

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA

INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: STPIM-0180-01(006), Catoosa County OFFICE: Program Delivery  
SR 151 from S of Rollins Ind Park/Holcomb Rd to SR 2/US 41  
PI No.: 621530- DATE: December 17, 2014

FROM: Albert V. Shelby III, State Program Delivery Engineer *Albert Shelby*

TO: Lisa Myers, State Project Review Engineer  
Attn: Matt Sanders

SUBJECT: **Request for VE Study Reversal**

Reference is made to the VE Implementation letter dated April 7, 2008, for the above referenced project. Attached is a request to reverse implementation of Alternate G-5.

Alternative G-5 recommended adding several overhead lights at the I-75 interchange and other key intersections. As stated in the comments section in the Implementation of VE Study Alternates dated September 6, 2007, this should be done pending approval of Local Government Maintenance Agreement.

Attached is the letter from the City of Ringgold stating they do not have the available funds to pay for the power of the lighting and an email from the Lighting Group in the Office of Design Policy and Support stating that lighting will not be included on this project.

This Office concurs with the request.

If you have any questions, please contact Cynthia Burney at (404) 631-1851.

<sup>BE</sup>  
AVS:BWK:ASA:CCB

Attachments

Approved: *Lisa L Myers* 12/29/14  
State Project Review Engineer Date

Approved: *Glen Burney* 1/5/2015  
Director of Engineering Date

Approved: *Ymes Pirkle* 1/6/15  
Chief Engineer Date



# City of Ringgold

150 Tennessee Street  
Ringgold, GA 30736

Office (706) 935-3061

Fax (706) 965-7446

[www.cityofringgold.com](http://www.cityofringgold.com)

February 28, 2010

Scott A. MacLean, Lead Design Engineer  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Design Policy & Support, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
One Georgia Center  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, GA 30308

RE: STPIM-0180-01(006) Catoosa County P.I. No. 621530

Dear Mr. MacLean:

On February 28, 2011, the Ringgold City Council met and unanimously agreed that due to the expense of the high intensity lighting that was proposed for the intersection of I-75 and Highway 151, the City will not be able to enter into the LGLPA. The estimate for this lighting is \$2,365.00 per month, with a fifty (50) year agreement to pay for such lighting.

The City of Ringgold is in no position to pay for this type of lighting at this time. The City is in total support of the project and the improvements that need to be made at this interchange; however, due to budgetary constraints, the cost of energizing the lighting at this intersection is not doable for the City of Ringgold. The City would like to see similar lighting to that which we currently have at the interchange which is much more cost effective.

If we can be of any further assistance please advise.

Sincerely,

Joe Barger  
Mayor, Ringgold, Georgia

JB/jp

CC: Devon Brooks, GDOT Area Engineer

scott's email no lighting in plans 3-18-11.txt

From: MacLean, Scott  
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 3:32 PM  
To: Rogers, Terry  
Cc: Ehrman, Bradley R.; Brooks, Devon; Simpson, Jim; Story, Brent; Hilliard, Bobby  
Subject: STPIM-0180-01(006) Catoosa County P.I. No. 621530

Terry, please be aware that Lighting plans will not be included this GDOT-Let project.

We have the City's letter on file, how they're not able to financially commit to Lighting at this time.

Thanks,  
Scott A. MacLean  
Lead Design Engineer  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Design Policy & Support, 26th Floor  
One Georgia Center  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

work: (404) 631-1551  
e-mail: SMacLean@dot.ga.gov

From: Rogers, Terry  
Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2011 9:16 AM  
To: MacLean, Scott; Hilliard, Bobby  
Cc: Ehrman, Bradley R.; Brooks, Devon; Simpson, Jim; Story, Brent  
Subject: RE: STPIM-0180-01(006) Catoosa County P.I. No. 621530

The county has responded that they have not received support from their board to assist the city with funding. They said they are content with lower priced lighting at the interchange.

