

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

-----  
**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** STP-2348(3) Forsyth  
P. I. No.: 141880  
S.R. 1005/Bethelview Road Widening

**OFFICE:** Engineering Services

**DATE:** May 27, 2008

**FROM:** Brian Summers, P.E., Project Review Engineer *REW*

**TO:** Brent Story, P.E. State Road and Airport Design Engineer

**SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES**

Recommendations for implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives are indicated in the table below. Incorporate alternatives recommended for implementation to the extent reasonable in the design of the project.

ALT No.	Description	Savings PW & LCC	Implement	Comments
B-2	Reduce the outside shoulder width from 16' to 12'.	\$2,762,000	No	There are 122 driveways along Bethelview Road and the sidewalks would have to wrap around the back side of the driveways in order to meet ADA requirements. In addition, there are numerous Utilities located along the corridor that will have to be relocated. See attached list for Utility type and locations.
B-1	Reduce the travel lanes from 12' to 11' and keep the width of left turn lanes at 12'.	\$2,222,000	No	Bethelview Road is classified as a Rural Major Collector and AASHTO recommends a 24' minimum width. However, AASHTO does allow a 22' width where the alignment and safety records are satisfactory. Based on accident data the accident rate on this corridor is as much as 22% greater than the statewide average. In addition there are 5% trucks on this corridor with a Design Year traffic of 35,500 vpd.

ALT No.	Description	Savings PW & LCC	Implement	Comments
N-1	Modify the medians in the left turn bay areas from curb and gutter to a 6' Raised Corrugated Concrete Median with 1' offsets.	\$100,000	No	Based on what is shown this would only be a 4" high median which is normally not used. However, a monolithic median with a Type 7 curb face that is 6" high will be considered for use on this project.
N-2	Reduce the median width by 4' and use a 2' Raised Corrugated Concrete Median with 1' offsets instead of curb and gutter and median.	\$2,067,000	No	This would cut the median width to 16'. At median openings the 2' raised Corrugated Concrete Median would not provide the desired refuge space for turning vehicles, especially at un-signalized intersections.
J-1	Reduce the Big Creek Bridge width 4' to accommodate 11' travel lanes in lieu of 12' travel lanes.	\$54,000	No	Does not apply since J-2 will be implemented.
J-2	Reduce the Big Creek Bridge width 8' to accommodate 11' travel lanes and a reduced median width of 16'.	\$109,000	No	This was contingent upon VE Alternatives B-1 and N-2 being implemented.
J-3	Construct dual structures with 12' travel lanes and eliminate 16' of the raised median on the Big Creek Bridge.	\$162,000	No	Would require that guardrail and a guardrail attenuator be installed in the median which is not desirable.
J-4	Construct dual structures with 11' travel lanes and eliminate 16' of the raised median on the Big Creek Bridge.	\$216,000	No	Would require that guardrail and a guardrail attenuator be installed in the median which is not desirable.
R-1	Replace the Multi Cell Box Culvert with a 3 span bridge.	\$91,000	No	Based on a more detailed cost estimate the bridge option is more expensive.

ALT No.	Description	Savings PW & LCC	Implement	Comments
L-1	Eliminate the sidewalk in areas where there are no commercial or residential buildings	\$670,000	No	Due to the nature of the corridor, sidewalks will be necessary to provide pedestrian connectivity within the project limits. There are over 230 properties, many of which are shopping centers, daycare centers, churches, and residential properties, that will need the sidewalk.
P-1	Reduce the width of the Roadway section and reduce or eliminate Project Retaining Walls.	\$350,000	Yes	This will be done where feasible.

A meeting was held on February 22, 2008 to discuss the above recommendations. Brad Hale with Moreland Altobelli, Jason McCook, Eugene Hopkins, and Scott Maclean with Road Design, and Brian Summers, Ron Wishon and Lisa Myers with Engineering Services were in attendance.

Additional information was provided by the Design Consultant on April 30, 2008 and May 23, 2008.

The results above reflect the consensus of those in attendance and those who provided input.

