

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA**

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: BRST0-0998-00(001) Gwinnett County **OFFICE:** Engineering Services
P.I. No.: 142285
I-85 @ SR 324/Gravel Springs Road **DATE:** March 23, 2009
Bridge Replacement

FROM: Ronald E. Wishon, Acting Project Review Engineer *REW*

TO: Robert W. Mahoney, P.E., Project Manager

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES

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

ALT No.	Description	Savings PW & LCC	Implement	Comments
ROADWAY (RD)				
RD-1	Cul-de-sac the County roads.	\$3,435,973	No	County Roads Camp Branch Road and Morgan Road serve as connector roads between two State routes. Gwinnett County is currently constructing two new schools on Morgan Road. Redesign would take 3-4 months and cost \$60,000.
RD-3	Use concrete pavement in lieu of asphalt in future interchange area.	Design Suggestion	No	Construction staging would have to be redesigned, could delay project delivery. This suggestion would result in a \$44,736 cost increase.

ROADWAY (RD) Continued				
RD-4	Provide sidewalk on south side of SR 324 only.	\$71,062	No	The existing mixed use development under construction on the north side of SR 324 to the east of I-85 will generate pedestrian traffic along with future developments along the corridor. Grassing and redesign costs would add an additional \$13,320 to the project cost.
RD-5	In lieu of phased bridge construction, use detour and construct the bridge in one phase.	\$825,000	No	Traffic detoured from SR 324 would be signed to use local County roads instead of the required State Routes. Would require local traffic to drive an additional 10 – 15 miles to access local schools and businesses. Additional costs for detour are \$110,000 and the Road User Costs would increase significantly.
RD-6	Signalize County road intersections.	Design Suggestion	No	Gwinnett County plans to conduct future signal warrant analysis in a separate SR 324 corridor study. Would add \$250,000 to the project cost.
RD-10	Use 11-foot travel lanes on County roads.	Proposed= \$68,971 Actual= \$38,039	Yes	This should be done. Redesign costs are \$30,932 and have been subtracted from the Proposed savings.

ROADWAY (RD) Continued				
R-11	Use 11-foot lane widths for the inside lane and turning lane and 12-foot for the outside lanes on SR 324.	\$212,315	No	Adjoining projects on either end have 12-foot lanes. High traffic volumes 2011 ADT = 32,800, Trucks = 8%. Redesign costs would be \$60,000.
R-12	Reduce the paved shoulders on the County roads from 4-feet to 2-feet.	Proposed= \$137,875 Actual= \$92,913	Yes	This should be done. Redesign costs are \$44,962 and have been subtracted from the Proposed savings.
R-13	Provide crosswalks on SR 324 at the termination of the sidewalk near the specimen trees at Camp Branch Road, at Camp Branch Road, and at Morgan Road.	(-\$13,228)	No	When signals are warranted in the future, crosswalks and wheelchair ramps at Camp Branch Road and Morgan Road will be provided.
R-15	Reduce pavement thickness on County Roads.	Proposed= \$508,862 Actual= 349,679	Yes	This should be done. Designer has reduced the pavement section, but not as much as the VE Team proposed.
BRIDGE (BR)				
BR-1	Provide intermediate bent in future I-85 median and reconfigure span arrangement.	\$2,624,939	No	Proposed bridge configuration has already been approved by FHWA and GDOT. Redesign efforts would delay the project by 6-12 months. Designer has calculated the cost savings to be a lesser amount, \$1,351,788.
BR-2	Eliminate the raised median and use striping only.	Proposed= \$106,311 Actual= \$68,145	Yes	This should be done. Designer has calculated \$38,166 for redesign and striping.

BRIDGE (BR) Continued				
BR-3	Provide sidewalk on the south side of the bridge only.	\$492,096	No	The adjacent Gwinnett County project on either end has sidewalks on both sides. Designer has calculated an actual cost increase of \$394,592 required to convert to a rural 10-foot shoulder.
BR-4	Provide twin structures with no turning lanes.	\$2,417,890	No	Redesign costs and other related costs would be \$381,082 and would delay the project by 6-12 months. Providing twin structures in-lieu of a single wide bridge with future turn lanes eliminates the option of the future Diamond interchange. A different type of interchange would have to be constructed, possibly a partial clover leaf.
BR-5	Use BT 63 girders on the end spans in lieu of steel girders.	\$1,650,446	No	The original design is a continuous steel box girder bridge. The end spans "only" cannot be changed to precast BT 63. The design consultant has adjusted the cost savings to provide a workable VE design. These revisions would require a complete bridge redesign and complete roadway redesign at the bridge. These redesign efforts would cause the project to miss the scheduled let date.

