|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A picture containing text, clipart  Description automatically generated | Revised Project Concept Report |
|  |
| Project Type: |  | P.I. Number: |  |
| GDOT District: |  | County: |  |
| Federal Route Number: |  | State Route Number: |  |
| Project Number: |  |  |
|  |
| *Project Description - Provide a very brief description of the project; Description should be no more than 2-3 lines long* |

 **Submitted for approval:** *Remove ALL blue guidance & delete any inapplicable signature lines*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Consultant Designer & Firm *or* GDOT Design Phase Office Head & Office *(edit)* |  | Date |
| *if applicable, remove if N/A* |  |  |
| TIA Deputy Program Manager |  | Date |
|  |  |  |
| TIA Regional Coordinator |  | Date |
|  |  |  |
| TIA Program Manager |  | Date |
| State TIA Administrator |  | Date |

*If any items from the approved Concept Report have changed, please add those sections from Appendix A into the report. Examples: FAA coordination, utility updates, MS4 updates, etc.*

**PLANNING, APPROVED CONCEPT, AND BACKGROUND**

**Prepared By:** *(Office)* **Date:**  *Date*

**Project Justification Statement:** **:** *A brief statement typically provided by or approved by the Office of Planning, the Office of Bridge Design, or the Office of Traffic Operations identifying and explaining the major issue(s) that the project is intended to address. The Project Justification should include:*

* *Name of the GDOT office(s) and/or committee(s) that approved the Project Justification Statement if applicable*
* *Any designated programs/networks that the project is included in (e.g., GRIP, SRTS, STRAHNET, Oversized Truck Route, designated bike route, APD, etc.).*
* *How the project originated - for example: Transportation Board, Senior Management, PNRC, Planning Office, planning study, local government, MPO, Operations, Bridge Maintenance, etc. and reference or attach any documentation supporting the initiation of the project (e.g., planning studies).*
* *A brief summary of the major issue(s) to be addressed by the project. For example: pedestrian mobility, congestion/LOS/capacity issues, high crash rates, geometric or structural issues, legislative program requirements (e.g., GRIP), infrastructure improvements, streetscapes, etc.*
* *Explanation of the proposed project limits – what conditions exist at the project termini, why should the project terminate at these limits, etc. Note that Logical Termini are determined as part of the NEPA process for federal-aid projects.*
* *Other relevant information regarding the issue(s) the project is intended to address.*
* *Performance goals – in general, what is the major performance goal of the project (e.g., reduce congestion, improve mobility, reduce crashes, correct geometric and/or structural deficiencies, etc.). Also list any expected secondary benefits the project is expected to provide.*

*The Project Justification Statement should only include information relevant to the issue(s) to be addressed. Please do not describe possible solutions or include information such as demographics/census information.*

*Note: The Design Phase Leader will update the approved PJS as needed, and the Office of Planning (or originating office) will review as part of the concept report approval process.*

**Existing conditions:** *A brief general description of the project location as it currently exists such as: intersection control,* *number of lanes, widths, medians, sidewalks, shared use paths, bicycle lanes, major intersections, substandard skew angles, structures, major utilities in project area, etc.*

**Description of the approved concept:**  *Describe the project as it is currently approved, including any previously approved revisions. Include the proposed length and general location of the project, including any city and county limits or proximity thereto.* *Identify and describe any context sensitive and/or practical design solutions to be utilized on the project. If an ITS Project, summarize the Concept of Operations briefly.*

**Federal Oversight:** [ ]  PoDI [ ]  Exempt [ ]  State Funded [ ]  Other

**(Approved Concept Report) Projected Traffic:**

 24 HR T:       % Open Year (20XX):       Design Year (20YY):

**Updated Traffic:**

 24 HR T:       % Open Year (20XX):       Design Year (20YY):

Updated Traffic Projections Performed by: *GDOT Office or Design Firm name*

Date approved by the GDOT Office of Planning: *Date*

*For the purposes of concept development, traffic data may be obtained from the GDOT Traffic Analysis & Data Application (TADA) web page where turning movements are not necessary for analyses or design of intersections.*