Approved: *Gerald M. Ross* Date: 5/28/08  
**Gerald M. Ross, P. E., Chief Engineer**

BKS/REW

Attachments

- c: Gus Shanine
- Todd Long
- Paul Liles
- Bill Ingalsbe
- Bill Duvall
- Joe King

STP-2348(3) Forsyth  
P.I. No. 141880  
VE Study Implementation  
Page 4.

James Magnus  
Jason McCook  
Eugene Hopkins  
Scott Maclean  
Larry Bowman  
Kenny Beckworth  
Ken Werho  
Nabil Raad  
Lisa Myers

**PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT**

PROJ ID	COUNTY	DESCRIPTION	SCHED. DATE	MGMT. LET DATE
141880- STP00-2348-00(003)	Forsyth	SR 1005/BETHEL VIEW RD FM SR 9 TO SR 20 INCLUDE SR 20 INT.	1/21/2011	
<b>TIP #:</b>	FT-008	<b>FIELD DIST:</b> 1	<b>Phase</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<b>MPO:</b>	Atlanta TMA	<b>TWIN:</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<b>MODEL YR:</b>	2020	<b>US:</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Fund</b>
<b>PROJ MGR:</b>	Hopkins, Eugene	<b>EST DATE:</b> 12/7/2007	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Status</b>
<b>PROG TYPE:</b>	Reconstruction/Rehabilitation	<b>PROJ LENGTH:</b> 6.11	CST	LR
		<b>TYPE WORK:</b> Widening	\$ 85,000.00	Q24 AUTHORIZED
			\$ 10,945,400.66	L240 PRECST
			\$ 38,942,000.00	L240 PRECST
<b>CONCEPT:</b>	ADD 4U(MED 20)	<b>LET RESP:</b> DOT		

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACT/EST FINISH	PCT	DISTRICT COMMENTS
		Define Project Concept	6/30/1999	12/15/1999	73	RW,CST-LR. County working on design. Draft EA signed 06/30/03. Public Hearing 10/02/03. County wants FY05 ROW.
		Concept Meeting	10/18/2000	10/18/2000	100	
		Concept Submittal and Review	1/5/2001	1/29/2001	100	
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	1/30/2001	2/5/2001	100	
		Management Concept Approval Complete	2/13/2001	2/13/2001	100	
5/28/2008	6/3/2008	Value Engineering Study	9/26/2007		83	
		Public Information Open House Held	8/23/2001	8/23/2001	100	
5/22/2008	5/22/2008	Environmental Approval	12/31/2007		91	
		Public Hearing Held	10/2/2003	10/2/2003	100	
7/11/2008	7/31/2008	Mapping			0	
8/4/2008	9/5/2008	Field Surveys/SDE			0	
5/22/2008	5/22/2008	Preliminary Plans	2/19/2001		68	
		Preliminary Bridge Design	6/7/2005	6/13/2005	100	
5/23/2008	6/27/2008	Underground Storage Tanks			0	
5/23/2008	9/4/2008	404 Permit Obtainment			0	
5/23/2008	5/26/2008	PFPR Inspection	3/11/2008	3/11/2008	100	
5/23/2008	5/30/2008	R/W Plans Preparation	2/15/2008		90	
7/28/2008	7/31/2008	R/W Plans Final Approval			0	
7/1/2008	7/3/2008	L & D Report Development and Approval			0	
8/1/2008	11/24/2010	R/W Acquisition			0	
12/22/2008	1/2/2009	Stake R/W			0	
		Soil Survey	5/16/2005	8/26/2005	100	
		Bridge Foundation Investigation	5/3/2006	7/17/2006	100	
7/4/2008	5/7/2009	Final Design			0	
8/4/2008	12/19/2008	Final Bridge Plans Preparation			0	
5/29/2009	6/1/2009	FFPR Inspection			0	
6/15/2009	6/26/2009	FFPR Response			0	

<b>BIKE PROVISIONS INCLUDED?</b>	N	<b>MEASUREMENT SYSTEM:</b>	E	<b>CONSULTANT:</b>	L	<b>UT EST:</b>	\$0
<b>Design:</b>	2nd PIOH 2.26.08; PFPR 3.11.08--need report [SAM 22-Mar '08]						
<b>EIS:</b>	EA DraftEAsubmitted 12-6-07 Bowman						
<b>LGPA:</b>	REV PMA SGN FORSYTH DO PE & UTILITIES 6-30-99.						
<b>EMG:</b>	RECST/REHAB (WIDENING); PE BY COUNTY						
<b>Traffic Op:</b>	SEND PLANS FOR REV PFPR SET 10/31/05 \$- PFPRsent3/10/08 W/R						
<b>PDD:</b>	LOCALS SUPPORT; WANT SOONER. LOCALS. LGPA includes local RW w/DOT \$? 12/19/03.						
<b>Bridge:</b>	SCP 8/03/06						
<b>Utility:</b>	NEED 1ST SUBMISSION PLANS 10/13/04						
<b>Programming:</b>	#1 2-05 #2 10-07						

<b>R/W INFORMATION</b>							
<b>REL PARCEL CT:</b>	140	<b>TOTAL PARCEL CT:</b>	238	<b>ACQUIRED BY:</b>	LOC	<b>ACQ MGR:</b>	<b>UNDER-REVIEW CT:</b> 0
<b>RELEASED CT:</b>	0	<b>OPT-PEND CT:</b>	0	<b>DEEDS CT:</b>	0	<b>COND-PEND CT:</b>	0 <b>COND-FILED CT:</b> 0
<b>RW CERT DT:</b>		<b>ACQUIRED CT:</b>	0	<b>RELOCATION CT:</b>	0		



Thomas D. Moreland, PE  
President

Vickie E. Moreland  
Senior Vice President

George M. Byrd, PE  
Senior Vice President

Bradley M. Hale, PE  
Vice President

Richard C. Bouffan, PE  
Vice President

Hisham H. Deeb, PE  
Vice President

Albert J. Joyner, Jr.  
Vice President

Henry E. Collins, Jr.  
Vice President

May 23, 2008

Mr. Scott MacLean  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Road Design – Room 444  
No. 2 Capitol Square  
Atlanta, GA 30334-1002

Re: Bethelview Road – Value Engineering  
STP-2348(3), Forsyth County  
P.I. No. 141880

Dear Mr. MacLean:

The following utility companies have facilities that will need to be relocated within the proposed shoulders on Bethelview Road.

**Underground**

AT&T  
Forsyth Co. Water & Sewer  
City of Cumming Water  
Atlanta Gas & Light

**Overhead**

AT&T  
Georgia Power Co.  
Georgia Transmission  
Sawnee EMC  
? Cable TV (formerly Prestige)

At this time we only have existing utility locations. Throughout the 6-mile corridor, the above utilities are not consistently located on a specific side of the road. The overhead utilities alternate between the east and west side of Bethelview Rd. Typically, there is a 12-inch water line on the east side of the road for the entire length of the project, and a 12-inch water line on the west side of the road for approx. 3.25 miles. Sanitary sewer is present on the west side for approx. 1.1 miles, and a 4-inch gas line is present on the west side for approx. 4.2 miles.

A few important items to note concerning the water and sewer lines:

- EPD requires 10 feet of lateral separation between water and sewer lines. They will allow less than 10 feet of lateral separation with a variance if at least 30 inches of vertical separation is provided, but this is not preferred.
- With an urban shoulder section, the curb & gutter and longitudinal storm drainage will often require underground utilities to be placed at least 7 to 8 feet from the edge of travel way. When several underground utilities are present, a 12-foot shoulder and right-of-way section would be inadequate and additional utility easement would be necessary.
- With a 12-foot shoulder, underground utilities would often be required under the proposed sidewalk.
- When guardrail is present, at least 6-feet of lateral separation is desired with sanitary sewer.
- Current GDOT guidelines for 45 mph urban sections require utility poles to be placed at least 12-feet behind the face of curb. With a 12-foot shoulder and right-of-way section, this would place the overhead utilities 2-feet outside of the right-of-way. Additional right-of-way and/or utility easement would be required in this case.

If there are any questions concerning this information, or if any additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to contact me at 770-263-5945.

