

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
STATE OF GEORGIA**

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

FILE: CSNHS-M003-00(996) Clayton Fulton **OFFICE:** Engineering Services
P.I. No.: M003996
Resurfacing of I-75 **DATE:** June 17, 2009

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

TO: David Crim, State Maintenance Engineer
Attn.: Willie Webb

SUBJECT: IMPLEMENTATION OF VALUE ENGINEERING STUDY ALTERNATIVES

The VE Study for the above project was held on May 8, 2009. Responses were received on June 9, 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.

ALT #	Description	Potential Savings/LCC	Implement	Comments
1	Use OGFC instead of PEM	Design Suggestion	No	OGFC decreases the drainage capacity by 33%. OGFC does not have the quality of PEM in terms of spray reduction, etc. The Office of Materials and Research and FHWA prefers PEM. The decrease in thickness must be made up by the use of extra 25 mm superpave at an average cost of \$62.6/ton to maintain the existing profile grade. Therefore the actual cost savings is only about 12%.
2	Review Section 150 – Traffic Control	Design Suggestion	Yes	Section 108.08 Complete Paving Operation will be edited to establish that there is a 180 calendar day time period for the contractor to complete all paving operations once milling and paving begins. This correction will free the notes of ambiguities. A note will be added to Section 150.11 stating that no daytime lane closures will be allowed.

3	Coordinate liquidated damages language between Special Provisions Section 108 and Section 150; increase liquidated damages for lane closures	Design Suggestion	Yes	Section 108.08 Complete Paving Operation will be edited to establish that there is a 180 calendar day time period for the contractor to complete all paving operations once milling and paving begins. This correction will free the notes of ambiguities. A note will be added to Section 150.11 stating that no daytime lane closures will be allowed. Section 150.11 L 3 will be deleted for consistency. Liquidated damages values will be revised and a note will be added to Section 150.11 for clarity.
5	Delete engineer's office	Design Suggestion	Yes	This will be done.

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

Approved: *Gerald M. Ross* Date: 6/18/09
 Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

Approved: *Richard Wayne Fedora* Date: 6/25/2009
 for Rodney Barry, PE, FHWA Division Administrator

REW/LLM
 Attachments

- c: R. Wayne Fedora/Aric Mance/Mindy Roberson/LaToya Johnson - FHWA
- Genetha Rice Singleton
- David Crim/Eric Pitts/Willie Webb/Reid Mathews/Robert Huff
- Mickey McGee/Loren Bartlett
- Mike Lobdell/Adrian Jackson
- Lisa Myers
- Matt Sanders

3. Value Engineering Alternative No. 3: Coordinate LD language between Section 108 and section 150: increase liquidated damages for lane closures.

This recommendation **will** be implemented due to the following reason:

- Section 108.08 Complete Paving Operation will be edited to establish that there is a 180 calendar day time period for the contractor to complete all paving operations once milling and paving begins. This correction will free the notes of ambiguities.
- A note will be added to Section 150.11 stating that no daytime lane closures will be allowed.
- Delete Section 150.11 L 3 for consistency.
- Revised liquidated damages values and add a note to section 150.11 for clarity.

4. Value Engineering Alternative No. 4: Delete engineer's office.

This recommendation **will be** implemented due to the following reason:

- The Engineers Office will be deleted.

The responses are a collaboration of the District Construction, District Maintenance and Maintenance Offices. If additional information is needed, please contact us.
DCC:wlw

PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:M003996,M003234,M003997

PROJ ID : M003996
COUNTY : Clayton, Fulton
LENGTH (MI) : 6.47
PROJ NO. : CSNHSM00300996
PROJ MGR : Webb, Willie
OFFICE : Maintenance
CONSULTANT : No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design
SPONSOR : GDOT
DESIGN FIRM :

MGMT LET DATE : 11/20/2009
MGMT ROW DATE :
SCHED LET DATE : 8/28/2009
WHO LETS? : GDOT Let
LET WITH :

DOT DIST : 7
CONG. DIST : 5, 13
BIKE : N
MEASURE : E
NEEDS SCORE :
BRIDGE SUFF :

MPO : Atlanta TMA
TIP # :
MODEL YR :
TYPE WORK : Resurface & Maintenance
CONCEPT : RESURFACING
PROG TYPE : Maintenance
Prov. for ITS : N
BOND PROJ :

SCHED START	SCHED FINISH	ACTIVITY	ACTUAL START	ACTUAL FINISH	%
6/30/2009		Value Engineering Study	2/12/2009		82
		Environmental Approval	1/28/2009	3/24/2009	100

PHASE **APPROVED** **PROPOSED** **COST** **FUND** **STATUS** **DATE AUTH**
 CST LUMP 2015 47,367,020.51 L010 PRECST

PROGRAMMED FUNDS		STIP AMOUNTS	
Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost
CST	LUMP	2015	47,367,020.51
CST Cost Est. Amt	35,346,000.00	Date:	1/23/2009
		Phase	CST
		Cost	0.00
		Fund	L010

bridge: NO BRIDGE REQUIRED
IS: PCE | Apvd 3.24.09 | CertLet 3.24.09 | Dollar 6.1.09
GPA: NOT APPLICABLE
programming: LUMP SUM 0006152
ility: LB: Need Plans 06-2009.

2-rel. Parcel CT: Total Parcel in ROW System: N/R
Under Review: Options - Pending: Relocations:
Released: Condemnations- Pend: Acquired:

Acquired by: N/R
Acquisition MGR:
R/W Cert Date:
DEEDS CT: