This document was developed as part of the continuing effort to provide guidance within the Georgia Department of Transportation in fulfilling its mission to provide a safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation system through dedicated teamwork and responsible leadership supporting economic development, environmental sensitivity and improved quality of life. This document is not intended to establish policy within the Department, but to provide guidance in adhering to the policies of the Department.

Your comments, suggestions, and ideas for improvements are welcomed.

Please send comments to:

State Design Policy Engineer
Georgia Department of Transportation
One Georgia Center
600 W. Peachtree Street, 26th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

DISCLAIMER

The Georgia Department of Transportation maintains this printable document and is solely responsible for ensuring that it is equivalent to the approved Department guidelines.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) has developed a Low Impact Bridge Program (Program) to provide expedited project delivery for these least complicated type bridge replacement projects. It is understood that as the project develops, concerns may be identified that would prohibit the project from moving forward in this expedited process.

To ensure timely project delivery, focused project management skills, forward thinking and thorough planning to identify issues and resolutions will be required. Careful consideration and proper project selection is critical. Projects that have more time consuming requirements such as impacts to sensitive environmental resources, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulated streams or complex constructability issues will not be selected for this program.

This document outlines the steps for the plan development process for this Program. Successful candidates for this process will require minimal permits, minor utility impacts, no FEMA coordination, no on-site detours, and meet other low-impact characteristics as identified in this document. Projects that ultimately qualify for this expedited process also must not exceed established environmental impact thresholds and thus qualify as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) determination in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
Intentionally Left Blank
Chapter 2. Purpose

The Program has been created with three major principles in mind – safety, stewardship and streamlining.

The safety of the travelling public is of paramount importance. It is the intent of this Program to reduce risk associated with structurally deficient, scour critical, temporarily shored, or fracture critical structures.

Second only to safety, the Program will foster stewardship of Georgia’s environmental and financial resources. Projects developed under the Program will seek to minimize the impact to the natural environment while providing long-term cost effective engineering solutions. The Program will result in accelerated, streamlined delivery of all phases of the bridge replacement process including planning, design, environmental approval and construction.
Chapter 3. Project Strategies

To accomplish the rapid design, approval and construction of a project in the Program GDOT will implement the following strategies.

A. Practical Design

Particular attention will be paid to preventing scope creep. Minor improvements to other design elements will be considered only when they do not result in significant increases to the physical limits, environmental impacts or costs of the project. Design variances or exceptions will be considered when there is no evidence that the existing condition will result in significant risk to the travelling public.

B. Standard Bridge Plans

The use of GDOT’s bridge standards and basic drawings should be the first alternative considered to reduce the engineering effort resulting in both cost and time savings. The use of pre-cast bridge elements will be considered if their use will result in a reduced duration of road closure.

C. Programmatic Agreement

Projects determined eligible for the Program will adhere to a streamlined (i.e., less paperwork) and expedited (i.e., reduced review times) project delivery process. GDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) agree to simplify the environmental process through the establishment of clear environmental impact threshold criteria and efficient documentation of findings supporting the determination that a project is categorically excluded under 23 CFR Part 771.117. These impact thresholds should meet the standards established in the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Process Agreement (2013 PCE Agreement) entered into by GDOT and FHWA in June 2013 (with the exception to Section II.3c). Projects eligible for the Program may involve Informal Section 7 Consultation under the Endangered Species Act. Under these conditions, a streamlined CE will be prepared and approval will be required by FHWA.
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Chapter 4. Project Selection

Prospective bridges will undergo several evaluations prior to being selected for this Program. In keeping with the streamlined project delivery focus, if at any time during the evaluations of the prospective bridges a criteria listed within this manual cannot be satisfied, please contact the State Bridge Engineer as soon as possible.

A. Initial Considerations

The management of the Program resides within the Office of Bridges and Structures. The Office of Bridges and Structures will identify the candidate pool using readily available data from the bridge inventory and other databases. To be considered eligible for this Program, the candidate bridge must qualify for Federal Funding, but cannot include any of the following criteria:

- Locations on the National Highway System
- Locations involving railroad crossings
- Locations at state border lines

In addition, the following seven major river crossings are defined as navigable and thus require coordination with the US Coast Guard (USCG) and cannot be involved with any of the bridges being considered:

1. Chattahoochee River
2. Flint River
3. Coosa River
4. Etowah River
5. St. Mary's River
6. Altamaha River
7. Savannah River

Additionally, the criteria below may be used in determining the most viable structures for consideration:

- Posting/closing requirements
- Annual Daily Traffic (ADT)
- Length of potential off-site detours
- Alignments (horizontal and vertical)
- Temporary shoring.

Channel widths
Utility attachments
Drainage areas
Structure lengths
1. Initial Screening

Due to constraints on resources, not all bridges will be able to move forward into this Program. Therefore, a subset of the list of bridges initially considered will be chosen to undergo this first screening to determine if they are a candidate bridge for this Program. This screening will require the assessment of a number of items that cannot be easily automated. To the extent practical, each bridge will be screened against the items contained in the Project Field Scoping Meeting portion of the Low Impact Bridge Program Decision-Making Form (FORM Attachment A). The Bridge Office will seek the input from appropriate subject matter experts, as needed. In general, each bridge will be screened out of the Program by the Office of Bridges and Structures if the following conditions cannot be met.

a. **Hydraulics**
   - Does not require coordination with the USCG or FEMA for a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR). These requirements will likely result in additional delays to the schedule.
   - Requires a less than complex hydraulic analysis.
   - A hydraulic opening of the replacement bridge shall be as large as or larger than the existing structure. Exceptional circumstances will be coordinated with the appropriate resource agencies.
   - Design variances for clearance may be considered in cases where the existing profile does not provide proper clearance over flood stages for the proposed bridge.
   - Detour maps should be prepared for coordination with local governments. Roadways will be closed during replacement construction (no on-site traffic) so a reasonable off-site detour route (length and duration) must be available. “Reasonableness” will be evaluated based on the input from the local government, school board and emergency services.

b. **Roadway Design**
   - Proposed projects (including staging) are restricted to within existing ROW except where easements are needed for construction of the project and installation of roadway safety features.
   - In the event of substandard geometry, design variances and/or exceptions may be considered. (See Attachment E Reference Sheet for Designers for supplemental information)

c. **Utilities**
   - Cannot require complex utility relocation or coordination, such as, but not limited to: high relocation costs, major transmission-type utility, required time restrictions (seasonal outages or bat season), asbestos material-type utility, services that are one-way feed, etc.
• Project locations with utility companies that claim prior rights will be evaluated on a case by case basis. If selected to continue in the Program, additional coordination time will be required.

d. **Environmental**

• Cannot involve federal land including, but not limited to, National Park Service, US Forest Service, military bases or US Army Corps of Engineer (USACE).

• Cannot impact a USACE permitted mitigation site.

• Cannot require consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service either for Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) or protected marine species.

• Cannot have an adverse modification to critical habitat, which would require Formal Section 7 consultation as defined under the Endangered Species Act.

• Cannot span a Wild and Scenic River.

• Cannot be a Type I project as defined in 23 CFR 772.5 (noise abatement).

• Cannot involve a bridge that has been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as a result of the Georgia Historic Bridge Survey.

• Cannot be located in a historic district listed in the NRHP.

• Cannot adjoin a National Historic Landmark.

• Cannot have air quality issues of concern for Mobile Source Air Toxins (MSAT) or result in a violation of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

e. **Construction**

• Cannot have complex constructability issues.

• Cannot require a road closure of more than 12 months (duration of closure).

f. **Geotechnical**

• Cannot involve known difficult geological issues in the area.
B. Candidate Bridge Selection

1. Project Selection Meeting

After the initial screening has been completed, a Project Selection Meeting will be held. During this meeting the bridges surviving the Initial Screening will be reviewed by a core group of representatives from each of the offices involved in the Initial Screening. The core group may decide that additional information is required before making a final decision on the retention of a structure as a candidate bridge in the Program.

