STA 565+30 Rt.	Design Suggestion	No	The soil nail wall will be looked at when the Soil Survey Report is completed. It is not possible to know if this is feasible at this time in the design process.
W-3	Use a MSE wall in lieu of Class A Concrete from STA 569+00 to STA 576+00 Lt.	Design Suggestion	Yes	A MSE wall will be utilized in this location if utility conflicts do not preclude it.
W-4	Use a MSE wall from STA 612+00 to STA 623+00 Lt. to reduce the commercial right-of-way requirements.	$343,600	Yes	The use of a retaining wall shall be implemented.

Additional information was provided by David Norwood on May 5, 2009.

The Office of Engineering Services concurs with the Project Manager's responses.

Approved: Gerald M. Ross **Date:** 5/13/09

Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

REW/LLM
Attachments
c: Genetha Rice-Singleton
Paul Liles
Bill Duvall
Bill Ingalsbe
Jennifer Harris-Dunham
Mike Haithcock
David Norwood
Sebastian Nesbitt
Dale Ferris
Nabil Raad
Nabil M. Raad
Alexis John
Lisa Myers
Matt Sanders
Andre Netterville
Andrew Heath
Andrew Farmer
Olivia Gauntner

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA

APR 2009 REC'D Office of Engineering Services D.O.T.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: CSSTP-0006-00(862) and BRST0-0213-01(005) Cobb Co.
PI Nos.: 0006862 and 731865
SR 92 Improvements from US 41/SR3/Cobb Parkway to Glade Road

OFFICE: Program Delivery

DATE: April 28, 2009

FROM: Bobby Hilliard, P.E., State Program Delivery Engineer

TO: Ron Wishon, State Project Review Engineer

SUBJECT: Value Engineering Study-Responses

Reference is made to the recommendations that were contained in the Value Engineering Study Report dated March 2009 for the above referenced project. Our responses and recommendations are as follows:

1. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-1:** Add a second right turn lane from southbound Glade Rd. to westbound SR 92 to improve traffic flow.
   Approval of the VE Alternative No. R-1 is recommended.

   Synchro 7.0 analysis yielded the following results:
   2012 Build
   AM (single SB right) - 30.2 sec of intersection delay
   AM (dual SB right) - 30.0 sec of intersection delay
   PM (single SB right) - 28.8 sec of intersection delay
   PM (dual SB right) - 23.8 sec of intersection delay
   2032 Build
   AM (single SB right) - 44.5 sec of intersection delay
   AM (dual SB right) - 43.8 sec of intersection delay
   PM (single SB right) - 87.3 sec of intersection delay
   PM (dual SB right) - 39.8 sec of intersection delay

   - The overall intersection delay will benefit from the addition of the right turn lane during all peak periods as well as the reduced delay for this individual right turn movement.
   - This alternative will increase right of way costs and was not accounted for in the recommendation. RW was necessary from the Lake Acworth Village, LLC parcel as part of the original design concept therefore the additional cost would increase the area of RW by $150/SF but not increase the pre-acquisition or negotiation cost for this parcel.

2. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-2:** Add right-in/right-out at STA 618+00 (RT) to accommodate access to local business.
   Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-2 is recommended.

   - All parcels shall maintain their existing access to SR 92 or be compensated during RW negotiations. Access of individual parcel owners was not show at the concept level.

3. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-3:** Make all inside lanes 11-foot-wide in lieu of 12-foot-wide. Use all 11-ft-wide lanes.
   Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-3 is not recommended.

   - The typical section provided showed the 12-foot lane on the inside and the 11-foot lane on the outside. That is not shown correctly. The 11-foot lane is the inside lane and the 12-foot lane is the outside lane. The design does propose to use 11-foot lanes on the inside lane.
   - Due to the 7.5% truck volume and the 40,000 ADT on this State Route we feel that the added safety providing the trucks and local busses with the additional width on the outside lane negates the cost savings of the narrower lane.

4. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-4:** Use 24-inch-wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch-wide curb and gutter.
   Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-4 is not recommended.

