

# SCI-823-0.00 PID No. 77366

# SR 823 OVER SLOCUM AVE (TR 248)

# PRELIMINARY DESIGN REPORT SUBMITTAL

Prepared for: OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT 9 650 EASTERN AVE. CHILLICOTHE, OHIO 45601

**JANUARY 14, 2008** 

Prepared by:



STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING

FEB 2 9 2008

RECEIVED



#### TranSystems

5747 Perimeter Drive Suite 240 Columbus, Ohio 43017 Tel 614 336 8480 Fax 614 336 8540

www.transystems.com

January 14, 2008

Mr. Jawdat Siddigi, PE Office of Structural Engineering Ohio Department of Transportation 1980 W. Broad Street Columbus, Ohio 43223

SUBJECT: Preliminary Design Report Submittal SR 823 over Slocum Ave. (TR 248) SCI-823-0.00 Portsmouth Bypass PID#77366

Dear Mr. Siddigi:

Submitted for review and comment is the Preliminary Design Report for SR 823 over Slocum Avenue (TR 248). Included are The TS&L drawings and the Final Geotechnical Report by DLZ. Ohio, dated September 6, 2007. Please find below our disposition to the November 29, 2006 comments by Jeff Crace, PE regarding the STS submittal.

1. We agree with the disposition of all comments except for number 5. The span length given in the Proposed structure Block should be measured from centerline to centerline of bearings (example: centerline of bearing at abutment to centerline of bearing pier), see the ODOT Bridge Design Manual, section 201.2.2F.

The measurement of the spans has been revised in the proposed structure data block.

Please don't hesitate to call me or Dr. Michael Lenett (513 621 1981) if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Weeks & AP

Michael D. Weeks, P.E., P.S. Project Manager

Cc: T. Barnitz, P.E.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Design Criteria	1
3.	Subsurface Conditions and Foundation Recommendation	1-2
4.	Roadway	2-3
5.	Proposed Structure Configuration	3-4
APPE • • •	NDIX A Site Plan (Sheets 1 & 2 of 7) General Plan (Sheet 3 of 7) Transverse Section (Sheet 4 of 7) Abutment Details (Sheets 5-7 of 7)	7 Sheets
APPE •	NDIX B Cost Estimate	4 Sheets



•

## PRELIMINARY DESIGN REPORT

### 1. Introduction

TranSystems is providing engineering services to the Ohio Department of Transportation for the design of new left and right overpass structures that will carry the proposed S.R. 823 bypass over Slocum Avenue. As requested by the Scope of Services, a Preliminary Design Report is to be submitted as part of Step 8 of the Major PDP process. The purpose of this report is to summarize the structure type selected for final design. A revised Type Study was submitted on September 7, 2006 and comments were received on October 2, 2006 by Jeff Crace. The comments were addressed by TranSystems on November 20, 2006 and final comments on the Type Study were received on November 29, 2006. The comments received on 11/29/06 have been incorporated into this submittal.

### 2. Design Criteria

The proposed structure will be designed according to the most current version of the Ohio Department of Transportation Bridge Design Manual and the 2002 AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17<sup>th</sup> Edition. Horizontal clearances (clear zone width and horizontal sight distance) are based on the Ohio Department of Transportation Location and Design Manual, Volume One – Roadway Design.

### 3. Subsurface Conditions and Foundation Recommendations

DLZ Ohio, Inc. performed the subsurface exploration for the proposed bridge and prepared the Bridge Foundation Recommendations in their report dated September 6, 2007 and an addendum dated October 5, 2007. Six test borings (TR-36, TR-37, TR-38 TR-38A, B-31 and B-32) were drilled and all encountered bedrock. The SSI found 72 to 81 feet of mostly cohesive soils with intermittent granular soils above bedrock.

DLZ recommends that H-piles bearing on bedrock are the best suited foundation type for support of the proposed substructures. Pile points are recommended to penetrate the sporadic layers of granular materials that were encountered in the test borings.

