

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** STP00-3213-00(001)(003) Bibb **OFFICE:** Engineering Services  
 BRMLB-3213-00(005)  
 P.I. Nos.: 350520 351130 351135  
 Forest Hill Road improvements **DATE:** June 8, 2009

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

**TO:** James B. Buchan, PE, State Urban Design Engineer

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

The VE Study for the above project was February 9-12, 2009. Responses were received on June 3, 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.

Forsyth Road/US 41 to Wimbish Road – 4 Lane Segment (Metric Units)				
ALIGNMENT (A)				
ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
AF-2	Use HDPE pipe in lieu of RCP for urban drainage in non-traffic areas longitudinal to roadway. Retain RCP for cross traffic areas.	\$46,740	Yes	HDPE material is approved by the Office of Materials and Research for use as storm drain pipe for longitudinal systems.
AF-4	Relocate the drainage outfall at Sta. 6+015 Lt. away from the existing building (Parcel #44) to reduce potential for damage to the building.	(\$-584) Cost Increase	Yes	This will be done.

SECTION (SF)				
SF-2	Reduce the median from 6 meters wide to 5 ½ meters wide and reduce the shoulders from 3.6 meters to 3.0 meters	\$404,266	No	The reduction of the median width will reduce the ROW, however, this project proposes underground utilities which require the width of required ROW as proposed. Also, the reduction of the ROW by 0.25 – 0.50 meters on either side of the alignment will not eliminate any potential displacements.
SF-3	Use 24-inch wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch	\$90,926	No	The use of a 24-inch curb and gutter would change the drainage design and a complete redesign may be needed. In addition, GDOT standards do not allow for the use of a 24-inch wide curb and gutter. The 1019A, 1019B and 1033 series inlet standard does not allow for use of the 24-inch curb and gutter.
SF-5	Use MSE walls in lieu of cast-in-place concrete retaining walls	\$598,971	Yes	The use of the MSE walls will reduce construction costs. Each wall will be analyzed for the most cost effective method and MSE walls will be used where possible.
SF-7	Use 3:1 front slopes in lieu of 4:1 at north side of Wimbish and 2:1 back slopes. Eliminate the wall at Sta. 14+080.	\$15,533	No	This option will require additional ROW. To address concerns of the condominium owners and to avoid a lengthy property acquisition process, the current design was used.
BRIDGE (BF)				
BF-1	Move the retaining wall at Charter Blvd. closer to the sidewalk to reduce ROW impacts.	(\$-13,527) Cost Increase	No	Moving the retaining wall closer to the roadway does not result in any ROW savings. The new location proposed in the VE study is in an existing sewer easement.
BF-2	Add wall at North Minster and Wimbish to reduce the fill quantities and ROW impacts.	(\$-95,359) Cost Increase	No	The costs associated with the wall in this alternative exceed the cost savings associated with reduced fill volumes and reduced right of way. In addition, this also results in a cost increase of approximately \$95,000 with little additional benefit to the project.

<b>Wimbish Road to Northside Drive/3-Lane Segment</b>				
<b>ALIGNMENT (AW)</b>				
AW-4	Use HDPE pipe in lieu of RCP for urban drainage in non-traffic areas longitudinal to roadway. Retain RCP for cross traffic areas.	\$284,885	Yes	HDPE material is approved by the Office of Materials and Research for use as storm drain pipe for longitudinal systems.
AW-5	Use Geogrid Fabric and reduce the base material	\$184,671	No	Although Geogrid fabric is currently approved by the Office of Materials and Research, it has not been used on a project. OMR states that use of Geogrid to replace part of the pavement structure is not acceptable.
AW-6	Increase the side slopes from 2:1 to 1:1 by using Tensar fabric and eliminate Wall #2.	\$126,498	Yes	The use of Tensar Fabric has been approved by OMR in the station range of wall #2.
<b>SECTION (SW)</b>				
SW-2	Use 24-inch wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch	\$104,012	No	The use of a 24-inch curb and gutter would change the drainage design and a complete redesign may be needed. In addition, GDOT standards do not allow for the use of a 24-inch wide curb and gutter. The 1019A, 1019B and 1033 series inlet standard does not allow for use of the 24-inch curb and gutter.
SW-3	Use MSE walls in lieu of cast-in-place concrete retaining walls	\$203,328	Yes	The comment applies to walls 2 and 3 only.
SW-4	Use 11-ft. wide through lanes in lieu of 12-ft. lanes.	\$111,868	No	The intent of this recommendation was to lower construction cost and right of way impacts. However, approximately half of the right of way has been acquired and the remainder is under negotiations. This recommendation would require redesign of the project, with nearly all plan elements affected. Therefore, no net savings can be realized with this recommendation.