   - The use of 24-inch curb and gutter will be not be implemented on the outside curb and gutter sections for this project. The use of a 24-inch curb in lieu of the proposed 30-inch curb will reduce the gutter flow capacity by up to 60 percent. See Chart 1, appendix A of HEC 22. Furthermore, analyzing spread over a 400-foot length of roadway typical section reveals a 12% increase in total spread when comparing the 24-inch curb with a 2 percent roadway cross slope, to a 30-inch curb with a 2 percent cross slope. Therefore hydraulically the 24-inch curb can be shown to under perform the 30-inch curb in both gutter flow capacity and in width of spread. This reduction of capacity will create the need for additional curb inlets, it is assumed of the 70 inlets provided in the concept costs estimate an additional 12 inlets will be required accommodate the reduction in gutter width, this will result in a cost addition of approximately $30,000.00 which was not accounted for in the VE Study Cost Worksheet.
   - The design team disagrees with the overall right of way saving shown in the VE Study Cost Work sheet. The overall right of way width will decrease, however clear zone is 24 feet for this facility, and will require permanent easement to be maintained regardless of the shoulder width. Assuming permanent easement is 60 percent of right of way costs, the savings in right of way costs are actually $60,812.00 instead of $152,030.00 and there should be negligible savings in right of way mark up.
   - The savings shown on the VE Study Cost Worksheet for the actual cost of materials and installation of the 24-inch curb and gutter are $65,310.00. Deduct the $30,000.00 additional cost of curb inlets; the saving is reduced to $33,310.00 in actual construction material cost and installation. Adding the saving in right of way cost equals a total savings for recommendation R-4 of $96,122.06 not $442,344.00 as shown in the VE Study.
   - The design team therefore recommends the use of 30-inch curb and gutter on the outside travel lane, due to the increased hydraulic capacity and function of the gutter design.

5. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-5:** Make raised medians 18-foot-wide in lieu of 20-foot wide.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-5 is recommended.

   - The use of an 18-foot wide median rather than a 20-foot median will reduce the overall footprint of the roadway and generate cost savings, both in right of way and materials.

6. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-6:** Make roadway medians 6-foot-wide including 24-inch-wide curb and gutter in lieu of 8-foot-wide including 30-inch-wide curb and gutter.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-6 is recommended.

   - The use of a 6-foot wide median rather than an 8-foot median will reduce the overall footprint of the roadway and generate cost savings both in right of way and materials

7. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-7:** Eliminate sidewalks from the left side of SR 92 except in busy commercial areas.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-7 is not recommended.

   - The need and purpose of the project includes non-motorized transportation options and therefore the sidewalk is necessary to the project meeting the intended purpose.

8. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-9:** Add a second left-turn-lane from westbound SR 92 to southbound US 41 to improve vehicle movement.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-9 is recommended.

   - A dual-left turn lane will be provided from westbound SR 92 onto US 41/Cobb Parkway.

9. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-10:** Locate the high point of the vertical curve at the center of the new 1330-foot bridge to improve drainage.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-10 is recommended at this time.

   - The bridge profile appears as though it can be shifted to the middle of the bridge. This will be the goal during preliminary plans to shift the PI of the vertical curve to the center of the bridge if at all feasible.

10. **Value Engineering Alternative No. R-12**: Convert the old roadway alignment into a multi-use trail in lieu of providing a new multi-use trail from STA 523+00 to STA 555+00 (RT).
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-12 is not recommended.

   - The multi-use trail may follow the proposed improvements in this area to a degree but due to vehicular access to the park on both ends of the abandoned bridge as well as unknown materials that will be used by the City of Acworth for the enhancements of their park, GDOT will provide safe and continuous ADA compliant access adjacent to SR 92 to meet guidelines set forth by FHWA. The bike route designated along SR 92 must be continuous and therefore cannot stop at the bridge and pick up on the other side. The multi-use trail will remain on state right of way and adjacent to SR 92.

11. Value Engineering Alternative No. R-13: Stripe out U-turn "eye-brow" lanes to improve safety.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R13 is not recommended.