The Core Group of attendees will be:
Bridge Design
Bridge Hydraulics
Environmental Services
Utilities
Construction
Geotechnical and
District Pre-Construction

As a result of the Project Selection Meeting, prospective bridges continuing in their evaluation will be considered Candidate Bridges and:

- Be forwarded to relevant Environmental Resource Agencies and FHWA
- Undergo an in-depth second screening with constraints and concerns to be addressed at the Project Field Scoping Meeting.
- Must receive the support of the local government to continue advancing through this second screening (including the road closure and off-site detour).

2. Local Government and Stakeholder Coordination

The use of off-site detours is key to the timely delivery of these bridge replacement projects. Therefore, early coordination is required to assess support of a detour during the construction phase of the project. After the Project Selection Meeting, the Office of Bridges and Structures will finalize a suitable detour route and solicit input from the local government, school system and emergency services. GDOT will provide all necessary road closure and detour signage, in addition to maintaining any state route portion of the detour, if applicable. However, any necessary part of the detour route that utilizes locally owned and maintained roads will be the local government's responsibility to maintain during the construction of the bridge. Sample letters soliciting information on potential impacts related to the use of a detour and requesting an official statement of support or opposition are included as Attachments B. Any concerns received from the local governments will be addressed and recorded for inclusion in the Environmental Document.
C. Project Field Scoping Meeting

1. Preparing for the Project Field Scoping Meeting

The following offices have responsibilities to prepare for the Project Field Scoping Meeting as defined below:

Office of Bridges and Structures

The Hydraulics Unit representative will complete the Preliminary Hydraulics Assessment for the project. Items to be included in this review may include drainage areas, existing plans, maintenance/inspection records, or proximity of other stream crossings. Factors included in determining the complexity of a hydraulic study include area of the basin, navigational waterways, multiple hydraulic openings, tidal influence, distance to receiving waters and abnormal flood conditions. In addition, perform local government coordination, complete Section I of the FORM based on the Initial Screening and Section II based on Local Government Support and Detour information.

The Office of Bridges and Structures will invite the following to attend the Project Field Scoping Meeting and will do so at least three weeks in advance to allow all teams time to review and prepare. These participants will be considered the Project Team:

Program Delivery | Bridge Hydraulics | TVA (if relevant)
--- | --- | ---
District Roadway Design | Utilities | |
Construction | Environmental Services | |
Geotechnical Bureau | Location | |
Local Government Officials | Resource Agencies as required (USACE, USFWS, FHWA) | GAEPD and SHPO |

The meeting invitation will include the LIBP manual (or link to online manual), bridge maintenance forms, a project description, a project detour and location map and the Project Information & Initial Considerations, and Candidate Bridge Selection sections (Sections I & II) of the FORM. Section III of the FORM (which catalogue the results of the environmental field work) will also be included in the meeting invitation or provided at the meeting upon request.
Office of Environmental Services (OES)

Environmental Services will assemble all of the preliminary environmental data pertinent to the project. In addition, the environmental team will send out early coordination letters requesting comments from government agencies, resources agencies, tribes, and municipalities in order to gather input on the project. If a tribal government expresses concern during early coordination, the project may be eliminated from the Program since the additional coordination required will not meet the Program schedule goals. Early coordination procedures outlined in the GDOT’s Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM) will be followed.

For the purpose of determining field survey requirements, project limits should include 75 feet upstream and downstream of the centerline or be the limits of the existing ROW, whichever distance is greater. In addition, the longitudinal survey limits will extend 500 feet from the center of the existing structure in both directions. If there is an intersecting road within 500 feet of the bridge approaches, in either direction, an additional 200 feet will be surveyed on the intersecting road, within existing ROW. Candidate Bridges will be surveyed for the presence of natural, cultural and community resources (e.g., churches, schools) following standard survey methodological approaches pursuant to GDOT’s EPM. For projects in the Program that are not intended to extend beyond existing ROW and will not require easements, the 100 foot expanded archaeology survey corridor on typical GDOT projects may be waived in some instances. This consideration will be determined based on available design information and consultation with Office of Bridges and Structures. Field data will be assessed to ensure that the entire survey area has been surveyed. After the delineation and classification of all resources is complete, this information will be provided to the Design Engineer for placement on the plans. The project ecologist will notify the Design Engineer of any streams that must be designed for fish passage due to classification or protected species habitat.

The results of the environmental field surveys will be discussed with the resource agencies and the project team at the Project Field Scoping Meeting. Project effects including any commitments to achieve the appropriate level of finding also will be discussed at the Project Field Scoping Meeting. The resource identification as well as the outcome of agency consultations will be recorded in Section III Part 3 the FORM.

Office of Utilities

The District Utilities Manager or designee will contact all utility owners and make them aware of the upcoming project and discuss any relocations or potential problems. A meeting will be scheduled on site, if deemed necessary.

District Design and/or Preconstruction

The District Design representative will confirm the existing ROW limits with the candidate counties, in order to fully evaluate the bridge at the Project Field Scoping Meeting and determine if any easements will be required for construction purposes.
2. Holding the Project Field Scoping Meeting

The Project Team will meet on site to finalize the scope of the project. A Bridge Office Representative will begin the meeting and explain that the intent of the meeting is to identify the benefits versus the risks of the project moving forward. All questions will be addressed and a clear scope of the bridge replacement will be determined.

If feasible, a potential Let date will be proposed at the Project Field Scoping Meeting. For those bridges selected for advancement to Final Selection, an expedited schedule will be established based on either a 31-week or 38-week Environmental Review Process (see Attachment C for sample schedules).

Relevant sections of the FORM will be discussed and the Office of Bridges and Structures will compile these comments to serve as the minutes of the meeting.

The Office of Bridges and Structures will ensure that all attendees leave the meeting with a clear direction as to what is expected of them with regards to their responsibilities to meet each step of the process and the overall schedule. Areas of responsibility will fall into three distinct categories: utilities, design, and environmental, with overall project progress lying with the Project Manager (PM) once the project has been programmed.

Once the Project Field Scoping Meeting has been completed, the actual work of designing, estimating, assembling contract documents, obtaining NEPA approvals, acquiring environmental permits for the project will begin.
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Chapter 5. Final Selection

After the Project Field Scoping Meeting, Candidate Bridges meeting the criteria detailed within this manual along with the conditions listed below will be recommended by the Office of Bridges and Structures to be placed into the Construction Work Program (CWP) and scheduled for replacement under this Program. When projects are requested to be programmed, they will be referred to as Low Impact Bridge Projects and will be notated in GDOT’s project database (TPRO) through the use of the Priority Code “LIBP”. These projects will adhere to the schedules resulting from the Project Field Scoping Meeting in accordance with the streamlined provisions of this Program. Candidate Bridges exceeding the environmental thresholds will be disqualified from the Program.

Due to the overall nature of projects selected for the Program, the following impacts will not occur:

- Noise impacts.
- Residential or commercial displacements, access changes or impairment of existing land functions.
- Impacts to Prime Farmland.

The following project conditions may be included to ensure that environmental impacts remain below the thresholds specified above. This list is not all inclusive as other conditions may be identified.

- For projects with identified protected species, the construction contract will include Special Provision 107.23 G and/or H. Restrictive work dates may apply if work below the water surface, including pile removal, pile driving and cofferdam construction, will take place within suitable habitat for federally protected aquatic species or if a federally protected species is known to occur within the action area.

- In accordance with Specification 107.23B, construction activities will be performed in such a way as to prevent siltation and to prevent construction waste or debris from falling into the water.

- Any ground disturbing activities will be prohibited in areas identified as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESA) that are delineated by Orange Barrier Fencing and the following note will be included on the plans:

  The contractor shall ensure that all construction related activities (easements, staging, vehicular use, borrow or waste activities, construction trailer placement and staging) be restricted to the existing right-of-way. The contractor shall install orange safety fencing between mainline stations XXX+XX and XXX+XX to ensure that the ESA is not adversely impacted during project construction.

