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## A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND OVERVIEW OF SERVICE

City of Salem contracted with the Consultant for the purpose of providing an independent cost estimate for bridge types and other components of the proposed project. Construction of this project will provide much needed relief to traffic congestion at the existing parallel Willamette River crossings at Marion and Center Streets. The project will connect OR22 more directly with the Salem Parkway (Hwy US 99 Business) bypassing the Salem City downtown core. Additionally the bridge will serve as an alternate route crossing the Willamette River should the Center and Marion Street bridges be impassible.

Consultant collaborated with the Salem River Crossing Project Management Team (PMT) to review cost estimates for various components of the project that could be incorporated into the final design.

The Consultant independently developed a cost estimate based on all discussions and information provided for the project components set forth by the PMT. Once quantified, the independent Consultant's quantities could then be compared to those compiled by the PMT. Large discrepancies in costs and/or quantities could then be identified and discussed. The primary objective being that all major costs are accounted for at this early stage of project development in order to have an accurate budget figure today in order to avoid budget overruns in the future.

## B. STANDARDS AND GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

In the course of production of the independent cost estimate materials, the Consultant adhered to the standards defined in the Scope of Services document.

## C. METHODOLOGY

It was understood from the beginning of the project that methodologies, in terms of how items are categorized and quantified, be established into a consistent number of items and rules. This framework was set up to facilitate quantity comparison. Each estimating team developing their own quantification of items from a bare page would result in significant differences in methodology. This would, in turn, result in great difficulty at the reconciliation stage when attempting to compare two similar items. For example, one team may quantify concrete curb as a standalone item while the other may include it as an incidental to the sidewalk. To achieve reconciliation of the items at a later date would require either combining the items from the first estimate, or deconstructing the items from the second estimate. For this reason it was agreed that the independent estimators would be provided with a blank version of the estimating spreadsheet already developed to avoid this secondary step to reach resolution.

Once received, the Consultant reviewed the provided spreadsheet for completeness and accuracy with respect to the base map and plan overlay provided.

A project quantity takeoff was then performed by the Consultant on the "Preferred Alternative" project layout provided by the PMT. Primary quantities were recorded in the master spreadsheet.

Due to the early stage of development of the project layout, details such as extents of proposed individual retaining walls were estimated independently and overall quantities were compared. Any large discrepancies were identified and discussed in the progress meetings listed below.
D. REVIEW COMMENT AND SCHEDULE OVERVIEW

Consultant attended four meetings with the PMT. The first was a kick-off meeting to become familiar with the project, the team members, and the methodology being developed for the principle cost estimate.

Subsequent to the first meeting, the team re-assembled to discuss cursory progress by the independent estimate team and to delve further into the spreadsheet and methodology that was being employed by the principle cost estimating team. Layout of the projects physical parameters and assumptions were further clarified. Consultant shared our efforts to date with the PMT and noted feedback provided by the team.

A third meeting was held to provide in depth review of Consultant's progress on all of the components of the project sans the bridge components. The discussion defined how limits for roadway, sidewalk, lighting layout, etc., were being evaluated. Each team's methodology proved similar in approach to and assembly of the estimate. Some clarification was provided by the PMT regarding layout in specific areas to further refine the independent estimate.

In the final meeting unit pricing of the structures was verified to the limits identified in the project plans, and construction methodology (cast in place vs. pre-cast) confirmed. In addition, the PMT reviewed the final "cut" of the independent estimate including quantities, limits of construction, and pricing. The major cost of the project, is confirmed to be the structure components.

The independent estimator met with the primary estimator for the purpose of discussing the research done and offering advice on various items to be modified in the primary estimate. To preserve the record of independence the same modifications were not applied to every single line item of the estimate attached to this deliverable. However, unit prices for a number of the larger line items, having a large impact on the overall project costs, were discussed in detail and agreed to by the primary estimator, independent estimator, and PMT in the review meeting. The items that were adjusted to agreed upon prices after collaboration are summarized in the table below:

| Item | Independent Estimator | Unit | Primary Estimator | Unit | Agreed upon Price | Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steel Tub Girder Bridges | \$205 | /SF | \$300 | /SF | \$275 | /SF |
| Prestressed I-Girder Bridges | \$147.50 | /SF | \$145 | /SF | \$145 | /SF |
| Precast Segmental Approach Bridges | \$150 | /SF | \$150 | /SF | \$150 | /SF |
| Cast-in-place Segmental Bridges | \$295 | /SF | \$300 | /SF | \$300 | /SF |
| Retaining Walls | \$67.50 | /SF | \$60 | /SF | \$65 | /SF |
| Earthwork | \$10.46 | /CY | \$16 | /CY | \$16 | /CY |
| Landscaping | \$5 | /SF | \$3 | /SF | \$3 | /SF |
| Traffic Signal Interconnect | \$30 | /EA | \$22.50 | /EA | \$30 | /EA |
| New Traffic Signal Installation | \$275,000 | /EA | \$300,000 | /EA | \$300,000 | /EA |
| Illumination | \$365,000 | /MI | \$420,000 | /MI | \$420,000 | /MI |

The accompanying documentation was adjusted to include these agreed upon unit prices to achieve an agreeable reconciliation, but again other unit costs continued unmodified to preserve

|  | Original Prelim Independent Est | \$ | 364,286,052 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | New Independent Est Agreed Prices | \$ | 361,309,108 |
| the independence of the estima | Difference |  | 0.82\% |

With the agreed modifications in the Primary Estimate the construction costs totaled $\$ 361,309,108$ versus the bottom line estimate independently prepared, and recorded herein of $\$ 364,286,052$ or $99.2 \%$ of the planning estimate. The difference, of $0.8 \%$, can be considered well within the margin of the ability to estimate a construction project at this early stage and it was agreed that further research and development of unit costs in support of this estimate are not immediately required.

In conclusion, the Primary Estimating team's methodology appears to be sound based upon the independent review and research performed. Unit prices as applied, with the recommended modifications listed above, are accurate for their purpose and can be confidently relied upon to move forward with planning of construction at this time.

FORMAT REQUIREMENTS
In compliance with the requirements for submittal, deliverables are being made via E-Mail.
All text files are being submitted in .pdf format accompanied by the original source document in Microsoft Office suite formats (i.e. MS Word, Excel, PowerPoint etc.) and will be in a version compatible with city of Salem software version.
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Prepared for:
City of Salem Public Works
Department

| Principal Consultant | Consultant |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing | INDEPENDENT TAKEOFF |  |  |  |
| Cost Estimating Concept Component Matrix | Date | Name | Date | Name |
| Prepared By: | 5/31/2016 | Dan Pavela | 5/31/2016 | Bob Bochsler |
| Checked By: |  |  |  |  |
| \{Preferred Alternative\} Summary |  |  |  |  |
| Bid Item | Unit | Unit Cost | Quantity | Total |
| Curb, Gutter, \& Drainage with 5' Sidewalk (one side) | Mi. | \$618,596.99 | 3.43 | \$2,124,435.46 |
| Curb, Gutter, \& Drainage with 6' Sidewalk (one side) | Mi. | \$643,886.18 | 0.94 | \$603,399.40 |
| Curb, Gutter, \& Drainage with 8' Sidewalk (one side) | Mi. | \$699,114.98 | 0.96 | \$674,089.84 |
| Curb, Gutter, \& Drainage with 12' Sidewalk (one side) | Mi. | \$809,572.58 | 1.76 | \$1,428,864.94 |
| Earthwork | CY | \$16.00 | 332,780.84 | \$5,324,493.42 |
| New Roadway | Lane-Mi. | \$364,019.00 | 12.76 | \$4,646,119.93 |
| Overlay Existing Roadway | Lane-Mi. | \$118,426.77 | 2.16 | \$256,254.90 |
| Reconstruct Existing Roadway | Lane-Mi. | \$362,640.89 | 11.38 | \$4,125,812.77 |
| Traffic Signal Interconnect | Lin. Ft. | \$30.00 | 9,416.00 | \$282,480.00 |
| New Traffic Signal Installation | EA | \$300,000.00 | 8.00 | \$2,400,000.00 |
| Illumination | Mi . | \$420,000.00 | 5.91 | \$2,481,818.18 |
| Landscaping | SQ. Ft. | \$3.00 | 179,942.40 | \$539,827.20 |
| New Separated Multi-Use Path | Lane-Mi. | \$160,873.51 | 1.60 | \$257,191.95 |
| Cast-in-Place Segmental (Balanced Cantilever) Bridges (Main Channel) | SQ. Ft. | \$300.00 | 172,451.00 | \$51,735,300.00 |
| Precast Segmental (Span-By-Span) Bridges (West Approach Spans) | SQ. Ft. | \$150.00 | 498,321.00 | \$74,748,150.00 |
| Prestressed I-Girder Bridges (HWY 22 Ramp Spans over Old RR Tresite/Multi-Use Path) | SQ. Ft. | \$145.00 | 28,440.00 | \$4,123,800.00 |
| Steel Tub Girder Bridges (Multi-Use Path Structure over Wallace/Edgewater Intersection) | SQ. Ft. | \$275.00 | 29,100.00 | \$8,002,500.00 |
| Retaining Walls | SQ. Ft. | \$65.00 | 105,165.00 | \$6,835,725.00 |
| Subtotal 1: |  |  |  | \$170,590,262.99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction Surveying | 1.0-2.5\% | 1\% |  | \$1,705,902.63 |
| TP\&DT | 3.0-8.0\% | 3\% |  | \$5,117,707.89 |
| Mobilization | 8.0-10.0\% | 8\% |  | \$13,647,221.04 |
| Erosion Control | 0.5-2.0\% | 0.50\% |  | \$852,951.31 |
| New Right of Way Acquisition (UFS Acquisition Report) |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal 2: |  |  |  | \$21,323,782.87 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotals 1 \& 2: |  |  |  | \$191,914,045.86 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Contingency | 30-40\% | 40\% |  | \$76,765,618.34 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total: |  |  |  | \$268,679,664.20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Escalation (Build Year 2020) | \% | 3.00\% |  | \$42,793,704.80 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Subtotal 3: |  |  |  | \$311,473,369.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Design Engineering | 8\% |  |  | \$24,917,869.52 |
| Construction Engineering | 8\% |  |  | \$24,917,869.52 |
| Subtotal 4: |  |  |  | \$49,835,739.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand Total (subtotals 3\&4): |  |  |  | \$361,309,108.04 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| User Determined ValuesValues are linked to Workbook "P034882_Salem_River_Crossing_Unit_Cost_Calculations_DEC_2015.xls" Do not edit on this page |  |  |  |  |
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Principal Consultant
Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing
Cost Estimating Quantitiy Calculations Summary