Thank you,

Brad Hale, P.E.  
Project Manager

cc: File 99512  
BMH



Recycled Paper

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA  
PRECONSTRUCTION DIVISION  
OFFICE OF ROAD AND AIRPORT DESIGN



LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

DATE: Wednesday, April 30, 2008  
PROJECT: STP00-2348-00(003)  
COUNTY: Forsyth  
P.I. NO. 141880

TO: Brian Summers, State Project Review Engineer

ATTENTION: **Ron Wishon, Asst. Project Review Engineer**

We are sending you  attached  under separate cover

- ITEMS:  Correspondence  Plan Sheets  Utility Plans  
 Special Provisions  Profile Sheets  Geometry Layout  
 Typical Sections  Preliminary Plans  Revisions  
 Summary of Quantities  Right of Way Plans  Prints  
 Detailed Cost Estimate  Construction Plans  Mylar originals  
 VE Implementation Response Letter

COPIES	DESCRIPTION
1	VE Implementation Response Letter

These are transmitted as checked below:

- As requested  For your use  For approval  For revision  
 For revision  For your information  For review & comment

REMARKS:

Should you have any questions, please contact Scott MacLean at 404-656-5449.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
For: Brent A. Story, P.E.  
State Road and Airport Design Engineer

BAS/JM/WEH/sm



Thomas D. Moreland, PE  
President

Vickie E. Moreland  
Senior Vice President

George M. Byrd, PE  
Senior Vice President

Bradley M. Hale, PE  
Vice President

Richard C. Bouffan, PE  
Vice President

Hisham H. Deeb, PE  
Vice President

Albert J. Joyner, Jr.  
Vice President

Henry E. Collins, Jr.  
Vice President

April 29, 2008

Mr. Eugene Hopkins  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Road Design – Room 444  
No. 2 Capitol Square  
Atlanta, GA 30334-1002

Re: Bethelview Road – Value Engineering  
STP-2348(3), Forsyth County  
P.I. No. 141880

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

Outlined below are responses to the design suggestions included in the Value Engineering Report for the above referenced project. The alternatives marked as 'modified response' include additional information as requested. We have also removed any reference to current GDOT design policy, as requested, but have included references to AASHTO policy wherever relevant. The remaining responses have not changed since our initial letter on January 8, 2008.

Several of the recommendations below would require changes to the typical section for the entire length of the project (5.9 miles) and would adversely affect the project schedule. At this point, preliminary plans are complete, a PFPR has been held, and right-of-way plans have been submitted for review. Right-of-way is currently programmed in FY 2008. Forsyth County has requested that, if these changes are to be implemented, they be applied only to the segment north of the Castleberry Road intersection (+/- 5 miles). This would allow the segment between SR 9 and Castleberry Road (+/- 0.9 miles) to remain on schedule and be let to construction concurrently with the adjacent intersection improvements on SR 141 at SR 9 (P.I. 0007999).

#### **Alternative B-2 (modified response)**

Description: Use 12-ft. shoulders instead of 16-ft. shoulders

Cost savings: \$2,705,000

Response: *This project was re-designed with 16' urban shoulders at the Department's request (see attached e-mail correspondence). Reducing the shoulders to 12' would result in the following:*

- 1) **Schedule delay.** *The plan changes associated with this recommendation would delay R/W authorization by +/- 6 months. Funding for the R/W would need to shift from FY 2008 to FY 2009. Completion of the final construction plans would also be delayed by up to 6 months.*
- 2) **Significant re-design cost.** *In addition to revising approx. 800 drawings, changing the project footprint would require a concept revision, an additional PIOH, and a re-evaluation of the environmental document. The additional P&E cost imposed on Forsyth County would total between \$150,000 and \$200,000.*
- 3) **Less desirable sidewalk alignment.** *There are 122 driveways along the Bethelview Road mainline. Reducing the shoulders would require the sidewalks to wrap around the valley gutters in order to meet the minimum 2% cross slope required by ADA. (See attached GA STD Detail A2). The resulting 'jagged' sidewalk alignment is less desirable aesthetically and for pedestrian movement (joggers, etc.) Shifting the sidewalks closer to the roadway is also less desirable for pedestrian safety.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### **Alternative B-1 (modified response)**