- The additional paving for U-turn maneuvers shall adhere to the MUTCD guidelines which do not recommend striping for safety. The GDOT Design Guidelines for Signs and Pavement Markings does not recommend this hatching for eyebrows.

12. Value Engineering Alternative No. R-14: Use HDPE pipe in lieu of RCP pipe for the SR 92 longitudinal storm water drainage system.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-14 is not recommended at this time.

- The use of pipe is specified at the time of design but the contractor is allowed to use any of the GDOT allowable materials for the soils conditions listed in the Soil Survey Report. The use of the specific pipe can be specified in the plans. The pipe shall be considered for appropriate locations once the Soil Survey Report has been approved.

13. Value Engineering Alternative No. R-15: Realign Orr Rd. with Kemp Rd. at the median opening.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-15 is recommended.

- Orr Road will be realigned with Kemp Road as part of this project.

14. Value Engineering Alternative No. R-16: Shift the right turn onto North Main St. to the east to eliminate the need for the fifth lane on the bridge over the CSX.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-16 is not recommended.

- The right turn shall not be shifted off the bridge. The exiting curve from SR 92 to the off ramp is approximately 65-feet in radius. Per AASTHO the 65-foot radius provides a design speed of 15 mph design. This requires a deceleration length of 295-feet per AASTO standard, exhibit 10-73. There is 235- feet from the curve to the bridge in the existing condition. To provide AASHTO minimum recommended standards, it is necessary to extend the deceleration lane through the bridge.
- The existing vertical geometry creates a sight distance problem at this location, making the argument for a design exception difficult. The proposed project will provide the minimum K value of 61 for crest vertical curves.

15. Value Engineering Alternative No. R-17: Use Geogrid to reduce pavement section requirements.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. R-17 is recommended where possible.

- The possibility of using Geogrid on this project cannot be determined at this phase as a soil survey has not been completed therefore the pavement evaluation is not complete.

16. Value Engineering Alternative No. B-1: Provide 6-foot-wide medians in lieu of 8-foot-wide medians on the 1330-foot bridge.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. B-1 is recommended.

- A 6-foot median will be used across the bridge because there are no median drainage requirements on the bridge.

17. Value Engineering Alternative No. B-3: Use a storm water filtering system on the project to improve water quality.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. B-3 is recommended.

- The use of a storm water filtering system will be designed on this project.

18. Value Engineering Alternative No. B-5: Use 280-foot-long steel through girder spans in lieu of 140-foot-long bulb tees to minimize storage loss due to bridge piers.
VE Study Alternative No. B-5 will be considered for approval by URS/GDOT Office of Bridge Design.

- The conceptual design shown (precast concrete Bulb T's) utilizes structural elements that are commonly used and very cost-effective in the State of Georgia. During preliminary phase design, we can discuss the option of using continuous steel girders (not through girders as called for above) in lieu of precast Bulb T's with the Office of Bridge Design. The increased cost of the superstructure elements could possibly be offset by the reduced cost of the substructure elements. If the cost comparisons are favorable and the Office of Bridge Design grants its approval, structural steel girders could be used.

19. Value Engineering Alternative No. B-6: Increase abutment and wing wall height to reduce the length of the 1330-foot bridge.
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. B-6 is not recommended.

- The bridge length shown in the concept plans was set to provide clearance from the elevation 840' contour line, as requested by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This elevation is the normal pool elevation for Lake Allatoona which cannot be encroached upon without a loss in storage capacity.

20. Value Engineering Alternative No. B-7: Use cast-in-drill-hole (CIDH) piles on the 1330-foot bridge.
VE Study Alternative No. B-7 will be considered for approval by URS/GDOT Office of Bridge Design.

- The foundation design for the new bridge will be based on the results of a subsurface geotechnical investigation and analysis. A Bridge Foundation Investigation Report will be prepared by our subconsultant and will include recommended foundation types for this site. All foundation recommendations will be reviewed and approved by GDOT.

21. Value Engineering Alternative No. W-2: Use a soil nail wall in lieu of Class A Concrete from STA 556+00 to STA 565+30 (RT).
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. W-2 is not recommended at this time.

