

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA**

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: STP00-2610-00(004), Liberty County
P.I. No.: 550600
Frank Cochran Drive from
EG Miles Pkwy to Hero Rd.

OFFICE: Engineering Services

DATE: April 2, 2009

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

TO: Brent A. Story, P. E., State Road Design Engineer
Attention: Matt Sanders, 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				
1	Change the proposed Asphalt Pavement Design Structure to 1.5-inches of 12.5 mm (Superpave), 4-inches of 25 mm (Superpave) and 8-inches of Graded Aggregate Base (G.A.B.)	Proposed= \$1,793,000 Actual= \$1,026,050	Yes	It is the opinion of this Office that upon receipt of the new traffic diagrams, existing pavement evaluations and approved soil survey, a new pavement design structure will be proposed using a reduced Graded Aggregate Base (GAB) thickness from 12-inches to 8 inches and a reduced base course (25 mm Superpave) thickness from 4 inches to 3 inches. This change would provide a substantial amount of savings for this project.

ROADWAY (Continued)				
2	Change the proposed Asphalt Pavement Design Structure to 1.5-inches of 12.5 mm (Superpave), 4-inches 25 mm (Superpave) and 6-inches Soil Cement Base	\$2,736,400	No	Not applicable since alternate No. 1 will be implemented. The City of Hinesville stated that their past experience with the installation of soil cement base has not been good and has delayed the construction and caused additional maintenance of their roadway projects.
3	Match the typical section of the adjacent Project No. STP00-2610-00(001), P.I. No. 541940, Frank Cochran Drive Extension.	\$2,538,615	No	The costs savings realized by the elimination of the proposed curb & gutter, drainage structures and median reduction will be offset by the additional costs incurred by right-of-way acquisition, utility impacts, environmental impacts, increased earthwork, and redesign costs. The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design do not recommend the implementation of this alternative.

ROADWAY (Continued)				
4	Use an Urban Typical Section to minimize ROW impacts. The typical section would consist of four 11-foot lanes, a 19-foot raised and grassed median, 12-foot shoulder on the eastside including a 5-foot sidewalk, and a 15-foot shoulder on the westside, including an 8-foot multi-use path.	\$3,371,884	Yes	This should be done.
5	Usage of an 8-ft Asphalt Multi-Use Path Paving as opposed to a concrete path.	\$142,591	No	The use of concrete is the preferred choice for the multi-use path. It is believed that the use of asphalt will lead to increased long term maintenance. The potential additional cost savings for the asphalt installation and its durability may absorb any present worth savings by using this alternative.

ROADWAY (Continued)				
6	<p>Eliminate the sidewalk on the east side for Urban Typical Section. Use an Urban Typical Section to minimize ROW impacts. The typical section would consist of four 11-foot lanes, a 19-foot raised and grassed median, 12-foot shoulder on the eastside with no sidewalk and a 15-foot shoulder on the westside, including an 8-foot multi-use path. Eliminate the sidewalk on the east side for Urban Typical Section.</p>	\$3,937,868*	No	<p>Approximately one thousand homes and another four apartment projects totaling another three hundred residents currently exist within walking distance of Frank Cochran Drive outside of Fort Stewart. Located along Frank Cochran Drive near the Commercial area is one of the largest churches in Hinesville which provides service to the neighborhood. Many residents in the area walk to church service. There are also many commercial establishments within walking distance (see attached memo dated 4-2-09 regarding "Pedestrian Activity").</p> <p>*The cost savings of this alternate, Alt No. 6 removing the sidewalk is \$565,984; Alt. No. 6 less Alt. No. 4 = \$3,937,868-\$3,371,884.</p>
7	<p>Add Landscaping to the grassed median, using Crepe Myrtle or similar plantings.</p>	(-\$100,000)	No	<p>This alternative is not within the scope of the project and adds additional costs to the project. The City will pursue the landscaping for the roadway and this alternative will be independent of this project.</p>

STP00-2610-00(004), Liberty County
P.I. No. 550600
Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives
Page 5.

