Appendix B

Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport Service Plaza Site Assessment (Draft)



Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport

Service Plaza Site Assessment

DRAFT

July 30, 2015







MAA-AE-14-002 TASK 019

Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport Service Plaza Site Assessment Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.		
1. SERVICE PLAZA SITE ASSESSMENT	1		
1.1. Option 1 – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot			
1.1.1. Option 1A – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot to SS-1	5		
1.1.2. Option 1B – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot and Kit	TEN BRANCH5		
1.2. Option 2 – Under Amtrak Rail with Gravity along Old Stoney Rui	N ROAD TO ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY MANHOLE		
9515 (SS-8)			
1.2.1. Option 2A – To Anne Arundel County Manhole 9514 (SS-6)			
1.2.2. Option 2B – To Anne Arundel County Manhole 9513 (SS-7)			
1.3. Option 3 – Aviation Boulevard			
1.4. Option 4 – Amtrak Way			
1.5. Estimated Program Costs			
1.6. Facility Evaluation			
1.6.1. EVALUATION OF COMPATIBILITY WITH CURRENT AIRPORT LAYOUT PLAN	I (ALP)		
1.6.2. GENERAL SITE LOCATION			
1.6.3. UTILITY ACCESS			
1.6.4. SITE LAYOUT			
APPENDIX A – SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION			
APPENDIX B – COST ESTIMATES	21		
LIST OF EXHIBITS			
Exhibit 1: Existing Conditions	2		
Exhibit 2: All Options			
Exhibit 3: Option 1	4		
Exhibit 4: Option 1A			
Exhibit 5: Option 1B	7		
Exhibit 6: Option 2			
Exhibit 7: Option 2A			
Exhibit 8: Option 2B			
Exhibit 9: Option 3			
Exhibit 10: Option 4	15		
LIST OF TABLES			
Table 1: Estimated Program Costs			
LIST OF FIGURES			
Figure 1: Current Location on ALP			
Figure 2: Proposed MTA Yellow Line Extension			



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to analyze requirements to provide site utilities to the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) owned parcel (P46) and determine if the site was suitable for commercial development. As part of this study, it was determined that water, power, and telecommunications were all in close proximity to the site, but sanitary sewer service may be more complicated. Several alignments for the sanitary sewer were developed and evaluated. The least expensive option (with the assumptions used in the study) for the sewer would have to traverse Amtrak Right of Way, which could be challenging. Another option along Amtrak Way, similar in cost, appears to be the most feasible option. Based on the analysis performed on the site and its proximity to the other site utilities, it was determined the site is suitable for commercial development.



1. Service Plaza Site Assessment

The Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) requested that an analysis be performed for a potential service facility at Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI Marshall). The study parcel is identified as P-46 on the January 2015, Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and is currently used by MAA as a contractor staging area. Analysis included evaluation of the existing utilities and a facility evaluation for the proposed service station site located adjacent to the Northrop Grumman facilities on Aviation Boulevard (MD. 170). Specifically, the existing sanitary sewer utility was evaluated to determine a feasible connection for the site. Information presented in the study was populated from MAA legacy files, Anne Arundel County Geographic Information System (GIS) database, MAA AirPortal Database, design team files, and visual site inspection (See Appendix A). An official field survey was not conducted as part of this evaluation. Exhibit 1 illustrates the compiled existing conditions. There are a total of four alignment options that were evaluated. Options 1 and 2 have a few sub-options but all alignment options (See Exhibit 2) can be described as follows:

- Option 1 Northrop Grumman (NG) Alignment
- Option 2 Amtrak Rail and Stoney Run Road Alignment
- Option 3 Aviation Boulevard Alignment
- Option 4 Amtrak Way Alignment

The options listed above, as well as the sub-options, are discussed in additional detail in the following sections.

1.1. Option 1 – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot

Option 1 includes minimum pavement removal and is shown in Exhibit 3. This option traverses through the Northrop Grumman (NG) property from the northernmost corner of the site and connects to the existing sanitary sewer manhole SS-1. SS-1 appears to be the service connection (12-inch line) for the existing NG facility, but no documentation was found to validate this assumption. This would be proposed as a gravity line but would not be cost effective due to the hill that is located adjacent to the parking lot. A pump station and force main to move effluent up the hill seems to be a possibility but would add additional cost. From that point, gravity would be employed to minimize pump size and maintenance requirements. Further evaluation of projected flows would be necessary to determine size, cost, and ultimately feasibility of a pump station. Also, force mains usually involve more annual maintenance than traditional gravity lines. This option currently depicts a new manhole for tie-in which may require a pump around to make the connection.