**AASHTO Functional Classification (Mainline):** *Functional Classification*

**AASHTO Context Classification (Mainline):** *Context Classification*

**AASHTO Project Type (Mainline):** *Project Type*

*Functional Classification, Context, and Project Type are determined using guidance from Section 1.4 of AASHTO’s 7th Ed., A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets (a.k.a. The Green Book).*

*For GA see:* [*GDOT Functional Classification Map web link*](https://itos.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=962a2591f91a4303aeafe016ba8db96b)

**VE Study anticipated:**[ ]  No [ ]  Yes [ ]  Completed *Date*

*If a VE Study has been completed, attach the VE Implementation Letter*

**PROPOSED REVISIONS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Approved Features:** | **Proposed Features:** |
| *Describe the feature(s) of the current approved project concept. Use the proposed description contained in the most recent approved Concept Report or Revised Concept Report and provide approval date. This paragraph will list one or more of the following items to relate the proposed revision to:** *Typical section*
* *Project termini*
* *Right-of-way limits which may affect the analysis of environmental resources*
* *Horizontal alignment (from a widening project to new location project or vice-versa)*
* *Access control (Design Variance may be required)*
* *Controlling Criteria*
* *Vertical alignment (at-grade intersection or grade separation, etc.)*
 | *List the feature(s) to be revised. Revised Concept Reports should only be submitted for the seven bulleted items listed to the left. If the project termini are to be revised, new beginning and ending points shall be provided.* * *Typical section revisions*
* *Project termini*
* *Changes in right-of-way limits which may affect the analysis of:*
	+ *Historic resources*
	+ *Endangered species*
	+ *Archeological resources*
	+ *Wetlands or open waters*
	+ *Streams or their buffers*
	+ *Air quality*
	+ *Noise studies*
* *Revised horizontal alignment (from a widening project to new location project or vice-versa*
* *Access control revision (Design Variance may be required)*
* *Controlling Criteria*
* *Revised vertical alignment (from an at-grade intersection to grade separation, etc.)*
 |
| **Reason(s) for change:** *Briefly describe why the above mentioned changes are being proposed. Note: If project is being split into multiple units, a description including termini as well as separate cost estimates need to be provided for each proposed unit.* |

**Design Exceptions and/or Variances needed:** *If any Design Exceptions and/or Variances are needed to implement the changes above, briefly describe them here. Include approval dates, if available.* ***Important DE/DVs should be discussed with the Roadway Policy Group to verify feasibility of approval prior to submission of the concept report, particularly where Design Controls or other safety-related criteria (e.g., stopping sight distance) are affected and failure to obtain approval of the DE/DV(s) would substantially impact the project.***

**ENVIRONMENTAL AND PERMITS**

**Potential environmental impacts of proposed revision:** *Provide a short description of the anticipated effects of the revision (e.g., environmental impacts reduced by avoiding historic boundary/reduced project footprint/etc.; No anticipated environmental effects; Additional stream impacts; etc.). Also, a statement should be included concerning anticipated effects to the environmental/project schedule.*

**Have proposed revisions been reviewed by environmental staff?**  [ ]  No [ ]  Yes

**Environmental responsibilities (Studies/Documents/Permits):** *State who is responsible for performing the additional environmental work - e.g., Consultant, GDOT, etc.*

**Air Quality:**

Is the project located in an Ozone Non-attainment area?[ ]  No [ ]  Yes

Is a Carbon Monoxide hotspot analysis required? [ ]  No [ ]  Yes

*If yes to Ozone Non-attainment, provide a comparison between the proposed project concept and the conforming plan’s model description. Include such features as project limits, number of through lanes, proposed open to traffic year, etc. If project is exempt from conforming plan, explain why. If the project corridor contains a traffic signal, the design year traffic volumes exceed 10,000 vpd* ***and*** *the level of service is D, E, or F, a CO hotspot analysis is required.*

**Water Quality & MS4:** *Do the proposed changes affect any design aspects of the project related to MS4 and/or post-construction stormwater requirements (including environmental reasons such as Protected Species mitigation)? If yes, these should be briefly discussed here and attach supporting documentation as appropriate.*

**Environmental Comments and Information:** *If environmental impacts are expected to change as a result of the proposed revision, please list by section below; if not, please remove this portion. Include any changes to current permit(s) or mitigation required in the appropriate section(s) below.*

**NEPA/GEPA:** *Will the environmental document need to be reevaluated due to the proposed concept changes?*

**Ecology:** *List possible effects to: protected species and their habitats, streams, wetlands, etc. Are additional surveys required? If so, are there seasonal survey requirements that may affect the project schedule?*

**Archeology:** *List possible effects to archeological resources. Are additional surveys required?*

**History:** *List possible effects to historic resources. Are additional surveys required?*

**Air Quality:** *List possible effects to air quality and air quality analysis. Will additional modeling be required?*

**Noise Effects:** *Do the proposed changes affect the noise impacts of the project? If so, explain.*

**Public Involvement:** *Will additional public outreach be required as a result of the revision?*

**PROJECT COST AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

*Add additional rows as necessary;**Attach current cost estimates to report. Remove revised total row if necessary;*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Breakdown of PE** | **Breakdown of ROW** | **Breakdown of Reimbursable Utilities** | **Breakdown of CST** | **Total Cost** |
| TIA Programmed Budget |  |  |  |  |  |
| Funded By |  |  |  |  |  |
| Date of Estimate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated Amount |  |  |  |  |  |
| Budget Contingency/ Inflation |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Estimated Cost** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Revised Total Estimated Cost** |  |  |  |  |  |

\*CST Cost includes: Construction, Engineering and Inspection, Contingencies and Asphalt Fuel Price Adjustment.

* *Proposed Funding Source(s): show Federal, State, Local, or Undetermined as applicable (i.e. Federal, State, Federal/State, Federal/State/Local, undetermined, etc.). Please contact GDOT PM if questions.*
* *ROW, Utility, and CST estimates are to be included in attachments. Date of Estimate is the date the estimate was reviewed and/or approved. Estimates developed by design team are to be identified and noted below table (example: \*\* ROW Estimate developed by design team - submitted to GDOT for approval on xx/xx/xx). Total Cost Difference =* *Total Programmed cost vs Total Estimated Cost. If the total estimated cost is $2 Million or 20% greater than the total programmed cost, a brief explanation of the anticipated source of the additional required funding is needed (e.g., additional funding anticipated through SPLOST funds, additional federal or state funds will be pursued, etc.).*

*If Railroad PE and CONST costs are included in the PE Funding and Reimbursable Utilities, add note below table.*

**Recommendation:** Recommend that the proposed revision to the concept be approved for implementation.

**Comments:** *Add comments/notes as appropriate listing other information relevant to the revision.*

**Attachments:** *General guidance for attachments is provided in the Concept Report Template (PDP Appendix A)*

1. Project Location Map
2. Concept Layout(s)
3. Typical section(s) *attach updated typical section(s) if being revised*
4. Detailed Cost Estimate(s)
	1. Construction Cost Estimate*CST estimates should be generated using AASHTOWare and include Revisions to Programmed Costs and Cost Estimate Worksheets [see R.O.A.D.S.> Design Manuals> Design Related Resources> Engineering Services> Revisions to Programmed Costs template:* [*http://www.dot.ga.gov/PS/DesignManuals/DesignResources*](http://www.dot.ga.gov/PS/DesignManuals/DesignResources)*]*
	2. Right-of-Way *Attach GDOT ROW Cost Estimate Summary page. If ROW Cost Estimate was not developed or approved by GDOT Office of ROW, add footnote to ROW Cost Estimate Summary Page identifying author & organization on summary. Do not include ROW cost worksheets.*
	3. Section 404 Mitigation *Mitigation cost estimates from the Office of Environmental Services Special Projects Coordinator (currently Lisa Westberry)*
	4. Utilities *Include Railroad costs if applicable. If RR costs were not developed by GDOT Utilities personnel, identify author & organization on cost estimate*
5. Concept Utility Report *if applicable– provided by District Utilities*
6. Conforming plan’s network schematics showing thru lanes *Required for capacity-adding projects in air quality non-attainment areas only*
7. Other supporting documents as needed *i.e., meeting minutes - in order most recent to oldest*

**APPROVALS** *(remove GDOT signatures if not required)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Concur:** |  |  |  |
|  | Director of Engineering |  | Date |
| **Approve:** |  |  |  |
|  | Chief Engineer |  | Date |