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

Approved:  Date: 3/23/09
Gerald M. Ross, P. E., Chief Engineer

Approved:  Date: 4/2/2009
 Rodney Barry, P.E., FHWA Division Administrator

REW / DMF

Attachments

c: R. Wayne Fedora
LaToya Johnson
Genetha Rice Singleton
Robert Mahoney
Paul Liles
Bill Ingalsbe
Bill Duvall
Jennifer Tait
Kim Coley
James Magnus
Randy Davis
Harold Mull
Matt Needham
Ken Werho
Lisa Myers
Douglas Fadool
General Files

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: BRST0-0998-00(001) Gwinnett County
 PI No.: 142285
 I-85@ SR 324/Gravel Springs Road Bridge Replacement

OFFICE: District 1

DATE: March 9, 2009

FROM: Robert W. Mahoney, P.E., Project Manager
 District Preconstruction Engineer

TO: Ron Wishon, Acting State Project Review Engineer
 Attn: Lisa Myers

SUBJECT: Value Engineering Study-Responses

Reference is made to the recommendations that were contained in the *SR 324/Gravel Springs Road Bridge Replacement Value Engineering Study Report -90% Design Stage* dated February 5, 2009 for the above referenced project. Our responses and recommendations are as follows:

1. Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-1 – Cul-de-Sac the County Roads.
Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-1 is not recommended.

- Camp Branch Road and Morgan Road serve as connector roads between the state routes in this area of Gwinnett County. Elimination of the connections to SR 324 would lead to added traffic loads on SR 20, SR 124, Hamilton Mill Road and I-85.
- Gwinnett County Public Schools is currently constructing 2 schools on Morgan Road/Sunny Hill Road which draw students from the area north of SR 324/Gravel Springs Road. The closure of Morgan Road would negatively impact access to and from these schools. (Motorist costs for 10 years = ADT x add'l mi x government mileage rate x 365 days)
 Interpolated 2009 ADT = 22,000 VPD
 Additional mileage - Ivy Creek Road to SR 324 to SR 124 to Sunny Hill Road, 3.5 miles
 Government Mileage Rate = \$0.55/mi
- The County road redesign would further delay the project 3-4 months and possibly prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- Keeping the relocated Camp Branch and Morgan Roads open provides access to State Route 324 as well as improved traffic flow throughout local arterials.
- Cost savings already recommended on both County roads: reduced lane width (RD-10), reduced shoulder width (RD-12) and reduced typical (RD-15) for a total savings of \$480,631.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-1 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net

Paving	\$920,847		\$920,847	\$747,400	(\$30,964)	\$716,436
Guardrail				\$29,667		\$29,667
Erosion Control				\$105,840	(\$10,000)	\$95,840
Right of Way	\$1,980,000		\$1,980,000	\$1,980,000	(\$20,000)	\$1,960,000
Earthwork	\$173,265		\$173,265	\$314,902	(\$40,000)	\$274,902
Clearing and Grubbing	\$49,500		\$49,500	\$50,000		\$50,000
Drainage Structures				\$151,390	(\$773)	\$150,617
Motorist Costs					(\$1,925,000)	(\$1,925,000)
Additional Engineering			\$0.00		(\$60,000)	(\$60,000)
			\$3,123,612			\$1,352,462
		With 10% Markup	\$3,435,973		With 10% Markup	\$1,487,708

2. **Value Engineering Alternative RD-3 (Design Suggestion)** – Use concrete pavement in lieu of asphalt in future interchange area.

Approval of VE Study Alternative RD-3 is not recommended.