SECTION (SW) continued				
SW-5	Build a reduced 4 lane section with 11-ft. wide lanes in lieu of the 3 lane section with 12-ft. lanes to maximize cost, increase traffic capacity and improve LOS.	(\$-1,442,111) Cost Increase	No	Approximately half of the ROW has been acquired. In addition, through extensive public involvement a three lane section was chosen to minimize right of way impacts.
SW-5b	Widen Forest Hill Rd. by building a 4-lane section with 12-ft wide lanes and reduced shoulder width (9.5 ft.).	(\$-2,053,142) Cost Increase	No	Approximately half of the ROW has been acquired. In addition, through extensive public involvement a three lane section was chosen to minimize right of way impacts.
SW-6	Replace the retaining wall barrier with guardrail.	\$27,266	No	As part of the project's context sensitive design, roadway lighting, landscaping, irrigation, patterned retaining walls and handrails are included. Replacing the retaining wall barrier with guardrail would negate the aesthetic improvements offered by the project.
SW-7	Reduce the quantity of drain pipe by using more cross drains and eliminating one of the two longitudinal drains.	\$130,363	No	The savings of this recommendation do not account for the redesign cost and the utility conflicts caused by using more cross drains. Although this alternative will bring the Department a savings of at least \$48,000, it will, however, have a negative impact on MOT during construction. This may increase construction time and costs.
BRIDGES/STRUCTURES (BW)				
BW-1	Use a Conspan bridge in lieu of a box culvert	\$97,470	No	The recommended method would introduce two sets of hydraulic losses; one at the Conspan entrance, and the other at the joint where the two inside walls will remain.
BW-2	Straighten out retaining Wall #3 and the driveway at Sta. 45+50 to improve constructability	\$6,235	No	The original design of this driveway was similar to what the VE Team has recommended. The design was changed as part of ROW negotiations with the property owner.

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

Approved:  Date: 6/9/09  
Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

REW/LLM

Attachments

c: Genetha Rice Singleton  
Chuck Hasty/Nicoe Alexander/Jeff Simmons/Dwayne Wilson/Phillip Magoon  
Paul Liles/Bill Duvall/Bill Ingalsbe/Jack Muirhead  
Melanie Nable  
Lamar Pruitt  
Mike England  
Ken Werho  
Matt Sanders  
Lisa Myers

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** STP00-3213-00(001), STP00-3213-00 (003), &  
BRMLB-3213-00(005), Bibb County  
Forest Hill Rd FM Forsyth Rd to Northside Dr  
Forest Hill Road FM Wimbish Rd to Northside Dr  
Forest Hill Road at Sabbath Creek North of SR 19  
P.I. No's.: 350520, 351130, & 351135

**OFFICE:** Urban Design

**DATE:** May 29, 2009

**FROM:** James B. Buchan, P.E., State Urban Design Engineer

**TO:** Ron Wishon, Transportation Engineering Administrator  
Attn: Lisa Myers

**SUBJECT:** Value Engineering Study - Responses

Below are the responses to the Value Engineering Study conducted on February 9-12, 2009, for the above referenced projects. The VE team's recommendations are noted below in italics and Urban Design's responses follow. The responses are divided in two parts; part one for the four lane section and part two for the three lane section.