- Context sensitive bridge (e.g., Kansas Corral or Texas Rail) rails may be included in the vicinity of historic properties.

- Projects will include Special Provision 150 (Traffic Control) which specifies the maximum number of days a detour may be in place.

- Projects will include Special Provision 108 (Prosecution and Progress) assessing liquidated damages for projects exceeding the road closure duration noted in Special Provision 150.
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Chapter 6. Compiled Responsibilities of Team Members for All Phases

This Chapter summarizes the responsibilities for all LIBP Team Members. It is each member’s responsibility to be familiar with Attachment E of this Manual that provides specific information regarding the design and delivery of a LIBP project.

A. Project Manager (PM)

The Project Manager will be responsible for the following activities:

After Project Field Scoping Meeting

- The PM will be responsible for the overall delivery of the project and will coordinate with all participants in the process to ensure that the project stays on course.
- The PM will request traffic requests through the Office of Planning and will activate the relevant LIBP template schedule (Attachments C) and request any schedule modifications if there are any unforeseen changes to the project.
- Will be responsible for following up with the Utility Office and Engineering Services to confirm the Utility Certification Package is complete and construction funds are authorized.
- Prepare and submit detour report for approval and advertise the Notice of Detour Approval within 30 days of receiving approval, in accordance with GDOT’s Plan Development Process (PDP) and state law.

B. Resource Agencies

Resources agencies will be responsible for the following activities:

Preparing for Project Field Scoping Meeting

- Provide comments on Candidate Bridges indicating any field conditions that may disqualify a project from the Program.
- At least three (3) weeks notification of the Project Field Scoping Meeting date and location will be provided to the required Resource Agencies to allow time for this screening and review.

Project Field Scoping Meeting

- Attend Project Field Scoping Meeting or visit the site as necessary at another time to gather field data for response to scoping comment requests. If the Resource Agencies are unable to attend due to other conflicts, they can submit their comments and concerns via a provided copy of Section III of the FORM. Time extensions for comments will be considered as necessary.

After Project Field Scoping Meeting

- Review any written notifications required for any permit authorizations.

C. Office of Bridges & Structures

The Office of Bridges and Structures will be responsible for the following activities:

...
Compiled Responsibilities of Team Members for All Phases

Initial Screening

- The Hydraulics unit will assist in the Initial Screening process listed on pages 4-2.
- Coordinate with IT to create ProjectWise directories and paths for the bridges included in the Initial Screening process.

Preparing for Project Selection Meeting

- Coordinate with the Office of Environmental Services and the Office of Utilities to begin their initial screenings, as well as contact the District Design office to request existing ROW limits at the locations.
- Select a date and invite the Core Group to the Project Selection Meeting.

Preparing for Project Field Scoping Meeting

- The Office of Bridges and Structures will coordinate with the District Pre-Construction Engineer to gather local government contacts to send letters of early detour coordination and assess overall project support. (See Attachments B) Any detour concerns received from local entities will be addressed and documented as needed.
- Upon completion of the Preliminary Hydraulics Assessment, the Office of Bridges and Structures will complete and collect signatures for Section I and II of the FORM.
- Ensure that the Environmental Considerations portion of Section III of the FORM has been completed by OES and uploaded to ProjectWise.
- Invite Resource Agencies (with help from OES), including FHWA’s environmental staff and bridge engineer along with all other Project Team attendees at least three (3) weeks prior to the Project Field Scoping Meeting date. The meeting invitation will include the following attachments:
  - LIBP Manual (pdf version)
  - Sections I, II and III of the FORM
  - Project Description
  - Bridge Maintenance Forms
  - Project Location Map
  - Project Detour Map
- The Office of Bridges and Structures will prepare a rough schematic layout of the bridge and existing spans to be used at the Project Field Scoping Meeting.

Project Field Scoping Meeting

- A representative from the Office of Bridges and Structures will begin the Project Field Scoping Meeting and explain that the intent of the meeting is to establish the details and limits of the project. All questions will be addressed and a clear scope of the bridge replacement will be determined. The relevant sections of the FORM will be discussed.
- Topographic survey boundaries will be established by the Office of Bridges and Structures at the Project Field Scoping Meeting. (See Attachment D)
- The Hydraulics representative will utilize the prepared schematic layout to draw in the limits of the existing banks and prepare an estimate of the proposed span arrangement showing the proposed locations of the bents. This schematic will be uploaded to ProjectWise and sent to
the Office of Materials or a consultant to begin the Bridge Foundation Investigation (BFI) process.

- The Office of Bridges and Structures representative will be responsible for recording relevant notes and comments at the Project Field Scoping Meeting. These notes will serve as the meeting minutes and will be included in Section III of the FORM.
- All attendees will leave the Project Field Scoping Meeting with a clear direction as to what is expected of them with regards to their responsibilities to meet each step of the process and overall schedule.
- If possible, a potential let date will be discussed by the Office of Bridges and Structures representative prior to the close of the meeting.

**After Project Field Scoping Meeting**

- Section III of the FORM, including all meeting notes and comments, will be completed and signed by the preparer from the Bridge Office. The Bridge Office representative will also secure signatures from OES and the State Bridge Engineer. The Bridge Office will upload this section of the FORM to ProjectWise within one to two weeks after the Project Field Scoping Meeting and will notify OES when it is completed.
- The Bridge Hydraulic Study will be completed by the hydraulic engineer and will provide information and supporting computations as prescribed in the “Georgia Drainage Manual”.
- The Preliminary Bridge Layout will be completed and submitted with the Hydraulic Study to the Office of Bridges and Structures for review and comment (see Attachment C for sample schedules). The GDOT review will take no longer than 10 business days. For structure standards and details, refer to: [http://www.dot.ga.gov/doingbusiness/PoliciesManuals/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.dot.ga.gov/doingbusiness/PoliciesManuals/Pages/default.aspx)

**D. District Design Office or Consultant Design Team**

The District Design group will be responsible for the following activities:

**Initial Screening**

- The District Design office will be responsible for confirming with the counties existing ROW limits and any complex design issues that would prevent an expedited construction schedule.

**Project Selection Meeting**

- The District Design office will attend the Project Selection Meeting and provide feedback on the existing ROW limits and any design concerns.

**Preparing for Project Field Scoping Meeting**

- The District Design office will confirm the attendance of at least one design representative to be present at the Field Scoping Meeting who can discuss the need for any potential easements or design concerns.

**After Project Field Scoping Meeting**

- The District Design Office or Design Consultant will coordinate with the Bridge Office, the Office of Environmental Services and the ROW office as needed to deliver “Preliminary
Roadway Plans Complete” (Activity 21799) to the ROW Office to allow ROW activities to begin and submit for PFPR.

E. Office of Right of Way

The Office of Right of Way will be responsible for the following activities only when easements are needed or identified during or after the Project Field Scoping Meeting.

- Coordinate with the District Design or Design Consultant engineers to receive ROW plans prior to PFPR so that ROW plan preparation can begin with the delivery of complete Preliminary Roadway Plans.

F. Office of Environmental Services

The Office of Environmental Services will be responsible for the following activities:

Initial Screening

- The project ecologist will be responsible for background research, required ecological surveys and resource delineation (see Attachment C for sample schedules).

- The project historian and archaeologist will be responsible for background research and field surveys (if needed) to identify NRHP eligible or listed historic properties and archaeological sites.

Project Selection Meeting

- After the Project Selection Meeting, environmental staff will send the list of Candidate Bridges to the environmental resource agencies and FHWA to begin early coordination efforts.

Preparing For Project Field Scoping Meeting

- The Office of Environmental Services will compile the research collected during initial screening and field surveys and complete Section III of the FORM in preparation of the Field Scoping Meeting and upload the Section to ProjectWise.