- The location of the future interchange ramps has not been determined so we would be unable to identify limits of the concrete paving.
- Desire to maintain continuity with the existing pavement for the roadway approaches to the bridge.
- Construction staging would have to be redesigned for concrete paving, cure time would lengthen the construction time and the time required modifying the plans could delay the project and possibly prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-3 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Paving				\$216,704		\$216,704
Concrete					(\$226,440)	(\$226,440)
MOT					(\$20,000)	(\$20,000)
Additional Engineering					(\$15,000.00)	(\$15,000)
			DS			Add'l Cost (\$44,736)

3. **Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-4**-Provide sidewalk on one side only.

Approval of VE Study Alternative RD-4 is not recommended.

- The adjacent Gwinnett County projects on either end of this project have sidewalks on both sides. The sidewalk needs to remain on the north side of SR 324 to maintain pedestrian connectivity.

- The existing mixed use development under construction on the north side of SR 324 to the east of I-85 will generate pedestrian traffic along with future developments along the corridor.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-4 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Sidewalk	\$64,444		\$64,444	\$60,195		\$60,195
Grassing					(\$3,000.00)	(\$3,000)
Additional Engineering					(\$5,000.00)	(\$5,000)
			\$64,444			\$52,195
		With 10% Markup	\$71,061		With 10% Markup	\$57,415

4. **Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-5**-In lieu of phased bridge construction, use detour and construct bridge in one phase

Approval of VE Study Alternative No. RD-5 is not recommended.

- Traffic on SR 324 would have to be detoured on to adjacent state routes to enable the closing of the road and bridge – the detour route shown in the VE Study report utilizes local County roads instead of the required state routes.
- Due to the high volume of traffic on SR 324, this detour would add additional traffic volume to SR 20 (Current ADT = 59,000 VPD) and SR 124 (Current ADT = 18,000 VPD) and would require local traffic to drive an additional 10-15 miles to access local schools and businesses. (Motorist costs = ADT x detour mi/2 x government mileage rate x #of days)
- The schools under construction on Morgan Road/Sunny Hill Road would be negatively impacted by the closure of the bridge and resulting detours.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-5 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Staging	\$150,000		\$150,000	\$250,000		\$250,000
Shoring	\$600,000		\$600,000	\$100,000		\$100,000
Detour signage					(\$50,000)	(\$50,000)
Additional Detour Public Meeting					(\$20,000)	(\$20,000)
Construction Time				\$150,000		\$150,000
Motorist Costs					(\$25,394,875)	(\$25,394,875)
Additional Engineering					(\$40,000)	(\$40,000)
			\$750,000			Add'l Cost (\$25,394,875)
		With 10% Markup	\$825,000		With 10% Markup	(\$27,934,363)

5. Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-6 (Design Suggestion) –Signalize County road intersections.
Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-6 is not recommended.

- Gwinnett County plans to conduct a future signal warrant analysis on both county road intersections as part of an overall SR 324 corridor study, and not part of this project, to determine if signals are warranted.
- Signal warrant analysis and study approvals at this time could delay the project and possibly prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-6 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Camp Branch Rd Signal					(\$100,000)	(\$100,000)
Morgan Road Signal					(\$120,000)	(\$120,000)
Additional Engineering					(\$30,000)	(\$30,000)
DS						Add'l Cost (\$250,000)

6. Value Engineering Alternatives No. RD-10–Use 11’ travel lanes on County roads.
Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-10 is recommended.

- The travel lanes on the County roads will be reduced from 12’ to 11’.
- It is recommended that the grass shoulder width will be increased by one foot on each side to maintain the slopes, ditches and limits as currently designed and therefore minimize the additional engineering costs required. If the footprint were to be reduced, the schedule would be delayed to allow for additional engineering of the tie slopes, ditches and drainage structures.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-10 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Camp Branch Road Pavement				\$22,665		\$22,665
Morgan Road Pavement				\$26,915		\$26,915
Additional Engineering					(\$15,000)	(\$15,000)
			\$62,701			
With 10% Markup			\$68,971	With 10% Markup		
				\$34,581		
				\$38,039		

7. **Value Engineering Alternatives No. RD-11**—Use 11’ inside and turn lanes, and 12’ outside lanes for the typical section on SR 324.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-11 is not recommended.