Summary of Earthwork Tab

| Earthwork |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phas <br> Phase |  | Cu. Yds. |
|  | R | 26017.19 |
|  | B | 198049.11 |
|  | M_South | 37362.49 |
|  | M_North | 29151.44 |


| ILLUMINATION |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Miles |
| Phase | R | 1.46 |
| Phase | B | 2.07 |
| Phase | M_South | 1.20 |
| Phase | M_North | 1.17 |
| Phase | OH | 0.00 |


Summary of Landscape Tab

| Landscaping |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phas | R | Sq. Ft. |
|  | B | 44985.60 |
|  | M_South | 44985.60 |
|  | M_North | 44985.60 |
|  | OH | 44985.60 |

Summary of Traffic Signals Tab

| Traffic Signal Install |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Width <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase | R | Each |
|  | B | 0.00 |


| Cast-in-Place Segmental |  |  | Precast Segmental |  |  | Prestressed I-Girder |  |  | Steel Tub Girder |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type Code | CS | Sq. Ft. | Type Code | PS | Sq. Ft. | Type Code | PI | Sq. Ft. | Type Code | STG | Sq. Ft. |
| Phase | R | 0.00 | Phase | R | 218950.00 | Phase | R | 29100.00 | Phase | R | 28440.00 |
| Phase | B | 172451.00 | Phase | B | 279371.00 | Phase | B | 0.00 | Phase | B | 0.00 |
| Phase | M_South | 0.00 | Phase | M_South | 0.00 | Phase | M_South | 0.00 | Phase | M_South | 0.00 |
| Phase | M_North | 0.00 | Phase | M_North | 0.00 | Phase | M_North | 0.00 | Phase | M_North | 0.00 |


| Summary of Walls Tab |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Retaining Walls |  |  |
| Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase <br> Phase | R | 22543.00 |
|  | B | 82622.00 |
|  | M_South |  |
|  | M_North |  |



| Wallace Road | 隹 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sq Ft | Length | Width | Lanes | Miles | Lane Miles |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sq Ft / Length | Width / 12 ' | Length / 5280' | Lanes * Miles | Segment of Street Description | Phase ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{M}$ South, $M$ North, \& OH) | Type of Roadway Work ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{RC}$, \& MUP) | Remarks |
| 118,544 | 1322.00 | 89.67 | 7.47 | 0.25 | 1.87 | Inter. Of Hope/Wallace to the North limits of Const | B | RC |  |
| 15,205 | 131.00 | 116.07 | 9.67 | 0.02 | - 0.24 | Insection @ Hope/Wallace | B | RC |  |
| 8,200 | 146.00 | 56.16 | 4.68 | 0.03 | 0.13 | Hope Ave West of Inter. @ Wallace Road | B | RC | Short piece |
| 100,490 | 1092.00 | 92.02 | 7.67 | 0.21 | 1.59 | Inter Hope/Wallace South to Inter. Becket St | B | RC |  |
| 1,603 | 41.00 | 39.10 | 3.26 | 0.01 | 0.03 | Turn-Out Wallace/Lynda Lane | B | RC | ooks like only curb and sidewalk upgrade, not total reconstruct |
| 3,188 | 79.00 | 40.35 | 3.36 | 0.01 | 0.05 | Turn-Out Wallace/Empier Street | B | RC | ooks like only curb and sidewalk upgrade, not total reconstruct |
| 1,576 | 38.00 | 41.47 | 3.46 | 0.01 | 0.02 | Turn-Out 200 ft North on Westside of Wallace | B | RC | ooks like only curb and sidewalk upgrade, not total reconstruct |
| 105,596 | 1022.00 | 103.32 | 8.61 | 0.19 | 1.67 | Hope Ave between int of Hope/Marine and Hope/Wallace | B | N | Bob Added this here |
| 710 | 21.00 | 33.81 | 2.82 | 0.00 | 0.01 | Turn-Out 220' of Beckett Road W. Side | B | RC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Lan | ne miles for Str |  | 5.60 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marine Drive | (Phase M Nort | th)- Extg. Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sq Ft | Length | Width | Lanes | Miles | Lane Miles |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sq Ft / Length | Width / 12 ' | Length / 5280' | Lanes * Miles | Segment of Street Description | Phase ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{M}$ South, M North, \& OH ) | Type of Roadway Work ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{RC}, \&$ MUP) | Remarks |
| 87,090 | 1638.00 | 53.17 | 4.43 | 0.31 | 1.37 | Round-About @Riverbend (Complete) to 300' South frm Center | M_North | N | All round about down to MD $88+22.68$ PT |
| 27,916 | 997.00 | 28.00 | 2.33 | 0.19 | - 0.44 | Frm 300' south of Round-about to edge of Sub Divisioin | M_North | N | Down to MD curve \#9 marker 250ft N of Harritt DR |
| 8,040 | 246.00 | 32.68 | 2.72 | 0.05 | 0.13 | From edge of Sub Division to Harritt Drive Inter. | M_North | 0 |  |
| 2,690 | 53.00 | 50.75 | 4.23 | 0.01 | 0.04 | Harritt Drive Wallace Rd/Marine Dr Intersection | M_North | N |  |
| 1,153 | 483.00 | 2.39 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 0.02 | Harritt Drive from Wallace Rd to Marine Dr | M_North | 0 |  |
| 95,558 | 2177.00 | 43.89 | 3.66 | 0.41 | 1.51 | Marine Drive From Harrit to Hope Ave | M_North | N |  |
| 3,247 | 90.00 | 36.08 | 3.01 | 0.02 | 0.05 | Turn-Out @ River Valley Dr on Marine Drive | M_North | $\stackrel{\text { RC }}{ }$ | River Valley DR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Lan | ne miles for Str |  | 3.56 |  |  |  |  |
| Marine Drive | (Phase M Sout | th) - Extg. Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sq Ft | Length | Width | Lanes | Miles | Lane Miles |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Phase | Type of Roadway Work |  |
|  |  | Sq Ft / Length | Width / 12 ' | Length / 5280' | Lanes * Miles | Segment of Street Description | (R, B, M South, M North, \& OH) | ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{o}, \mathrm{RC}, ~ \& ~ M U P)$ | Remarks |
| 73,245 | 1016.00 | 72.09 | 6.01 | 0.19 | 1.16 | From south end Hope Ave Inter.(include Ramp) To Beckett Street | M_South | N | This segment should include the ramp to the WB Bridge |
| 2,229 | 77.00 | 28.95 | 2.41 | 0.01 | 0.04 | Turn-Out W. Side of Marine Drive 300' N . of Beckett Street | M_South | RC |  |
| 4,443 | 75.00 | 59.24 | 4.94 | 0.01 | 0.07 | Inter. Marine Dr./Beckett Street | M_South | N |  |
| 32,277 | 752.00 | 42.92 | 3.58 | 0.14 | 0.51 | Beckett Street frm Marine Drive to Wallace Rd. | M_South | N |  |
| 15,814 | 394.00 | 40.14 | 3.34 | 0.07 | - 0.25 | Frm S. end Beckett St Inter to N end of 5 th Av Inter. | M_South | N | New? 5th st into existing development |
| 2,998 | 58.00 | 51.69 | 4.31 | 0.01 | - 0.05 | 5th Ave / Marine Drive Intersection | M_South | N |  |
| 72,381 | 2208.00 | 32.78 | 2.73 | 0.42 | 1.14 | from south end of inter. @ 5th Ave to Glen Creek Road inc Inter. | M_South | N |  |
| 3,268 | 68.00 | 48.06 | 4.00 | 0.01 | -0.05 | loop Section W side of Marine Drive @ Cameo Street | M_South | N |  |
| 2,182 | 76.00 | 28.71 | 2.39 | 0.01 | 0.03 | Turn-Out off W. Side Marine Drive @ Calico St. | M_South | N |  |
| 2,162 | 74.00 | 29.22 | 2.43 | 0.01 | 0.03 | Taybin Rd from Marine Dr West to limit | M_South | 0 | plus 325 ft of just right hand curb? |
| 30,255 | 672.00 | 45.02 | 3.75 | 0.13 | 0.48 | Glen Creek Road from Marine Dr to limit of Construction | M_South | $\bigcirc$ |  |
| 7,048 | 83.00 | 84.92 | 7.08 | 0.02 | - 0.11 | Inter. Marine Drive / Glen Creek Road | M_South | RC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1,437 | 38.00 | 37.82 | 3.15 | 0.01 | 0.02 | Turn-Out 500' West off Northside of Glen Creek Rd | M_South | 0 |  |
| 20,386 | 453.00 | 45.00 | 3.75 | 0.09 | 0.32 | Extension of Glen Creek Rd South of Marine Dr. Inter. | M_South | RC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | fro |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Lan | ne miles for Str | reet | 4.26 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wallace Road | d- Extg. Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sq Ft | Length | Width | Lanes | Miles | Lane Miles |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Sq Ft / Length | Width / 12' | Length / 5280' | Lanes * Miles | Segment of Street Description | Phase (R, B, M South, $M$ North, \& OH) | Type of Roadway Work ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{RC}, \&$ MUP) | Remarks |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | NOT USED |  |  |  |
| 719 | 21.00 | 34.24 | 2.85 | 0.00 | 0.01 | Turn-Out North End of Inter. @ Beckett St. and Wallace Rd | OH | RC |  |
| 87,218 | 882.00 | 98.89 | 8.24 | 0.17 | 1.38 | S. End of Beckett St inter to N. End of Ochard Hghts Inter | OH | RC |  |
| 17,172 | 138.00 | 124.43 | 10.37 | 0.03 | - 0.27 | Inter @ Orchard Hght / Wallace Rd | OH | RC |  |
| 79,375 | 900.00 | 88.19 | 7.35 | 0.17 | 1.25 | S. End Orchard Hghts Inter to South limits of Construction | OH | RC |  |
| 74,407 | 1432.00 | 51.96 | 4.33 | 0.27 | 1.17 | Orchard Hghts frm Wallace Rd to West Limits of Construction | OH | RC |  |
| 1,550 | 50.00 | 31.00 | 2.58 | 0.01 | 0.02 | Turn-Out Northside of Orchard Hghts at Valley Dr. | OH | RC |  |
| 2,180 | 54.00 | 40.37 | 3.36 | 0.01 | 0.03 | Turn-Out Southside of Orchard Hghts at Valley Ave | OH | RC |  |
| 2,613 | 67.00 | 39.00 | 3.25 | 0.01 | - 0.04 | Turn-Out Southside of Orchard Hghts at Overlook Ave | OH | RC |  |
| 593 | 20.00 | 29.65 | 2.47 | 0.00 | 0.01 | Turn-Out Westside off Wallace Rd. @ Taybin Rd. | OH | RC |  |
| 1,773 | 35.00 | 50.66 | 4.22 | 0.01 | -0.03 | Turn-Out Eastside off Wallace Rd. @ Taybin Rd. | OH | RC |  |
| 1,012 | 20.00 | 50.60 | 4.22 | 0.00 | 0.02 | Turn-Out Eastside of Wallace Rd. @ 150' South of Taybin Rd. | OH | RC |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Lan | ne miles for Str | reet | 4.24 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Hwy 22-Extg. Street |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sq Ft | Length | Width | Lanes | Miles | Lane Miles |  |  |  | Remarks |
|  |  | Sq Ft / Length | Width / 12' | Length / 5280' | Lanes * Miles | Segment of Street Description | Phase ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{M}$ South, $M$ North, \& OH) | Type of Roadway Work ( $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{O}, \mathrm{RC}$, \& MUP) |  |
| 27,390 | 470.00 | 58.28 | 4.86 | 0.09 | 0.43 | from Glen Creek Rd Inter. South to Bridge Abutment East \& west | R | N |  |
| 2,382 | 199.00 | 11.97 | 1.00 | 0.04 | 0.04 | Glen Creek Rd Inter. MUP South to Construction limit Eastside | R | MUP |  |
| 3,336 | 278.00 | 12.00 | 1.00 | 0.05 | 0.05 | MUP South from Old RR Trestle to Construction Limits | R | MUP |  |
| 26,717 | 2226.00 | 12.00 | 1.00 | 0.42 | 0.42 | Edgewater-MUP (complete) | R | MUP |  |
| 47,171 | 576.00 | 81.89 | 6.82 | 0.11 | 0.74 | Wallace Rd Inter. @ Hwy 22 | R | RC |  |
| 12,694 | 294.00 | 43.18 | 3.60 | 0.06 | 0.20 | Edgewater @ Wallace Rd @ Grade | R | 0 |  |
| 5,619 | 166.00 | 33.85 | 2.82 | 0.03 | 0.09 | East od MUP at South end of Wallace Rd | R | 0 |  |
| 10,788 | 225.00 | 47.95 | 4.00 | 0.04 | 0.17 | Edgewater @ Wallace Rd @ Grade | R | RC |  |
| 59,214 | 1980.00 | 29.91 | 2.49 | 0.38 | 0.93 | Hwy 22 Ramp E. of Edgewater Southbound Traffic | R | N |  |
| 35,475 | 1033.00 | 34.34 | 2.86 | 0.20 | 0.56 | East of Edgewater on Hwy 22 @ Rosemont NB | R | 0 |  |
| 24,257 | 625.00 | 38.81 | 3.23 | 0.12 | 0.38 | RAMP East of Edgewater on Hwy 22 @ Rosemont NB | R | N |  |
|  |  | Total Lane miles for Street |  |  | 4.03 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total Lan | ne miles for Str |  |  |  |  |  |  |






Principal Consultant
Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing
PER EACH FOR TRAFFIC SIGNAL BID ITEMS


Principal Consultant
Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing
LINEAR FT. FOR INTERCONNECT BID ITEM

Preferred Alternative


Principal Consultant
Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing
SQUARE FT. FOR LANDSCAPING BID ITEM


Principal Consultant
Project: P034882 Salem River Crossing
SQUARE FT. FOR BRIDGE BID ITEMS


Principal Consultant
Project: Po34882 Salem River Crossing
SQ. FT. FOR WALLS BID ITEM AND CU. YDS. OF WALL EARTHWORK

| Date |  |  |  |  |  |  | Name | Date | Name |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prepared By |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Checked By: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Consultant | Dan Pavela | 12/9/2015 | Bob Bochsler |  |  |  |  |  |  |