**Part 1: STP00-3213-00(001), 4-lane Section**

***AF-2: Use High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE) in lieu of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) for urban drainage non-traffic areas longitudinal to roadway. Retain RCP for cross traffic areas.*** HDPE material is approved by the Office of Materials and Research for use as storm drain pipe for longitudinal systems. Urban Design does recommend implementing this alternative.

***AF-4: Relocate the drainage outfall at STA 6+015 LT away from the existing building (Parcel #44) to reduce the potential for damage to the building.*** Relocating the outfall will reduce potential for damage to the existing building on parcel # 44 and requires minimal cost to achieve the benefit. Urban Design does recommend implementing this alternative.

***SF-2: Reduce the median from 6 meters wide to 5.5 meters wide and reduce the shoulders from 3.6 meters to 3.0 meters.*** The reduction of the median width will reduce the right of way, however, this project proposes underground utilities which require the width of required right-of-way as proposed. Also, the reduction of the right of way by 0.25 – 0.50 meters on either side of the alignment will not eliminate any potential displacements. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

***SF-3: Use a 24-inch wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch.*** The use of a 24-inch curb and gutter would change the drainage design and a complete redesign may be needed. In addition, GDOT standards do not allow for the use of a 24-inch wide curb and gutter. The 1019A, 1019B and 1033 series inlet standard does not allow for use of the 24-inch curb and gutter. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

***SF-5: Use mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) walls in lieu of cast in place (CIP) concrete retaining walls.*** The use of the MSE walls will reduce construction costs, although the actual savings may not be as stated in the VE study. Each wall will be analyzed for the most cost effective method. Urban Design recommends implementation of this alternative to the extent possible.

**SF-7:** Use 3:1 front slopes in lieu of 4:1 at north side of Wimbish and 2:1 back slopes. Eliminate the wall at STA 14+080. This option will require additional ROW. To address concerns of the condominium owners and to avoid a lengthy property acquisition process, the current design was used. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**BF-1:** Move the retaining wall at Charter Blvd. closer to the sidewalk to reduce right of way impacts. Moving the retaining wall closer to the roadway does not result in any ROW savings. The new location proposed in the VE study is in an existing sewer easement. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**BF-2:** Add wall at North Minister and Wimbish to reduce the fill quantities and right of way impacts. The costs associated with the wall in this alternative exceed the cost savings associated with reduced fill volumes and reduced right of way. In addition, this also results in a cost increase of approximately \$95,000 with little additional benefit to the project. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**Part 2: STP00-3213-00(003) & BRMLB-3213-00(005), 3-Lane Section**

**AW-4:** Use High Density Polyethylene Pipe (HDPE) in lieu of concrete RCP for urban drainage in non-traffic areas longitudinal to roadway. Retain RCP for cross traffic areas. HDPE material is approved by the Office of Materials and Research for use as storm drain pipe for longitudinal systems. Urban Design does recommend implementing this alternative.

**AW-5:** Use Geogrid fabric and reduce the amount of base material in the pavement section. Although Geogrid fabric is currently approved by the Office of Materials and Research (OMR), it has not been used on a project at this point. Since this corridor has a design year ADT of 19,020 vpd, it would be an ideal test subject for the Geogrid fabric. Urban Design does recommend implementing this alternative.

**AW-6:** Increase the side slopes from 2:1 to 1:1 by using Tensar Fabric and eliminate Wall #2. The use of Tensar Fabric has been approved by OMR in the station range of wall #2. Urban Design recommends implementation of this alternative.