- Will confirm if any comments from resource agencies or FHWA need to be included at the Field Scoping Meeting if they are unable to attend.

Project Field Scoping Meeting

- Attend Project Field Scoping Meeting and confirm field survey comments and findings.

After Project Field Scoping Meeting

- The NEPA document will be attached to and support the Preconstruction Notification (PCN) in accordance with the general permit requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The State Environmental Administrator or designee will review and submit the PCN to the USACE (see Attachment C for sample schedules). The State Environmental Administrator or designee will receive all permit authorizations from the respective agencies and will assist in the PM’s review of the final construction plans to ensure that all permit requirements have been addressed in the final plans.

- The State Environmental Administrator will be responsible for approving the CE on FHWA’s behalf.
• The project Green Sheet (environmental commitments matrix) will receive a final review by the Office of Environmental Services following its approval by the Project Manager and Engineer of Record.

G. Office of Utilities

Initial Screening and Preparing for Project Field Scoping Meeting

• The Office of Utilities will coordinate directly with utility owners to initially identify any utilities deemed to be in conflict with the project. This will include beginning any planning and verifications that may be necessary.

After Project Field Scoping Meeting

• Once the start of final plans begin, the Office of Utilities will be tasked with coordinating the marking of existing utilities and proposed utility relocations for the subject project.

H. Office of Materials or Geotech Consultant

Initial Screening

• The Geotechnical Bureau will identify any potential drilling concerns or known difficult geological issues at the candidate sites.

Project Field Scoping Meeting

• The Geotechnical Bureau will determine number of borings required during the Field Scoping Meeting.

After Project Field Scoping Meeting

• The Geotechnical Bureau or Geotech Consultant will use the schematic received and created from the Office of Bridges and Structures after the Field Scoping Meeting is complete to begin the BFI process.

• Bridge Foundation Investigations will be completed by the Geotechnical Bureau or consultant designee at least 7 months prior to the Let date (see Attachment C for sample schedules). The BFI recommendations shall be performed in accordance with the Geotechnical Bureau’s “Guidelines for Geotechnical Engineering Manual”.
Chapter 7. Program Evaluation

The Bridge Program Manager will evaluate the Program’s effectiveness by annually comparing scheduled Let dates to actual Let dates for projects. Issues causing missed schedules will be tracked. GDOT will also track the issues causing projects to be eliminated from this Program.

In addition to schedule assessments, monitoring of the compliance with the associated Interagency Agreements will be undertaken through annual internal reviews to be conducted by GDOT, and joint reviews to be conducted periodically by FHWA and GDOT.

The reporting period will coincide with the state fiscal year (July 1 through June 30) and a report will be produced by the following September 30.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Low Impact Bridge Program Decision-Making Form (FORM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Sample Early Coordination Letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sample Template Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Sample LIBP Limits of Survey Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Reference Sheet for Designers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Georgia Department of Transportation | Low Impact Bridge Program (LIBP) Decision-Making Form and Programmatic Categorical Exclusion for Eligible LIBP Projects

PI#: XXXXXXX, Structure No: , County: XXXX

I. Project Information & Initial Considerations

Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Click here to enter text.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDOT District #: Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP/TIP #: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Funded Year and Code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrologic Unit Code: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Crossing: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADT: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Serial #: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length &amp; Width: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge deficiencies: Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description: This project proposes the replacement of the structurally deficient, posted bridge XXX-XXXX-0.

This bridge is eligible for federal funds.

Initial Considerations

1. Does this bridge involve the railroad? No
2. Does this bridge cross into an adjoining state? No
3. Does this bridge involve a major river crossing/a river under US Coast Guard jurisdiction? No
4. Will this bridge replacement require a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR)? No
5. Will this bridge require complex hydraulics analysis? No
6. Will this bridge replacement project require any additional right-of-way other than easements needed for construction of the project and installation of roadway safety features? No
7. Will this project require an increase in capacity (i.e., additional travel lanes)? No
8. Will this bridge replacement require complex utility relocations or coordination? No
9. Does this bridge crossing involve any utility companies with prior rights that cannot be accommodated? No
10. Does this bridge adjoin any federal land, including but not limited to the National Park Service, US Forest Service, military bases or US Army Corps of Engineer (USACE) lakes? No
11. Does this project impact a USACE approved mitigation site? No
12. Will this project impact Essential Fish Habitat or protected marine species requiring consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service? No
13. Is this bridge located in an area with Critical Habitat as defined under the Endangered Species Act? No
14. Does this bridge span a Wild and Scenic River? No
15. Is this a Type I project as defined in the noise abatement regulations 23 CFR 772.5(h) (i.e., a highway on new location or the physical alteration of an existing highway which significantly changes either the horizontal or vertical alignment or increases the number of through-traffic lanes)? No

16. Does this project involve a bridge that’s been determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in the Manual it is NRHP as a result of the Georgia Historic Bridge Survey? No

17. Is this bridge located in a NRHP listed historic district? No

18. Does this project adjoin a National Historic Landmark? No

19. Would this project be of concern for Mobile Source Air Toxins (MSAT)? No

20. Will this project result in violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)? No

21. Does this project have complex constructability issues? No

22. Will this project require a road closure of greater than 12 months? No

23. Does this project involve known geological issues in the area that would prevent inclusion in the Program? No

*If the answer to any of the above questions is yes, the project is not eligible for the Program. For bridges with “no” responses to the above questions, the Office of Bridges and Structures will solicit local government support for this project.*

**Project Information & Initial Considerations sections preparation & approval:**

**Prepared By:**

Name: Bridge Office Staff

**Reviewed By:**

Name: Environmental Data Reviewed by OES Section Manager or Higher

**Reviewed & Approved By:**

Name: State Bridge Engineer or Assistant State Bridge Engineer

*Is this project eligible for advancement through the Candidate Bridge Selection phase & solicitation of local support?* Yes

*If No, DO NOT complete remaining sections.*
## Candidate Bridge Selection

### 1. Project Detour

Description of detour route: See attached map

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Gross detour length?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Approximate net detour length?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Improvements needed to road on detour?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of needed road improvements (if yes above): n/a

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Improvements needed to bridge on detour?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of needed bridge improvements (if yes above): n/a

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e. Are bridge projects on detour programmed in STIP?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STIP # and construction year funding for bridge on detour: n/a

### 2. Local Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of Supporter</th>
<th>Date of Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Click here to enter text. Click here to enter a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Services</td>
<td>Click here to enter text. Click here to enter a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School System</td>
<td>Click here to enter text. Click here to enter a date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If local government, board of education and emergency services all do not support this project, it is not eligible for the Program. If the project is eligible thus far, that is, has met the Initial Considerations & received local support, the Office of Bridges and Structures will schedule a Project Field Scoping Meeting.

### Candidate Bridge Selection & Local Support section preparation and approval:

**Prepared By:**

Name:  
Bridge Office Staff

**Reviewed & Approved By:**

Name:  
State Bridge Engineer or Assistant State Bridge Engineer

Is this project eligible for advancement to the Project Field Scoping Meeting?  
Yes

If No, DO NOT complete remaining sections.
III. Project Field Scoping Meeting

The Office of Bridges and Structures should work with other offices to assemble the following information for discussion at the meeting:

**Existing Features:** Ensure the Bridge Inventory Data Listing is available at the meeting and attached to this form.

1. **During Construction/Utility Considerations**

   a. Should work zone pedestrian access be maintained during construction?

   Reasons:

   b. Overhead utility lines:

   In conflict?

   c. Power transmission lines:

   In conflict?

   d. Telephone/cable lines:

   In conflict?

   e. Fiber optic:

   In conflict?

   f. Water:

   In conflict?

   g. Sewer:

   In conflict?

   h. Natural gas:

   In conflict?

   i. Other:

   In conflict?

   j. List utility owners:

   k. Based on the past history near this project site, what is the estimated time required to complete utility adjustments? **Months**

   l. Is there any future utility construction anticipated in the project area?

   m. Is a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) buy-out property being impacted?