|  | A | B | C ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | \| D | | \| E | F | G | H | - 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Principal Consultant |  | ODOT COST D | DATA FROM: "w | 'www.oregon.gov/ | T/HWY/ES | MATING/docs | bid_item_prices/w | veighted_average_prices_2014.pdf" |
| 3 | Cost Estimating Concept Component Matrix | Date | Name | Date | Name |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Prepared By: | 5/31/2016 | Dan Pavela | 5/31/2016 | Bob Bochs |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Checked By: | 1/14/2016 DAN PAVELA |  | Curb, Gutter, \& Drainage with ${ }^{\prime}$ |  | Sidewalk (one side) |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ODOT Average | ODOT Average of 3 | User Input | Project Unit of |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | Bid Item | Awarded Price | Low Bidders | Unit Cost | Measure |  |  |  | Value | Final Unit | Cost Per Mile | Remarks |
| 74 | 74 Striping Thermoplastic Extruded, Surface, Profile | 0.89 | \$0.91 | \$0.91 | ${ }_{\substack{\text { 4" Strip for } \\ \text { mile }}}^{\text {1 }}$ | 5280 | Lane Mile | \$ 4,804.80 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 76 | Overlay Existing Roadway |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$118,426.77 |  |
| 77 | Reconstruct Existing Roadway $10^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{HMAC}$ on $12^{\prime \prime}$ Aggregate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ODOT Average | ODOT Average of 3Low Bidders | onstruct Existing <br> User Input <br> Unit Cost | Project Unit of | PUM |  |  |  |
| 78 | ltem | Awarded Price |  |  | Measure | Value | Final Unit | Cost Per Mile | Remarks |
| 79 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Level 3, $1 / 2$ inch Dense HMAC / Ton Mixture |  |  |  | - Lane Mile |  | Tons per |  |  |
| 80 |  | \$59.29 | \$56.26 | \$56.26 |  | 4093.06 |  | 230,275.33 | e: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 20 |
| 81 | PG 64-22 Asphalt in HMAC / Ton | \$110 | \$146.73 | \$146.73 | Per Lane Mile $\left(12^{\prime}\right)$ | 253.77 | Tons per Lane Mile | \$ 37,235.59 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg ltem Prices 2014 |
| 82 | Agg Base / Ton | 16.27 | \$18.17 | \$18.17 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { Per Lane Mile } \\ \left.(12)^{\prime}\right) \end{array}$ | 4693.33 | Tons per | \$ 85,277.87 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | Per Lane Mile |  | Acre per |  | Source: Consultant Calculated cost based on ODOT |
|  | Removal of Structures \& Obstructions / Acre |  | 3,470.02 | \$3,470.02 | (12') | 1.45 | Lane Mile | \$ 5,047.30 | Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 84 | Striping Thermoplastic Extruded, Surface, Profile | 0.89 | \$0.91 | \$0.91 | 4" Strip for 1 | 5280 | Lane Mile | \$ 4.804 .80 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 85 |  |  | S0.9 |  |  |  | Lane Mile | 4,804.00 | Source. ODOT Weighled Avg lem Pires 2014 |
| 86 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$362,640.89 |  |
| 87 |  | Traffic Signal InterconnectUser InputProject Unit ofPUM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Cost Basis |  |  | Unit Cost | Measure | Value | Final Unit | Linear Foot |  |
| 89 | Trafic Signal Interconnect |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 90 |  |  | \$30 | \$30 | Lin. Ft. | 1 | Per Lin Ft | 30.00 | Source: Consultant intermal source document - 30 per mtg |
| 91 |  |  |  |  | Lin. Ft. | 1 | Per Lin Ft | - |  |
| 92 |  |  |  |  | Lin. Ft. | 1 | Per Lin Ft | \$ - |  |
| 93 |  |  |  |  | Lin. Ft. | 1 | Per Lin Ft |  |  |
| 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$30.00 |  |
| 95 | - | Traffic Signal Instalataion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | User Input | Project Unit of | PUM |  | Cost Per |  |
| 96 |  |  |  |  |  | Value | Final Unit | Each |  |
| 97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Traffic Signal Installation |  |  | \$ 300,000.00 | Each | 1 | Per Each | \$ 300,000.00 | $\$ 250 \mathrm{k}-\$ 300 \mathrm{k}$ ea for three to five lane int in ea direction. |
|  | 99, |  |  |  | Each | 1 | Per Each | \$ 300,000.00 | Source. Consulant internal source document-300 per mig |
| 989910010101010 |  |  |  |  | Each | 1 | Per Each | \$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Each | 1 | Per Each | - |  |
|  | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$300,000.00 |  |
| 103 |  |  |  |  | Illumination |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | User Input | Project Unit of | PUM |  | Cost Per |  |
| 104 | 4 Cost Basis |  |  | Unit Cost | Measure | Value | Final Unit | Mile |  |
| 105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 106 | 6 Illumination |  | 420000 | \$ 420,000.00 | Mile | 1 | Mile | \$ 420,000.00 | Source: Consultant internal source document - 420k per mtg |
| 107 |  |  |  |  | Mile | 1 | Mile |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Mile | 1 | Mile | \$ |  |
| $\frac{108}{109}$ |  |  |  |  | Mile | 1 | Mile | \$ - |  |
| $\frac{109}{110}$ | T Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$420,000.00 |  |
| 111 |  |  |  |  | Landscaping |  |  |  |  |
| 112 | 2 Cost Basis |  |  | User Input Unit Cost | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Projectuan Unit of } \\ & \text { Measure } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PUM } \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Final Unit | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Per } \\ \text { Square Foot } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 113 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Source: Green Values National Stormwater Management |
| 114 | 4 Landscaping |  |  | 3.00 | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | 3.00 | Calculator - 3.00 per meeting |
| 115 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | - |  |
| 116 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ - |  |
| 117 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. |  |  |
| 118 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$3.00 |  |
| 119 | New Separated Mutit-Use Path 4" HMAC on $6^{\prime \prime}$ Aggregate Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ODOT Average | ODOT Average of 3 | User Input | Project Unit of |  |  |  |  |
|  | Sid lem | Awarded Price | Low Bidders | Unit cost | Measure | Value | Final Unit | Cost Per Mile | Remarks |
| 121 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 122 | 22Level 3 , $1 / 2$ inch Dense HMAC / Ton Mixture | \$59.29 | \$56.26 | \$56.26 | Per Lane Mile <br> (12') | 1637.22 | Tons eer | \$ 92,110.13 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Per Lane Mile |  | Tons per |  |  |
| 123 | 3 PG 64-22 Asphalt in HMAC / Ton | \$110 | \$146.73 | \$146.73 | (12') | 101.51 | Lane Mile | \$ 14,894.24 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 124 | 4 Agg Base / Ton | 16.27 | \$18.17 | \$18.17 | $\underset{\substack{\left.\text { Per Lane Mile } \\(12)^{\prime}\right)}}{ }$ | 2346.67 | Tons per Lane Mile | \$ 42,638.93 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg liem Prices 2014 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Per Lane Mile |  | Acre per |  |  |
| 125 | 5 Clearing and Grubbing / Acre | 947.45 |  | \$947.45 | ${ }^{\left.(12)^{\prime}\right)}$ | 1.45 | Lane Mile | 1,378.11 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 126 | 6 Removal of Structure \& Obstructions / Acre |  | 3,470.02 | \$3,470.02 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Per Lane Mile } \\ \left.(12)^{\prime}\right) \end{array}$ | 1.45 | Acre per | \$ 5,047.30 | Source: Consultant Calculated cost based on ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
|  | - Removal of Structures \& Obstructions/Acre |  | 3,470.02 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 127 | 7 Striping Thermoplastic Extruded, Surface, Profile | 0.89 | \$0.91 | \$0.91 | mile | 5280 | Lane Mile | \$ 4,804.80 | Source: ODOT Weighted Avg Item Prices 2014 |
| 128 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9 New Roadway -4" HMAC on 6" Aggregate Base | Per Lane (12') Mile |  |  |  |  |  | \$160,873.51 |  |
| $\frac{12}{13}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 131 | Cast-in-Place Segmental (Balanced Cantilever) Bridges (Main Channel) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 132 | 2 Cost Basis |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { User Input } \\ & \text { Unit Cost } \end{aligned}$ | Project Unit of Measure | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PUM } \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Final Unit | Cost Per Square Foot |  |
| 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 134 | 4 Concrete Box Girder Main Span |  |  | \$ 300.00 | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | 300.00 | \$215-\$375-300 per meeting |
| 135 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ |  |
| 136 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | 5 |  |
| $\frac{13}{13}$ | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$300.00 |  |
| 139 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 144 | Precast Segmental (Span-By-Span) Bridges (West Approach Spans) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1 Cost Basis |  |  | User Input <br> Unit Cost | Project Unit of Measure | PUM | Final Unit | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Cost Per } \\ \text { Square Foot } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 | 3 PCPS conc box Girder |  |  | \$ 150.00 | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | 150.00 | \$110-\$190-150 per meeting |
| 144 <br> 145 <br> 14 <br> 1 |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ - |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ - |  |
| 146 | 6 |  |  |  | Sq. Ft. | 1 | Per Sq. Ft. | \$ |  |
| 147 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$150.00 |  |
| 148 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 <br> 15 <br> 15 |  |  | Prestressed 1-Girde | der Bridges (HWY | Y 22 Ramp Span | er Old R R | site/Multi-Use |  |  |
|  | Cost Basis |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { User Input } \\ \text { Unit Cost } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Project Unitiof } \\ & \text { Measure } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\text { PuM }} \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Final Unit | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost Per } \\ \text { Square Foot } \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | Cost Basis |  |  |  | - |  |  |  | C____ |