- The lane widths for all lanes should remain at 12’ due to the high traffic volumes (2011 ADT = 32,800 VPD) and high truck percentage (8%) on SR 324 in the opening (2011) and design (2031) years.
- The adjacent road widening projects completed by Gwinnett County have all 12’ lanes.
- The additional engineering would further delay the project 3-4 months and possibly prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-11 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
SR 324 Pavement	\$43,894		\$43,894	\$27,768		\$27,768
SR 324 Bridge	\$149,120		\$149,120	\$158,720		\$158,720
Additional Engineering					(\$60,000)	(\$60,000)
			\$193,014			\$126,488
		With 10% Markup	\$212,316		With 10% Markup	\$139,137

8. **Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-12** – Reduce paved shoulders on County Roads from 4’ to 2’.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-12 is recommended.

- The paved shoulders on the County roads will be reduced from 4’ to 2’
- It is recommended that the grass shoulder width will be increased by 2 feet to maintain the slopes, ditches and limits as currently designed and therefore minimize the additional engineering costs required. If the footprint were to be reduced, the schedule would be delayed to allow for additional engineering of the tie slopes, ditches and drainage structures.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-12 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Camp Branch Rd				\$47,716		\$47,716
Morgan Road				\$56,751		\$56,751
Additional Engineering					(\$20,000)	(\$20,000)
			\$125,341			\$84,467
		With 10% Markup	\$137,875		With 10% Markup	\$92,913

9. Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-13 – Provide crosswalks at intersections.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-13 is not recommended.

- When signals are warranted in the future, crosswalks and wheelchair ramps at Camp Branch Road and Morgan Road will be provided.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-13 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Striping					(\$1,760)	(\$1,760)
Pedestrian poles					(\$5,200)	(\$5,200)
Additional Engineering					(\$10,000)	(\$10,000)
			(\$12,550)			Add'l Cost (\$16,960)
		With 10% Markup	(\$13,228)		With 10% Markup	(\$18,656)

10. Value Engineering Alternative No. RD-15 – Reduce pavement thickness on County roads.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. RD-15 is recommended.

- Gwinnett County recommends a pavement section consisting of a 1.50" surface coarse, 2" binder coarse, 4" base coarse and 10" of GAB.
- The County roads will have a significant amount of school bus traffic so the pavement thickness has not been reduced to the full extent of the VE study recommendations.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative RD-15 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Camp Branch Rd	\$210,165		\$210,165	\$157,165		\$157,165
Morgan Road	\$221,585		\$221,585	\$165,725		\$165,725
Additional Engineering					(\$5,000)	(\$5,000)
			\$462,602			\$317,890
		With 10% Markup	\$508,862		With 10% Markup	\$349,679

11. Value Engineering Alternative No. BR-1 – Provide intermediate bent in future I-85 median and reconfigure span arrangement.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. BR-1 is not recommended.

- The proposed bridge configuration has been approved by FHWA and GDOT. The design is based on an FHWA approved recommendation of the future I-85 corridor widening in this area.
- The proposed bridge has already been shortened by 52' per direction of FHWA to provide some reduction in the cost of the bridge construction.
- The additional design costs to reengineer the bridge as well as the time associated with the changes would delay the project for 6-12 months and could prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative BR-1 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Concrete Bridge with center bent				\$2,386,350		\$2,386,350
Guardrail					(\$17,452)	(\$17,452)
Additional BF1					(\$20,000)	(\$20,000)
Staging on I-85					(\$900,000)	(\$900,000)
Additional Engineering					(\$220,000)	(\$220,000)
			\$2,386,308			\$1,228,898
		With 10% Markup	\$2,624,939		With 10% Markup	\$1,351,788

12. Value Engineering Alternative No. BR-2 –Eliminate raised median and use striping only.

Approval of the VE Alternative No. BR-2 is recommended.

- The future bridge layout with dual left turn lanes does not include a raised median and is handled with striping only.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative BR-2 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Concrete Median	\$96,646		\$96,646	\$105,942		\$105,942
Striping					(\$38,992)	(\$38,992)
Additional Engineering					(\$5,000)	(\$5,000)
			\$96,646			\$61,950
		With 10% Markup	\$106,311		With 10% Markup	\$68,145

13. Value Engineering Alternative No. BR-3-Provide sidewalk on south side of bridge only.

Approval of VE Study Alternative BR-3 is not recommended.