Description: Use 11-ft. through lanes

Cost savings: \$2,223,000

Response: *The functional classification of this roadway is a Rural Major Collector, however, it has been designed with an urban section. The 2004 AASHTO Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (Green Book) recommends 12-foot lanes for rural collectors with traffic volumes exceeding 2,000 vehicles per day (exhibit 6-*





5, page 425). This table includes the caveat statement that 11-foot lanes may be retained on reconstructed roadways where the alignment and safety records are satisfactory. AASHTO also recommends 12-foot lanes for urban collectors in "industrial areas" except where right-of-way limitations exist (page 433).

Average daily traffic volumes are projected to increase from 21,000 to 35,500 by the year 2025, with 5% trucks. These volumes are significantly higher than the cut-off volumes for 11-foot lanes as recommended by AASHTO. The existing roadway has 12-foot lanes and has accident rates up to 22% above statewide averages (see attached).

Based on the traffic volumes, accident rates, increasing development within the corridor, and the AASHTO criteria above, 12-foot lanes could be interpreted as the appropriate width in the event of a future legal case.

Changing the typical section would also result in the following:

- 1) **Schedule delay.** The plan changes associated with this recommendation would delay R/W authorization by 9 to 12 months. Funding for the R/W would need to shift from FY 2008 to FY 2009. Completion of the final construction plans would also be delayed by 9 to 12 months.
- 2) **Significant re-design cost.** In addition to revising approx. 800 drawings, changing the project footprint would require a concept revision, an additional PIOH, and a re-evaluation of the environmental document. The additional P&E imposed on Forsyth County would total between \$300,000 and \$350,000.
- 3) **Potential cost escalation due to inflation.** Although construction for this project is currently in long range, the resulting inflation from a one-year delay could increase the construction cost by approx. \$1.5 million (\$29.9 million cost after savings x 5% inflation) if funding were made available.

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### **Alternative N-1**

Description: Modify the 8-foot medians in the left turn bay areas from curb & gutter to corrugated concrete with 1-foot offsets.

Cost savings: \$157,000

Response: *In discussions with your office, it is our understanding that the Department does not prefer to use corrugated concrete in lieu of curb & gutter for narrow median sections. Otherwise, this change would require minimum design effort and could be completed without impact to the project schedule.*

Final Disposition: **DEFERRED TO GDOT**

#### **Alternative N-2 (modified response)**

Description: Reduce the median width by 4 feet and use corrugated concrete with 1-foot offsets.

Cost savings: \$2,067,000

Response: *Alternative N-2 would result in a median width of 16 feet for the entire project. AASHTO recommends median widths of 18 to 25 feet when necessary to provide adequate refuge space for turning vehicles in median crossovers (Green Book page 434). There are 17 proposed intersections with unsignalized median crossovers where vehicle refuge within the median will be common for left-turn movements. Reducing the median widths only in the areas where this does not occur (as a compromise alternative) would not be practical and would result in undesirable/frequent lane tapers for the through lanes.*

*As noted with alternative N-1, it is our understanding that the Department does not prefer to use corrugated concrete in lieu of curb & gutter for narrow median sections. Reducing the median width would also result in the following:*

- 1) **Schedule delay.** The plan changes associated with this recommendation would delay R/W authorization by 9 to 12 months. Funding for the R/W would need to shift from FY 2008 to FY 2009. Completion of the final construction plans would also be delayed by 9 to 12 months.



- 2) **Significant re-design cost.** In addition to revising approx. 800 drawings, changing the project footprint would require a concept revision, an additional PIOH, and a re-evaluation of the environmental document. The additional P&E imposed on Forsyth County would total between \$300,000 and \$350,000.
- 3) **Potential cost escalation due to inflation.** Although construction for this project is currently in long range, the resulting inflation from a one-year delay could increase the construction cost by approx. \$1.5 million (\$30 million cost after savings x 5% inflation) if funding were made available.