Challenges with Option 1 include:

- Traversing property not currently owned by MAA
- Depth of gravity only alignment
- Force main maintenance costs



MATCHLINE - SEE THIS SHEET SS-9 AMTRAK STATION ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY SEWER -SS-7 SS-8 -SS-3 PARKING AMTRAKRAIL KITTEN BRANCH SS-6 PARKING OVER HEAD SS-2 ELECTRIC LINES SS-OVER PASS SS-1-WALKWAY SS-5 SERVICE PLAZA SITE AREA AVIATION BOULEVARD WC TO PUC MD. 170 ASSUMED TO SERVICE AND CROSS TO NORTHROP GRUMMAN COMPLEX UNDERGROUND TUNNEL LIGHT SEE NOTE + POLE (TYP.) NORTHROP GRUMMAN LEGEND: SERVICE WATER NATURAL GAS AIRPORT PROPERTY LINE PLAZA SITE STORM WATER ELECTRICAL HIKER/BIKER TRAIL SANITARY SEWER COMMUNICATION STREAM NOTE: TUNNEL LOCATION/ELEVATION AND UTILITIES ARE NOT FIELD VERIFIED. VERIFICATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE DESIGNERS SCOPE OF WORK. PROJECT TITLE: DESIGNED: N.D.C. MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES





MARYLAND AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENGINEERING OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

SHEET TITLE:

SCALE:



EXISTING UTILITY PLAN

1" = 300'

DATE:

JULY 2016

CONTRACT NO .:

SHEET NO .:

EX-1



0	BJECT ID	STRUCTURE	RIM ELV.	INVERT	CONTRACT ID	DESCRIPTION	OBJECT ID	STRUCTURE	RIM ELV.	INVERT	CONTRACT ID	DESCRIPTION
	SS-1	-	-	-	SAA-CO-86-005	NORTHROP GRUMMAN SEWER MANHOLE	SS-6	AAC 9514	62.00	50.94 150.96	86-5-6-018	AAC-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
	SS-2	401-54-SSM-005	79.65	70.48	MAA-CO-13-016	MAA-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE	SS-7	AAC 9513	58.00	49.20 I 49.22	86-5-1-018	AAC-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
	SS-3	401-54-SSM-006	78.33	70.16	-	MAA-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE	SS-8	AAC 9515	64.00	51.27 / 51.51	86-5-6-018	AAC-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
	SS-4	401-54-SSM-004	80.17	-	-	MAA-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE	SS-9	AAC 33554	60.80	50.06 / 50.16	0819-014-0	AAC-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE
	SS-5	401-54-SSM-001	82.47	72.42 73.0	MAA-CO-10-001	MAA-SANITARY SEWER MANHOLE						

A <u>=</u> COM	
ADCI	

DESIGNED: N.D.C.			
DRAWN: R.E.Z.			
CHECKED: K.M.F.			
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION NO.:	REVISION DATE:	DESCRIPTION:



MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MARYLAND AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENGINEERING OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

PROJECT TITLE: SHEET TITLE:



MATCHLINE - SEE THIS SHEET

OPTION NUMBER	EXHIBIT NUMBER
1	3
1A	4
1B	5
2	6
2A	7
2B	8
3	9
4	10

LEGEND:	
	EXIST SANITARY SEWER
	PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER
	STREAM
	SERVICE PLAZA SITE

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES

SANITARY SEWER OPTIONS

1" = 300'

JULY 2016

CONTRACT NO .:

SHEET NO .:

EX-2



LEGEND:

PROFILE NOTES:

- EXIST SANITARY SEWER
 1) ALL N

 PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER
 2) MININ ASSU

 WATER
 3) UTILIT AIRPO

 STORM WATER
 AIRPO

 NATURAL GAS
 COUN

 ELECTRICAL
 COUN

 STREAM
 SERVICE PLAZA SITE
 - ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY
 MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
 HITH ITIES ARE ESTIMATED PASED ON
 - 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION



BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Thurg out Marshall



DESIGNED. N.D.C.			
DRAWN: R.E.Z.			
CHECKED: K.M.F.			
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION NO.:	REVISION DATE:	DESCRIPTION:

"	=	300'

SCALE:

160

SANITARY SEWER -OPTION 1 PLAN AND PROFILE

SHEET NO .:

EX-3

|--|

CONTRACT NO .:

)	150
						140
						130
					,	120
						110
	- N	EW I F IN	MAN	HOL =XIS	E T	100
	S	EWE	R P	PE	•	90
						80
RC	OPC	SEL) INV	′. = 7	8.78	70
						60
)				30-	+00	
P/	٩R	KIN	G			

1.1.1. Option 1A – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot to SS-1

Option 1A is shown in Exhibit 4. As an adjustment to Option 1, Option 1A would traverse from the northernmost corner of the site adjacent to the parking lot, tying into existing sewer manhole SS-1. It would be a proposed 8-inch gravity line and would minimize pavement reconstruction as it is aligned with the least amount of parking lot. Similar to Option 1, a force main adjustment would be warranted in the area that traverses through the hill. A pump station would be required for this portion of the alignment (approximately 500 feet).

Challenges for Option 1A include:

- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Depth of installation for gravity only option
- The age/condition of the line between SS-1 and SS-2 as it is believed to be the old clay pipe (incorrectly shown as PVC on AirPortal) and possibly in poor shape.
- Potential and likely conflict with the underground pedestrian tunnel (depth unknown)

1.1.2. Option 1B – Through Northrop Grumman Parking Lot and Kitten Branch

Option 1B is shown in Exhibit 5. This alignment would be similar to Option 1 with the exception to the connection to SS-2, which is an MAA sanitary sewer manhole identified in MAA-CO-13-016. It would be a proposed 8-inch sanitary line. This alignment would require crossing/disturbing the Kitten Branch (Waters of the U.S.) and may require additional work such as a casing to protect the alignment. As a result of the alignment, construction would occur within the Kitten Branch footprint and additional environmental permitting would be required, and would probably render the alignment significantly higher in cost. Further evaluation would be required to determine the feasibility of a 3-inch force main to clear the portion within higher existing elevations. Connecting into the SS-2 location avoids the section of pipe suspected to be in poor shape.

Challenges for Option 1B include:

- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Traversing and permitting Kitten Branch work





LEGEND:

<i>——— EXIST SANITARY SEWER</i>
PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER
WATER
STORM WATER
NATURAL GAS
ELECTRICAL
COMMUNICATION
— STREAM
SERVICE PLAZA SITE

PROFILE NOTES:

- 1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY
- 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
- 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION



	DESIGNED: N.D.C.				MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	PROJECT TITLE:
	DRAWN: R.E.Z.					
	CHECKED: K.M.F.			BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON	OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	SHEET HILE.
DCI	APPROVED: C.A.J.		DESCRIPTION:	A I R P O R T	BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	SCALE:



LEGEND:

PROFILE NOTES	3:
----------------------	----

- 1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY
- 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
- 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION



DESIGNED: N.D.C.			_		MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DRAWN: R.E.Z.			_		
CHECKED: K.M.F.				BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON	OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION	DESCRIPTION:	-	A I R P O R T	BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER WATER STORM WATER NATURAL GAS ELECTRICAL COMMUNICATION STREAM SERVICE PLAZA SITE

SEWER

EXIST SANITARY

A<u>=</u>(

DESIGNED:	N.D.C.			
DRAWN:	R.E.Z.			
CHECKED:	K.M.F.			
APPROVED:	C.A.J.	REVISION NO.:	REVISION DATE:	DESCRIPTION:

SCALE:

JULY 2016

DATE:

SHEET NO .:

EX-5

1.2. Option 2 – Under Amtrak Rail with Gravity along Old Stoney Run Road to Anne Arundel County Manhole 9515 (SS-8)

Option 2 is shown in Exhibit 6. This alignment extends from the southwestern corner of the site along existing driveway and Old Stoney Run Road to Anne Arundel County (AAC) sanitary sewer manhole SS-8. It requires crossing under the existing Amtrak rail via jack and bore/casing, which was included in the cost estimate. As this alignment is in the western direction, it removes the risk of the anticipated pipe condition at SS-1 and the permitting associated with the NG property and Kitten Branch coordination. Implementation of the alignment may include installation of a utility corridor crossing under Amtrak and Stony Run. The location within the Old Stoney Run Road alignment allows for construction access which improves the construction costs associated with the work.

Challenges for Option 2 include:

- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Crossing under Amtrak line, although it appears there is sufficient work area available to accomplish this and has been done recently (within 20 years)
- Several utilities to cross under including gas, water, and stormwater
- Requires crossing Stony Run potentially through an existing culvert

1.2.1. Option 2A – To Anne Arundel County Manhole 9514 (SS-6)

Option 2A is shown in Exhibit 7. This is a similar alignment to Option 2 but will be located further north and it ties into manhole SS-6. Based on a review of as-built documents, there is less utility congestion and a slightly shorter alignment. This alignment would require construction within a wetland which is of special state concern. Similar to Option 2, crossing of Amtrak is required with jack and bore, and Stony Run.

Challenges for Option 2A include:

- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Crossing Amtrak (permitting and construction)
- Access to the work area since area is located in more wooded terrain than Option 2
- Crossing and permitting work in wetland of special state concern





LEGEND:



PROFILE NOTES:

1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY

2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%

3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION





DESIGNED: N.D.C.				
DRAWN: R.E.Z.				
CHECKED: K.M.F.				
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION F	REVISION DATE:	DESCRIPTION:	



BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT SCALE:

"	=	300'
	-	300

SANITARY SEWER -OPTION 2 PLAN AND PROFILE

SHEET NO .:

EX-6

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES

CONTRACT NO .:



LEGEND:



PROFILE NOTES:

1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY

- 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
- 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION



DESIGNED: N.D.C.				
				BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON
CHECKED: K.M.F.				INTERNATIONAL
				Thursond Marshall
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION NO.:	REVISION DATE:	DESCRIPTION:	AIRPORT

MARYLAND AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENGINEERING OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

SHEET TITLE:

SCALE:

"	=	300'

SHEET NO .:

EX-7

OPTION 2A PLAN AND PROFILE DATE:

SANITARY SEWER -

1.2.2. Option 2B – To Anne Arundel County Manhole 9513 (SS-7)

Option 2B is shown in Exhibit 8. This final option is similar to Options 2 and 2A with the exception of it being much further north with a slightly shorter alignment that connects in with SS-7. The terrain issues are similar to Option 1B.

Challenges for Option 2B include:

- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Crossing Amtrak (permitting and construction)
- Access to the work area since area is located in more wooded terrain than Option 2
- Crossing and permitting work in wetland of special state concern.

1.3. Option 3 – Aviation Boulevard

Option 3 is shown in Exhibit 9. This alignment will follow Aviation Boulevard (Route 170) and connect to existing SS-1. It would be located within the Right of Way (ROW) of Aviation Boulevard and would likely require State Highway Administration (SHA) approval. As compared to the other alignments previously described, it is likely that this approval would be obtained in a shorter timeframe than NG, Maryland Department of Environment, or Amtrak based on previous experience.

Challenges for Option 3 include:

- SHA ROW access (construction and permitting)
- Large amount of pavement reconstruction
- Potentially more significant MOT required during construction
- The age/condition of the line between SS-1 and SS-2 as it is believed to be the old clay pipe (incorrectly shown as PVC on AirPortal) and possibly in poor shape
- Potential and likely conflict with the underground pedestrian tunnel (depth unknown)





LEGEND:



PROFILE NOTES:

- 1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY
- 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
- 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY GIS INFORMATION



DESIGNED: N.D.C.			MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	PROJECT TITLE:
DRAWN: R.E.Z.				SHEET TITLE:
CHECKED: K.M.F.		BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON	OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES	
APPROVED: C.A.J.	REVISION REVISION	ALRPORT	BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT	SCALE:

		1	No.
— <i>SS-3</i>			- (
			1
— <i>SS-4</i>			
Lo			
MD	170		

SER	/ICE PLAZA UTILITIES	

CONTRACT NO .:

SANITARY SEWER -OPTION 2B PLAN AND PROFILE

DATE:

1" = 300'

JULY 2016

SHEET NO .:

EX-8



LEGEND:

	EXIST SANITARY SEWER
	PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER
	WATER
	STORM WATER
	NATURAL GAS
	ELECTRICAL
	COMMUNICATION
<u> </u>	STREAM
	SERVICE PLAZA SITE

PROFILE NOTES:

- 1) ALL MANHOLES NOT SHOWN FOR CLARITY
- 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER ASSUMED AT 0.4%
- 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED **BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND** ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY **GIS INFORMATION**





MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MARYLAND AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENGINEERING OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON

INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

SHEET TITLE:



"	=	300'	

140

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES SANITARY SEWER -OPTION 3 PLAN AND PROFILE

DATE:

CONTRACT NO .:

EX-9

			130
			120
			110
			100
SS-1			90
			80
			70
POSED	INV	= 77.3	2 ₆₀
			50
	1		40
		30+00)

1.4. Option 4 – Amtrak Way

Option 4 is shown in Exhibit 10. The final alignment includes a pipe installation along Amtrak Way that would leave the site from the northernmost corner and connect to existing manhole SS-9. Similar to Option 3, it is located within the ROW for Amtrak Way and would require SHA coordination. As a comparison, this is probably the fastest schedule implemented option with regards to approvals. The terrain allows for the pipe installation as a gravity line that could be relatively shallow. A potential for the alignment to be in grass areas only also exists. However, this alignment has the longest length of pipe installation. As this alignment is to the north, it eliminates all crossings of Amtrak rail, NG property, and floodplains.

Challenges of this option include:

- SHA ROW (assumed)
- Length of run
- Not currently MAA property (land/easement acquisition)
- Potentially more significant MOT for traffic along Amtrak Way



PROFILE NOTES: 140 LEGEND: EXIST SANITARY 1) ALL MANHOLES NOT 130 MAA PROPERTY LIMIT SEWER SHOWN FOR CLARITY PROPOSED SANITARY SEWER 2) MINIMUM SLOPE OF SEWER 120 ASSUMED AT 0.4% 110 - 11' MAX WATER STORM WATER 3) UTILITIES ARE ESTIMATED 100 **BASED ON AIRPORTAL AND** NATURAL GAS 90 ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY ELECTRICAL **GIS INFORMATION** 80 COMMUNICATION STREAM -STORMWATER -STORMWATER 70 SERVICE PLAZA SITE 60 NEW 50 MANHOLE 40 25+00 20+00 10+00 15+00 **OPTION 4 - THROUGH AMTRAK WAY** PROJECT TITLE: DESIGNED: N.D.C. AECOM MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MARYLAND AVIATION ADMINISTRATION DRAWN: R.E.Z. SHEET TITLE: FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENGINEERING OFFICE OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES CHECKED: K.M.F. INTERNATIONAL **ADC** Thurgood Marshall BALTIMORE/WASHINGTON SCALE: APPROVED: C.A.J. INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT REVISION REVISION NO.: DATE: DESCRIPTION:



1.5. Estimated Program Costs

As part of this study, cost estimates were developed for the most viable options. A summary is shown below in Table 1. Full cost estimates are provided in Appendix B.

OPTION	ESTIMATED COST
Option 1 (NG Combination)	\$793,200
Option 1 (NG Gravity)	\$1,318,000
Option 2 (Amtrak Rail Gravity)	\$536,200
Option 3 (Aviation Blvd Gravity)	\$744,200
Option 4 (Amtrak Way Gravity)	\$682,400

Table 1: Estimated Program Costs

As Option 2 has the lowest cost, its challenges will be associated with the access, easement agreements, schedule, and approvals required to construct below the Amtrak rail facility. It is believed that Amtrak will permit the construction, but the process is tedious and they have very specific requirements that were attempted to be captured in the construction cost estimate.

Options 1, 2, and, 3 all fall within the same range and are seemingly viable options with their own advantages/disadvantages. Options 1 and 3 will likely involve the replacement of the original vitrified clay line between SS-1 and SS-2 (this was included in the cost estimate as it hasn't been verified). The cost of maintenance is also a consideration as force main can have additional costs with pumps, cleanouts, blow-offs, operation, etc. The decision on option could be influenced by the most likely stakeholder to coordinate acceptance and approval.

Option 4, while slightly more expensive, appears to be the cleanest option. The obstacles associated with this alignment seem to be less challenging and the construction seems to involve the least amount of risk.

1.6. Facility Evaluation

Included in this study was a site evaluation on the facility itself, some of the preliminary elements identified are described in the following sections.

