

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

-----  
**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** HPP00-0013-01(062) DeKalb Fulton                      **OFFICE:** Engineering Services  
P.I. Nos.: 731770  
SR 13/Buford Highway Enhancements                      **DATE:** January 25, 2010

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

**TO:** Mike Lobdell, PE, District Preconstruction Engineer - Chamblee

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

The VE Study for the above projects was held October 5-9, 2009. Responses were received on January 25, 2010. 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.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
A-1	Use existing signals at five locations. Eliminate new signal proposed for one location.	\$437,427	No	It was not the intention of the Designer to replace all existing signals. In some locations, existing strain poles will be replaced due to conflict with ADA ramps or road widening.
B-1	Stagger the proposed lighting	Proposed = \$1,799,516 Actual = \$246,371	Yes, partially	Pedestrian lighting was installed on phase 1 of the Buford Highway projects. The same light has been proposed for this project. It is estimated that the total number of lights may be reduced by 25% (59 lights). This would provide \$246,371 in savings.

C-1	Mill and inlay outside lane and widen a portion of roadway. Eliminate minor striping conflicts with hydro blasting.	\$428,564	No	Experience on other projects has shown that hydro blasting discolors the asphalt, which can appear similar to lane markings, especially at night. In the widened areas, the pavement will be milled and inlaid to remove the existing striping. In the areas of the project that will not be widened, the existing pavement and markings will be damaged during construction of the median. If only the outside lanes were to be resurfaced, the damaged areas of the inside lanes would not be repaired.
D-1	Reduce concrete median width	\$233,318	No	Where possible, the median is being placed within the existing two-way left turn lane and will not require additional ROW. Any additional ROW needed in these areas is for the widening of the shoulders in order to install the sidewalk. The roadway must be widened at the intersections to accommodate the 4 ft median for the left turn bays. Midblock crossings have been designed based on public input. The design requires a minimum 8 ft width.
E-1	Coordinate bus stops throughout the corridor. Involve the community. Eliminate Field Office.	Proposed as a Design Suggestion  Actual = \$76,900	Yes	The field office can be eliminated, resulting in a \$76,900 savings. Community involvement and bus stop coordination will be implemented if possible.

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

Approved:  Date: 1/25/10  
 Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

REW/LLM

Attachments

c: Ben Buchan  
Mike Lobdell/Melvin Waldrop  
Mickey McGee  
Ken Werho  
Nabil Raad  
Lisa Myers  
Matt Sanders

VE Team: Frantz Boileau  
Derrick Brown  
Clinton Ford  
Lowell James  
Kimberly Nesbitt  
Janique Suber

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE OF GEORGIA

## INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

**FILE:** HPP00-0013-01(062), DeKalb County  
P.I. No.731770  
Buford Highway Sidewalks

**OFFICE:** District 7

**DATE:** January 25, 2010

**FROM:** Mike Lobdell, PE, District Preconstruction Engineer

**TO:** Ronald E. Wishon, Project Review Engineer  
**ATTN:** Lisa Myers, AVS

**SUBJECT:** **Value Engineering Study-Responses**

Reference is made to the recommendations that were contained in the Value Engineering Report dated October 22, 2009 for the above referenced project.

The proposed project will add pedestrian safety and enhancement features along Buford Highway from Lenox Road in Fulton County to approximately 600 feet north of Afton Lane in DeKalb County. The improvements include sidewalk, pedestrian lighting, landscaping and a raised median. The Gross Length of the Project is 2.453 miles.