The stability of the spill through slopes has also been investigated by DLZ. The analysis indicates that 2:1 slopes have adequate factors of safety for stability when using a friction angle of 35° (refer to the 10/5/07 addendum to the 9/6/07 report and DLZ's "Report of Subsurface Investigation for Embankments (Station 416+00 to 509+50), Project SCI-823-6.81, Phase 1 Stage 1", dated 11/29/06). In addition, due to the undrained analyses safety factors less than ODOT minimums of 1.5, the spill through slopes should be built using staged construction in conjunction with wick drains. The analyses also indicate that settlement of the spill through embankments is a concern. The calculations given in DLZ's report indicate that the amount of settlement following a waiting period of 99% primary consolidation reduces the settlement to less than 0.4 inches which prevents mobilization of downdrag on the piles. DLZ recommends that construction of the pier and abutment foundations not proceed until a minimum of 99% of the calculated primary consolidation has occurred. Wick drains are recommended for use at this location to accelerate the consolidation. DLZ presents multiple triangular spacing options for the wick drains and has calculated the time rate of consolidation for each spacing presented (see DLZ's 9/06/07 report). Waiting periods to reach 99% consolidation will therefore be a function of the wick drain spacing. The final design should incorporate requirements or waiting periods associated with the spacing selected if the contractor is allowed to select the wick drain spacing. Additional information regarding embankment construction is available in the DLZ report for the Highland Bend Embankments dated August 2, 2007. DLZ has also prepared plans to indicate the locations of wick drain treatment and settlement monitoring and they are included in this submittal and the 8/2/07 Highland Bend Embankment Report. Shallow foundations bearing in the proposed fill have been investigated for



the proposed abutments. However, the differential settlement exceeded AASHTO allowable values in Section 4.4.7.2.5 on tolerable movements. Due to the differential settlement exceeding allowable values shallow foundations have not been selected as the final foundation type.

MSE wall evaluations were preformed by DLZ as well, and are presented in the 9/06/07 report. The MSE walls were evaluated with respect to bearing capacity, sliding, overturning, global stability and settlement. These wall evaluations reveal that MSE wall can be used at the proposed location between Pershing Ave Stations 30+25.00 and 32+00.00 to retain the embankment off of the Slocum Pershing intersection. The MSE wall evaluations found that a minimum strap length of 1.0H (H= height from top of leveling pad to top of coping) was required to satisfy external stability concerns. Consistent with the embankment construction in this region, the use of wick drains and monitoring of pore water pressures is also recommended. DLZ also recommends the MSE wall be built in stages to maintain stability of the embankment. Differential settlement calculations have also been prepared by DLZ and indicate that the differential settlement will exceed 1%. Slip joints in the facing panels are recommended to accommodate the movement. An effective friction angle of 35° has been assumed for the proposed embankment construction (see earlier comments this section). The final design should incorporate this material requirement into the details and quantities.

#### 4. Roadway

The purpose of this project is to construct a new bypass state route around the town of Portsmouth, Ohio. The proposed alignment will carry two lanes of traffic, 15 plus miles in either direction, from an interchange with US 52 just east of Portsmouth to another interchange with US 23, located north of Portsmouth in Valley Township.

Both the left and right structures are similar and will consist of two 12'-0" travel lanes with 6'-0" median shoulders with a 1'-6" outside straight face will be 44'-11½" out-to-out with a 1'-6" outside straight face deflector parapet (SBR-1-99) and a 1'-5 ½" inside straight face deflector parapet (similar to a Type B1 or C1 barrier from Roadway Standard Construction Drawing RM-4.3 but using a base width of 1'-5 ½" and top width of 60% \$  $2^{5/8"}$ ). The left and right structures will be separated by a 1" longitudinal joint. Horizontal and vertical sight distances are in accordance with the design standards for all alternatives considered. The profile grade line for both bridge sections will be located at the inside edge of pavement which is 7'-6" from the centerline of survey and construction of S.R. 823. Noise Barriers are required on the structures in compliance with the noise analysis and environmental documentation.

Alignment & Profile: The proposed horizontal geometry of SR 823 is along a tangent for the entire length of both the left and right structures. The cross section is a normal crown. The proposed mainline profile grade line is located on the inside edge of pavement for both bridges. A 1700' vertical curve begins at station 122+50 with a PVI = 578.23,  $G_1$ = -4.10%,  $G_2$ =5.00%. The horizontal and vertical geometry for all alternatives considered are the same. Spill through embankment slopes will be a maximum of 2:1 in order to minimize bridge length and the roadway slopes shall be 2.5:1 to satisfy stability.

Slocum Avenue will remain on its current geometry and Pershing Avenue will be relocated to each side of SR 823 using an offset-t intersection.