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

Approved:  Date: 4/3/69
Gerald M. Ross, P. E., Chief Engineer

REW/DMF

Attachments

c: Genetha Rice Singleton
Brent Story
Jim Simpson
Matt Sanders
Paul Liles
Bill Ingalsbe
Bill DuVall
Will Murphy
Ken Werho
Lisa Myers
Douglas Fadool
General Files

VE Team – Steve Wyche
Darryl VanMeter
Chandria Brown
Teresa Lannon
Andrew Hoenig

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA**

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE STP00-2610-00(004) **OFFICE** Road Design
PI # 550600
Liberty County
Frank Cochran Drive from EG Miles Pkwy to Hero Rd. **DATE** March 27, 2009

FROM 
Billy Edwards, City Manager for the City of Hinesville and
Brent A. Story, P.E., State Road Design Engineer

TO Ron Wishon, Acting Project Review Engineer
Attn: Lisa Myers, Design Review Engineering Manager/VE Coordinator

SUBJECT Value Engineering Study – Responses to recommendations

This is in response to the recommendations that were contained in the *Frank Cochran Drive Extension Value Engineering Mod 1 Training Report* dated March 11, 2009 for the above referenced project. Our responses and recommendations are as follows:

- **Creative Idea No. 1 – Change proposed Asphalt Pavement Design Structure Revision to 1.5” of 12.5 mm (Superpave), 4” 25 mm (Superpave) and 8” Graded Aggregate Base (G.A.B.)**
 - This alternative as listed in the VE report is based on an assumed flexible pavement design. The proposed pavement design in the VE report was performed for this typical section using very preliminary traffic volumes which has not yet been reviewed and approved by the Office of Environment and Location.
 - The traffic data and typical sections for the adjacent project were also examined for comparison and it was noted that the 24-hour truck percentage was significantly higher than the one that was assumed for this VE report.
 - The Office of Road Design also has not received an approved soil survey report with its recommended pavement design values.
 - The VE report recommended that the entire binder course (19 mm Superpave) be removed from the proposed asphalt design structure. This should not be done because the VE report states that the base course (25 mm Superpave) will have limitations in which vehicular travel will not be permitted on it and cannot be left exposed for an extended period of time.

Project No. STP00-2610-00(004)
P.I. No. 550600
Frank Cochran Extension
March 27, 2009

- It is also unlikely the GDOT Pavement Committee will accept the omission of the binder course (19 mm Superpave) from the paving operation on this heavily travelled urban local collector which will include heavy military equipment.
- It is the opinion of this Office that upon receipt of new traffic diagrams, existing pavement evaluations and approved soil survey, a new pavement design structure will be proposed using a reduced Graded Aggregate Base (GAB) thickness from 12” to 8” and a reduced base course (25 mm Superpave) thickness from 4” to 3”. This would provide a substantial amount of savings for this project while implementing a portion of Creative Idea 1.

Pavement Item	Original Cost	Proposed Cost	Savings
G.A.B. (12")	\$2,332,000.00		
G.A.B. (8")		\$1,723,200.00	\$608,800.00
25 mm Superpave (3")		\$1,413,750.00	\$417,250.00
25 mm Superpave (4")	\$1,885,000.00		
TOTALS	\$4,217,000.00	\$3,136,950.00	\$1,026,050.00

○ *The City of Hinesville and Office of Road Design recommend the partial implementation of this creative alternative as discussed above.*

➤ **Creative Idea No. 2 – Change proposed Asphalt Pavement Design Structure Revision to 1.5” of 12.5 mm (Superpave), 4” 25 mm (Superpave) and 6” Soil Cement Base**

- The City of Hinesville stated that their past experience with the installation of soil cement base has not been good. The installation and use of soil cement base has delayed the construction and caused additional maintenance of their roadway projects.

○ *The City of Hinesville and Office of Road Design recommend the partial implementation of this alternative variation contingent upon the comments in Creative Idea No. 1.*

➤ **Creative Idea No. 3 – Typical Section Match of Adjacent Project No. STP00-2610-00(001), P.I. No. 541940, Frank Cochran Drive Extension**

- The typical section in the approved concept report consists of four and five lane urban typical sections to accommodate the anticipated traffic increase by the 2028 design year and to also minimize environmental and R/W impacts. The engineering redesign costs, earthwork amounts and R/W acquisition funding to match the rural typical section of the adjacent project will increase significantly and further delay the project schedule.
- The adjacent project was for a new rural roadway and it did not have to accommodate existing utilities when it was built.
- This roadway section also has significant development and would be impacted by the matching wider rural typical section. This rural typical section will also impact the existing utilities and require additional right-of-way acquisition.