- The adjacent Gwinnett County projects on either end of this project have sidewalks on both sides. The sidewalk needs to remain on the north side of the bridge to maintain sidewalk connectivity for current and future developments.
- Maintaining the sidewalk would save the cost of reworking the bridge rail from a parapet to a pedestrian rail in the future.
- If the curb and gutter and sidewalk are removed on the bridge, the shoulder would become a rural shoulder with a minimum width of 10'. This 10' shoulder would actually increase the width of the bridge by two feet.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative BR-3 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Remove Sidewalk	\$447,360		\$447,360	\$634,880		\$634,880
Bridge Shoulder					(\$793,600)	(\$793,600)
Additional Engineering					(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)
			\$447,360			Add'l Cost (\$358,720)
		With 10% Markup	\$492,096		With 10% Markup	(\$394,592)

14. Value Engineering Alternative No. BR-4-Provide twin structure with no turn lanes.

Approval of VE Study Alternative BR-4 is not recommended.

- The savings in deck area realized by building twin structures would be offset by having to remove the existing inside bridge rails and cantilevers to construct the future median.
- The proposed bridge is based on the approved future section along I-85 and the knowledge that a full interchange is planned for this location.
- The inside shoulders of each bridge structures would need to be four feet wide with a parapet on each structure.

- The additional design costs to reengineer the bridge as well as the time associated with the changes would delay the project for 6-12 months and could prevent the project from being included in the economic stimulus package.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative BR-4 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Bridge Median	\$2,205,237		\$2,205,237	\$2,856,960		\$2,856,960
Bridge Shoulder					(\$793,600)	(\$793,600)
Guardrail		(\$7,155)	(\$7,155)		(\$11,716)	(\$11,716)
Additional Engineering					(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)
			\$2,198,082			\$1,851,644
		With 10% Markup	\$2,417,890		With 10% Markup	\$2,036,808

15. Value Engineering Alternative No. BR-6-Use BT 63 girders on end spans in-lieu of steel girders.
Approval of VE Study Alternative BR-6 is not recommended.

- A single span steel girder structure of this magnitude would be uneconomical. There would be a need for additional girder depth and stiffness to handle the deflection and loss of stiffness at the bents. The savings of using a three span unit is in the ability to distribute the loading from the main span to the end spans. This allows for a lighter section in the main span and an efficient section in the end spans. The optimum balance point for a three span unit is to have end spans at length between 78% and 84% of the main span length. Our current design is at 84.6% and does balance the main span loading.
- Center span depth would increase 12"-18" therefore roadway profile would also increase 12"-18" and require redesign of roadway plans at the bridge.
- Redesign of bridge would delay the construction schedule.
- As a review of the proposed alternate, as calculated by the Project Designer, inclusion of this change would only modify the cost/benefit for Alternative BR-6 as follows:

Category	Savings from VE Study Report			Engineer's Estimated Savings		
	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net	Savings	Add'l Cost	Net
Steel Girder Span	\$4,801,294		\$4,801,294	\$3,867,094		\$3,867,094
BT 63 Girder Spans	(\$3,300,889)		(\$3,300,889)	(\$3,300,889)		(\$3,300,889)
Additional Engineering					(\$200,000)	(\$200,000)
			\$1,500,405			\$366,205
		With 10% Markup	\$1,650,446		With 10% Markup	\$402,826

RWM:gsp

Fadool, Douglas

From: Latoya.Johnson@dot.gov
Sent: Friday, March 20, 2009 3:13 PM
To: Myers, Lisa; Mahoney, Robert
Cc: Fadool, Douglas
Subject: RE: Additional Justification response to Relocated Camp Branch Road Connection to SR 324-BRST0-0998-00(001) Gwinnett Co. PI # 142285-

Hi Lisa,
Robert's additional justification is okay with me. The additional upgrades needed for Ivy Creek Road and the possible access issues seem like reasonable justification. Please include these comments in the implementation letter and send the letter to Chief Engineer for approval. Be sure that it is clear that Gwinnett County offered input for the recommendations. Thanks