2. **Environmental Considerations**

   a. Waters of the US and buffered state waters at the site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource #</th>
<th>Resource type</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   Add rows as needed

   b. If the bridge is located within the Tennessee Valley Authority’s Jurisdiction, will a permit be required? If yes, schedule will be adjusted as accordingly.
c. Is a Clean Water Act 404 permit required?
   May need to determine at field scoping meeting.

   If yes, what type of permit is anticipated?
   Projects requiring Individual Permits will be removed from the program.

d. Is a Buffer Variance anticipated?

e. Known federally listed threatened, endangered, candidate or proposed species populations in area (based on IPaC County listing, early coordination with USFWS and DNR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Habitat present?</th>
<th>Survey season</th>
<th>Expected survey date</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Add rows as needed

f. Is Section 7 ESA Informal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service anticipated?

g. Is Section 7 ESA Informal consultation or essential Fish Habitat (EFH) consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service anticipated?
   Projects requiring consultation with NMFS are not eligible for the LIBP.

h. Is Section 7 ESA Formal consultation anticipated?
   Projects requiring formal consultation are not eligible for the LIBP.

i. Is the project anticipated to have adverse modifications to designated Critical Habitat?
   If so, this project is not eligible for the LIBP.

j. Wildlife Habitat: Is there evidence of bird nesting or bats roosting under/within the bridge or culvert?
   Comments:
   If within project area of potential effect (APE) an adverse effect would occur, project is eligible for LIBP provided that the project includes special provisions to protect nesting areas and/or roosting areas under/within bridges and culverts.

k. Listed, eligible or potentially eligible National Register of Historic Places properties in the area within the APE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Name</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Add rows as needed

l. Other Resources near the project site (public lands, parks, wildlife refuges, cemeteries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Add rows as needed
m. Have tribal governments expressed any concerns following consultation?  
   If yes, what is the nature of the concern?

n. Will the project impact a church, community center or other community facility?  
   If yes, what is the nature of the impact?

o. Is this project on a Statewide Bicycle Route or a local non-marked bicycle route?

p. Any clarification/additional concerns related to the discussions above?

(Add rows as needed)

### 3. Hydraulics

This Project does NOT require FEMA Approval

a. Will a state storm water permit be required?

b. Is there unusual scour potential?  
   Is protection needed?

c. Are banks stable?  
   Is protection needed?

d. Does stream carry appreciable amount of large debris?

e. Based on the likelihood of the presence of protected aquatic species, will the placement of  
   bents in the water be allowed?

Comments:

### 4. Geotechnical

a. Are there any historic and/or vibration sensitive structures nearby?

Comments:

b. Are there any known landfills and/or geoenvironmental hazard sites at or within close proximity  
   to the project site?

Comments:

c. Are any impacts anticipated to natural springs or artesian wells?

Comments:

d. Possible foundation type:

### 5. Other items to be discussed/resolved at Field Scoping Meeting by attendees

a. Superstructure type/drainage:

b. Number of spans:

c. Length of spans:

d. The optimum Let Date for this project:

e. Identify any potential easements needed for construction of project or roadway safety features:
Date of the Project Field Scoping Meeting: [Click here to enter a date.]

Location: [Click here to enter text.]

**ATTENDEES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone, Email (if outside of GDOT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotech/Drilling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Office/District Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Bridge Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Environmental Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAEPD Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add rows as needed
ADDITIONAL MEETING NOTES:


Bridge Inventory Data Listing is attached.

**Field Scoping Meeting section preparation & approval:**

**Prepared By:**

Name  
Bridge Office Staff  

Date

**Review By:**

Name  
Environmental Data Reviewed by OES Section Manager or Higher  

Date

**Reviewed & Approved By:**

Name  
State Bridge Engineer  

Date

**Is this project eligible for advancement through the Final Selection phase?**

If No, this project is not eligible for LIBP funds.  

Choose an item.
Date

Name
Title
County EMA
Street Address
City, State, Zip

RE: Request for Comments on GDOT County Bridge Replacement Candidate
Route over Creek

Dear Mr./Ms. Name,

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is preparing the planning and environmental studies for the above referenced bridge replacement candidate. We propose to close this bridge during its construction and replacement which may take six to nine months.

The purpose of this letter is to solicit your input concerning the potential impact of the proposed project on the provision of emergency services in the area. A detour map is attached illustrating the proposed route and location of the project.

To allow us to fully evaluate the concerns of all stakeholders, please provide comments to the email address below by [insert date, allow 30 days for response]. Documenting both the beneficial or adverse impacts of the proposed project as it relates to the interest of your agency is a vital part of the required environmental documentation. Your timely response is appreciated as there are several other bridges proposed for this fiscal year’s cycle.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this project, please contact Carol Kalafut of the Office of Bridge Design at ckalafut@dot.ga.gov or 404-631-1882. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

William M. DuVall, P.E.
State Bridge Engineer

WMD:CIK
Attachment
cc: Local Grants Administrator
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Bridge Replacement Project  
Detour Impact Form  
<Bridge Serial No.>, <County>

1. Please rate the impact to Emergency Response services if the bridge were closed for up to a year.

☐ No Impact  ☐ Low Impact  ☐ Moderate Impact  ☐ High Impact

2. If concerns were identified on # 1, please specify what they are, and be as specific as possible (examples: condition of detour routes, located in a high call volume area, closure could affect response to schools, weight restrictions, expected new development in the area, coordination with partner agency required to facilitate service). In order for the project to continue in the Preliminary Engineering phase, any concerns regarding impact on service, must be addressed by project staff. For example, if the box for “High Impact” is checked, a response of N/A would not be valid.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Are there any future time periods or events that you know of where bridge closure would be of particular concern? Please note the event and any details you are familiar with.

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

4. Is there anyone you feel we should contact specifically regarding this project? Please note their name, contact information, and reason we should contact them?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

5. Are there any additional comments you have for this project? Are the road names referenced the names the locals would use?

________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________________________

Form Completed by (Name): ________________________________________________

(Title): __________________________________________________________

Date: _________________________

☐ By checking this box, we support the bridge replacement utilizing an offsite detour.
Date

Name
Title
Local Government
Street Address
City, State, Zip

RE: Request for Comments on GDOT County Bridge Replacement Candidate Route over Creek

Dear Mr./Ms. Name,

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) has developed a Low Impact Bridge Replacement Program (Program) to provide expedited project delivery for the least complicated bridge replacement projects. As noted in the online Program manual, prospective bridges will go through a tiered evaluation process that takes into account a number of factors.


The purpose of this letter is to solicit your input concerning the potential impact of the proposed project on the citizens in your community. We propose to close this bridge during its construction and replacement which may take six to nine months. Please find attached a detour map showing the location of the bridge and a proposed detour route.

Since the bridge is on a locally owned and maintained route, it will be the local government’s responsibility to maintain any local routes utilized for the detour. The Department will provide all necessary road closure and detour signage, in addition to maintaining any state route portion of the detour.

To allow us to fully evaluate the concerns of all stakeholders, please provide comments to the email address below by (insert date, allow 30 days for response). Documenting both the beneficial or adverse impacts of the proposed project as it relates to the interest of your citizens is a vital part of the required environmental documentation. Your timely response is appreciated as there are several other bridges proposed for this fiscal year’s cycle.

It is understood that as the project develops, concerns may be identified that would prohibit the project from moving forward in this expedited process.
However, please be assured that GDOT is committed to advancing bridges not qualifying for this expedited process through our regular plan development process.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this project, please contact Carol Kalafut of the Office of Bridge Design at ckalafut@dot.ga.gov or 404-631-1882. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

William M. DuVall, P.E.
State Bridge Engineer

WMD:CIK
Attachments
cc: Local Grants Administrator
    District Engineer
Georgia Department of Transportation  
Bridge Replacement Project  
Detour Impact Form  
<Bridge Serial No.>, <County>

Using the attached detour map, please respond to the questions below. Please provide as much information as you feel is necessary. Please respond to all questions – use “N/A” or “Not-known” if no relevant information to question is available. If you need additional information or mapping for this project, please contact us using the information provided in the cover letter.