**Vertical and Horizontal Clearances** – The vertical alignment of these mainline structures is dictated by the overall vertical design of the new bypass profile. According to the ODOT Location and Design Manual, Volume One – Roadway Design, Figure 302-1E, a preferred vertical clearance of 15'-0" (minimum of 14'-6") must be provided over Slocum Avenue which is positioned directly below the S.R. 823 mainline structures at this site. Each alternative considered provides more than the preferred 15'-0" clearance. The 15'-0" clear zone



- 2 -

from edge of traveled way is based on Figure 600-1E of the ODOT L&D Manual, Volume One. The information input into Figure 600-1E is as follows:

- A. existing Slocum Ave. may be classified as an Urban Local Road and the posted speed is 50 mph;
- B. from phone conversations with Scioto County Engineers Office the most recent ADT of Slocum Avenue is 1,897 at the Corporation Limits and is similar to the traffic data presented on the plans for existing Slocum Ave. over the Little Scioto River.
- C. Slocum Avenue will have open drainage and ditch slopes of 4:1 are assumed

Using the identified parameters of items A) through C) in Figure 600-1E results in the minimum horizontal clear zone width of 15'-0".

**Pavement Drainage** - The collection of storm water runoff will be addressed off of the bridge, thus scuppers will not be required. Catch Basins have been provided near the rear abutment to direct pavement drainage away from the bridge and near the forward abutment to collect drainage from the bridge.

**Utilities** - No utilities will be placed on the bridge. However, lighting and ITS conduits will be provided as necessary. Existing utilities along Pershing Avenue will require relocation. The utilities include; water, gas and sanitary lines as well as overhead electric lines.

**Maintenance of Traffic** – While the new bridges are under construction, traffic will be maintained on both existing Slocum and Pershing Avenues. It is anticipated that there will be limited closures during construction for beam setting.

#### 5. Proposed Structure Configuration

**Span configuration:** The proposed structure is comprised of a 3-span structure with span lengths of 106'-4", 106'-4" and 106'-4" measured from centerline bearings. The spans measured from the centerlines of the substructures is 107'-6 ½", 108'-9", 107'-6 ½". This span arrangement was selected to make the beams in all three spans equal length. The abutments and piers are oriented parallel to Slocum Avenue with a skew of 38°33'37". Embankment slopes of 2:1 are used for both abutments. A retaining wall is required along Pershing Avenue to prevent the embankment from encroaching upon the road. The maximum height of the wall is approximately 36' and MSE wall construction is proposed due to their use in other areas on the project. The embankments are set to begin at the 15'-0" clear zone allowing for a traversable roadway ditch within that zone.

#### Substructure:

- <u>Abutments:</u> Both the forward and rear abutments will be semi-integral supported on H-piles as they are located in new embankment fill. The piles shall be HP14x73 with a design capacity of 95-tons per pile, driven to refusal on bedrock. The details of the abutments will follow ODOT Standard Construction drawings. An integral or fixed abutment was considered due to the 4% (approx.) grade that the structure will be built to except the 38° skew is in excess of the limits set forth in section 205.8 of the BDM.
- II. <u>Piers</u>: The piers will consist of T-type piers, each supported on a HP14x73 H-piles, with a design capacity of 95 tons. The wide stem of a T-type pier is useful to minimize/eliminate slenderness effects anticipated for the 50' & 45' tall piers. It is recommended that one of the piers be a fixed design (i.e. fixed bearings) in order to resolve reactions associated with constructing the structure on a 4% (approx.) grade. Discussions with OSE staff indicated that it is also important to check the superstructure to substructure connection and that it may be a weak point. The pier would also need



- 3 -

to be designed for a proportional amount of the thermal movement in accordance with BDM section 205.9.

#### Superstructure:

1. <u>Girders and Deck</u>: The preliminary design of this structure consists of 5- 60" AASHTO Type 4 Modified prestressed beams, spaced at 9'-6" with 3'-5 3/4" overhangs. The design loading applied was HS-25 with Alternate Military Loading and a future wearing surface of 60 psf. The structures will be simple span for non-composite dead loads and continuous for superimposed and live loads. In accordance with the BDM the beams are also checked for a simply supported condition under all loads except the future wearing surface. This analysis indicates that concrete strengths of 6000 psi at release and 8000 psi final are required. Discussions with Ohio Prestressers Association indicate concrete strength and shipping feasibility were not of particular concern or reason for additional cost (please refer to the attached documentation). Both the left and right bridge width will be 42'-0" from toe to toe of parapets with an overall bridge deck width of 44'-11 1/2". Deck thickness, including a 1" monolithic wearing surface, is 8 1/2". Elastomeric bearings are anticipated at the substructures.