Terry Rogers

Associate Project Manager  
15 Kennedy Drive  
Forest Park, Georgia 30297  
phone 404-608-4778

From: MacLean, Scott  
Sent: Wednesday, March 09, 2011 10:42 AM  
To: Hilliard, Bobby  
Cc: Rogers, Terry; Ehrman, Bradley R.; Brooks, Devon; Simpson, Jim; Story, Brent  
Subject: STPIM-0180-01(006) Catoosa County P.I. No. 621530

Bobby -

Even though they support the interchange project itself, the City of Ringgold has gone on record as saying they can't afford the monthly expense of an installed Lighting system. See attached.

During these tough financial times, we're seeing Local governments across the state partner with other entities to pay for Lighting. I'd like your thoughts about possibly contacting the County and/or the Econ. Dev. Auth to assist the City of Ringgold. Perhaps the City Manager (Dan wright) in Ringgold would be receptive to something like this.

scott's email no lighting in plans 3-18-11.txt

Catoosa County Economic Development Authority  
<http://www.catoosaeda.org/>

Catoosa County government  
<http://www.catoosa.com/>

They're looking towards this "partnering" in neighboring Gordon County with P.I. 610870 [Steve Adewale's project] - each entity would contribute 1/3 toward the monthly Lighting cost.

Thanks,  
Scott A. MacLean  
Lead Design Engineer  
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Office of Design Policy & Support, 26th Floor  
One Georgia Center  
600 West Peachtree Street, NW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

work: (404) 631-1551  
e-mail: [SMacLean@dot.ga.gov](mailto:SMacLean@dot.ga.gov)

F

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** STP-IM-180-1(6) Catoosa  
P.I. No.: 621530  
I-75 @ S.R. 151 Interchange

**OFFICE:** Engineering Services

**DATE:** September 6, 2007

**FROM:** Brian K. Summers, PE, Project Review Engineer

**TO:** Babs Abubakari, P.E., State Consultant Design and Program Delivery Engineer

**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 #                    | Description   | Potential Savings/LCC | Implement | Comments  |
|--------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------|---|
| <b>GENERAL SCOPE (G)</b> |   |                       |           |   |
| G-1                      | Since there are four lanes in the Lafayette area, delete the segment of the project from Lafayette Street north to S.R. 41, including the South Chickamauga Creek Bridge. New project limits would be from Sta. 13+00 to Sta. 101+00. Eliminate the Right of Way in the Lafayette segment also. | \$2,507,932           | No        | The project was extended for operational issues and to include the replacement of the South Chickamauga Creek Bridge. |
| G-4                      | Add empty conduits along S.R. 151 for future integration of the traffic lights.   | Design Suggestion     | Yes       | This should be addressed during plan development.   |



| ALT #                                | Description   | Potential Savings/LCC | Implement | Comments  |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|-----------|---|
| <b>GENERAL SCOPE (G) - continued</b> |   |                       |           |   |
| G-5                                  | Add several overhead lights at the I-75 Interchange and other key intersections.  | Design Suggestion     | Yes       | This should be done pending approval of Local Government Maintenance Agreement.   |
| G-6                                  | The ADT of 22,000 in the Design Year appears very high; research traffic volume numbers and recheck in the field, if possible.                                  | Design Suggestion     | Yes       | This should be addressed during plan development.   |
| <b>ALIGNMENT (A)</b>                 |   |                       |           |   |
| A-3                                  | Reduce the amount of construction south of Holcomb Road; drop the southbound through lane on S.R. 151 at Holcomb Road. Grade out for sidewalks but do not pave. | \$510,155             | No        | The additional work south of the intersection is necessary to provide the appropriate design speed taper from a two lane facility to a four lane facility with a raised median. |
| <b>TYPICAL SECTION (C)</b>           |   |                       |           |   |
| C-1                                  | Add curb and gutters to both sides of Old Alabama Road and reduce the Right of Way requirements in total on the west side of the road.                          | \$733,140             | Yes       | This should be done.  |
| C-9                                  | Use grassed median in lieu of pavement. Maintenance costs should be managed by the City.  | \$105,245             | No        | Future Maintenance costs would minimize the cost savings.   |

STP-IM-180-1(6) Catoosa  
P.I. No. 621530  
Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives  
Page 6.