**SW-2:** Use 24-inch wide curb and gutter in lieu of 30-inch. The use of a 24-inch curb and gutter would change the drainage design and a complete redesign may be needed. In addition, GDOT standards do not allow for the use of a 24-inch wide curb and gutter. The 1019A, 1019B and 1033 series inlet standard does not allow for use of the 24-inch curb and gutter. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**SW-3:** Use MSE walls in lieu of cast in place (CIP) concrete retaining walls. The comment applies to walls 2 and 3 only. Base construction costs for walls 2 and 3 are estimated at \$409,000 as shown in the detailed cost estimate which is \$105,000 less than the assumed base cost used in the VE study recommendation. Urban Design recommends implementation of this alternative.

**SW-4:** Use 11-ft wide through lanes in lieu of 12 ft lanes. The intent of this recommendation was to lower construction cost and right of way impacts. However, approximately half of the right of way has been acquired and the remainder is under negotiations. This recommendation would require redesign of the project, with nearly all plan elements affected. Therefore, no net savings can be realized with this recommendation. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**SW-5:** Build a reduced four lane 11-ft lanes section with 11-ft wide lanes in lieu of the three lane section with 12-ft wide lanes to maximize cost, increase traffic capacity, and improve LOS. Approximately half of the right of way has been acquired. In addition, through extensive public involvement a three lane section was chosen to minimize right of way impacts. The recommendation would increase the construction cost by an estimated \$1.44 Million. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**SW-5b:** *Widen Forest Hill Rd. by building a 4-lane section with 12-ft-wide lanes and reduced shoulder width (9.5 ft).* Approximately half of the right of way has been acquired. In addition, through extensive public involvement a three lane section was chosen to minimize right of way impacts. The recommendation would increase the construction cost by an estimated \$2.05 Million. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**SW-6:** *Replace the retaining wall barrier with guardrail.* As part of the project's context sensitive design, roadway lighting, landscaping, irrigation, patterned retaining walls and handrails are implemented. Replacing the retaining wall barrier with guardrail would negate the aesthetic improvements offered by the project as included as part of the public involvement. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**SW-7:** *Reduce the quantity of drain pipe by using more cross drains and eliminating one of the two longitudinal drains.* The savings of this recommendation do not account for the redesign cost and the utility conflicts caused by using more cross drains. Although this alternative will bring the Department a savings of at least \$48,000, it will, however, have a negative impact on MOT during construction. This may increase construction time and costs. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**BW-1:** *Use a Conspan Bridge in lieu of a box culvert.* The recommended method would introduce two sets of hydraulic losses; one at the Conspan entrance, and the other at the joint where the two inside walls will remain. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

**BW-2:** *Straighten out retaining wall #3 and the driveway at station 45+50 to improve constructability and reduce cost.* The driveway was originally designed as recommended, but was changed to the current design as part of ROW negotiations with the property owner, which are complete at this time. Urban Design does not recommend implementing this alternative.

If there are any additional questions or concerns, please contact Nicoe Alexander at (404) 631-1717, Dwayne Wilson at (404) 631-1720, or Philip Magoon at (404) 631-1716.

*CAK*  
JBB:PJM:DOW

## Myers, Lisa

---

**From:** Jubran, Abdallah (AJ)  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2009 12:14 PM  
**To:** Myers, Lisa; Geary, Georgene  
**Cc:** Pahno, Steve V; Jubran, Abdallah (AJ)  
**Subject:** RE: VE Study responses for PI Nos. 350520, 351130, 351135 Bibb

Lisa,

Use of Geogrid to replace a part of the pavement structure is not acceptable as you point out below. Test cases or "Research Project" proposals are reviewed by the Research Advisory Committee (RAC).

The reduced pavement structure has a lower SN. An SN reduction (proposed is 1.05) reduces the service life to a fraction of the original. A road with an AADT of 19,000 plus, whether it is County or State owned and maintained is an important corridor for local users.