......



\_\_\_\_\_

OUT / OUT DECK - 90'-0" - € CONSTRUCTION S.R. 823 7'-6" 71-5" 44' - 111/2" 0/0 DECK 44' - 111/2" 0/0 DECK 1'-6" 12'-0" SHOULDER 12' -0" 12'-0" TRAVEL LANE 6'-0" 12'-0" TRAVEL LANE 12'-0" SHOULDER 6'-0" 12' -0" PARAPET' SHOULDER TRAVEL LANE SHOULDER TRAVEL LANE PROFILE GRADE 81/2" REINFORCED PROFILE GRADE 9" SINGLE SLOPE DEFLECTOR -& CROWN -VARIES, IO1/2" MIN. CONCRETE DECK ⊢ € BEAM & CROWN PARAPET BRIDGE RAILING, (DECK + HAUNCH) --- INCLUDING I" (TYP.) SEE STD. DWG. SBR-1-99 (TYP.) MONOLITHIC \_0.016 0.040 0.040 0.016 WEARING SURFAC MODIFIED AASHTO TYPE 4 BEAM (60") (TYP.)-- MODIFIED ÄÄSHTO TYPE 4 BEAM (60") (TYP.)  $\langle 1 \rangle$ <u>3' - 5%</u> (TYP.) 4 SPACES e 9'-6" - 38'-0" 4 SPACES e 9'-6" - 38'-0" <u>3' - 5¥</u>" TYP SUBSTRUCTURE DIMENSIONS MEASURED ALONG & PIER 15'-6" 21'-0" 15' -6" 15' -6" 51-91 21'-0" 15' -6" 31' - 3" ± PIER 39' - 0" ± PIER ò 25' -0" 25'.-0" (TYP.) (TYP.) TYPICAL TRANSVERSE SECTION

Ο

0

Ο



SUPERSTRUCTU	IRE DEPTH
ITEM	60" MODIFIED AASHTO TYPE 4 BEAM
SLAB (INCLUDING WEARING SURFACE)	8.5″
HAUNCH (BOTTOM OF SLAB TO TOP OF FLANGE)	2*
GIRDER DEPTH	60*
TOP OF WEARING SURFACE TO BOTTOM OF GIRDER FLANGE (INCH)	70.5"
TOP OF WEARING SURFACE TO BOTTOM OF GIRDER FLANGE (FEET)	5.875'

٤

 $\square$ 

0

 $\left\{ \right\}$ 

 $\square$ 

ſ٦

0

Ο

 $\circ$ 



#### ABUTMENT SECTION

.

NOTES: I. WICK DRAINS EMBANKMENT FOR MORE DI

- 2. CONSTRUCTIO PILE FOUND BEHIND THE HEEL OF THU DISTANCE OI THE PIER AN GEOTECHNIC CONSOLIDAT CONSOLIDAT TO CONSTRUC AND BREAST SUPERSTRUC IMMEDIATEL AND ON A I GRANULAR M
- 3. ITEM 203 G COMPACT GR THE CONSTR STATIONS I