1. Please quantify the number of impacts anticipated by the off-site detour shown on the attached map.
   - Daily Number of vehicles __________  
   - Daily Number of Trucks ____________  
   - Number of Residences ____________  
   - Number of Businesses ____________  
   - Detour Length ____________

2. Please rate the impact on service if the bridge were closed for up to a year? (Please note that any concerns identified here must be explained in #3 below, in order for the Project Designers to address the concerns)
   - [ ] No Concerns  [ ] Moderate Concerns  [ ] Major Concerns

3. If concerns were identified on #2, please specify what they are below, be as specific as possible (Conditions of detour route, location of students, new development expected, weight restrictions, etc.). In order for the project to continue in the Preliminary Engineering phase, any concerns regarding impact on service, must be addressed by project staff. For example, if the box for “Major Concerns” is checked, a response of N/A would not be valid.
   ________________________________  
   ________________________________  
   ________________________________  

4. Are there any future time periods or events that you know of where bridge closure would be of particular concern? Please note the event and any details you are familiar with.
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

5. Is there anyone you feel we should contact specifically regarding this project? Please note their name, phone number, and reason we should contact them? (Separate letters and detour forms have been sent to the County EMA Director and the Superintendent of Schools.)
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

6. Are there any additional comments you have regarding the project? Are the road names referenced the names the locals would use?
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________
   __________________________________________

7. Estimated width of existing right-of–way at bridge _________ ft

Form Completed by (Name): __________________________________________
   (Title): __________________________________________
   Date: __________________________________________

[ ] By checking this box, we support the bridge replacement utilizing an offsite detour.
Date

Name
Title
County School Board
Street Address
City, State, Zip

RE: Request for Comments on GDOT County Bridge Replacement Candidate Route over Creek

Dear Mr./Ms. Name,

The Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT) is preparing the planning and environmental studies for the above referenced bridge replacement candidate. We propose to close this bridge during its construction and replacement which may take six to nine months.

The purpose of this letter is to solicit your input concerning the potential impact of the proposed project on school bus routes. Please provide the number of daily bus trips across this bridge when submitting your comments. A detour map is attached illustrating the proposed route and location of the project.

To allow us to fully evaluate the concerns of all stakeholders, please provide comments to the email address below by [insert date, allow 30 days for response]. Documenting both the beneficial or adverse impacts of the proposed project as it relates to the interest of your agency is a vital part of the required environmental documentation. Your timely response is appreciated as there are several other bridges proposed for this fiscal year’s cycle.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this project, please contact Carol Kalafut of the Office of Bridge Design at ckalafut@dot.ga.gov or 404-631-1882. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

William M. DuVall, P.E.
State Bridge Engineer

cc: Local Grants Administrator
Georgia Department of Transportation
Bridge Replacement Project
Detour Impact Form
<Bridge Serial No.>, <County>

Using the attached detour map, please respond to the questions below. Please provide as much information as you feel is necessary. Please respond to all questions – use “N/A” or “Not-known” if no relevant information to question is available. If you need additional information or mapping for this project, please contact us.

1. How many School Buses cross the bridge per day?
   Number of Buses __________  Number of Trips __________

2. Please rate the impact on service if the bridge were closed for up to a year? (Please note that any concerns identified here must be explained in #3 below, in order for the Project Designers to address the concerns.)
   □ No Concerns  □ Moderate Concerns  □ Major Concerns

3. If concerns were identified on #2, please specify what they are, and be as specific as possible (Conditions of detour route, location of students, new development expected, weight restrictions, etc.). In order for the project to continue in the Preliminary Engineering phase, any concerns regarding impact on service, must be addressed by project staff. For example, if the box for “Major Concerns” is checked, a response of N/A would not be valid.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

4. Are there any future time periods or events that you know of where bridge closure would be of particular concern? Please note the event and any details you are familiar with.

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

5. Is there anyone you feel we should contact specifically regarding this project? Please note their name, phone number, and reason we should contact them?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

6. Are there any additional comments you have regarding the project? Are the road names referenced the names the locals would use?

______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________

Form Completed by (Name): _____________________________________________________
(Title): ________________________________________________________________
Date: __________________________

☐ By checking this box, we support the bridge replacement utilizing an offsite detour.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Planned Start</th>
<th>Planned Finish</th>
<th>Actual Start</th>
<th>Actual Finish</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Primary Constraint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Noise Analysis (with steps)</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>22-Jul-19</td>
<td>13-Nov-19</td>
<td>As Late As Pos...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Analysis</td>
<td>65.0d</td>
<td>18-Jul-19</td>
<td>13-Nov-19</td>
<td>As Late As Pos...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Document Summary</td>
<td>81.0d</td>
<td>18-Jul-19</td>
<td>13-Nov-19</td>
<td>As Late As Pos...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>81.0d</td>
<td>18-Jul-19</td>
<td>13-Nov-19</td>
<td>As Late As Pos...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td>80.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity ID</td>
<td>Planned Duration</td>
<td>Total Float</td>
<td>BL Project Start</td>
<td>BL Project Finish</td>
<td>Actual Start</td>
<td>Actual Finish</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90375</td>
<td>10.0d</td>
<td>12.0d</td>
<td>28-Nov-19</td>
<td>17-Dec-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90400</td>
<td>5.0d</td>
<td>12.0d</td>
<td>12-Dec-19</td>
<td>18-Dec-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90450</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>12.0d</td>
<td>18-Dec-19</td>
<td>18-Dec-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90500</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>08-Jan-20</td>
<td>08-Jan-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90500</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>19-Dec-19</td>
<td>19-Dec-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95100</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>06-Mar-20</td>
<td>06-Mar-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95300</td>
<td>30.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>16-Jan-20</td>
<td>27-Feb-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95400</td>
<td>4.0d</td>
<td>43.0d</td>
<td>19-Dec-19</td>
<td>27-Feb-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95500</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>26-Mar-20</td>
<td>26-Mar-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95600</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>15-May-20</td>
<td>15-May-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As at As Per...

- PM Submits FFPR Responses to OES
- Verify FFPR Responses (OES)
- PM Distributes FFPR Responses
- Final Submittal
- Submit Corrected FFPR Plans
- Final Submittal Summary
- Submit Final Plans
- Utility Agreements Preparation and Certification
- G.O. ROW Certification
- Construction Authorization
- Project Advertisement
- Let Contract
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Planned Start</th>
<th>Planned Finish</th>
<th>Actual Start</th>
<th>Actual Finish</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Primary Constraint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00000</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00100</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td>20-Mar-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Supplemental Activities**

- Procurement (for Design, BFI, Database, etc.) – if needed
- Procurement Requisition Form Submitted by PM
- Consultant Requisition Form Submitted by PM
- Notice to Proceed (NTP) for Consultant Contract

**Primary Constraint**

- 27-Jun-17
- 07-May-18
- 10-Aug-17
- 14-Jul-17
- 10-Aug-17
- 07-May-18
- 15-Sep-17
- 18

**Database Preparation**

- 20000: 30.0d - 07-May-18
- 20010: 0.0d - 18-May-18

**Field Surveys**

- 20400: 30.0d - 18-May-18
- 20400: 0.0d - 18-May-18

**BFI Process Work**

- 20600: 10.0d - 18-May-18
- 20600: 0.0d - 18-May-18

**Local and Consultant Design Activities for Preliminary Plans**

- 20060: 50.0d - 18-May-18
- 22567: 0.0d - 18-May-18

**Preliminary Roadway Plans**

- 20131: 30.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 20131: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Submittal Preliminary Plans to GDOT Offices**