- The soil nail wall will be looked at when the Geotechnical Engineer issues the Soil Survey Report. It is not possible to know if this is feasible at this time in the design process. Right of way and utility impacts will also be part of the wall selection process as the project moves further along the design process.

22. Value Engineering Alternative No. W-3: Use a MSE wall in lieu of Class A Concrete from STA 569+00 to STA 576+00 (LT).
Approval of VE Study Alternative No. W-3 is recommended.

- Right of way and utility impacts will be part of the wall selection process as the project moves further along the design process. A MSE wall will be utilized in this location if utility conflicts do not preclude it.

23. Value Engineering Alternative No. W-4: Use a MSE wall from STA 612+00 to STA 623+00 (LT) to reduce the commercial right-of-way requirements.

Approval of VE Study Alternative No. W-4 is recommended.

- The use of a retaining wall shall be implemented.

BH:MAH:DAN:jmh

Cc: URS Corporation – Sean Pharr

Myers, Lisa

From: Norwood, David
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2009 11:28 AM
To: Myers, Lisa
Subject: RE: VE implementation

Hey...I consulted the M-3 detail and used a 400' turn-lane and 180' taper for a total of 5880 SF which gives a ROW cost of $68,000. Also, ROW for this area is $11.50/SF...not $150. I just chastised the consultant for making that "typo".

I revised the response as below.

- This alternative will increase right of way costs and was not accounted for in the recommendation. RW was necessary from the Lake Acworth Village, LLC parcel as part of the original design concept therefore the additional work would increase the area of RW by 5880 SF for a total of $68,000 at $11.50/SF.

Thanks,
David

-----Original Message-----
From: Myers, Lisa
Sent: Friday, May 01, 2009 7:32 AM
To: Norwood, David
Subject: FW: VE implementation

One more thing - Response #4 for R-4. The third bullet says take 65,310 subtract 30,000 and get 33,310. We are missing 2,000. This screws up the rest of the numbers in the paragraph.

Lisa Myers, AVS
Transportation Engineer Assistant Administrator - VE Coordinator

GA DOT - Engineering Services
One Georgia Center - 5th Floor
600 W. Peachtree Street NW
Atlanta, GA 30308

Voice: 404-631-1770
Fax: 404-631-1956
lmyers@dot.ga.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Norwood, David
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2009 8:07 AM
To: Myers, Lisa
Subject: RE: VE implementation

Here are the responses. I don't have a Cover Sheet...we have not begun Preliminary Design Phase. If you need the half-size for Gerald, he is very familiar with these two projects. He has the Concept Report now reviewing it.

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0006862,731865-

PROJ ID :	0006862	SR 92 FM SR 3/US 41 TO COWAN @ I-75				MGMT LET DATE :	12/15/2011
COUNTY :	Cobb					MGMT ROW DATE :	09/15/2010
LENGTH (MI) :	3.86	MPO:	Atlanta TMA	DOT DIST:	7		
PROJ NO.:	CSSTP-0006-00(862)	TIP #:	CO-301	CONG. DIST:	11	SCHED LET DATE :	3/7/2012
PROJ MGR:	Norwood, David	MODEL YR :	2020	BIKE:	Y	WHO LETS?:	Prepare Plans for Shelf
OFFICE :	Program Delivery	TYPE WORK:	Widening	MEASURE:	E	LET WITH :	731865-
CONSULTANT:	Turnkey Consultant, (Contract with GDOT)	CONCEPT:		NEEDS SCORE:			
SPONSOR :	Cobb County	PROG TYPE:	Reconstruction/Rehabilitation	BRIDGE SUFF:			
DESIGN FIRM:	URS Corporation	Prov. for ITS:	N				
		BOND PROJ :					