## Research into Bridge Cost for Third Willamette River Crossing (12.21.12)

Forecasting the 2013 bridge spending pattern through to 2020, average annual growth of 1.7 percent is expected for FY 14 through $\mathrm{FY} 20^{i}$

| Bridge Demolition: | Low | High |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Typical Bridge Removal | $\$ 35$ | $\$ 60$ |
| Movable Span Bridge (Bascule) | $\$ 60$ | $\$ 70$ |
| Widening: |  |  |
| Bridge Widening Construction | $\$ 85$ | $\$ 160$ |

Florida DOT Transportation Costs Reports, April 2014

| Bridge Type | Low | High |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Short Span Bridges: |  |  |
| Reinforced Concrete Flat Slab Simple Span* | \$115 | \$160 |
| Pre-cast Concrete Slab Simple Span* | \$110 | \$200 |
| Reinforced Concrete Flat Slab Continuous Span* | NA | NA |
| Medium and Long Span Bridges: |  |  |
| Concrete Deck/ Steel Girder - Simple Span* | \$125 | \$142 |
| Concrete Deck/ Steel Girder - Continuous Span* | \$135 | \$170 |
| Concrete Deck/ Pre-stressed Girder - Simple Span | \$90 | \$145 |
| Concrete Deck/ Pre-stressed Girder - Continuous Span | \$95 | \$211 |
| Concrete Deck/ Steel Box Girder - Span Range from 150' to 280' (for curvature, add a $15 \%$ premium) | \$140 | \$180 |
| Segmental Concrete Box Girders - Cantilever Construction, Span Range from 150' to 280' | \$140 | \$160 |
| Movable Bridge - Bascule Spans and Piers <br> * Increase the cost by twenty percent for phased construction. | \$1,800 | \$2,000 |

Florida DOT Transportation Costs Reports, April 2014

How to use this section 1. Compare costs from city to city. In using the RSMeans Indexes, remember that an index number is not a fixed number but a ratio: It's a percentage ratio of a building component's cost at any stated time to the National Average cost of that same component at the same time period. Put in the form of an equation: Specific City Cost National Average Cost x $100=$ City Index Number Therefore, when making cost comparisons between cities, do not subtract one city's index number from the index number of another city and read the result as a percentage difference. Instead, divide one city's index number by that of the other city. The resulting number may then be used as a multiplier to calculate cost differences from city to city. The formula used to find cost differences between cities for the purpose of comparison is as follows: City A Index City B Index x City B Cost (Known) = City A Cost (Unknown) In addition, you can use RSMeans CCI to calculate and compare costs division by division between cities using the same basic formula. (Just be sure that you're comparing similar divisions.) ${ }^{\text {iv }}$

## Historical Cost Indexes

The table below lists both the RSMeans ${ }^{\circledR}$ historical cost index based on Jan. 1,1993 = 100 as well as the computed value of an index based on Jan. 1, 2015 costs. Since the Jan. 1, 2015 figure is estimated, space is left to write in the actual index figures as they become available through either the quarterly RSMeans Construction Cost Indexes or as printed in
the Engineering Neus-Record. To compute the actual index based on Jan. 1, $2015=100$, divide the historical cost index for a particular year by the actual Jan. 1, 2015 construction cost index. Space has been left to advance the index figures as the year progresses.

| Year | HistoricalCost IndexJan. $1,1993=100$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current Index } \\ \text { Based on } \\ \text { Jan. } 1,2015=100 \end{gathered}$ |  | Year | Historical <br> Cost Index <br> Jan. $1,1993=100$ <br> Actual | $\begin{gathered} \text { Current Index } \\ \text { Based on } \\ \text { Jan. } 1,2015=100 \end{gathered}$ |  | Year | HistoricalCost IndexJan. $1,1993=100$Actual | Current IndexBased onJan. $1,2015=100$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Est. | Actual | Est. | Actual |  |  | Est. | Actual |  |  | Est. | Actual |
| Oct 2015* |  |  |  |  | July 2000 | 120.9 | 58.5 |  | July 1982 | 76.1 | 36.8 |  |
| July 2015* |  |  |  |  | 1999 | 117.6 | 56.9 |  | 1981 | 70.0 | 33.9 |  |
| April 2015* |  |  |  |  | 1998 | 115.1 | 55.7 |  | 1980 | 62.9 | 30.4 |  |
| Jan 2015* | 206.7 |  | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1997 | 112.8 | 54.6 |  | 1979 | 57.8 | 28.0 |  |
| July 2014 |  | 204.9 | 99.1 |  | 1996 | 110.2 | 53.3 |  | 1978 | 53.5 | 25.9 |  |
| 2013 |  | 201.2 | 97.3 |  | 1995 | 107.6 | 52.1 |  | 1977 | 49.5 | 23.9 |  |
| 2012 |  | 194.6 | 94.1 |  | 1994 | 104.4 | 50.5 |  | 1976 | 46.9 | 22.7 |  |
| 2011 |  | 191.2 | 92.5 |  | 1993 | 101.7 | 49.2 |  | 1975 | 44.8 | 21.7 |  |
| 2010 |  | 183.5 | 88.8 |  | 1992 | 99.4 | 48.1 |  | 1974 | 41.4 | 20.0 |  |
| 2009 |  | 180.1 | 87.1 |  | 1991 | 96.8 | 46.8 |  | 1973 | 37.7 | 18.2 |  |
| 2008 |  | 180.4 | 87.3 |  | 1990 | 94.3 | 45.6 |  | 1972 | 34.8 | 16.8 |  |
| 2007 |  | 169.4 | 82.0 |  | 1989 | 92.1 | 44.6 |  | 1971 | 32.1 | 15.5 |  |
| 2006 |  | 162.0 | 78.4 |  | 1988 | 89.9 | 43.5 |  | 1970 | 28.7 | 13.9 |  |
| 2005 |  | 151.6 | 73.3 |  | 1987 | 87.7 | 42.4 |  | 1969 | 26.9 | 13.0 |  |
| 2004 |  | 143.7 | 69.5 |  | 1986 | 84.2 | 40.7 |  | 1968 | 24.9 | 12.0 |  |
| 2003 |  | 132.0 | 63.9 |  | 1985 | 82.6 | 40.0 |  | 1967 | 23.5 | 11.4 |  |
| 2002 |  | 128.7 | 62.3 |  | 1984 | 82.0 | 39.7 |  | 1966 | 22.7 | 11.0 |  |
| > 2001 |  | 125.1 | 60.5 |  | - 1983 | 80.2 | 38.8 |  | > 1965 | 21.7 | 10.5 |  |


| National Highway Construction Cost Index ( NHCCl ) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Cost Trends For Highways if |  |  |  |
| October 2015 |  |  |  |
| Table PT-1 |  |  |  |
|  | Year | Quarter | NHCCI Index |
|  | 2003 | March | 1.0000 |
|  |  | June | 1.0156 |
|  |  | September | 1.0038 |
|  |  | December | 0.9929 |
|  | 2004 | March | 1.0260 |
|  |  | June | 1.0838 |
|  |  | September | 1.0848 |
|  |  | December | 1.0910 |
|  | 2005 | March | 1.1189 |
|  |  | June | 1.1489 |
|  |  | September | 12045 |
|  |  | December | 1.2428 |
|  | 2006 | March | 12727 |
|  |  | June | 1.3464 |
|  |  | September | 1.4084 |
|  |  | December | 1.3693 |
|  | 2007 | March | 1.3425 |
|  |  | June | 1.3118 |
|  |  | September | 1.2891 |
|  |  | December | 1.2383 |
|  | 2008 | March | 12500 |
|  |  | June | 1.2938 |
|  |  | September | 1.3521 |
|  |  | December | 1.2835 |
|  | 2009 | March | 1.1818 |
|  |  | June | 1.0801 |
|  |  | September | 1.0752 |
|  |  | December | 1.0410 |
|  | 2010 | March | 1.0883 |
|  |  | June | 1.0871 |
|  |  | September | 1.0595 |
|  |  | December | 1.0520 |
|  | 2011 | March | 1.0524 |
|  |  | June | 1.0091 |
|  |  | September | 1.0817 |
|  |  | December | 1.0890 |
|  | 2012 | March | 1.1147 |
|  |  | June | 1.1468 |
|  |  | September | 1.1315 |
|  |  | December | 1.1148 |
|  | 2013 | March | 1.1002 |
|  |  | June | 1.1092 |
|  |  | September | 1.1185 |
|  |  | December | 1.0827 |
|  | 2014 | March | 1.0847 |
|  |  | June | 1.1007 |
|  |  | September | 1.1354 |
|  |  | December | 1.1158 |
|  | 2015 | March | 1.1334 |
|  |  | June | 1.1436 |



Source: Federal Highway Administration, Office of Highway Policy Information, "National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI)"
The index is preliminary and subject to revision, the 2013 4th quarter index will be available soon.