	DESIGN ACENCY BECH SVSTEMS SIG PRIME SUIT 210 SIG PRIME SUIT 210
B TC RENE FILLER WS	DESIGNED DRAWN REVIEWED DATE PJP CAS MSL 11/07/07 CHECKED REVISED STINCTURE TILE NUMBER MSL 7306342L, 7306350R
RFORATED C.P.P 55 (REAR ABUT.) 55 (FWD. ABUT.)	BUTMENT SECTION SCI-823-0229 L&R LOCUM AVENUE (T.R. 248)
NS AND SETTLEMENT MONITORING ARE REQUIRED FOR THE PROPOSED T CONSTRUCTION. SEE WICK DRAIN AND INSTRUMENTATION PLANS DETAILS. ION CONSTRAINTS: PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTING THE PROPOSED DATIONS, CONSTRUCT THE BRIDGE APPROACH EMBANKMENTS	TYPICAL ABU BRIDGE NO. 5 S.R. 823 OVER SLO
E ABUTMENT UP AT A 1:I SLOPE FROM THE BOTTOM OF THE HE FONTING TO SUBGRADE ELEVATION AND FOR A MINIMUM OF 250 FEET BEHIND THE ABUTMENTS. CONSTRUCTION OF AND ABUTMENT FOUNDATIONS CAN PROCEEDE AFTER THE CAL DESIGN COORDINATOR HAS DETERMINED THAT 99% TION HAS BEEN REACHED. THE ESTIMATED TIME TO 99% TION HAS BEEN REACHED. THE ESTIMATED TIME TO 99% TION DEPENDS UPON THE WICK DRAIN SPACING SELECTED UCT THE EMBANKMENT. AFTER THE ABUTMENT FOOTING TWALL ARE COMPLETED AND PRIOR TO SETTING CTURE MEMBERS, CONSTRUCT THE EMBANKMENT LY BEHIND THE ABUTMENT UP TO THE BEAM SEAT ELEVATION 1:I SLOPE UP TO THE SUBGRADE ELEVATION, WITH TYPE B	SC1-823-0.00 PID 77366
MATERIAL CONFORMING TO 703.16.C. GRANULAR MATERIAL, TYPE B, AS PER PLAN; PLACE AND RANULAR EMBANKMENT MATERIAL IN 6 INCH LIFTS FOR RUCTION OF THE APPROACH EMBANKMENT BETWEEN 119+30 TO 125+25.	5/7 <u>832</u> 847



Ο

0

Ο

Ο



		DESIGNED	DRAWN R	REVIEWED DATE	DESIGN AGENCT
20.00 201-823-0.00	FRU. ADVINCAL MAC NALL DLIAILA	CAS	CAS	10/10/11 TSN	Tessin Custome
7	BRIDGE NO. SCI-823-0229 L&R	CHECKED	REVISED	REVISED STRUCTURE FILE KUMBER	
	SR823 OVER SLOCUM AVENUE (TR248)	ЪР		7306342L, 7306350R	5747 PERIMETER ONIVE, SUITE 240 DERLIN, ONDO 4307



						00 - PORTSMOU						
					S.R. 82	3 over Slocum Ave	/enue L&R					
				Chec	By: PJP cked: MSL	TRUCTURE TYPE ST	TUDY Date: Date:					· .
Π								. 31512000				
∐ A!	LTERNA	ATIVE COST SUMMARY										
	Alternative No.	Span Arrangement No. Spans Lengths	Total Span Length (ft.)	Framing Alternative	Proposed Stringer Section	Subtotal Superstructure Cost	Subtotal Substructure Cost	Structure Incidental Cost (16%)	Structure Contingency Cost (20%)	Total Alternative Const. Cost	Life Cycle Maintenance Cost	Total Relative Ownership Cost
	1	3 106.33'-106.33'-106.33'	323.83	5 Prestressed Concrete Girders /per BRIDGE	Modified AASHTO Type 4 (60")	\$2,132,000	\$2,127,000	\$681,400	\$0	\$4,940,000	\$0	\$4,940,000
	NOTE 1. Structu structu	TES: cture incidental cost allowance includes pr tural steel painting, bearings, and crushed	provision for struct 1ed aggregate slop	ture excavation, porous backfill, se	ealing of concrete surfaces,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			· · · · ·	<u> </u>		v
		nated construction cost does not include e			quantified seperately, if required.		, . ,					
										3 		
		· · ·							· · · ·			
								· .				
	:	·	··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		· ····································	-					,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
						· · · · ·					۰ ۰	
		·				- -						
										ъ.		
										• ••		
						Cost Summary						1A
			· .									