- The costs savings of the elimination of the proposed curb & gutter, drainage structures and median reduction will be offset by the additional costs incurred by right-of-way acquisition and utility impacts.
 - *The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design do not recommend the implementation of this alternative.*

- **Creative Idea No. 4 – Change Typical Section Width with Urban Section (four 11-ft lane widths, a 19-ft raised and grassed median, 12-ft shoulder on the eastside including a 5-ft sidewalk, and a 15-ft shoulder on the westside including an 8-ft multi-use path)**
 - This alternative will eliminate much if not all of the Right-of-Way acquisition requirements and minimize the impact on the existing utilities.
 - The City of Hinesville wants to maintain the multi-use path width at 10-ft instead of 8-ft which is directed as a standard developed as part of their Memorial Drive project where they established a desired cross section. That cross section included a roadway separated by a landscape median with a 5-ft sidewalk on one side and a 10-ft multi-use path on the other side. The 10-ft path achieves the type of multi-use path corridor that the City is trying to achieve to encourage two-way multi-modal traffic along the roadway. The City also feels that the 10-ft path makes the corridor more pedestrian friendly.
 - *The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design recommend the implementation of this alternative variation contingent upon the comments listed in Creative Idea Nos. 1 & 5 for asphalt pavement design structure and multi-use asphalt path.*

- **Creative Idea 5 – Usage of an 8-ft Asphalt Multi-Use Path Paving as opposed to a concrete path.**
 - The use of concrete is the preferred choice for the multi-use path. It is believed that the use of asphalt will lead to increased long term maintenance. The potential additional cost savings for the asphalt installation and its durability may absorb any present worth savings by using this alternative.
 - *The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design do not recommend the implementation of this alternative.*

- **Creative Idea 6 – Elimination of sidewalk on one side for Urban Typical Section**
 - The City of Hinesville ordinance currently requires that all newly constructed streets to have sidewalks on both sides to encourage pedestrian activity. They believe that the same standard should also apply to the roadway as to encourage pedestrian activity.
 - *The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design do not recommend the implementation of this alternative.*

Project No. STP00-2610-00(004)

P.I. No. 550600

Frank Cochran Extension

March 27, 2009

➤ **Creative Idea 7 – Add Landscaping**

- The City of Hinesville would prefer to continue the landscape theme planned for the Frank Cochran Drive Extension. However, this alternative is not within the scope of the project and adds additional costs to the project. The City will pursue the landscaping for the roadway and this alternative will be independent of this project.

- *The City of Hinesville and the Office of Road Design do not recommend the implementation of this alternative.*

The VE Study Implementation team recommends a combination of partial changes that would address Creative Idea Nos. 1 thru 7 as outlined above. Implementation of these changes would result in a combined savings of \$ 4,338,822.00.

BAS/JSS/MJS/tpc

cc: File

Billy Edwards, City Manager for the City of Hinesville

Paul Simonton, P.C. Simonton & Associates, Inc.

P.C. Simonton & Associates, Inc.
Consulting Engineers

309 North Main Street
Post Office Box 649
Hinesville, Georgia 31310

1050 Parkside Commons
Suite 101
Greensboro, GA 30642

Memo

To: Tom Cox
From: Paul Simonton
CC: Billy Edwards
Re: Frank Cochran Widening

4-2-09

Pedestrian Activity

I have attached for your use a copy of the Section 7.0 Scope of the City's development regulations regarding design standards for streets. Section 7.1.19 Sidewalks addresses the City requirements of all streets being constructed that are classified as either Local, Collector or Arterial Streets. As you can see this ordinance requires all new streets in the City to include a minimum 5' sidewalk on both sides of the street.

Approximately one thousand homes and another four apartment projects totaling another three hundred residents currently exist within walking distance of Frank Cochran Drive outside of Fort Stewart. Located along Frank Cochran Drive near the Commercial area is one of the largest churches in Hinesville which provides service to the neighborhood. Many residents in the area walk to church service

These residential areas do not contain any commercial areas. The closest commercial establishments that service these residents are located near the intersection of Frank Cochran Drive and SR 196/119. These commercial areas include many fast food and sit down restaurants to include McDonalds, Burger King, Buffalos Café, Waffle King and many others. In addition two shopping strip centers exist in the area plus convenience stores. Continuing along Frank Cochran Drive Extension to Hwy 84 is the Wal-Mart Center which includes groceries and the Lowe's store plus more fast food and shopping centers. In addition the U.S Post Office is located on Hwy 84 at the intersection with Frank Cochran Extension. All of these facilities are within walking distance of the residential areas along Frank Cochran Drive. It should also be noted that the pending transit service soon to begin will extend transit service to the intersection of Frank Cochran Drive and S.R. 119/196 intersection. Convenient pedestrian access to this location meets the needs of the community.