## STEEL STRUCTURES

| Str. No. | Str. Name | County | Contract | Description | Dwg No. | Deck Area SQFT | Low Bid Total Cost |  | Low Bid Unit Cost | Ave 3 Bid Total Cost | Ave 3 Bid Unit Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Steel Box Girders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21218 | Hwy 2 over Hood River <br> Bridge Connector (Conn 2) | Hood River | 14122 | Trapezoidal structural steel box girders, single span, 98'-7" ctr-to-ctr end bents | 82313 | 8,710.8 | \$ 2,024,491 | \$ | 232.41 | \$ 2,044,651 | \$ 234.73 |
| 20878 | Sandy River, Hwy 2 EB | Multnomah | 14165 | Steel box girders w/haunch, 4 spans, 200'. 220'-220'-200' | 81319 | 68,263.5 | \$15,052,888 | \$ | 220.51 | \$15,624,680 | \$ 228.89 |
| 20879 | Sandy River, Hwy 2 WB | Multnomah | 14165 | Steel box girders w/haunch, 4 spans, 200'. 220'-220'-200' | 81366 | 53,484.7 | \$11,293,989 | \$ | 211.16 | \$11,512,879 | \$ 215.26 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal (per sqft.) |  | 130,459.0 | \$28,371,368 | \$ | 217.47 | \$29,182,210 | \$ 223.69 |
| Steel Plate Girders |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21358 | Valley View Rd Conn \#1 over Hwy 1 (N. Ashland Intchg) | Jackson | 14244 | 2 span continuous steel plate girders, 259'-6" ctr-to-ctr end bents | 83881 | 16,596.3 | \$ 2,073,034 | \$ | 124.91 | \$ 2,328,288 | \$ 140.29 |

viii

| PRECAST SEGMENTAL BOX GIRDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 110120 | BR0252-407 <br> SOUTH OF DOWNTOWN DENVER | U | $\begin{array}{r} 1760.0000 \\ 547.0000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 39.0000 \\ 149.0000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 68640.0 \\ & 81503.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 6,691,822 \\ & \$ 7,102,517 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 97.49 \\ & \$ 87.14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 110324 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BRR600-297 } \\ & \text { I- } 25 \text { BRIDGE OVER SOUTH PLATTE } \end{aligned}$ | U | 371.0000 | 197.0000 | 73087.0 | \$6,901,209 | \$94.42 |
| 110526 | STA 0911-005 <br> SH 91 COPPER MOUNTAIN TO COUNT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { M } \\ & \mathrm{F}-12-\mathrm{AG} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 308.0000 \\ \text { WEIGHTED } \\ \text { NEW ST } \end{gathered}$ | 62.0000 AVERAGE RUCTURES | $\begin{array}{r} 19096.0 \\ 242326.0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 142,321 \\ \$ 20,837,868 \end{array}$ | $\$ 7.45$ $\$ 85.99$ |

### 9.3.2 Post - tensioned Concrete Box Girder, Segmental Bridges

| Project Name and Description | Letting Date | Deck Area (SF) | Cost per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A1A over ICWW (St. Lucie River) <br> (Evans Crary) (890158) | 97/98 | $\begin{gathered} 297,453 \\ \text { Span by Span } \end{gathered}$ | \$80.50 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930480) | 99/00 | 77,048 Balanced Cantilever | \$100.73 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930477) | 99/00 | 20,925 Balanced Cantilever | \$96.31 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930479) | 99/00 | 69,233 Balanced Cantilever | \$88.49 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930482) | 99/00 | 47,466 Balanced Cantilever | \$104.96 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930482) | 99/00 | 81,059 Balanced Cantilever | \$101.44 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930483) | 99/00 | 90,926 Balanced Cantilever | \$101.57 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930484) | 99/00 | 41,893 Balanced Cantilever | \$115.11 |
| Palm Beach Airport Interchange at I-95 (930478) | 99/00 | $\begin{gathered} \hline 20,796 \\ \text { Balanced Cantilever } \end{gathered}$ | \$95.16 |
| 17th Street over ICWW (Ft. Lauderdale) (860623) | 96/97 | 135,962 Balanced Cantilever | \$74.71 |
| SR 704 over ICWW Royal Palm Way (930507 \& 930506) | 00/01 | 43,173 each C-I-P on Travelers | \$163.88 |
| US 92 over ICWW (Broadway Bridge) Daytona (790188) | 97/98 | 145,588 Balanced Cantilever | \$81.93 |
| US 92 over ICWW <br> (Broadway Bridge) Daytona (790187) | 97/98 | 145,588 Balanced Cantilever | \$81.93 |
| SR 789 over ICWW (Ringling Bridge) (170021) | 00/01 | 329,096 Balanced Cantilever | \$81.43 |
| US 98 over ICWW (Hathaway Bridge) (460012) | 00/01 | 575,731 Balanced Cantilever | \$87.72 |

### 9.3.3 Post-tensioned Cast-in-place Concrete Box Girder Bridge (low level overpass)

| Project Name and Description | Letting Date | Deck Area (SF) | Cost per SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SR 858 over ICWW Hallandale Beach <br> $(860619 ~ \& ~ 860618)$ | $97 / 98$ | 29,888 each | $\$ 83.25$ |
| SR 858 Flyover Hallandale Beach (860620) | $97 / 98$ | 21,777 | $\$ 81.99$ |
| 4th Street over I-275 | $94 / 95$ | 12,438 | $\$ 75.21$ |



| PRECAST PRESTRESSED REINFORCED CONCRETE DECK GIRDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Str. No. | Str. Name | County | Contract | Description | Dwg No. | Deck Area SQFT |  | Low Bid Total Cost |  | Low Bid Unit Cost |  | Ave 3 Bid <br> Total Cost | Ave 3 Bid Unit Cost |
| 63 inch Bulb I |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21576 | Hwy 69 over Hwy 1 | Lane | 14537 | 21~precast prestressed Bl63, 244'-0" ctr-ctr end bents | 89961 | 31,028.7 | \$ | 2,884,943 | \$ | 92.98 | \$ | 3,265,764 | \$ 105.25 |
| Modified 45 inch Bulb T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21747 | Scoggins Creek, Old Tualatin Valley Hwy \#47 | Washington | 14551 | 5~PCPS Modified DBT45 beams | 91063 | 3,520.0 | \$ | 343,420 | \$ | 97.56 | \$ | 351,858 | \$ 99.96 |
| 48 inch Bulb $T$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22019 | Undercrossing 3RD Street Bridge | Deschutes | 14576 | 2~Precast prestressed BT48 girders \& 2~pcsp $20^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime \prime}$ min. girders (variable depth), $140^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ ctr-ctr end bents | 91303 | 4,506.6 | \$ | 1,132,571 | \$ | 251.32 | \$ | 1,096,516 | \$ 243.32 |
| 22021 | Undercrossing Murphy Road Bridge | Deschutes | 14576 | 6~Precast prestressed BT48 girders \& 2~pcsp $20^{\prime \prime} \times 48^{\prime \prime}$ min. girders (variable depth), $185^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ ctr-ctr end bents | 91283 | 9,984.4 | \$ | 1,800,825 | \$ | 180.36 | \$ | 1,651,904 | \$ 165.45 |
| 21488 | Hwy 42 over Hwy 2 | Sherman | 14548 | 17~Modified BT48 girders, $113^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ ctr-ctr end bents | 91137 | 9,786.0 | \$ | 1,002,808 | \$ | 102.47 | \$ | 1,042,219 | \$ 106.50 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal (per sq.ft.) |  | 24,276.9 |  | 3,936,204.3 | \$ | 162.14 |  | 3,790,639.3 | \$ 156.14 |
| 60 inch Bulb T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21487 | Hwy 42 over UPRR | Sherman | 14548 | 17~Modified BT60 girders, 145'-15/16" ctr-ctr end bents | 91110 | 13,077.6 | \$ | 1,500,437 | \$ | 114.73 | \$ | 1,337,264 | \$ 102.26 |

xiv

| PRECAST PRESTRESSED REINFORCED CONCRETE DECK GIRDER |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Str. No. Str. Name | County | Contract | Description | Dwg No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Deck Area } \\ & \text { SQFT } \end{aligned}$ | Low Bid <br> Total Cost |  | Low Bid Unit Cost |  | Ave 3 Bid Total Cost | Ave 3 Bid Unit Cost |
| 84 inch Bulb T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22004** Creek, Hwy 39 at MP 56.40 | Yamhill | $14584$ | 7~BT84 precast prestressed girders, 155'-6 3/4" ctr-ctr end bents | 90367 | 7,177.7 | \$ 550,328 | \$ | 76.67 | \$ | 571,864 | \$ 79.67 |
| 90 inch Bulb T |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21343 Applegate River, Hwy 25 | Josephine | 14541 | PCPS BT90, 520'-0" ctr-ctr end bents | 90273 | 25,202.0 | \$ 2,860,815 | \$ | 113.52 | \$ | 2,829,792 | \$112.28 |
| *For information, prestressed BT84 girders (agency provided). Cost intended for loading, transportation, preparation and installation. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