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%
		Concept Development	7/10/2007	5/4/2009	100
		Concept Meeting	2/5/2009	2/5/2009	100
		PM Submit Concept Report	3/12/2009	3/12/2009	100
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	4/10/2009	4/20/2009	100
		Management Concept Approval Complete	**4/24/2009**	**5/4/2009**	**100**
	5/19/2009	Value Engineering Study	7/30/2008		82
		Public Information Open House Held	7/8/2008	7/8/2008	100
	7/29/2010	**Environmental Approval**	**7/27/2007**		8
/2010	5/27/2010	Pub Hear Held/Comm Resp (EA/FONSI, GEPA)			0
	5/28/2009	Mapping	8/1/2007		97
	6/11/2009	Field Surveys/SDE	7/27/2007		48
12/2009	**8/12/2010**	**Preliminary Plans**			0
8/2009	1/15/2010	Preliminary Bridge Design			0
	9/10/2009	Underground Storage Tanks	8/27/2008		82
3/2009	8/20/2009	404 Permit Obtainment			0
3/2010	9/6/2010	PFPR Inspection			0
/2010	11/1/2010	R/W Plans Preparation			0
/2/2010	**12/3/2010**	**R/W Plans Final Approval**			**0**
/13/2010	10/15/2010	L & D Approval			0
/6/2010	1/10/2012	R/W Acquisition			0
28/2011	5/11/2011	Stake R/W			0
18/2009	1/12/2010	Soil Survey			0
10/2010	9/17/2010	Bridge Foundation Investigation			0
/18/2010	**6/28/2011**	**Final Design**			0
/9/2010	3/30/2011	Final Bridge Plans Preparation			0
20/2011	7/21/2011	FFPR Inspection			0
4/2011	8/17/2011	Submit FFPR Responses (OES)			0

PROGRAMMED FUNDS

Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
PE	2006	2006	2,503,873.10	L240	AUTHORIZED	2/7/2006
ROW	2009	2013	7,513,386.00	L230S	PRECST	
CST	2009	2018	17,655,000.00	L230S	PRECST	

PE Cost Est Amt:	2,503,873.10	Date:	
ROW Cost Est Amt:	7,513,386.00	Date:	10/10/2008
CST Cost Est Amt:	17,655,000.00	Date:	10/10/2008

STIP AMOUNTS

Phase	Cost	Fund
PE	0.00	L240
ROW	1,575,000.00	L230S
CST	10,347,000.00	L230S

ridge:	BRIDGE REQUIRED
esign:	CTM sched for 2/5/09
S:	EA/FONSI | Not Appvd | No tOn Schedule ROW | Nable[4.13.09]
GPA:	NOTIFICATION LETTER SENT TO COBB 3-24-06.
og. Develop:	PROGRAMMED AT THE REQUEST OF ARC - FY05|PE STIP AMEND #10 12-05|FIRE PROGRAM DE-OBLIGATED PE FUNDS 1-07
ogramming:	#1 1-07|#2 5-07|#3 8-08|#4 10-08
raffic Op:	TURNKEY-AWAITING CNSLT PFPR PLANS FOR REVIEW
ility:	OCD SUE;Tk4,Ct12
MG:	RECST/REHAB (WIDENING); TURNKEY PROJECT

District Comments

Same Env Doc w/ 731865.

rel. Parcel CT:	53	Total Parcel in ROW System:		Cond. Filed:		Acquired by:	DOT	DEEDS CT:
nder Review:		Options - Pending:		Relocations:		Acquisition MGR:		
eleased:		Condemnations- Pend:		Acquired:		R/W Cert Date:		

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:0006862,731865-

SR 92 @ PROCTOR CREEK/LAKE ACWORTH IN SW ACWORTH

PROJ ID :	731865-					MGMT LET DATE :	
COUNTY :	Cobb					MGMT ROW DATE :	09/15/2010
LENGTH (MI) :	0.57	MPO:	Atlanta TMA	DOT DIST:	7		
PROJ NO.:	BRST0-0213-01(005)	TIP #:	CO-311	CONG. DIST:	11	SCHED LET DATE :	11/14/2012
PROJ MGR:	Norwood, David	MODEL YR :	2020	BIKE:	Y	WHO LETS?:	Prepare Plans for Shelf
OFFICE :	Program Delivery	TYPE WORK:	Bridges	MEASURE:	E	LET WITH :	0006862
CONSULTANT:	Turnkey Consultant, (Contract with GDOT)	CONCEPT:	BR REPL	NEEDS SCORE:	7		
SPONSOR :	GDOT	PROG TYPE:	Replacement	BRIDGE SUFF:	44.53		
DESIGN FIRM:	URS Corporation	Prov. for ITS:	N				
		BOND PROJ :					