LaToya

Transportation Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
Georgia Division
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Suite 17T100
Atlanta, GA 30303
404-562-4280 phone
404-562-3703 fax

From: Myers, Lisa [mailto:lmyers@dot.ga.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2009 7:48 AM
To: Johnson, LaToya
Cc: Fadool, Douglas
Subject: FW: Additional Justification response to Relocated Camp Branch Road Connection to SR 324-BRST0-0998-00(001) Gwinnett Co. PI # 142285-

LaToya,

Please let me know if Robert's additional justification is ok with you. If so, we will include it with the implementation letter and send the letter to the Chief Engineer for approval. When he has signed it, we will send it on to you.

If you are not ok with Robert's additional justification, let me know, and we will schedule a meeting to discuss it.

Lisa Myers, AVS 
Design Review Engineer Manager/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

From: Mahoney, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2009 5:23 PM
To: Johnson, LaToya; Myers, Lisa; Wishon, Ron; Fadool, Douglas
Cc: Alan Chapman; Scott.Vickery@gwinnettcountry.com; John Ray; VAX-BraswellJ(SMTP); OConnor, Brian

Subject: Additional Justification response to Relocated Camp Branch Road Connection to SR 324-BRST0-0998-00(001)
Gwinnett Co. PI # 142285-

LaToya,

Attached are the assembled responses for the need to leave Relocated Camp Branch Road connection to SR 324 in the above referenced project. We hope that we have been able to provide you with enough additional information as requested to determine this a reasonable request from Gwinnett County and GDOT.

If you should need additional information or questions answered on this issue, we will be glad to discuss at the FFPR tomorrow.

Thanks for your review and consideration of this request.

Robert W. Mahoney, P.E.
District Preconstruction Engineer
Georgia Department of Transportation
District 1
P.O. Box 1057
Gainesville, Georgia 30503-1057
770-532-5520 (phone)
770-532-5542 (fax)
mail to: rmahoney@dot.ga.gov

We'll get you there.
www.511ga.org



Help GDOT serve you better. Visit <http://www.howmyservice.dot.ga.gov> and rate the service you received from Team GDOT.

Additional Justification

Relocated Camp Branch Road Connection to SR 324 BRST0-0998-00(001) Gwinnett Co. PI # 142285

1. The as-designed Relocated Camp Branch Road will line up with a future access road serving the future HOV interchange for I-85 south of the proposed SR 324 SOV interchange. This alignment and HOV interchange location was originally proposed by Mark Bartlett of FHWA at a joint meeting with GDOT and Gwinnett County.
2. Closing Camp Branch Road will place traffic on Ivy Creek Road. Ivy Creek Road is a local County road with an average pavement width of <20' and a pavement structure constructed to only accommodate local traffic. Ivy Creek Road would require significant upgrades both additional width for safety reasons and additional pavement structure to be able to support the additional traffic.
3. Using Ivy Creek Road as the access point to S.R. 324, combines truck and car traffic onto a narrow road which has an almost 90 degree horizontal curve. This is a local road intended for local road usage only, not for connectivity. Camp Branch is more conducive to thru traffic due to its alignment and pavement structure.
4. Camp Branch is the through movement for the current T intersection of Ivy Creek Rd. and Camp Branch Rd. Switching thru traffic onto Ivy Creek Road, in its current configuration, means that thru traffic traveling North on Ivy Creek Rd. would be forced to stop at the intersection causing additional delay.
5. Combined with Pucketts Mill Rd., Camp Branch Rd. provides approximately 2 miles of parallel connectivity and access on the west side of I-85 between Hamilton Mill Rd. and SR324.

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:142285-

MGMT LET DATE : 07/17/2009
MGMT ROW DATE : 12/19/2008
SCHED LET DATE : 2/11/2010
WHO LETS? : GDOT Let
LET WITH :

DOT DIST : I
CONG. DIST : 7
BIKE : Y
MEASURE : E
NEEDS SCORE : 04
BRIDGE SUFF : 55.31

PROJ ID : 142285-
COUNTY : Gwinnett
LENGTH (MI) : 0.80
PROJ NO. : BRST0-0998-00(001)
PROJ MGR : Mahoney, Robert
OFFICE : District 1
CONSULTANT : Local Design, Local PE funds
SPONSOR : Gwinnett County
DESIGN FIRM : Gresham, Smith and Partners

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS				Date Auth		
						Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost		Fund	Status
		Concept Development	9/17/2004	7/20/2005	100	PE	2000	2000	32,000.00	Q10	AUTHORIZED	12/30/1999
		Concept Meeting	10/22/2004	10/22/2004	100	ROW	2006	2006	852,000.00	L1C0	AUTHORIZED	2/20/2009
		PM Submit Concept Report	3/15/2005	3/17/2005	100	ROW	2009	2009	6,000,000.00	L1C0	AUTHORIZED	2/20/2009
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	4/1/2005	4/15/2005	100	CST	LR	2010	13,156,434.90	C240	PRECST	
		Management Concept Approval Complete	4/20/2005	7/20/2005	100							
		Value Engineering Study	11/10/2008	10/24/2002	85							
		Public Information Open House Held	10/24/2007	6/26/2008	100							
		Environmental Approval	4/24/2007	6/26/2008	100							
		Mapping	11/17/2008	12/5/2008	100							
		Field Surveys/SDE	1/22/2007	2/26/2009	100							
		Preliminary Plans	8/23/2007	2/14/2008	86							
		Preliminary Bridge Design	10/8/2007	10/12/2007	100							
		Underground Storage Tanks	5/22/2007	3/7/2008	100							
		404 Permit Obtainment	2/5/2008	2/5/2008	0							
		PFPR Inspection	4/3/2008	6/30/2008	100							
		R/W Plans Preparation	4/3/2008	6/30/2008	100							
		R/W Plans Final Approval	4/3/2008	6/30/2008	100							
		L & D Approval	6/5/2008	6/12/2008	100							
		R/W Acquisition	10/1/2007	10/3/2007	29							
		Stake R/W	2/4/2008	5/13/2008	0							
		Soil Survey	10/1/2007	10/3/2007	100							
		Bridge Foundation Investigation	2/4/2008	5/13/2008	100							
		Final Design	10/21/2008	3/18/2009	27							
		Final Bridge Plans Preparation	3/18/2009	3/18/2009	95							
		PFPR Inspection			100							
		Submit PFPR Responses (OES)			0							

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	STIP AMOUNTS					
						Phase	Cost	Phase	Cost		
		PE Cost Est Amt:				PE	852,000.00	Date:	7/31/2008	Q10	
		ROW Cost Est Amt:				ROW	6,000,000.00	Date:	7/31/2008	L1C0	0.00
		ROW Cost Est Amt:				ROW	12,529,938.00	Date:	7/31/2008	L1C0	7,928,000.00
		CST Cost Est Amt:				CST				C240	0.00

PDD: 12-29-99 APRIL BOARD ADDITION; ASSIGNED CONSULTANT TASK FORCE 4/30/99. COUNTY
 MAY INCLUDE IN RD PROJ. 9-2-2000.
Bridge: WE1 02/02/09 CONSUL - GSP
EIS: CE/Approv-26-08(R)Reeval02-18-09|Updated02-23-09|COLEY
LGPA: PFA SGN GWINNETT DO PE 2-9-07.
Prog. Develop: See Email from Pirkie on 3/5/09 to stimulus
Programming: R/W LS 0006206/RW ADV ACQ \$852 IN 2007|1625 8-07 REMOVED RZ ADV ACQ \$
Traffic Op: PFPR sent 3/16/09 NR/KW
Utility: GWINNETT COUNTY HANDLING COORD 02/29/08
EMG: BRIDGE REPLACEMENT; PE BY COUNTY

District Comments
 R/W not authorized in FY08 even though R/W plans were approved. TIP Amendment done with ARC by locals. R/W in FY09 and Const in FY09. Need R/W authorized. R/W acquisition contract. (12/15/08) RWAM FFPR scheduled 03/18/09

Acquired by:	LOC	DEEDS CT:	6
Acquisition MGR:	Byers, Kim (LOC)		
R/W Cert Date:			