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative J-1

Description: Reduce the bridge width 4 feet to accommodate through roadway lane width reduction to 11-feet (ALT B-1)  
 Cost savings: \$54,000  
 Response: *This recommendation is incidental to alternative B-1. Since 11-foot lanes are not desirable (see above), this alternative is not practical.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative J-2

Description: Reduce the bridge width 8-feet due to lane width reduction (ALT B-1) and median width reduction (ALT N-2).  
 Cost savings: \$109,000  
 Response: *This recommendation is contingent on the implementation of alternatives B-1 and N-2. Since neither of these alternatives is desirable, this alternative is not practical.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative J-3

Description: For the proposed bridge over Big Creek, construct dual structures and eliminate the median (12-foot lanes)  
 Cost savings: \$179,000  
 Response: *Constructing dual structures would require guardrail within the proposed 20-foot median. Even with impact attenuators, the guardrail introduces a hazard that does not exist with the current design. This is less desirable from a standpoint of driver safety.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative J-4

Description: For the proposed bridge over Big Creek, construct dual structures with 11-foot lanes (per ALT B-1) and eliminate the median.  
 Cost savings: \$227,000  
 Response: *This recommendation is a combination of alternatives B-1 and J-3. For the reasons noted above, this alternative would not be desirable for driver safety.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative R-1

Description: Replace the box culvert at Cheatham Creek with a 3-span bridge.  
 Cost savings: \$91,000  
 Response: *The value engineering study estimated the cost of the 3-span bridge option at \$50 / SF. Current construction cost for this type of bridge is approximately \$90 / SF. Applying this rate, the bridge option is approximately \$231,000 more expensive than the culvert option. Bridges are also more susceptible to icing and therefore less desirable with respect to driver safety than culverts.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

#### Alternative L-1 (modified response)

Description: Eliminate sidewalk in areas where there are no commercial / residential buildings.  
 Cost savings: \$280,000



Response: *A full urban section, including sidewalks, will be necessary to accommodate future development and pedestrian traffic in this area. There are a total of 235 properties within the project limits. Of significant importance are 13 existing and/or proposed residential neighborhoods and 24 existing and/or proposed commercial developments including strip shopping centers, daycare centers, churches, etc. Pedestrian movement between the multiple residential and commercial properties will occur with or without sidewalks. Sidewalk continuity must be maintained for pedestrian safety.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

**Alternative P-1**

Description: Reduced retaining wall cost as a result of narrowing the roadway section (per ALT's B-2 and B-1).

Cost savings: up to \$483,000

Response: *This recommendation is incidental to alternatives B-2 and B-1. For the reasons noted above, these alternatives are not desirable.*

Final Disposition: **REJECT**

If there are any questions concerning this information, or if any additional information is needed, please do not hesitate to contact me at 770-263-5945.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Brad Hale'.

Brad Hale, P.E.  
Project Manager

cc File 99512  
TDM  
BMH  
Scott MacLean  
Jason McCook  
Jimmy Vaughan  
John Cunard

**Brad Hale**

**From:** Fulbright, Kim [Kim.Fulbright@dot.state.ga.us]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 12, 2003 9:13 AM  
**To:** Schell, Jim; Wirsching, Amy; Long, Todd; rwhitesides@moreland-altobelli.com; bhale@moreland-altobelli.com; JVCunard@forsythco.com; tlallen@forsythco.com  
**Cc:** Ross, Gerald  
**Subject:** STP-2348(3) Forsyth County, P.I. No. 141880

During the Public Information Meeting held for the Bethelview Road widening project, the issue was raised about providing an urban section with curb and gutter and sidewalks for the entire length of the project.

After further review of the project and discussions with representatives of GDOT and Forsyth County it is the opinion of this office that curb and gutter with sidewalks should be used for the entire length of the project from SR 9 to SR 20. Because of the present and future development along Bethelview Road, the urban section with sidewalks is more appropriate for this corridor and will help reduce right of way impacts.

The proposed typical section will be 4-lanes with a 20 foot raised median and 16 foot outside shoulders with curb and gutter and 5' sidewalks. The 16 foot shoulder provides for a 6' grassed strip between the back of curb and the sidewalk and places the sidewalk behind the valley gutter for driveways as required by our ADA details. The required right of way will be set at the shoulder breakpoint unless additional right of way is required for utilities.