			-		STRUCTURE		-823-0.00 - P S.R. 823 over RESTRESSED CO	Slocum Ave	nue I &R	S TIVE 1 - SUPERST	RUCTURE	
					By: PJP ed: MSL		2014-0-012-0012-0012-0002-0002-0002-0002	Da	te: 10/5/2006 te: 9/5/2006		KUUTUKE	
SUPE	RSTRUCTURE											
Alternati No.	ve Span Arrangement No. Spans Lengths	Total Span Length (ft.)	Deck Length (ft.)	Deck Volume (cu. yd.)	Deck Concrete Cost	Deck Reinforcing Cost	Approach Slab Cost	Approach Roadway Cost		ming native	Propo Girder S	
1	3 106.33'-106.33'-106.33'	323.83	326	1261	\$689,600	\$319,800	\$117,600	\$0	5 Prestress Girders /p	ed Concrete er BRIDGE		ITO Type 4 (60")
							COST SUPP	ORT CALCUL	TIONS			
Parapets: Slab: No	No. Area (sq. ft.)   Parapets 1 4.26   Parapets 1 4.77   Left Bridge 0.71 44.96   Right Bridge 0.71 44.96   ote: Deck width is out to out 10% of deck area allowed for haunches a   Concrete, Class QSC2 st (\$/cu. yd):   Year Annual 2005   Escalation	Year <u>2007</u>	Haunch & Overhang Area 3.2 3.2	Total Concrete Area (sg. ft.) 44.1 44.1		Prestressed Co Unit Costs: AASHTO Type IV Pier Diaphragms Abutment Diaphra Intermediate Diap Modified Type 4 I-	Beams gms hragms Beams (60") omplexity Factor	Year 2005 \$1,800 ea. \$1,200 ea. \$905 ea. \$250 per f		Year 2007 \$1,980 ea. \$1,320 ea. \$1,000 ea. \$280 ea.	No. Required 20 0 72 3190	\$39,600 \$0 \$72,000 \$893,172 \$1,004,772
Parapets Weighted Based on of total co Epoxy C Unit Cos	\$385.00 5.0% Average = parapet and slab percentages ncrete area oated Reinforcing Steel <u>st (\$/Ib):</u> 285 lbs of reinforcing steel per cubic yard of de Year Annual 2005 Escalation	\$579.00 \$424.00 \$547.00 \$ck concrete Year 2007 \$0.89				Unit Cost (\$/sq. Length = 30 Area = 60 Approach Slabs Approach Road See Rdwy, for Wic Embankment fill	) ft. 0 sq.yd. Year <u>2005</u> \$178.00 <b>way</b>	Width = 90 Annual Escalation 5.0% Year 2005	ft Year <u>2007</u> \$196.00 Annual <u>Escalation</u> 5.0%	Expansion Join Unit Costs (\$/Li Strip Seal Expans Year 2007 \$4.41	<u>n.Ft.):</u>	Cost Ratio 1.00
						Wick Drains Roadway incl. bas Barrier (single face Barrier (dble faced	0.00 ft. e 0.00 sq.yd. ed) 0 ft.	\$1.00	5.0% 5.0% 5.0% 5.0%	\$1.10 \$28.67 \$55.13 \$88.20		

Superstructure (Concrete Alt 1)

0") \$1,004,772 \$2,132,000 Year Annual Year 2005 Escalation 2007 \$250 5.0% \$352

Prestressed

Concrete Cost Subtotal Superstructure Cost

## SCI-823-0.00 - PORTSMOUTH BYPASS

					S STRUCTURE TYPE STUDY - PRE		Slocum Avenue		- SUBSTRUCT	TURE				
-1					By: PJP cked: MSL			Date	te: 10/5/2006 te: 9/5/2006				с.	
SUBSTRUC	JTURE	×										* s.		
Alternative No.	Span Ar No. Spans	Arrangement s Lengths	Fram Alterna		Proposed Stringer Section	Pier Concrete Cost	Pier Reinforcing Cost	Abutment Concrete Cost	Abutment Reinforcing Cost	Pile Foundation Cost	MSE Wall Cost	Additional Crane Cost	Earthwork Cost	Subtotal Substructur Cost
1	3 10	106.33'-106.33'-106.33'	5 Prestressed Cc /per BR		Modified AASHTO Type 4 (60")	\$516,000	\$102,400	\$195,800	\$33,900	\$876,400	\$327,200	\$75,000	\$0	\$2,127,000
						COST SUPPC	ORT CALCULATION	NS						
er QC/QA Cr		QSC1 Cost: (Spread	<u>d Footing)</u>				<u>Pile Foundatio</u>	on Unit Cost (\$/ft.):	HF	IP 14X73 Piles, Furnish	hed & Driven			
<u>mponent</u> p	Volume ( <u>cu. yd.)</u> 316	Year <u>2005</u> \$575.00	Annual <u>Escalation</u> 5.0%	Year <u>2007</u> \$634.00	Total <u>Cost</u> \$200,340			Number of Piles			Total Pile <u>Length</u>			
m otings al	382 222 920	\$575.00 \$300.00	5.0% 5.0%	\$634.00 \$331.00	\$242,190 <u>\$73,480</u> \$516,000			228	SEE QUANTITY	Y CALCULATIONS	22,020			
					\$510,000		Pile Foundatio	on Unit Cost (\$/ft.):	Year 2005 <u>Unit Cost</u>	Annual <u>Escalation</u>	Year <u>2007</u>			
r QC/QA Cr		<u> QSC1 Cost: (Drilled</u>	<u>/ Shaft)</u>					Furnished	\$26.47	<u>5.0%</u>	\$29.20			
	Volume	Year	Annual	Year	Total			Driven	\$9.62	5.0%				
ip	<u>(cu. yd.)</u> 0	<u>2005</u> \$575.00	Escalation 5.0%	<u>2007</u> \$634.00	<u>Cost</u> \$0		Sheff Founda	Total			\$10.60 \$39.80			
lumns	0	\$575.00	5.0%	\$634.00	\$0 \$0		Snan Foundau	tion Unit Cost (\$/ft.):	30	6" Drilled Shaft				
otings otal outment QC/	0 C/QA Concrete, 0	\$300.00 Class QSC1 Cost:	5.0%	\$331.00	\$0 \$0			Number of Shafts				Total Shaft <u>Length</u>		
							Alt. 1	0	SEE QUANTIT	Y CALCULATIONS		0		
omponent	Volume (cu. yd.)	Year <u>2005</u>	Annual Escalation	Year <u>2007</u>	Total									
utment	423	\$420.00	5.0%	<u>2007</u> \$463.00	<u>Cost</u> \$195,800		Unit Cost	tion Unit Cost (\$/ft.): Escalation	<u>:</u> 2008		Temporary Sh Unit Costs (\$/	Shoring and Suppe \$/sq. ft.):	<u>oort</u>	
	Note: Inc	cludes wingwalls.					\$125.00	5.0%	\$152.00			Temp. Shoring	Temp. Girder	
cavation ar	nd Embankmen						Cost of Shafts:	\$ -				<u>Area (sq. ft.)</u>	Support (lump sum)	
		Year	Annual	Year	Total				ATTACK		Alt, 1	0	\$-	
omponent	Quantity	2005	Escalation	2007	Cost \$0	Allenter								
mbankment ock Excavation	0 in 0	\$2.00 \$6.00	5.0% 5.0%	\$2.00 \$7.00	\$0 \$0							Year 2004	Annual	Year
ick Drains	0	\$1.00	5.0%	\$1.00	\$0 \$0						Temporary	Unit Cost	Escalation	2008
ote: Embankr	hent and Wick Dr	Drains Included in Rdwy.	Costs		MSE Abutment Unit Cost (\$/sq.	<b>4</b> .).					Shoring	\$22.50	5.0%	\$27.3
poxy Coater	d Reinforcing St	iteel			Total Area	<u>а. п.):</u> Year 2005	Annual	Year			Cofferdam	\$32.00	5.0%	\$38.9
nit Cost (\$/lb					<u>(sq. ft.)</u>	Unit Cost	Escalation	<u>2008</u>			GUICIGain	<b>\$</b> 52,00	5.0%	<b>\$</b> 30.9
		eel per cubic yard of pier el per cubic yard of abutr			Alt. 1 4,040	\$70.00								
usumo oc					Alt. 1 4;040	\$70.00	5.0%	\$81.00		Additional Crar	<u>he Cost</u>			
	Year <u>2005</u>	Annual Escalation	Year 2007							\$ 75,000				
Pier Abutment	\$0.81 \$0.81	5.0% 5.0%	\$0.89 \$0.89							A HILL BE AND A				

Substructure (Concrete Alt 1)

ЗA

# SCI-823-0.00 - PORTSMOUTH BYPASS S.R. 823 over Slocum Avenue L&R STRUCTURE TYPE STUDY - PRESTRESSED CONCRETE GIRDER ALTERNATIVE 1 - QUANTITY CALCULATIONS