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%
		Concept Development	11/26/2002	5/4/2009	100
		Concept Meeting	7/23/2003	7/23/2003	100
		PM Submit Concept Report	3/12/2009	3/12/2009	100
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	4/10/2009	4/20/2009	100
		Management Concept Approval Complete	**4/24/2009**	**5/4/2009**	**100**
	5/19/2009	Value Engineering Study	7/30/2008		82
		Public Information Open House Held	7/8/2008	7/8/2008	100
	7/15/2010	**Environmental Approval**	**7/27/2007**		8
/2010	5/13/2010	Pub Hear Held/Comm Resp (EA/FONSI, GEPA)			0
		Field Surveys/SDE	10/1/2004	12/1/2004	100
2009	**7/29/2010**	**Preliminary Plans**			0
	5/7/2009	Preliminary Bridge Design	12/1/2004		95
	9/10/2009	Underground Storage Tanks	8/27/2008		82
2009	8/20/2009	404 Permit Obtainment			0
/2010	8/23/2010	PFPR Inspection			0
/2010	10/18/2010	R/W Plans Preparation			0
9/2010	**11/19/2010**	**R/W Plans Final Approval**			0
		L & D Approval	8/26/2003	9/8/2003	100
2/2010	9/18/2012	R/W Acquisition			0
/2011	4/13/2011	Stake R/W			0
/2009	3/30/2010	Soil Survey			0
2009	11/30/2010	Bridge Foundation Investigation			0
/2010	**6/8/2011**	**Final Design**			0
/2010	5/17/2011	Final Bridge Plans Preparation			0
/2011	7/1/2011	FFPR Inspection			0
/2011	7/28/2011	Submit FFPR Responses (OES)			0

PROGRAMMED FUNDS

Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
PE	2000	2000	965,803.61	Q10	AUTHORIZED	1/21/2000
ROW	2008	2013	3,027,414.46	L1C0	PRECST	
CST	2010	2018	24,033,176.72	L1C0	PRECST	

PE Cost Est Amt:		Date:	
ROW Cost Est Amt:	2,309,600.00	Date:	10/10/2008
CST Cost Est Amt:	15,492,000.00	Date:	10/10/2008

STIP AMOUNTS

Phase	Cost	Fund
PE		Q10
ROW	193,000.00	L1C0
CST	5,197,000.00	L1C0

D:	[01R] APRIL BOARD ADDITION: ASSIGNED CONSULTANT TASK FORCE 4/30/99
dge:	ACB 11/03/08 - 95% P.L.
ign:	CTM sched for 2/5/09
:	EA-FONSI|NotAppvd|NotOnSchedROW|Nabl(8.29.08)
PA:	REQ COBB DO UTIL 7-31-03|REQ ACWORTH DO UTIL 7-31-03|RESCISSION LETTER SENT TO ACWORTH 7-15-04
gramming:	#1 5-07
ffic Op:	AWAITING CONSULTANT PFPR PLANS FOR REVIEW 031004
ity:	CC: PPLANS TO UTS 07/06 (-4)
G:	BRIDGE REPLACEMENT
ceptual Design:	PBQD-14 ->H&L, NEW BR DOWNSTREAM OF DAM; PRELIM PLANS SOON

District Comments

Same Env Doc w/ 0006862.
MUST COORD. W/ARMY COE. IMPACTS TO LAKE ARE 161,000 CY FILL AND 6.76 ACRE FOOTPRINT FOR SHORTEST BRIDGE. Project within limits of0006862

el. Parcel CT:	11	**Total Parcel in ROW System:**	**Cond. Filed:**	**Acquired by:**	DOT	***DEEDS CT:***
der Review:		**Options - Pending:**	**Relocations:**	**Acquisition MGR:**		
eased:		**Condemnations- Pend:**	**Acquired:**	**R/W Cert Date:**		