| ALT #   | Description  | Potential Savings/LCC | Implement | Comments  |
|---|--|-----------------------|-----------|---|
| <b>CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT (CM) - continued</b> |  |                       |           |   |
| CM-6/7  | Temporarily close Old Alabama Road at South Chickamauga Creek to allow faster construction of the new bridge. Use local surface streets to temporarily detour traffic around the site. Construct the bridge in 4 months in lieu of 8 months. | \$300,000             | No        | This is not feasible since there are no local streets that could be used as a detour that would accommodate the additional traffic. |

A meeting was held on September 6, 2007 and Adolfo Guzman and Joe Garland with Clark Patterson, Stanley Hill and Lowell James with Consultant Design and Brian Summers, Ron Wishon and Lisa Myers with Engineering Services were in attendance.

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

Approved: *Gerald M. Ross* Date: 9/10/09  
Gerald M. Ross, P. E., Chief Engineer

Approved: *Rodney Barry* Date: 9/19/07  
for Rodney Barry, P.E., FHWA Division Administrator

BKS/REW

Attachments

c: Gus Shanine, FHWA  
Todd Long

STP-IM-180-1(6) Catoosa

P.I. No. 621530

Implementation of Value Engineering Study Alternatives

Page 7.

Lowell James

Joe King

Kenny Beckworth

Ken Werho

Lisa Myers

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA



INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

**FILE** STP-IM-180-1(6) Caloosa County **OFFICE** Consultant Design  
PI No.: 621530  
SR 151/Old Alabama Road Widening **DATE** August 9, 2007  
*M. Babs Abubakari*  
**FROM** Babs Abubakari, P.E., State Consultant Design Engineer  
**TO** Brian K. Summers, P.E., Project Review Engineer  
Attention: Lisa Myers

**SUBJECT VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY – FINAL REPORT RESPONSE**

Below are the responses to the Value Engineering Study conducted on June 12-15, 2007 for the above reference project. Each comment was study and addressed by both the Department's Project Manager and the Consultant's Project Manager:

**GENERAL SCOPE (G):**

*Value Engineering Alternative G-1 – End SR 151 at LaFayette Street.*

COMMENTS: As outlined in the Concept Report dated February 9, 1998, the original scope of this project ended reconstruction of SR 151 just before Boynton Road/LaFayette Street. For traffic safety issues, the scope was revised to include the section of SR 151 from Boynton Road/Lafayette Street to US 41, as shown in the Revised Concept Report dated August 16, 2004.

The implementation of this Alternative is not recommended.

*Value Engineering Alternative G-4 – Add empty conduits along SR 151 for the future integration of traffic lights.*

COMMENTS: The plans supplied to the VE Study Team included signal interconnect plans (Sheets 28-01 to 28-04). The addition of empty conduits for future traffic lights will be discussed with GDOT and local officials during the Preliminary Field Plan Review.

The implementation of this design suggestion will be investigated further during detailed design.

Project No. STP-IM-180-1(6)  
P.I.No.621530  
July 24, 2007  
Page 2

 **Value Engineering Alternative G-5 – Add several overhead lights at the I-75 interchange and other key intersections.**

COMMENTS: Under the existing conditions there is no roadway lighting along SR 151 or I-75 within the project area. According to the GDOT Design Policy Manual, “if no existing roadway lighting system is present, AND the site does not meet the AASHTO warranting conditions for roadway lighting, THEN a written request for lighting must come from the Local Government for the inclusion of roadway lighting to be included in a programmed GDOT project to be considered.” According to the City Manager for the City of Ringgold, the Mayor and the City Council have agreed to light the I-75 interchange and agree to the energy and maintenance costs associated with the installation.

The implementation of this design suggestion is recommended.

**Value Engineering Alternative G-6 – The ADT of 22,000 in the design years appears very high; research traffic volume numbers and recheck in the field if necessary.**

COMMENTS: Existing and future traffic volumes were supplied by GDOT. GDOT will examine these counts to determine if they are still accurate.

The implementation of this design suggestion is recommended.