The existing Frank Cochran Extension recently completed between Hwy 84 and Hwy 196 has sidewalks on both sides of the road. This allows pedestrian access along the route from the residential area to the commercial and service organizations along the route without having to cross the very busy four lane roadway. We anticipate the widened Frank Cochran Drive will create a similar situation where crossing the road to get to the pedestrian facilities will offer a significant safety hurdle for the neighborhood.

Sec. 7.0. Scope.

The following design standards shall be considered minimum requirements in the platting of all subdivisions. The planning commission and the governing authority may require standards that exceed these minimums. All approved minimum standards shall be on file at the planning commission.

Sec. 7.1. Streets.

7.1.1. *Conformity to existing maps or plans:* The location and width of all proposed streets shall be in conformity with official plans and maps and with existing amended plans of the planning commission.

7.1.2. *Continuation of adjoining street system:* The proposed street layout shall be coordinated with the street system of the surrounding area. Where possible, existing major streets shall be extended to connect with adjacent properties and the use of cul-de-sacs should be avoided, except when no other option is feasible.

7.1.3. *Access to adjacent properties:* It is desirable to provide for street access to adjoining property. Proposed streets shall be extended to the boundary of such property and a temporary turn-around shall be provided, unless the planning commission approves another system for access. Houses fronting on minor streets shall have access from minor streets only. Each subdivision should seek to provide at least two points of access (streets) to existing public streets where feasible, and in a subdivision with, or the potential for, 75 or more lots, two or more access streets shall be provided unless the development can meet the standards for a variance as defined in article X.

7.1.4. *Street names:* Proposed streets, which are obviously in alignment with other existing and named streets, shall bear the assigned name of the existing streets. In no case shall the name of the proposed streets duplicate or be phonetically similar to existing street names, irrespective of the use of suffix, street, avenue, boulevard, drive, place, court, etc. It shall be unlawful for any person in laying out any new street or road to name such street or road on any plat, by marking, or in any deed or instrument, without first getting approval of the planning commission. The planning commission shall coordinate or cause to be coordinated, with the emergency 911 department for approval of street names.

7.1.5. *Minor streets:* Minor streets shall be so laid out that their use by through-traffic will be discouraged.

7.1.6. *Private streets:* There shall be no private streets platted in any subdivision. Private streets are allowed in planned developments and quality developments as described in article VIII.

7.1.7. *Trees:* All requirements of the tree protection ordinance must be met, and the landscape and tree planting plan should be submitted with the preliminary plat.

7.1.8. *Railroads and highways (freeways, expressways):* Railroad rights-of-way and limited access highways where so located as to affect the subdivision of adjoining lands shall be treated as follows:

(a) In residential districts a buffer strip not less than 25 feet in depth in addition to the normal depth of the lot required in the district shall be provided adjacent to the railroad right-of-way or limited access highway. This strip shall be part of the platted lots and shall be so designated on the plat: "This strip is reserved for the planting of trees and shrubs by the owner. The placement of structures hereon is prohibited."

(b) In districts zoned for business, commercial, or industrial uses, the nearest street extending parallel or approximately parallel to the railroad shall, wherever practical, be at

a sufficient distance there from to ensure suitable depth for commercial or industrial sites.

(c) All other streets, which are parallel to the railroad, when intersecting a street that crosses the railroad at grade, shall, to the extent practicable, be at a distance of at least 150 feet from the railroad right-of-way. Such distance shall be determined with due consideration of the minimum distance required for future separation of grades by means of appropriate approach gradients.

7.1.9. *Reserved strips prohibited:* Reserved strips at the terminus of a new street shall be prohibited.

7.1.10. *Street jogs:* Street jogs with centerline offsets by less than 150 feet shall be prohibited.

7.1.11. *Right angle intersections:* Street intersections shall be as nearly at right angles as practicable.

7.1.12. *Cul-de-sac:* A minor street having a permanent dead end or otherwise having an outlet must be provided with a turn-around having a roadway diameter of at least 80 feet and a right-of-way diameter of at least 100 feet. In no cases shall a cul-de-sac be more than 600 feet in length. Temporary dead-end streets shall not be longer than 600 feet, and shall be provided with a turn-around having a 30-foot radius.

7.1.13. *Alleys:* Service alleys or drives may be required in multiple dwelling, commercial and industrial developments and shall have a minimum surface treatment width of 15 feet, but shall not be provided in one-family and two-family residential developments unless the subdivider provides evidence satisfactory to the planning commission of the need for alleys.

7.1.14. *Paving requirements:* All streets must be prepared and paved according to the following methods or by equivalent methods that are acceptable to the governing authority:

(1) Subgrade. The subgrade shall be 24 inches of compacted subgrade material compacted to 95 percent density.

(2) Base. The base shall consist of a graded aggregate base course screened one and one-half inches or smaller with a thickness of six inches after being thoroughly compacted and constructed.

(a) All materials shall be secured from an approved source and shall conform to Georgia Department of Transportation's minimum acceptable standards for this area.

(b) As soon as the base material has been spread and mixed, the base shall be brought to approximate line, grade and cross-section and then rolled with a sheepsfoot roller until the roller walks out and finally with a pneumatic tire or general purpose roller until full thickness of the base course has been compacted thoroughly. Defects shall be remedied as soon as they are discovered. New materials shall be added if necessary and defective portions shall be entirely removed.

(c) The base course shall be maintained under traffic and kept free from ruts, ridge and dusting, true to grade and cross-section until it is primed.

(d) No base material shall be deposited or shaped when the subgrade is frozen or thawing or during unfavorable weather conditions.

(3) Pavement. Wearing surface shall consist of one and one-half (1 1/2) inches thick bituminous aggregate plant mix Type "E" or "F" and shall be placed in accordance with the latest edition of the Georgia Department of Transportation Standard Specifications for Roads and Bridges.

(4) Curb and gutter. Concrete curbs and gutter are required on all new streets. The width of the curb and gutter shall not be less than 24 inches, unless approved by the planning commission and the governing authority.

7.1.15. *Street right-of-way widths:* Minimum street right-of-way widths shall be as follows.

7.1.16. *Sight distance for vertical curves:* Where vertical curves are used, the minimum sight distance shall be as follows:

GENERAL MINIMUM DESIGN STANDARDS

TABLE INSET:

	Minimum Right-of-Way (feet)	Design Speed (MPH)	Minimum Curve Radii (feet)	Minimum Stopping Sight Distance (feet)
Local	60	30	275	200.0
Collector	60	35	350	240.0
Arterial	80	40	500	275.1

7.1.17. *Horizontal curves:* Where a deflection angle of more than ten degrees occurs in the alignment of a marginal access or minor street or road, a curve of reasonable radius shall be introduced. A curve shall be introduced at any change in direction of a collector, industrial or commercial service street or major thoroughfare. On major thoroughfares the state department of transportation or governing authority's engineer shall determine the centerline radius of curvature. On collector, industrial or commercial service streets, the centerline radius of curvature shall not be less than 350 feet. On minor streets, the centerline radius of curvature shall not be less than 150 feet unless the topography of the land to be subdivided makes this impractical.

7.1.18. *Street grades:* Grades on major thoroughfares shall be established or approved by the governing authority engineer. Grades on collector streets shall not exceed eight percent unless topographic conditions make this impractical. Grades on minor residential streets shall not exceed 15 percent, unless topographic conditions make this impractical. All streets should have a minimum grade of not less than three-tenths of one percent.

7.1.19. *Sidewalks:* Sidewalks must be installed on all streets. All sidewalks shall be constructed in accordance with the standards of the Standard Specifications, except where unusual conditions exist which eliminate the necessity for sidewalks and said exceptions are specifically granted by the planning commission and the governing authority.

Minimum Sidewalk Standards

TABLE INSET:

Arterial Streets	Minimum of 5 feet, both sides	6 ft is preferred
Collector Streets	Minimum of 5 feet, both sides	6 ft is preferred
Local Streets	Minimum of 5 feet, both sides	6 ft is preferred

Where it is deemed necessary for public safety, the planning commission may require either additional sidewalks or wider sidewalks than listed above.