*A.J. Jubran, P.E.  
State Pavement Engineer  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
404-363-7582  
404-363-7684 fax*

[ajubran@dot.ga.gov](mailto:ajubran@dot.ga.gov)

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

---

**From:** Myers, Lisa  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2009 11:02 AM  
**To:** Jubran, Abdallah (AJ)  
**Cc:** Pahno, Steve V  
**Subject:** FW: VE Study responses for PI Nos. 350520, 351130, 351135 Bibb

AJ/Steve – this VE Study recommended using Geogrid in place of some of the base. I have attached the pages from the VE Study report so you can see the actual recommendation. This VE Study was done a while ago – we have since told the VE teams to stop using it.

Urban Design wants to use it on this project. It is a county road, not a state route. They felt this might be a good candidate for a test case.

What do you think? I pasted the box from the implementation letter below, in my original email to Nicoe Alexander, the Project Manager. Should we say yes, pending approval from OMR, or should we say no? Please let me know as soon as possible so I can get it up to the Chief for signature.

**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**

---

**From:** Alexander, Nicoe  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2009 8:48 AM  
**To:** Myers, Lisa; Wilson, Dwayne  
**Cc:** Simmons, Jeff; Magoon, Philip  
**Subject:** RE: VE Study responses for PI Nos. 350520, 351130, 351135 Bibb

Lisa,

Chuck talked with Brad Young last week. It has been approved. if we are trying to save money, no is the time to think outside the box. We are on the hook for doing construction on a non-SR. we need to save money somehow.

*Nicoe Alexander*

Nicoe Alexander  
Design Group Manager  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Urban Design - Group 7  
One Georgia Center  
600 West Peachtree St., 27th Floor  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
(404) 631-1717

---

**From:** Myers, Lisa  
**Sent:** Monday, June 08, 2009 7:12 AM  
**To:** Wilson, Dwayne  
**Cc:** Alexander, Nicoe; Simmons, Jeff; Magoon, Philip  
**Subject:** RE: VE Study responses for PI Nos. 350520, 351130, 351135 Bibb

I have a question about AW-5.

AW-5	Use Geogrid Fabric and reduce the base material	\$184,671	Yes	Although Geogrid fabric is currently approved by the Office of Materials and Research (OMR), it has not been used on a project at this point. Since this corridor has a design year ADT of 19,020 vpd, it would be an ideal test subject for the Geogrid fabric, pending approval by OMR.
------	---	-----------	-----	---

Did you run this by OMR? In the past, they haven't agreed to this, in fact, they were dead set against it.

**Lisa Myers, AVS** ☺





**PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:350520-351130-351135-**

**CR 723/FOREST HILL RD IN MACON FM FORSYTH RD TO WIMBISHI RD**

**MGMT LET DATE :**

**MGMT ROW DATE :**

**PROJ ID :** 350520-  
**COUNTY :** Bibb  
**LENGTH (MI) :** 0.88  
**PROJ NO.:** STP00-3213-00(001)  
**PROJ MGR:** Alexander, Nicole  
**OFFICE :** Urban Design  
**CONSULTANT:** Local Design, Local PE funds  
**SPONSOR :** Bibb County  
**DESIGN FIRM:** Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

**MPO:** Macon  
**TIP #:** MCN-22  
**MODEL YR :** 2020  
**TYPE WORK:** Widening  
**CONCEPT:** ADD 4U(MED 20)  
**PROG TYPE:** Reconstruction/Rehabilitation  
**Prov. for ITS:** N  
**BOND PROJ :**