- 20131: 50.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22567: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Preliminary Bridge Design**

- 20200: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22567: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**BFI Report**

- 20200: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22567: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Environmental**

- 21900: 275.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22500: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Special Technical Studies**

- 21200: 275.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22500: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Agency Consultation for Ecology**

- 30.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Federal Resource Assessment of Effects (FRA)**

- 30.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Procurement Requirements Form Submitted by PM**

- Notice to Proceed (NTP) for Consultant Contract

**Database Summary**

- Field Database Preparation
- Field Survey Summary
- SDE Process Work

**Preliminary Roadway Plans**

- 20700: 30.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22567: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Preliminary Plans Complete**

- 22567: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Preliminary Bridge Design Summary**

- Request Preliminary Bridge Layout
- Bridge Hydrostatic Study and Layout Development (in-house)

**BFI Report Summary**

- 80700: 180.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 80800: 75.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 81200: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 81250: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Environmental Document Approval**

- 10000: 275.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 10000: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 10000: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Technical Studies**

- 21200: 275.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 22500: 40.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Environmental Technical Studies Complete**

- 3489: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17
- 3489: 0.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Conduct Agency Consultation for Ecology**

- 30.0d - 20-Mar-17

**Federal Resource Assessment of Effects (FRA)**

- 30.0d - 20-Mar-17

**PE Funding Authorization**

- PE Funding Authorization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity ID</th>
<th>Activity Description</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Planned Duration</th>
<th>Actual Start</th>
<th>Actual Finish</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Primary Constraint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Section 106 Consultation (with steps)</td>
<td>12-Jan-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>07-May-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Analysis</td>
<td>12-Jan-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>07-May-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct Noise Analysis (with steps)</td>
<td>12-Jan-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>07-May-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Analysis</td>
<td>12-Jan-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>07-May-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Document</td>
<td>04-Feb-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>02-Apr-18</td>
<td>26-Jun-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA Document Summary</td>
<td>04-Feb-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>02-Apr-18</td>
<td>26-Jun-18</td>
<td>As Late As Possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare CE</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review CE</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit CE to FHWA</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA Review of CE</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permits</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTS Revisions and Revisions Plans for Application, Revisions Modified</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA and Buffer Variance (BV) Permits LOC</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404 Permit</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete 404 Permit (with steps)</td>
<td>02-May-18</td>
<td>3.0d</td>
<td>20-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Certification for CST Authorizations</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>8.0d</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Plans &amp; Change Form (Transit), Circulate to Environmental</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>8.0d</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Certification for Let Complete</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>8.0d</td>
<td>08-May-18</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Phase</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Phase Summary</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit RFI Results and Plans to Environmental for Technical Studies</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Plans to Environmental for Permit Applications</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Receipt of Site &amp; 2nd Submissions</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Plan Preparation</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Construction Plans Complete</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and Consultant Design Activities for Final Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Construction Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Roadway Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Final Roadway Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Typical Sections</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Horizontal Alignment</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Vertical Alignment</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Cross Sections (with steps)</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Signing &amp; Marking Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Drainage Designs</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Erosion Control Plans</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive Utility Plans and Plot Utilities</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of FFRP Comments</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Design</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Design Summary</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Plan Preparation</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Design Letters (for in-house design only)</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Bridge Design Letters</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Recommendation Letter</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loads Letter</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final FFRP</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pm Request FFRP</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>20.0d</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Activity ID</td>
<td>Planned Duration</td>
<td>Total Float</td>
<td>Bl Project Start</td>
<td>Bl Project Finish</td>
<td>Actual Start</td>
<td>Actual Finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Submits FFPR Responses to OES</td>
<td>90375</td>
<td>10.0d</td>
<td>17.0d</td>
<td>11-Jun-18</td>
<td>22-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify FFPR Responses (OES)</td>
<td>90400</td>
<td>5.0d</td>
<td>17.0d</td>
<td>25-Jun-18</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Distributes FFPR Responses</td>
<td>90450</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Submittals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Corrected FFPR Plans</td>
<td>90500</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Submittals Summary</td>
<td>95000</td>
<td>90.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>28-Jun-18</td>
<td>07-Nov-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Final Plans</td>
<td>95100</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>28-Aug-18</td>
<td>28-Aug-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Agreements Preparation and Certification</td>
<td>95200</td>
<td>30.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>18-Jul-18</td>
<td>28-Aug-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. ROW Certification</td>
<td>95300</td>
<td>30.0d</td>
<td>31.0d</td>
<td>02-Jul-18</td>
<td>06-Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Authorization</td>
<td>95400</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Advertisement</td>
<td>95500</td>
<td>15.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td>18-Oct-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let Contract</td>
<td>95600</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>27-Nov-18</td>
<td>07-Nov-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Submittals</td>
<td>95700</td>
<td>90.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>29-Jun-18</td>
<td>07-Nov-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Final Plans</td>
<td>95800</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>28-Aug-18</td>
<td>28-Aug-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Agreements Preparation and Certification</td>
<td>95900</td>
<td>30.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.O. ROW Certification</td>
<td>96000</td>
<td>30.0d</td>
<td>31.0d</td>
<td>02-Jul-18</td>
<td>06-Jul-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Authorization</td>
<td>96100</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>0.0d</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td>18-Sep-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIMITS OF EXISTING BRIDGE BUSINESS GROUP TO DETERMINE THE LIMITS OF SURVEY COVERAGE.

WIDE FLOODPLAINS - FOR SITES WHERE THE FLOODPLAIN IS VERY WIDE AND FLAT, CONTACT THE ENGINEERING FIELD REPORT. STATED IN THE HYDRAULIC EXTREME HIGH WATER ELEVATION CROSS SECTIONS TO 2 FT ABOVE EXTEND LIMITS OF FLOODPLAIN (BOTH UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM SIDES) ENGINEERING FIELD REPORT.

TO ACCURATELY DEFINE THE STREAM CHANNEL CROSS SECTION. CHANNEL SHOULD INCLUDE TOP OF STREAM BANK, EDGE OF WATER AND ENOUGH STREAMBED SHOTS 500 FT UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM FROM THE PROPOSED CENTERLINE. CROSS SECTIONS OF THE STREAM TRAVERSE - A STREAM TRAVERSE IS REQUIRED FOR ALL CROSSINGS AND SHOULD EXTEND IS REQUIRED AND SHOULD INCLUDE A STREAM CROSS SECTION.


300 FT
Attachment E - Reference Sheet for LIBP Designers

LIBP Design Procedures do not follow the normal progression through the Plan Development Process (PDP). This attachment provides guidance for delivering the following types of projects: Low Impact Bridge Program (LIBP) and state-funded “low-impact” bridges. (Design Build bridges must have the EOR request concurrence from the Bridge Office to use the guidance below and include a note regarding the LIBP Manual on the plan cover sheet.)

GENERAL INFORMATION

- LIBP projects will not follow the normal progression through the Plan Development Process (PDP). Several tasks included in the PDP are handled during the pre-programming phase of the project. Therefore the following PDP activities will be altered or omitted completely from the LIBP design process:
  - No Concept Report required; the Field Scoping Meeting and FORM (Attachment A) replaces the Concept Report.
  - No Pavement Design when ADT < 10,000 (see link below in DESIGN INFORMATION SECTION).
  - Traffic Counts will be requested by PMs through the Office of Planning with minimal analysis.
  - No PFPR coordination unless right-of-way easements are required for construction of the project and installation of roadway safety features. FFPR will be held for all LIBPs (see below in SCHEDULE INFORMATION).
  - Utility coordination will be handled with one combined submission rather than two (see below in UTILITIES INFORMATION).
  - Approval from Engineering Services will not be required to add or update an estimate for a Utility Phase and/or a ROW Phase (for easements) to LIBP projects. The request to add a new phase, or update an estimate, can only be approved by the Bridge Office after confirming need with designer(s) and the Project Manager.
  - Off-site detour coordination is handled with local governments prior to programming and no PIOH will be required (see below in DESIGN INFORMATION).
  - Construction and detour closure duration times will be minimized as needed (coordinate with Bridge Office as necessary).