7.1.20. *Reserved.*

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:550600-

CS 907/FRANK COCHRAN DRIVE FROM SR 119 TO HERO ROAD

MGMT LET DATE : 07/15/2012
 MGMT ROW DATE : 03/15/2010
 SCHED LET DATE : 6/15/2012
 WHO LETS?: GDOT Let
 LET WITH :

DOT DIST: 5
 CONG. DIST: 1
 BIKE: N
 MEASURE: E
 NEEDS SCORE: 6
 BRIDGE SUFF:

MPO: Hinesville
 TIP #: 2005-F-1
 MODEL YR :
 TYPE WORK: Widening
 CONCEPT: ADD 2U
 PROG TYPE: Reconstruction/Rehabilitation
 Prov. for ITS: N
 BOND PROJ.:

PROJ ID : 550600-
 COUNTY : Liberty
 LENGTH (MD) : 2.70
 PROJ NO.: STP00-2610-00(004)
 PROJ MGR: Sanders, Matt
 OFFICE : Road Design
 CONSULTANT: Local Design, Local PE funds
 SPONSOR : Hinesville
 DESIGN FIRM: Hussey Gay Bell & Deyoung, Inc.

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS				Fund	Status	Date Auth
						Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost			
		Concept Development	12/12/2004	1/31/2007	100	PE	2003	2003	338,000.00	Q20	AUTHORIZED	8/12/2002
		Concept Meeting	6/23/2006	6/23/2006	100	ROW	LOCL	LOCL	0.00	LOC	PRECST	
		PM Submit Concept Report	1/10/2007	1/10/2007	100	CST	2012	2016	20,500,046.06	L200	PRECST	
		Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	1/10/2007	1/17/2007	100							
		Management Concept Approval Complete	1/24/2007	1/31/2007	100							
5/11/2009		Value Engineering Study	10/31/2008	8/24/2006	82							
9/10/2009		Public Information Open House Held	8/24/2006	8/24/2006	100							
		Environmental Approval	1/3/2007	7/14/2002	18							
		Mapping	7/1/2002	6/15/2003	100							
		Field Surveys/SDE	8/15/2002		100							
		Preliminary Plans	1/15/2007		13							
3/27/2009		Preliminary Bridge Design			0							
3/27/2009		Underground Storage Tanks			0							
11/4/2009		PFPR Inspection			0							
11/5/2009		R/W Plans Preparation			0							
12/31/2009		R/W Plans Final Approval			0							
12/11/2009		L & D Approval			0							
2/3/2010		R/W Acquisition			0							
7/12/2010		Stake R/W			0							
3/27/2009		Soil Survey			0							
7/24/2009		Bridge Foundation Investigation			0							
12/16/2009		Final Design			0							
4/29/2010		Final Bridge Plans Preparation			0							
11/16/2011		PFPR Inspection			0							
12/1/2011		Submit PFPR Responses (OES)			0							

Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost	STIP AMOUNTS		
				Phase	Cost	Fund
PE	2003	2003	338,000.00	PE	0.00	Q20
ROW	LOCL	LOCL	0.00	ROW	14,569,000.00	LOC
CST	2012	2016	20,500,046.06	CST	0.00	L200

District Comments
 TAS/HGBD consultant, City's consultant working on concept and Env3-30-05/reviewing concept @ G.O.; need concept team meeting 9-26-05/concept report is in review/12-13-05/initial concept meeting held 7-5-06/concept meeting held 6-23-06/9-12-06/PIOH held 8-24-06/9-24-07/consultant has draft doc except for the noise study

Bridge:	Design:	EIS:	LGPA:	Programming:	Traffic Op:	Utility:	EMG:	Pre. Parcel CT:	Under Review:	Released:	Cond. Filed:	Relocations:	Acquired:	Acquired by:	Acquisition MGR:	R/W Cert Date:	DEEDS CT:
CULVERT	MJS Delays w/ENV Consultant (Mar 2009)	CE/Not Apprv/OnSchedRW/Pug[3.9.09]	PMA SGN HINESVILLE DO PEJROW & UTIL. 10-17-01.	ADDED BY SHIP COMMITTEE 1-27-94	SEND PLANS FOR REVIEW WHEN PFPR IS SCHED/\$	1st submission plans to utility owners 8/19/2008	RECST/REHAB (WIDENING); PE BY LOCAL	20	Total Parcel in ROW System:	Options - Pending:	Condemnations- Pend:			LOC	Cravey, Mack (LOC)		