Our responses and recommendations to the VE Recommendations are as follows:

<i>VE Recommendation No. &amp; Description w/ Projected Initial Cost Savings</i>		<i>Recommendation Response</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Idea No.			
A-1	Use Existing Signals  \$437,427	Approval Not Recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not our intention to replace signals unless necessary. In some locations, existing strain poles will be relocated due to conflict with ADA path or road widening. In these instances, signal replacement will be required due to the strain pole replacement.</li> </ul>
B-1	Use Staggered Lighting  \$739,116	Approval Partially Recommended	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pedestrian lighting was installed on phase 1 of the Buford Highway projects. The same light has been proposed for this project in order to provide a consistent look throughout the corridor. However a photogrammetric analysis shall be performed for the proposed lighting design, and the number of lights shall be reduced where possible.</li> <li>It is estimated that the total number of lights may be reduced by as much as 25%, which results in the elimination of 59 lights. The total estimated savings for this alternative proposal would be approximately \$246,372.</li> </ul>

<i>VE Recommendation No. &amp; Description w/ Projected Initial Cost Savings</i>	<i>Recommendation Response</i>	<i>Comments</i>
C-1	Mill and Inlay Outside Lane  \$428,564	Approval Not Recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experience on other projects has shown that hydroblasting causes driver confusion on projects where lanes are being shifted. The process discolors the asphalt, which can appear similar to a lane marking, especially at night. Therefore, the areas of widening the pavement need to be milled and inlaid to remove the existing striping and avoid driver confusion.</li> <li>• There are other locations along the corridor that will not be widened. However, the existing pavement and markings in these areas are likely to be damaged during the construction of the median and pedestrian crossings. If only the outside lane were to receive new asphalt, the result would have the appearance of patchwork construction. Therefore, the project would have an added value greater than the savings by resurfacing the entire roadway.</li> </ul>
D-1	Reduce Concrete Median Width  \$233,318	Approval Not Recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Except at the intersections the median is being placed within the existing two-way left turn lane and not causing the ROW to be affected. Most of the ROW being affected in these areas is due to widening shoulders to account for a 5' sidewalk with a 2' offset.</li> <li>• The roadway needs to widen at the intersections to account for the 4' median needed at the left turn bays, and we do not recommend reducing the 4' width due to safety and maintenance concerns.</li> <li>• The mid block crossings have been designed such that a pedestrian is forced to turn and look at oncoming traffic before crossing. This unique design has been shown to the public and is important for enhanced pedestrian safety. The design requires a minimum 8' median width.</li> </ul>
E-1	Bus Coordination and Community Targeting Campaign. Eliminate Field Office  Design Suggestion	Approval Recommended <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus coordination and community involvement will be done to the extent possible.</li> <li>• This project is located close to the District Office. The Field Office can be eliminated for a savings of \$76,900.</li> </ul>

-End of Responses-



PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:731770-

**PROJ ID:** 731770-      **SR 13/BUFORD HWY FM CS 434/LENOX RD TO CR 1645/AFTON LN-PH I**      **MGMT LET DATE:** 04/15/2011  
**COUNTY:** Dekalb, Fulton      **MPO:** Atlanta TMA      **MGMT ROW DATE:** 04/17/2009  
**LENGTH (MI):** 2.27      **TIP #:** DK-324D      **BASELINE LET DATE:** 04/13/2011  
**PROJ NO.:** HPP00-0013-01(062)      **MODEL YR:** 2020      **SCHED LET DATE:** 6/7/2011  
**PROJ MGR:** Lobdell, Mike      **TYPE WORK:** Miscellaneous Improvements      **WHO LETS?:** GDOT Let  
**AOHD Initials:** GLF/MW      **CONCEPT:** ENHANCEMENT      **LET WITH:** 0008802,  
**OFFICE:** District 7      **PROG TYPE:** Enhancement      **NEEDS SCORE:** 4      0008803  
**CONSULTANT:** Consultant Design (DOT contract)      **BRIDGE SUFF:**  
**SPONSOR:** GDOT      **Prov. for ITS:** N  
**DESIGN FIRM:** Post Buckley Schuh and Jernigan, Inc      **BOND PROJ.:**

