

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

-----  
**INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE**

**FILE:** CSNHS-M002-00(967) Morgan Newton Walton      **OFFICE:** Engineering Services  
P.I. No.: M003997  
Resurfacing of I-20      **DATE:** June 29, 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 5, 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
2	Use OGFC instead of PEM	Design Suggestion	No	The Office of Materials and Research recommends PEM. OGFC does not have the quality of PEM in terms of spray reduction.
3	Reverse proposed construction sequencing	Design Suggestion	No	The 8 ft. inside shoulder will be completed first to provide a safe area for traffic while the outside shoulder and lane are constructed. The staging allows the indentation rumble strips and guardrail sections to be installed on the outside shoulder during the last stage of reconstruction.
4	Use alternate 2 pavement design	Design Suggestion	No	The Office of Materials and Research recommend that both alternates be placed in the contract. The contractors will have the opportunity to bid on one or the other in order to get the best price.

5	Review Special Provision Section 108	Design Suggestion	Yes	A review of Section 108 and Section 150 will be completed. Special provisions included in the contract require the contractor to expedite the work without offering an incentive.
8	Review Special Provision Section 150	Design Suggestion	Yes	A review of the Special Provision will be completed. General Note #5 will be incorporated into Section 150.11.

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

Approved: Gerald M. Ross <sup>(SR)</sup> Date: 6.29.09  
Gerald M. Ross, PE, Chief Engineer

Approved: Richard Wayne Fedora Date: 7/13/2009  
for Rodney Barry, PE, FHWA Division Administrator

REW/LLM  
Attachments

- c: R. Wayne Fedora/Aric Mance/Christy Poon-Atkins - FHWA
- Genetha Rice Singleton
- David Crim/Eric Pitts/Willie Webb/Reid Mathews/John Dantzler
- Randy Davis
- Rusty Merritt
- Edwin Thompson
- Lisa Myers
- Matt Sanders

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
STATE OF GEORGIA**

---

INTERDEPARTMENT CORRESPONDENCE

**FILE** CSNHS-M003-00(997), Morgan/Newton/Walton      **OFFICE** Maintenance  
Resurfacing of I-20  
PI: M003997      **DATE** June 9, 2009

**FROM** Willie L. Webb, Maintenance Design Manager

**TO** Lisa Myers, Transportation Engineer Assistant Administrator- VE Coordinator

**SUBJECT** VE Study Response

Reference is made to the recommendations that were contained in the Value Engineering Study Report dated May 7, 2009 for the above referenced project. Responses and recommendations are as follows.

**1. Value Engineering Alternative No. 2: Use OGFC instead of PEM**

This alternate **is not** recommended for implementation due to the following reasons:

- The Office of Materials and Research recommends PEM.
- OGFC does not have the quality of PEM in terms of spray reduction, etc.

**2. Value Engineering Alternative No. 3: Reverse proposed construction sequencing.**

This alternate **is not** accepted for implementation:

- The reason for completing the 8 ft. inside shoulder first is to provide a safe area for traffic while the outside shoulder and lane are being constructed. The staging allows the indentation rumble strips and guardrail sections to be installed on the outside shoulder during the last stage of reconstruction.

**3. Value Engineering Alternative No. 4: Use alternate 2 pavement design.**

This alternate **is not** recommended for implementation due to the following reasons:

- The office of Materials and Research recommended that both alternates be placed in the contract. The contractors will have the opportunity to bid on one or the other in order to get the best price.

**4. Value Engineering Alternative No. 5: Review Special Provision Section 108- Prosecution and Progress**

This alternate is recommended for implementation due to the following reasons:

- A review of the Section 108 and Section 150 will be completed.
- Special Provisions are in the contract requiring the contractor to expedite the work without the offering of an incentive.

**5. Value Engineering Alternative No. 8: Review Special Provision 150- Traffic Control**

This alternate is recommended for implementation due to the following reasons:

- A review of the Special Provision 150 will be completed.
- General Note #5 will be incorporated into Section 150.11.- Special Conditions.

The responses are a collaboration of the District Construction, District Maintenance, The Office of Materials and Research, FHWA and Maintenance Office. If additional information is needed, please contact us.

DCC:wlw

**PRECONSTRUCTION STATUS REPORT FOR PI:M003996,M003234,M003997**

**PROJ ID :** M003997      **I-20 FROM SR 142/NEWTON TO SR 83/MORGAN**      **MGMT LET DATE :** 11/20/2009  
**COUNTY :** Morgan, Newton, Wagon      **DOT DIST:** 1, 2      **MGMT ROW DATE :**  
**LENGTH (MI) :**      **MPO:** Not Urban      **CONG. DIST:** 8, 7, 10      **SCHED LET DATE :** 8/28/2009  
**PROJ NO.:** CSNHSM00300997      **TIP #:**      **BIKE:** N      **WHO LETS?:** GDOT Let  
**PROJ MGR:** Webb, Willie      **MODEL YR :**      **MEASURE:** E      **LET WITH :**  
**OFFICE :** Maintenance      **TYPE WORK:** Resurface & Maintenance      **NEEDS SCORE:**  
**CONSULTANT:** No Consultant, GDOT In-House Design      **CONCEPT:** RESURFACING      **BRIDGE SUFF:**  
**SPONSOR :** GDOT      **PROG TYPE:** Maintenance      **Prov. for ITS:** N

SCHED		ACTIVITY		ACTUAL		%	
START	FINISH	START	FINISH	START	FINISH	START	FINISH
6/30/2009		Value Engineering Study	2/12/2009	4/6/2009	82		
		Environmental Approval	1/28/2009		100		

PROGRAMMED FUNDS				STIP AMOUNTS	
Phase	Approved	Proposed	Cost	Phase	Fund
CST	LUMP	2015	55,077,930.82	CST	L010
CST Cost Est Amt	41,100,000.00	Date:	1/23/2009	Cost	0.00
				Fund	L010

**Bridge:** NO BRIDGE REQUIRED  
**EIS:** PCE/APV Demand Cert For Let on 4.09.09/LB 6.2.09  
**LGPA:** NOT APPLICABLE  
**Programming:** LUMP SUM 0006152  
**Utility:** (JW) NEED PLANS 06/03/2009

**Acquired by:** N/R  
**Acquisition MGR:**  
**R/W Cert Date:**

**Cond. Filed:**  
**Relocations:**  
**Acquired:**

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

**DEEDS CT:**

**District Comments**