Therefore it is requested that the concept be revised to reflect to proposed changes which will include updated cost estimates for construction, utilities and right of way. The detailed right of way estimate along with updated plans will need to be provided to our right of way office for review and approval.

The layouts and handouts for the upcoming public hearing also need to reflect these changes.

If you have any questions or comments let me know as soon as possible.

**Kimbal D. Fulbright**

Design Engineer Group Manager  
Road and Airport Design  
(404) 656-5407  
FAX: (404) 657-0653

**Table 2: Accident Rates for Bethelview Road, 1995-1999**

Year	No. of Accidents	No. of Injuries	Calculated Accident Rate	Statewide Average Accident Rate	Calculated Injury Rate	Statewide Average Injury Rate
1995	27	17	176	193	111	122
1996	36	13	211	201	76	122
1997	42	22	235	194	123	112
1998	43	12	213	174	59	100
1999	50	7	219	N/A	31	N/A

Note: Statewide average accident/injury rate data is not available for 1999.

**Table 3: Detailed Accident Inventory for Bethelview Road (SR 9 to SR 20)**

Year	Total No. of Accidents	Accident Types				
		Rear End	Angle	Sideswipe	Head On	Other
1995	27	11	12	1	0	3
1996	36	12	13	4	0	7
1997	42	15	18	1	0	8
1998	43	18	12	1	1	11
1999	50	18	16	3	1	12

<sup>1</sup> This category includes "Non-Collision With a Motor Vehicle," "Struck Object," and "Overturned" accidents.

**Table 4: Detailed Accident Inventory for SR 141 (NB Off-Ramp to SR 9)**

Year	Total No. of Accidents	Total No. of Injuries	Accident Types				
			Rear End	Angle	Sideswipe	Head On	Other
1995	26	9	12	8	3	3	0
1996	21	6	9	8	2	0	2
1997	21	7	8	8	5	0	0
1998	21	5	10	10	1	0	0
1999	37	6	28	7	1	0	1

<sup>1</sup> This category includes "Non-Collision With a Motor Vehicle," "Struck Object," and "Overturned" accidents.



# Georgia Department of Transportation

## Bethelview Road Widening and Reconstruction FACT SHEET February 26, 2008

Project No.'s: STP00-2348-00(003)  
P.I. No.:141880  
Forsyth County

**Location:** In central Forsyth County west of the City of Cumming from SR 9/Atlanta Highway to SR 20/Canton Highway.

**Purpose:** To provide additional traffic capacity and improved access to accommodate existing and future traffic volumes in the project corridor through the 2030 design year and to promote orderly traffic flow and improved traffic safety by use of a 20-foot median to separate oncoming traffic and median breaks with designated left turn lanes at major intersections.

**Project Length:** 5.91 miles

**Accident Statistics (2003 – 2005):**

➤ 205 total accidents, 55 injuries.

**Traffic Projections (Average Daily Traffic – ADT)**

Bethelview Road	2005 ADT	2030 ADT	2030 DHV
	21,000	35,500	3995

**Typical Sections:**

**Existing:** Two 12-foot lanes with grassed shoulders. Existing R/W is 80' to 100' wide.

**Proposed:** Bethelview Road - Four-lane urban section with 20-foot raised median, 16 foot outside shoulders with curb and gutter, 5-foot sidewalks separated from curb by a six-foot grass strip. Proposed R/W is 100' to 132' wide.

**Design Speed:** Bethelview Road Posted: 45 MPH Design: 45 MPH

**Existing Traffic Signals To Remain (4):** Castleberry Rd, Bluffton Springs Rd, Kelly Mill Rd, SR 20  
**Proposed Signals (2):** Bennett Pkwy, Drew Rd

**Project Cost**

CST: \$ 32,110,274  
R/W: \$ 23,663,857  
UTIL: \$ 1,482,000  
TOTAL:\$ 57,256,131

**Project Schedule**

R/W: FY 2008  
CST: FY 2009 (estimated constr. time = 24 months)

**Number of Impacted Parcels:** 235 (including 6 residential and 1 commercial displacement)