BASE START	BASE FINISH	LATE START	LATE FINISH	TASKS	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%	PROGRAMMED FUNDS						
								Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost			
				Concept Meeting	3/14/2001	3/14/2001	100	PE	1999	1999	514,645.88	Q92	AUTHORIZED	5/7/1999
				PM Submit Concept Report	5/17/2001	5/17/2001	100	ROW	LOCL	LOCL	450,000.00	LOC	PRECST	
				Receive Preconstruction Concept Approval	5/10/2001	5/17/2001	100	ROW	LOCL	LOCL	162,500.00	LOC	PRECST	
				Management Concept Approval Complete	5/24/2001	6/26/2001	100	UTL	LOCL	LOCL	750,000.00	H640	PRECST	
			2/9/2010	Revise or Re-validate Approved Concept	12/15/2008	6/1/2009	83	CST	2012	2012	3,518,984.72	L240L	PRECST	
				Value Engineering Study	7/27/2009		100	CST	2012	2012	918,861.07	Q92	PRECST	
				Environmental Approval	5/2/2007	5/21/2007	100							
				Preliminary Plans	10/1/2007	7/2/2009	100							
7/10/2009	7/13/2009	1/29/2010	2/2/2010	PPPR Inspection	6/2/2009	6/2/2009	100							
7/14/2009	11/2/2009	1/29/2010	6/17/2010	R/W Plans Preparation	6/2/2009	7/4/2009	100							
11/3/2009	12/4/2009	1/29/2010	6/17/2010	R/W Plans Final Approval	10/6/2009	10/21/2009	100							
12/7/2009	12/9/2009	1/29/2010	2/2/2010	L & D Approval	5/24/2001	6/26/2001	100							
12/7/2009	4/23/2010	1/29/2010	6/17/2010	R/W Authorization			0							
5/17/2010	5/18/2010	7/9/2010	7/12/2010	Final Design			0							
6/1/2010	6/14/2010	7/26/2010	8/6/2010	PPPR Inspection			0							
				Submit PPPR Responses (OES)			0							

Activity	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Fund	Status	Date Auth	STIP AMOUNTS	
							Activity	Fund
PE Cost Est Amt:	1,924,131.55	1,924,131.55	12/17/1998	PE	0.00	Q92	0.00	Q92
ROW Cost Est Amt:	514,645.88	514,645.88	6/26/2009	ROW	525,000.00	Q920S	525,000.00	Q920S
Utility Cost Est Amt:	162,500.00	162,500.00	6/1/2009	ROW	0.00	LOC	0.00	LOC
CST Cost Est Amt:	3,039,831.31	3,039,831.31	6/26/2009	UTL	1,882,825.00	Q92	1,882,825.00	Q92
CST Cost Est Amt:	793,746.74	793,746.74	6/26/2009	CST	1,937,000.00	L240L	1,937,000.00	L240L
CST Cost Est Amt:				CST	750,000.00	H640	750,000.00	H640

**PDD:** DEC 98 BD ASSIGNED TO PLANNING. Redesign ADA requirements Need CST-FY05 for RW to buy.  
9/16/03. Let w/0006254. 3/10/04  
NO BRIDGE REQUIRED  
**Bridge:** GLF/MW  
**Design:** CE 1 Aprvd 5 21.07 IRE 6 24.09 | OnSch Let 1 Dollar 11 2.09  
**EIS:** PMA SGN DEKALB DO ROW/UTIL20% PE & CST 4-19-00.  
**LGPA:** ADDITIONAL DEMO \$ ON PH 0008802 & 0008803#1 5-05#2 11-06#P# 0002902 & 0006254 WAS  
**Programming:** COMBINED INTO THIS PROJECT# 10-07  
**Traffic Op:** JETCLIS&M REVW TO Scott Z. 4/23/03\$PPPRsent 5/29/09 K/WNR  
**Utility:** WW-MPLANS TO Ut's 11/05/08(-4)  
**EMG:** MISCELLANEOUS IMPROVEMENT (LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENT)

**Acquired by:** LOC  
**Acquisition MGR:** Black, Pam (LOC)  
**R/W Cert Date:**

**DEEDS CT:**