By: PJP Checked: MSL

Date: Date: 10/5/2006 9/5/2006

Location	Load/girder (Kips)	# Girders	Total Girder Load	Subst Wt (kips)	Pile Cap.(Kips	No. Piles	Increase Factor	Total Piles	Top Elev.	Bot Elev.	Pile Length	Total Pile Length
Rear Abut.	0	0	0	0	140		1	21	603.6	474.0	120.0	(Feet)
Pier 1	0	0	0	0	140			36			130.0	2730
Pier 2	0	0	0	0	140				560.6		85.0	
Pier 3	0	0	0	0			1	36	549.5	476.5	. 75.0	2700
Pier 4	0	0	0	0	140		1	0	0	0	0.0	The state of the Court
Pier 5	0	0	0	0	140	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Contraction of the second of
	0	0	0	0	140	- 0	1	0	0	0	0.0	Contraction of the second s
Pier 6	0	0	0	0	140	0	1	0	0	0		0
Pier 7	0	0	0	0	140			Ave.	0	0	0.0	C
Fwd. Abut.	0	0	0	0	140	and the second se		0	0	0.0	0.0	0
TotaL			0	0	140	0	1	21	593.55	476.4	120.0	2520
		1						114			12	11010
							Qty x 2 (L/R)	228				22020

Pier Location	Length	1.1.11		ap				Ste					Footing		
		Width	Depth	Area	Volume	Width	Height	Lengt	h	Volume	Width	Denth	Length	11/2/	Total Volume
Pier 1 (Piles)	52.00	5	8.21	41.05	2135	3.5		21.00		2007				Volume	1
Pier 2 (Piles)	52.00	5	8.21	41.05						2297	15		25.00	1500	593
Pier 3			0.21	41.00	2135	3.5	39	21.00	X	2867	15	4	25.00	1500	650
Pier 4															
Pier 5															
Pier 6															
Pier 7					NCT	_									
Total (Cu.Ft.)	1				4269			_	- 1						(
Total (Cu.Yd.)					158		-	-		5163				3000	1243
			Qty x 2 (	/P)	316				ŝ.	191				111	460
				Lity	316					382				222	920

Pier Quantities

Abut Location	Length			kwall				Beam Sea	nt	A CONTRACTOR OF THE OWNER	A NUMBER OF STREET	Footin	na	A CARLES OF A COMPANY	an star start and the
Deer Alex		Width	Depth	Area	Volume	Width	Height	Area	Volume	Width	Denth		-	Volume	Total Volume
Rear Abut	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0	0.00	0	0	Deptin	Alca	#1000	volume	
Fwd. Abut	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	0	0			0	0	(	1	0	
Total (Cu.Ft.)				0.00	0	0		0.00	0	0	0	(	) 1	0	
Total (Cu.Yd.)				2/	0				0					0	
2			Qty x 2 (	1 /R)	0			1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	0					0	
					U				0					0	4:

Abut Location		W	all	
- ar Looddon	Height	Length	Area	Volume
Rear Abut	0		0.0	-
RA Wing (L)	-		0.0	
RA Wing (R)			0.0	
Fwd Abut	0	0	0.0	
FA Wing (L)			0.0	
FA Wing (R)			0.0	4
Total (Sq.Ft.)			4040	

Location	Load/girder (Kips)	# Girders	Total Load	Subst Wt (kips)	Pile		fts for Piers	Total Shafts	Top Elev.	Bot Elev.	Pile Length	Total Shaft Length
Rear Abut.	0	0	0		0	0		Onarta				(Feet)
Pier 1	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	
Pier 2	0		0	0	0	0	1	. 0	0	0	0.0	0
Pier 3	0		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	and the second of the second second
Pier 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL
Pier 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	ō	0	0	and the second se	and the second se
Pier 6	0	0	0	0	0	0			0	0	0.0	Category and the strength in the product from an all of the
Pier 7	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0.0	• • 0
Fruid Allert			0	0	0	0	1	<b>0</b>	0	0	0.0	0
Fwd. Abut.	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.0	
Total	6						1	0			0.0	0

Superstructure P/S Concrete Quantities				CARE OF THE	Spacing				
Location	Type of girder	# Girders	Span Length (ft.)	Total Length (ft.)	Int. diaphragm		Number of Int Diap. 1 location	Total N Span	lo. in
Span 1	MOD TYPE 4 60	10	106.3	1063		100		3	24
Span 2		10	106.3	1063	26.58			3	24
Span 3	4	10	106.3	1063				2	24
Span 4		0	0.0	0	0.00			3	24
Span 5		0	0.0	0	0.00				0
Span 6		0	0.0	0	0.00				0
Span 7		0	0.0	0	0.00				0
Span 8		0	0.0	0	0.00				0
Span 9		0	0.0	0	Total				70
Total	MOD TYPE 4 60		0.0	3190					72

4A