SCHEDULE INFORMATION

- No Schedule Reviews will be held for LIBP projects. Template Schedules (Attachments C) will be activated by GDOT OPD.
  - Activity 81312 on LIBP Schedules 1 and 2 (Submit BFI Results to Environmental for Technical Studies) will be considered “Lock-down Plans”. Activity 81397 will be “Lock-Down Plans” for LIBP w/ROW Schedule.
  - Since Lock-down will occur prior to FFPR, careful consideration must be made to avoid modification after FFPR. It is recommended that designers perform a site visit with plans in hand prior to Lock-down submission.
  - With FHWA’s recent approval to allow right of way easements on LIBP projects, and for those projects identified with the need for easements, the LIBP Schedule will include a PFPR and a ROW phase.

SURVEY INFORMATION

- Limits of topo survey are reduced from a normal Hydraulic Engineering Field Report (HEFR), but a complete HEFR is still required (see Attachment D for LIBP survey limits).
UTILITIES INFORMATION

- If Utility Coordination is needed, the schedules will allow for one utility submission rather than the normal two. Submission will be requested during the final roadway design phase and will be 60-90 days duration. If prior rights are a concern, they should be noted at the Selection Meeting and if determined present, will be a 120 day duration.

DESIGN INFORMATION

- Traffic counts will be requested by GDOT OPD through the Planning office. Results should be on ProjectWise (PW) by the start of design phase. The Bridge Hydraulics section will use this information to determine shoulder widths on bridges.
- Replacement of a bridge with a culvert will not be considered for LIBPs, regardless of Drainage Area size, as such actions are excluded from the PCE Agreement between GDOT and FHWA.
- If required, the MS4 Post-Construction Stormwater Report will be handled by the Bridge Hydraulic Section and will be included with project file. All LIBP projects will be exempt as they are off-system bridges and will not require full MS4 analysis.
- Preliminary Section 20 Plans will be initiated by the Bridge Office and provided to the Roadway Designer to be completed.
- Superelevation transitions will not be allowed on LIBP bridges; the maximum superelevation rate will be 4%.
- No formal pavement design; use the Minor pavement design flowchart/worksheet on ROADS: http://www.dot.ga.gov/PartnerSmart/DesignManuals/Pavement/Guidelines%20for%20Minor%20Pavement%20Projects.pdf
- Soil Surveys are not typically needed for LIBP projects, however, if serious concerns regarding soil settlement are evident, contact the Geotech Department for evaluation.
- Minimum of 10-ft lanes will be allowed on bridges, roadway widths to match existing.
- Make efforts to keep area disturbed to under an acre to avoid Stream Buffer Variance (SBV) and Erosion Control Worksheets, etc.
- Advance Warning Signs shall be replaced only if they are present at existing bridge and fall within the limits of the project. This includes the W8-13 (Bridge Ices before Road), which is “Not Required” per the MUTCD and will not require a design variance/exception.
- The Office of Traffic Operations has given permission for LIBP projects to forego the use of GDOT Construction Details T-23A EdgeLine Rumble Strips and T-25 Rumble Strip Details for Shoulder, Edgeline and Freeway as detailed in Section 6.5.1 of the GDOT DPM. However, LIBP projects must provide GDOT Construction Detail T-15A Details of Raised Pavement Marker Location on Non-Limited Access Road and T-15C Details of Raised Pavement Markers.
- Item 652 – Paint should be used for all asphalt topped box beams or cored slab bridges. For bridges with traditional beams and concrete decks, Item 657 - Tape, will be required.
- Approach Slab Standard 9017P has been the typical standard used on LIBP projects. However, SPECIAL DETAIL sheets 9017P-SD and 9017Q-SD (for the 30 ft and 20 ft approach lengths, respectively) have been created to provide a Modified Detail “A” to address the use of asphalt overlay on the approach slabs for LIBP projects. Please contact Carol Kalafut at ckalafut@dot.ga.gov for access to this standard until the original standards have been updated and approved by FHWA. (Approach slabs 9017M, can still be used for walls tied to a bridge and 9017K if curb and gutter are present.)
- Off-site detour coordination is handled with local governments prior to programming and no PIOH is required. In addition, GDOT OPD will be responsible for the detour ads and approvals. Design will include the provided detour route (from Bridge Office) in the Final Signing and Marking plans.
Design Policy and Support has provided guidance on the following items:

- Design Variance/Exceptions for superelevation/cross-slope on bridge will be considered (if bridge drainage requirements warrant the need).
- Design Variances will not be required for Standard 9031T (Shoulder Width at Approach Slab).
- Design Deviations for bridges that are: 1. in a horizontal curve with an existing normal crown, 2. have an ADT of 400 or less, and 3. meet the requirements on page 30 of the AASHTO Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT ≤ 400) will be allowed.
- Design Deviations for 1-ft of free-board in roadside ditches will be allowed for LIBPs.
- For locating Crash Data for Design Variance/Exception submittals, please use the GEARS site. If you need assistance with this, please contact Carol Kalafut or the following link to establish an account login: https://www.gearsportal.com/Pages/Public/Home.aspx
- See Also: AASHTO Guidelines for Geometric Design of Very Low-Volume Local Roads (ADT ≤ 400) when applicable for additional support and justification for requesting the Design Variance or Exception.

Design Policy and Support has provided the following guidance for Minimum Scope for Guardrail Installations and is effective immediately for the Department’s Low Impact Bridge Program (LIBP) bridges:

During the early planning for LIBP projects, designers should make every effort to provide normal shoulder widths and traversable (3:1 or 4:1) and recoverable (4:1) slopes as defined by AASHTO guidance whenever it is practical to do so. In cases where normal shoulder widths and traversable and recoverable slopes do not exist on LIBP bridge approaches, at a minimum guardrail installations approaching bridges in the LIBP shall be designed to provide length of need for protecting the bridge end. In these cases, GDOT Standard Drawings 4000W, 4384, and 4388 apply to LIBP with the exceptions below:

- No Design Variance will be required for lateral offsets that comply with Figure 11.2 “Guidelines for W-Beam Guardrail Placement for 3R, PM, and Safety and Operational Improvement Projects with Restricted Right of Way and Limited Shoulder Widths”, in the GDOT Design Policy Manual;
- The bridge end post should be considered the warranting area/object (reference GDOT STD 4388, detail titled “Guardrail Location at Bridge Ends”);
- End Terminals should be Type 12A; With Type 12A end terminal, no guardrail installations less than the minimum length of T-Beam plus one-section of W-Beam guardrail (25-ft) will be considered;
- Designers should establish shoulder grading widths for end-terminals as detailed on GDOT STD 4384 and 4388. However, if the shoulder grading widths detailed on GDOT STD 4384 and 4388 cannot be met, the shoulder grading widths for end-terminals should be no less than those detailed in Figure 8-3 “Grading for Tangent Guardrail Terminal” (Type 12A terminal) and Figure 8-2 “Grading for Flared Guardrail Terminal” (Type 12B or 12C terminal), of the 2011 AASHTO Roadside Design Guide.
- Referring to GDOT STD 4388 and 4000W, designers should make every effort to provide 4:1 slopes adjacent to end-terminals and guardrail. However, in cases where traversable and recoverable slopes do not exist on LIBP bridge approaches, no Design Variance will be required for slopes between 4:1 and 2:1. No slopes steeper than 2:1 will be allowed.
- If the above minimum shoulder and slope dimensions for guardrail installation cannot be met, designers shall establish required easements for the construction of these slopes. However, all guardrail, guardrail end terminals and shoulders shall be placed within the existing right of way.