#### ALIGNMENT (A):

**Value Engineering Alternative A-3 – Reduce the amount of construction south of Holcomb Road; drop southbound through lane on SR 151 at Holcomb Road.**

COMMENTS: The scope of the project includes a four-lane section through the intersection of Holcomb Road/Rollins Industrial Boulevard. The additional construction to the south of the intersection is required in order to meet the design speed taper requirements from the existing two-lane section to the proposed four lane section at the intersection. In addition, the current design is for an unsignalized intersection. Based upon the traffic volumes, the side streets experience a high delay during the peak hour. Using a two-lane design for SR 151 instead of a one-lane design as suggested by VE Alternative A-3, the delay for the side streets decreases.

The implementation of this Alternative is not recommended.

#### TYPICAL SECTION (C):

**Value Engineering Alternative C-1 – Add curb and gutter on SR 151 beginning at Sta. 13+00 to Sta. 74+00.**

# Preconstruction Status Report - Primary County

PI Number: **621530- SR 151 FM S OF ROLLINS IND PARK/HOLCOMB RD TO SR 2105 41**

**BASELINE LET DATE:** 5/10/13  
**SCHED LET DATE:** 7/15/15  
**LIGHTING TYPE:** None  
**MGMT LET DATE:** 4/17/15  
**MGMT ROW DATE:** 8/20/10  
**WHO LETS?** GDOT Let  
**LET WITH:**

**CHALLENGER TMA:** Chathamcooga TMA  
**GA-521530**  
**PRIORITY CD:** 6  
**DOT DIST:** 14  
**CONG. DIST:** N  
**BIKE:** E  
**MEASURE:** 69.76  
**SUFF:** 77.81

**MPO:** Cataosa  
**TIP #:** 2.03  
**MODEL YR:** 2020  
**TYPE WORK:** Widening  
**CONCEPT:** ADD ALUMED 20  
**PROJ MGR:** Burney, Cynthia  
**CONCEPT:** Reconstruction/Rehabilitation  
**PROG TYPE:** Rehabilitation  
**BOND PROJ:**

**OFFICE:** Program Delivery  
**CONSULTANT:** Consultant Design (DOT contract)  
**SPONSOR:** GDOT

| BASE START | BASE FINISH | TASKS                                | ACTUAL START | ACTUAL FINISH | %   |
|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----|
| 11/1/96    | 9/15/98     | Concept Development Summary          | 11/1/96      | 8/16/04       | 100 |
| 7/1/97     | 7/1/97      | Concept Meeting                      | 7/1/97       | 7/1/97        | 100 |
| 5/13/98    | 5/13/98     | PM Submit Concept Report             | 5/13/98      | 5/13/98       | 100 |
| 9/15/98    | 9/15/98     | Management Concept Approval Complete | 9/15/98      | 9/15/98       | 100 |
| 5/17/04    | 8/16/04     | Revised Concept Summary              | 5/17/04      | 8/16/04       | 100 |
| 1/31/08    | 1/31/08     | Public Information Open House Held   | 1/31/08      | 1/31/08       | 100 |
| 10/1/99    | 2/25/10     | Environmental Summary                | 10/1/99      | 5/5/10        | 100 |
| 2/24/00    | 4/30/09     | Database Summary                     | 5/26/99      | 4/30/09       | 100 |
| 11/10/03   | 1/29/10     | Preliminary Roadway Plans            | 11/10/03     | 8/17/10       | 100 |
| 4/12/05    | 1/29/10     | Preliminary Bridge Design Summary    | 2/25/05      | 5/27/09       | 100 |
| 1/29/10    | 1/29/10     | Bridge Layout Complete               | 2/9/05       | 8/25/08       | 100 |
| 2/9/05     | 8/25/08     | UST Summary                          | 5/17/10      | 5/18/10       | 100 |
| 3/26/10    | 3/26/10     | PFPR Request (OES)                   | 6/16/10      | 6/17/10       | 100 |
| 3/29/10    | 4/23/10     | PFPR Inspection                      | 8/11/10      | 10/8/10       | 100 |
| 4/26/10    | 6/24/10     | R/W Plans Preparation                | 10/12/10     | 11/8/10       | 100 |
| 5/4/10     | 5/6/10      | L & D Approval                       | 10/13/10     | 11/8/10       | 100 |
| 6/25/10    | 2/20/13     | ROW Acquisition Summary              | 6/2/10       |               | 96  |
| 8/19/10    | 8/19/10     | ROW Authorization                    | 2/25/11      | 2/25/11       | 100 |
| 5/16/05    | 9/7/05      | Soil Survey Summary                  | 5/16/05      | 8/10/10       | 100 |
| 2/1/10     | 10/20/10    | BFI Report Summary                   | 11/24/10     | 7/15/11       | 100 |
| 5/7/10     | 9/8/11      | Final Construction Plans             | 3/3/11       | 9/30/14       | 100 |
| 10/21/10   | 3/9/11      | Final Bridge Plans Preparation       | 3/3/11       | 3/4/14        | 100 |
| 11/9/12    | 11/9/12     | FFPR Inspection                      |              |               | 0   |
| 2/28/13    | 2/28/13     | Submit Final Plans                   |              |               | 0   |
| 3/21/13    | 3/21/13     | Construction Authorization           |              |               | 0   |