**DOT DIST:** 3  
**CONG. DIST:** 8  
**BIKE:** N  
**MEASURE:** M  
**NEEDS SCORE:** 8  
**BRIDGE SUFF:**

**SCHED LET DATE :** 1/7/2011  
**WHO LETS?:** GDOT Let  
**LET WITH :**

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS				Date Auth		
						Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost		Fund	Status
6/19/2009	10/1/2009	Concept Development	12/12/1984	4/20/1998	100	PE	1984	1984	123,933.34	Q20	AUTHORIZED	6/14/1984
		Concept Meeting	1/27/1998	1/27/1998	100	ROW	2008	2022	33,067,121.94	L200	PRECST	
		PM Submit Concept Report	3/10/1998	3/10/1998	100	CST	2009	2025	17,607,284.71	L200	PRECST	
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	3/17/1998	3/17/1998	100							
		Management Concept Approval Complete	3/20/1998	4/20/1998	100							
		Revise or Re-validate Approved Concept	7/2/2003	9/8/2003	100							
6/30/2009		Value Engineering Study	7/10/2008		83							
		Public Information Open House Held	5/30/2002	5/30/2002	100							
		Environmental Approval	1/1/1999	6/15/2004	100							
		Pub Hear Held/Comm Resp (EA/FONSI, GEPA)	6/11/2001	6/11/2001	100							
		Field Surveys/SDE	2/10/2003	3/9/2003	100							
		Preliminary Plans	1/1/2000	2/27/2006	100							
		Underground Storage Tanks	12/14/2004	1/13/2005	100							
		404 Permit Obtainment			0							
		FPFR Inspection	4/11/2006	4/11/2006	100	PE	1984	1984	12,824,000.00	Q20		
		R/W Plans Preparation	2/9/2007	2/9/2007	100	ROW	2008	2022	7,682,000.00	L200		
		R/W Plans Final Approval	6/12/2007	9/10/2007	100	CST	2009	2025	4,039,000.00	L200		
		L & D Approval	1/12/2007	1/22/2007	100							
		R/W Acquisition			0							
		Stake R/W			0							
		Soil Survey	12/10/2004	11/17/2005	100							
6/19/2009	11/11/2010	Final Design			0							
11/9/2009	11/20/2009	FPFR Inspection			0							
9/21/2010	10/11/2010	Submit FPFR Responses (OES)			0							

**District Comments**

**PDD:** CONCEPT IS 20' MEDIAN. Public Hearing on 6/11/01. CAG process 10/2/01.

**Bridge:** SWW 3/03/06 - RET WALLS - 90% P.L.

**Design:** NA:PJM:Stantec:#9: Preparing responses to VE Rec's (090506

**EIS:** EAJFONSIApp#6-15-04IRE for 350520 approved 6.30.08(OnSchedRWInahld(7.15.08)

**LGPA:** REV PMA SGN BIBB DO PE & UTIL 8-29-03

**Planning:** CONC REPRT COST FM \$1,601,000 TO \$2,510,000 4/20-98 | SPLST #9

**Prog. Develop:** RW STIP AMENDMENT #26 5-06

**Programming:** PA MOD TO REDUCE PE 12-21-88ITEMP SR 1125; 1125TA - 1125TC#2 8-07#3 9-08#4 12-08

**ROW:** 12/14/07 CONFLICT WITH PFA AND R/W ACQ CONTRACT

**Railroad:** NO

**Traffic Op:** CAHISND LCL CNSL PLNS 4 RV030601|S?FPFR sent 3.17.06 w/r

**Utility:** On hold for plan changes 06/03/09

**EMG:** 892 (H27-W/V29); PE BY COUNTY

Temp SR designations - SR 1125, 1125TA & 1125TC - Approval date 8/28/04 [11/30/04].waiting on Re-Eval CSTin 6/08 [9-1-06].Need 2010-CST in TIP [9-24-07 SEE R/W COMM/RW ACQ ACT SUSPENDED PENDING PRJCT PRIORITIZATION[091508]

**STIP AMOUNTS**

Phase	Cost	Fund
PE	0.00	Q20
ROW	4,039,000.00	L200
CST	7,682,000.00	L200

Prel. Parcel CT:	57	Total Parcel in ROW System:	61	Cond. Filed:	0	Acquired by:	LOC	DEEDS CT:	0
Under Review:	9	Options - Pending:	0	Relocations:	0	Acquisition MGR:	Gooch, Audrey (LOC)		
Released:	21	Condemnations- Pend:	0	Acquired:	0	R/W Cert Date:			

**PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:350520-,351130-,351135-**

**PROJ ID :** 351130- **CR 723/FOREST HILL RD FM WIMBISH RD TO CR 79/NORTHSIDE DR** **MGMT LET DATE :** 12/15/2006  
**COUNTY :** Bibb **MPO:** Macon **MGMT ROW DATE :** 12/15/2006  
**LENGTH (MI) :** 1.78 **TIP #:** MCN-25 **DOT DIST:** 3 **SCHED LET DATE :** 6/24/2010  
**PROJ NO.:** STP00-3213-00(003) **MODEL YR :** 2020 **CONG. DIST:** 8 **WHO LETS? :** GDOT Let  
**PROJ MGR:** Alexander, Nicole **TYPE WORK:** Widening **BIKE:** N **MEASURE:** E **LET WITH :** 351135-  
**OFFICE :** Urban Design **CONCEPT:** ADD 3U(MED 14) **NEEDS SCORE:** 6  
**CONSULTANT:** Local Design, Local PE funds **BRIDGE SUFF:**  
**SPONSOR :** Bibb County **PROV. for ITS:** N  
**DESIGN FIRM:** Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS						
						Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth
		Concept Development	3/3/1995	12/15/1998	100	PE	1996	1996	82,000.00	Q20	AUTHORIZED	12/18/1995
		Concept Meeting	6/16/1998	6/16/1998	100	ROW	2007	2007	1,958,000.00	L200	AUTHORIZED	11/29/2006
		PM Submit Concept Report	10/9/1998	10/9/1998	100	CST	2009	2023	17,776,914.86	L200	PRECST	
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	10/13/1998	10/13/1998	100							
		Management Concept Approval Complete	11/20/1998	12/15/1998	100							
		Revise or Re-validate Approved Concept	9/2/2003	9/8/2003	100							
	6/30/2009	Value Engineering Study	7/10/2008		83							
		Public Information Open House Held	12/29/2000	1/1/2001	100							
		Environmental Approval	5/1/2001	6/15/2004	100							
		Pub Hear Held/Comm Resp (EA/FONSI, GEPA)	5/17/2001	6/1/2001	100							
		Field Surveys/SDE	5/4/1999	6/1/1999	100							
		Preliminary Plans	6/17/2002	7/19/2005	100							
		Underground Storage Tanks	3/15/2004	6/15/2004	100							
	6/19/2009	404 Permit Obtainment			0	PE	82,000.00	82,000.00				
		PFPR Inspection	8/24/2005	8/24/2005	100	ROW	1,958,000.00	1,958,000.00				0.00
		R/W Plans Preparation	9/27/2005	2/8/2006	100	CST	8,551,000.00	8,551,000.00				0.00
		R/W Plans Final Approval	3/6/2006	6/21/2006	100							
		L & D Approval	10/24/2005	10/26/2005	100							
	4/28/2010	R/W Acquisition	11/2/2006		78							
		Stake R/W	12/6/2006	1/16/2007	100							
		Soil Survey	11/22/1999	4/6/2009	100							
	1/22/2010	Final Design	8/30/2005		24							
2/15/2010		FPFR Inspection			0							
3/2/2010		Submit FPFR Responses (OES)			0							

**STIP AMOUNTS**

Phase	Cost	Fund
PE	0.00	Q20
ROW	0.00	L200
CST	10,694,000.00	L200

**District Comments**

TEMP SR. DESIGNATIONS-SR 1125, 1125TA & 1125TC - APPRVL.DATE 8/28/04 [11/30/04]  
 RAW PLANS SUBMTD FOR APPRVL[2-08-06]RAW ACQ ACT SUSPENDED PENDING PRJCT  
 PRIORITIZATION[091508]

Acquired by:	LOC	DEEDS CT:
Acquisition MGR:	Gooch, Audrey (LOC)	53
RAW Cert Date:		

**PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:350520-,351130-,351135-**

**PROJ ID :** 351135-  
**COUNTY :** Bibb  
**LENGTH (MI) :** 0.20  
**PROJ NO.:** BRMLB-3213-00(005)  
**PROJ MGR:** Alexander, Nicole  
**OFFICE :** Urban Design  
**CONSULTANT:** Local Design, Local PE funds  
**SPONSOR :** Bibb County  
**DESIGN FIRM:** Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

**CR 723/FOREST HILL ROAD @ SABBATH CREEK NORTH OF SR 19**

**MGMT LET DATE :** 12/15/2006  
**MGMT ROW DATE :** 12/15/2006  
**SCHED LET DATE :** 5/10/2010  
**WHO LETS? :** GDOT Let  
**LET WITH :** 351130-

**DOT DIST:** 3  
**CONG. DIST:** 8  
**BIKE:** Y  
**MEASURE:** E  
**NEEDS SCORE:** 7  
**BRIDGE SUFF:** 77.44

**MPO:** Macon  
**TIP #:** MCN-59  
**MODEL YR :** 2020  
**TYPE WORK:** Bridges  
**CONCEPT:** BR REPL  
**PROG TYPE:** Replacement  
**Prov. for ITS:** N  
**BOND PROJ :**

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS				Date Auth		
						Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost		Fund	Status
		Concept Development	3/31/1995	4/30/1995	100	ROW	2007	2007	0.00	L200	AUTHORIZED	11/29/2006
		Concept Meeting	3/31/1995	4/30/1995	100	CST	2009	2023	715,151.29	L110	PRECS	
		PM Submit Concept Report	3/31/1995	4/30/1995	100							
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	3/31/1995	4/30/1995	100							
		Management Concept Approval Complete	3/31/1995	4/30/1995	100							
		Revise or Re-validate Approved Concept	9/2/2003	9/8/2003	100							
	6/30/2009	Value Engineering Study	10/7/2008		83							
		Public Information Open House Held	5/1/2001	5/1/2001	100							
		Environmental Approval	3/1/1999	6/15/2004	100							
		Pub Hear Held/Comm Resp (EA/FONSI, GEPA)	5/17/2001	6/11/2001	100							
		Field Surveys/SDE	5/4/1999	6/1/1999	100							
		Preliminary Plans	6/17/2002	7/19/2005	100							
		Underground Storage Tanks	3/15/2004	6/15/2004	100							
	6/19/2009	404 Permit Obtainment	8/24/2005	8/24/2005	0							
	6/19/2009	FFPR Inspection	9/27/2005	2/8/2006	100							
		R/W Plans Preparation	3/6/2006	6/21/2006	100							
		R/W Plans Final Approval	10/24/2005	10/26/2005	100							
		L & D Approval			50							
		R/W Acquisition			0							
		Stake R/W			100							
		Soil Survey	11/22/1999	7/29/2005	13							
		Final Design			0							
		FFPR Inspection			0							
		Submit FFPR Responses (OES)			0							

STIP AMOUNTS		Phase	Cost	Fund
ROW Cost Est Amt:	0.00	Date: 2/21/2006	0.00	L200
CST Cost Est Amt:	344,000.00	Date: 3/26/2008	489,000.00	L110

**District Comments**

TEMP S.R. DESIGNATIONS - SR 1125, 1125TA, & 1125TC - APPRVL DATE 8/28/04  
 [11/30/04]RW ACQ ACT SUSPENDED PENDING PRJCT PRIORITIZATION(091508)

**Acquired by:** LOC  
**Acquisition MGR:** Gooch, Audrey (LOC)  
**R/W Cert Date:**

**Pre. Parcel CT:** 2  
**Under Review:** 0  
**Released:** 2

**Total Parcel in ROW System:** 2  
**Options - Pending:** 0  
**Condemnations- Pend:** 0

**Cond. Filed:** 0  
**Relocations:** 0  
**Acquired:** 2

**DEEDS CT:** 2