xv

| Deck Area Total Cost Summary Fiscal Year 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure Type | Total Area Square Feet |  | Total Bid Amount | Cost per <br> Square <br> Feet | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Structures } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| P.S. Slabs - 18 inch | 8,850.8 | \$ | 1,109,896 | \$ 125.40 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 21 inch | 2,944.0 | \$ | 467,776 | \$ 158.89 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 26 inch | 17,756.9 | \$ | 2,840,630 | \$ 159.97 | 4 |
| P.S. Slabs - 30 inch | 4,212.0 | \$ | 702,150 | \$ 166.70 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 151 inch | 7,888.0 | \$ | 1,007,233 | \$ 127.69 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 163 inch | 3,483.3 | \$ | 363,606 | \$ 104.38 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 60 inch | 18,295.3 | \$ | 3,980,091 | \$ 217.55 | 2 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 72 inch | 4,768.2 | \$ | 653,328 | \$ 137.02 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 84 inch | 21,296.0 | \$ | 2,458,272 | \$ 115.43 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 90 inch | 59,024.9 | \$ | 7,741,974 | \$ 131.16 | 2 |
| Steel Box Girders | 130,459.0 | \$ | 28,371,368 | \$ 217.47 | 3 |
| Steel Plate Girders | 16,596.3 | \$ | 2,073,034 | \$ 124.91 | 1 |
| Total | 295,574.7 | \$ | 51,769,358 | \$ 175.15 | 21 |


| Deck Area Total Cost Summary Fiscal Year 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure Type | Total Area <br> Square Feet |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total Bid } \\ & \text { Amount } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost per } \\ \text { Square } \\ \text { Feet } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Number <br> of Structures |
| P.S. Slabs - 15 inch | 5,341.3 | \$ | 1,182,156 | \$221.32 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 21 inch | 4,302.8 | \$ | 567,266 | \$ 131.84 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 30 inch | 3,828.0 | S | 418,713 | \$ 109.38 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Box Girder - 39 inch | 3,564.0 | \$ | 449,578 | \$ 126.14 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Box Girder - 48 inch | 10,034.5 | S | 1,683,850 | \$ 167.81 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 134 inch | 3,356.6 | \$ | 548,679 | \$ 163.46 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 60 inch | 3,402.7 | \$ | 297,823 | \$ 87.53 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 84 inch | 7,526.8 | \$ | 745,874 | \$ 99.10 | 1 |
| Steel Plate Girders | 65,881.8 | S | 8,772,293 | \$ 133.15 | 3 |
| Total | 107,238.4 | \$ | 14,666,232 | \$ 136.76 | 13 |

xvii

| Deck Area Total Cost Summary Fiscal Year 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure Type | Total Area <br> Square Feet |  | Total Bid | Cost per <br> Square <br> Foet | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{c} \text { Number } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { Structures } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ |
| P.S. Slabs - 15 inch | 776.0 | \$ | 113,682 | \$ 146.50 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 21 inch | 5,432.5 | \$ | 759,567 | \$ 139.82 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 26 inch | 2,244.0 | \$ | 266,437 | \$ 118.73 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 30 inch | 13,761.5 | \$ | 1,705,641 | \$ 123.94 | 5 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Box Girder - 33 inch | 781.3 | \$ | 146,220 | \$ 187.14 | 2 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Box Girder - 42 inch | 14,080.0 | \$ | 2,383,849 | \$ 169.31 | 4 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Box Girder - 48 inch | 6,413.0 | \$ | 723,722 | \$ 112.85 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 163 inch | 4,830.0 | \$ | 416,665 | \$ 86.27 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 90 inch | 5,052.4 | \$ | 1,135,523 | \$ 224.75 | 1 |
| Steel Plate Girders | 36,537.5 | \$ | 5,584,296 | \$ 152.84 | 3 |
| Total | 89,908.2 | \$ | 13,235,602 | \$ 147.21 | 21 |


| Deck Area Total Cost Summary Fiscal Year 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Structure Type | Total Area Square Feet |  | Total Bid Amount | Cost per <br> Square <br> Feet | Number <br> of Structures |
| P.S. Slabs - 12 inch | 1,413.4 |  | 335,709 | \$ 237.52 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 15 inch | 3,511.8 |  | 242,750 | \$ 69.12 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 18 inch | 4,092.9 | \$ | 688,450 | \$ 168.20 | 3 |
| P.S. Slabs - 21 inch | 1,272.0 | \$ | 162,552 | \$ 127.79 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 30 inch | 5,993.3 |  | 901,474 | \$ 150.41 | 2 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 163 inch | 31,028.7 |  | 2,884,943 | \$ 92.98 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Modified BT45 | 3,520.0 |  | 343,420 | \$ 97.56 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 48 | 24,276.9 | \$ | 3,936,204 | \$ 162.14 | 3 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 60 | 13,077.6 | \$ | 1,500,437 | \$ 114.73 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 90 | 25,202.0 |  | 2,860,815 | \$ 113.52 | 1 |
| Steel Plate Girders | 44,742.0 |  | 6,978,177 | \$ 155.96 | 2 |
| Total | 158,130.7 | \$ | 20,834,931 | \$ 131.76 | 17 |

[^0]
## Deck Area Total Cost Summary Fiscal Year 2014

| Structure Type | Total Area Square Feet |  | Total Bid Amount |  | Cost per <br> Square <br> Feet |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P.S. Slabs - 18 inch | 1,159.6 | \$ | 176,307 | \$ | 152.04 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 21 inch | 4,961.3 | \$ | 810,411 | \$ | 163.35 | 2 |
| P.S. Slabs - 26 inch | 14,373.0 | \$ | 4,801,160 | \$ | 334.04 | 1 |
| P.S. Slabs - 30 inch | 3,382.3 | \$ | 338,704 | \$ | 100.14 | 1 |
| Cast-in-place Post-tensioned Concrete Box | 34717.0 | \$ | 5,571,234 |  | 160.48 | 1 |
| Precast Pres. R.C. Box Girder 33 inch | 16,988.2 | \$ | 2,393,985 | \$ | 140.92 | 1 |
| Precast Pres. R.C. Box Girder 48 inch | 3,304.0 | \$ | 652,351 | \$ | 197.44 | 1 |
| Precast Pres. R.C. Box Girder 52 inch | 13,794.6 | \$ | 2,487,165 | \$ | 180.30 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb I 75 inch | 23,087.5 | \$ | 2,291,145 | \$ | 99.24 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb 184 | 7,957.8 | \$ | 1,520,214 | \$ | 191.04 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 36 | 25,512.9 | \$ | 3,373,074 | \$ | 132.21 | 3 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 45 | 6,522.9 | \$ | 991,097 | \$ | 151.94 | 1 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 72 | 58,614.1 | \$ | 7,893,700 | \$ | 134.67 | 3 |
| Precast Prestr. R.C. Deck Girder - Bulb T 84 | 16,773.0 | \$ | 2,048,852 | \$ | 122.15 | 1 |
| Steel Plate Girders | 53,291.6 | \$ | 9,945,337 | \$ | 186.62 | 2 |
| Total | 284,439.8 | \$ | 45,294,735 |  | 2,446.58 | 21 |



xxii


Salem River Crossina Preferred Alternate－Pridae Cost Rance Data Analvsis：Janvary 6． 2016