| Phase | Approved | Proposed | Cost            | Fund  | Status     | Date Auth |
|-------|----------|----------|-----------------|-------|------------|-----------|
| PE    | 1992     | 1992     | \$240,500.00    | 33E   | AUTHORIZED | 3/5/92    |
| PE    | 2003     | 2003     | \$1,796,268.00  | Q25   | AUTHORIZED | 3/5/92    |
| PE    | 2013     | 2013     | \$766,180.00    | L240  | AUTHORIZED | 3/5/92    |
| PE    | 2014     | 2014     | \$150,000.00    | L240  | AUTHORIZED | 2/25/11   |
| ROW   | 2011     | 2011     | \$1,812,597.00  | L230S | AUTHORIZED | 2/25/11   |
| ROW   | 2012     | 2012     | \$969,403.00    | L230S | AUTHORIZED | 2/25/11   |
| ROW   | 2012     | 2012     | \$11,168,000.00 | L240  | AUTHORIZED | 2/25/11   |
| CST   | 2016     | 2016     | \$2,480,000.00  | M230S | PRECST     |           |
| CST   | 2016     | 2016     | \$31,146,265.39 | M240  | PRECST     |           |
| UTL   | 2016     | 2016     | \$1,330,750.14  | M240  | PRECST     |           |

  

| Activity | Cost            | Fund  |
|----------|-----------------|-------|
| 4/9/13   |                 |       |
| 1/31/11  | \$0.00          | 33E   |
| 10/1/14  | \$150,000.00    | L240  |
| 10/1/14  | \$0.00          | Q25   |
|          | \$3,811,403.00  | L230S |
|          | \$10,285,756.41 | L240  |
|          | \$2,480,000.00  | M230S |
|          | \$20,517,175.15 | M240  |
|          | \$4,475,060.00  | M240  |

**STIP AMOUNTS**

**COST EST AMTS**

**District Comments**

CPL Ct exp 12/31/16, Adolfo Guzman PM 678-318-1239 X. 3005

Scope  
 -Concept valid  
 Schedule  
 -A PCRF to adjust baseline match let date submitted 10.9.14  
 Next Milestone  
 -FFPR 1/16 & 1/17  
 Budget  
 -\$142K Contract  
 -\$277K in-house

Risk  
 -Requested updated traffic 6/8/14, ecology and TIP admin mod needed

Submitted cost estimate  
 CST \$33,015,554.30  
 UTL \$1,304,667.00  
 Hit by tornado 4/11

**Pre Parcel CT** 50 **Total Parcel in ROW System:** 66 **Cond Filled:** 17 **Acquired by:** DOT **DEEDS CT:** 49

**Under Review** 0 **Options Pending:** 0 **Relocations:** 2 **Acquisition MGR:** Workman, Mick

**Released:** 66 **Condemnations - Pend:** 0 **Acquired:** 66 **R/W Cert Date:**

Severe property damage from Tornado on most parcels on project April 27, 2011  
 Provide additional capacity - improve mobility and reduce congestion - enhance economic development - reduce crash