|  RR Testiemurtilyse Path） |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CA Corrpinatus Bridge Conl $2514^{\text {² }}$ | \＄150．00 | \＄325．00 | min | 1．0300 | \＄155．85 | \＄5337．87 | n／a | nia | nia | mion | min |  |
| Florifo DOT Transportation Costs Reports，Apri2014 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | \＄80．00 | \＄211．11 | rim | 1．0080 | \＄935．51 | \＄ 5191934 | n／a | 1.0678 k 7 | \＄28．92 | 52：202 | min |  |
|  |  | 5851.37 | \＄243， 37 | 1.0717 | no | ร2\％934 | 5\％0\％75 | no | no | mo | min | Werteeisf drar |
| COOT 2010 Bridpe Cost Oata．Swel Stuxtures＇ | n 9 | 5180．39 | S165．45 | 1.0717 | no | 815927 | 8177．37 | na | no | mo | ma |  |
| COOT 2010 Endipa Cas Outa，Shael Sinutirat | n＇a | 5114.73 | \＄10228 | 1.0717 | nia | \＄122．93 | \＄10259 | n＇a | n＇a | rim | min |  |
| Doot 2010 Mriton Cose Onin Siad Sinutares | n／ | 511357 | \＄11228 | 1.0717 | nim | \＄171 51 | 5170231 | n／ | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{h}$ | min | mis |  |
| Batuosidibial Costion | nh | 1316497 | min | 1.0717 | nh | ［117889 | 0 | nh | nim | min | 0 |  |
| COOT 2010 Bridpa Coat Oilla Shat Sanchasat | n晾 | 393．00 | \％in | 1．0717 | ni | 30087 | nha | n塤 | n＇a | min | mis |  |
| DOOT 2011 Mridon Cose Onia Sinel Sinutime | na | 5100.09 | nin | 1.0717 | nh | \＄107 17 | n的 | na |  | nim | mis． |  |
|  | nh | S1970］ | \％ | 1.0717 | nh | 5206 ${ }^{\text {ar }}$ | $\mathrm{n} /$ | nh | nh | \％ | 03 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Aversoat | 5uppestos | Cost Ras | 90 | mamm | \＄127．38 | \＄160．73 | \＄167．09 | Cost range sey $\$ 125.00$ to $\$ 170.00$ |
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| Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers Original Data Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series Id: CUUR0300SA0,CUUS0300SA0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not Seasonally Adjusted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area: | South urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Item: | All items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base <br> Period: <br> Years: | $\begin{aligned} & 1982-84=100 \\ & 2005 \text { to } 2015 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Annual | HALF1 | HALF2 |
| 2005 | 183.6 | 184.7 | 185.9 | 187.3 | 187.3 | 187.8 | 188.5 | 189.4 | 192.0 | 192.5 | 190.7 | 190.1 | 188.3 | 186.1 | 190.5 |
| 2006 | 191.5 | 191.8 | 192.8 | 194.7 | 195.5 | 196.3 | 197.0 | 197.1 | 195.8 | 194.7 | 194.3 | 194.8 | 194.7 | 193.8 | 195.6 |
| 2007 | 195.021 | 195.950 | 197.904 | 199.618 | 200.804 | 201.675 | 201.571 | 201.041 | 201.697 | 202.155 | 203.437 | 203.457 | 200.361 | 188.495 | 202.226 |
| 2008 | 204.510 | 205.060 | 206.676 | $208.085$ | 210.006 | 212.324 | 213.304 | 212.387 | 212.650 | 210.108 | 205.559 | 203.501 | 208.681 | 207.777 | 209.585 |
| 2009 | 204.288 | 205.343 | 206.001 | 206.657 | 207.265 | 209.343 | 208.819 | 209.000 | 208.912 | 209.292 | 209.738 | 209.476 | 207.845 | 206.483 | 209.206 |
| 2010 | 210.056 | 210.020 | 211.216 | 211.528 | 211.423 | 211.232 | 210.988 | 211.308 | 211.775 | 212.026 | 211.996 | 212.488 | 211.338 | 210.913 | 211.764 |
| 2011 | 213.589 | 214.735 | 217.214 | 218.820 | 219.820 | 219.318 | 219.682 | 220.471 | 220.371 | 219.969 | 219.961 | 219.469 | 218.618 | 217.249 | 219.987 |
| 2012 | 220.497 | 221.802 | 223.314 | $224.275$ | 223.356 | 223.004 | 222.667 | 223.919 | 225.052 | 224.504 | 223.404 | 223.109 | 223.242 | 222.708 | 223.776 |
| 2013 | 223.933 | 225.874 | 226.628 | 226.202 | 226.289 | 227.148 | 227.548 | 227.837 | 227.876 | 227.420 | 226.811 | 227.082 | 226.721 | 226.012 | 227.429 |
| 2014 | 227.673 | 228.664 | 230.095 | 231.346 | 231.762 | 232.269 | 232.013 | 231.611 | 231.762 | 231.131 | 229.845 | 228.451 | 230.552 | 230.302 | 230.802 |
| 2015 | 226.855 | 227.944 | 229.337 | 229.957 | 230.886 | 232.026 | 231.719 | 231.260 | 230.913 | 230.860 | 230.422 |  |  | 229.501 |  |

xxvi
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| Oregon DOT Weighted Average Item Prices - Calendar Year 2014 <br> WEIGHTED AVERAGE ITEM PRICE REPORT <br> BY ITEM, REGION AND QUARTER |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{lr}\text { ITEM } & \text { REGION } \\ \cdots \cdots\end{array}$ | CALENDAR QUARTER ......... | NUMBER OF OCCUR'S $\qquad$ | TOTAL QUANTITY .-....... | TOTAL DOLLARS <br> ........ | AVERAGE <br> AWARDED PRICE | average OF LOW 3 bIDDERS |
| REMOVAL OF PIPES / FOOT |  |  |  |  | ....... | ......... |
| 0310-0100000F 0 | 201402 | 9 | 4,973.00 | \$56,918 | \$11.45 | \$9.48 |
|  | 201403 | 1 | 344.00 | \$2,322 | \$6.75 | \$8.92 |
|  | 201404 | 2 | 460.00 | \$7,110 | \$15.46 | \$10.22 |
| CODE NOT | 201404 | 1 | 758.00 | \$9,096 | \$12.00 | \$11.00 |
|  |  | 13 | 6,535.00 | \$75,446 | \$11.54 | \$9.68 |
| REMOVAL OF CURBS / FOOT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0310-0101000F $\quad 0$ | 201401 | 1 | 200.00 | \$300 | \$1.50 | \$4.17 |
|  | 201402 | 3 | 6,875.00 | \$10,075 | \$1.47 | \$2.54 |
|  | 201403 | 2 | 1,170.00 | \$3,762 | \$3.22 | \$2.69 |
|  | 201404 | 1 | 280.00 | \$1,400 | \$5.00 | \$5.72 |
| CODE NOT | 201403 | 1 | 307.00 | \$6,140 | \$20.00 | \$12.17 |
|  | 201404 | 1 | 400.00 | \$1,200 | \$3.00 | \$3.67 |
|  |  | 9 | 9,232.00 | \$22,877 | \$2.48 | \$3.06 |
| REMY OF WALKS AND DRIVEWAY / SQYD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0310-0102000J 0 | 201401 | 1 | 250.00 | \$3,750 | \$15.00 | \$12.67 |
|  | 201402 | 4 | 721.00 | \$6,109 | \$8.47 | \$11.93 |
|  | 201403 | 1 | 2,500.00 | \$5,750 | \$2.30 | \$3.00 |
|  | 201404 | 2 | 239.00 | \$2,432 | \$10.18 | \$27.62 |
| CODE NOT | 201403 | 1 | 47.00 | \$1,410 | \$30.00 | \$40.00 |
|  | 201404 | 1 | 104.00 | \$2,080 | \$20.00 | \$11.33 |
|  |  | 10 | 3,861.00 | \$21,531 | \$5.58 | \$7.49 |
| REMOVAL OF SURFACINGS / SQYD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0310-0103000J 0 | 201402 | 5 | 39,569.00 | \$102, 125 | \$2.58 | \$4.43 |
|  | 201403 | 1 | 1,800.00 | \$5,940 | \$3.30 | \$4.20 |
|  | 201404 | 1 | 59.00 | \$1,770 | \$30.00 | \$46.00 |
|  | (iten continued) |  |  |  |  |  |
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| Item | Source | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Source } \\ & \text { \$/Unit } \end{aligned}$ | Source Unit | Inflation Rate | Source Yr | Build Yr | Forecaste <br> d Cost | Unit | Weighted |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| General Excavation | ODOT 2014 | 11.08 | CY | 2.0\% | 2014 | 2016 | \$ 11.52 | CY | 46\% |
| Embankment in Place | ODOT 2014 | 6.2 | CY | 2.0\% | 2014 | 2016 | \$ 6.45 | CY | 80\% |
| TOTALS |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 17.97 | CY | \$ 10.46 |
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| Bioswales <br> (Parking Lot and <br> Roadside) | Low | $\$ 5.500 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ | City of Portland, Bereau of Environmental Services, Willamette Watershed <br> Program - Task Memorandum 4.1 August 2005 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mid | $\$ 15.000 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ | Water Environment Research Federation Low Impact Development Best <br> Management Practices Whole Life Cost Model 2007 |
|  | High | $\$ 24.000 / \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$ | Center for Neighborhood Technology, "Green Infrastructure Data Quantific ation <br> and Assessment In the Calumet Region" Accessed January 2009 <br> Web Link |
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