1.6.1. Evaluation of Compatibility with Current Airport Layout Plan (ALP)

There are no apparent, immediate impacts with the current ALP as the site (P46 in below image) is located at the midpoint between the approach ends of Runway 15R and Runway 10.





Figure 1: Current Location on ALP

Source, January 2015 ALP, Sheet 3

As far as the ultimate ALP build out, the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) light rail is depicted to be relocated through portion of the site and ultimately connect to the future people mover system at the Amtrak station. While all of the options would still work with the proposed light rail Yellow Line Extension T, Options 1 and 3 would provide the most flexibility with the alignment as those alignments don't cross the planned light rail route.



Baltimore/Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport Service Plaza Site Assessment



Figure 2: Proposed MTA Yellow Line Extension

Source, January 2015 ALP, Sheet 3

The location is outside all current Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) areas under study at BWI Marshall and the proposed use would not be precluded by any FAA criteria. There doesn't appear to be any concerns/conflicts with ALP or airspace with the proposed development over the next 20 years.

1.6.2. General Site Location

Site location would seem to be attractive for development as it is already a paved and graded site, so permitting challenges should not be too intense. The site is located at a signaled intersection with a good deal of traffic from NG and Amtrak. The west side is bound by the airport hiker/biker trail. The employee lot for NG is adjacent and the elevated walkway from the NG facility would provide fairly easy and convenient access for the employees to be able to walk to patronize the businesses.



Vehicular access could potentially come straight in from Aviation Boulevard, Amtrak way or Old Stoney Run Road. The current access is from Old Stoney Run Road and Amtrak Way. The Stoney Run entrance could be built up as it is essentially an access road for Amtrak at this time. This entrance could provide for some additional vehicle queueing and line of sight to easy traffic concerns. Accessing directly from Aviation Boulevard may not be feasible without widening aviation to have turn lane.

1.6.3. Utility Access

All of the major utilities (aside from sanitary sewer) are easily accessed from the site. Power, water, communications, gas, and closed storm drain systems are all within or immediately adjacent to the site.

1.6.4. Site Layout

A detailed site layout was not part of the study scope, but the site generally drains to the southwest. Assuming the developer would largely maintain the existing site grading, this would make placing the sanitary and storm drain collection outfalls in the vicinity of Option 2 more attractive. The other options would still be feasible but more expensive for the developer due to the deeper excavations required to install the sanitary line. The site appears to be of sufficient acreage to accommodate a service station (with car wash) and a fast food restaurant. The actual layout of the site will factor into the preferred utility rough in location(s).



Appendix A – Supporting Documentation











BW/I

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES











COMM

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA SITE

BW/1

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES







ADCI

BW/I

ERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES





ELECTRICA COMMUN

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA SITE

BW/I

RVICE PLAZA UTILITIES



ELECTRICAL COMMUNICA

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA SITE

BW/I

ERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES



ELECTRICAL COMM

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA SITE

BW/I

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES





ADCI

BW

RVICE PLAZA UTILITIE



ADCI

BW/I

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES

EXISTING UTILITY PLAN

18



ADCI

BW/I

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES

л	\sim
1	ч
-	~



ADCI

BW/1

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES



BW/I

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES

\sim	
,	1
/	
_	_





COM

ADCI

SERVICE DI AZA SITE

BW

ERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES



BW/I

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES



ELECTRICAL COMMU

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA SITE

BW/I

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES







BW/I

ADCI

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES















2306

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES EXISTING UTILITY PLAN

BW/I

ADCI

\sim	\sim
-	/
_	_



BW

ADCI

MAINTLE C

IN TROUMAND

SERVICE PLAZA UTILITIES EXISTING UTILITY PLAN

EX-

MD 170 MD 170 SS-4 SS-4 SS-4 SS-4 SS-2 KITTEN BRANCH SS-3	55-1 22+00 EXISTING METER 0 24+00 22+00 PARKING		NORTHROP G	RUMMAN RPASS KWAY +00 PARKING	14+00 14+00	12+00-12 12+00-12+00-12 12+00-12 12+00-12 12+00-12 12+00-12 12+00-12 12+00-			CE PLAZA SITE 01 335 a AC. 01 335 a AC. 01 335 a AC. 01 35 a AC. 0	2 18-30 55-8 55-8
	18.0.0 (8.0.1)	SS-1				SAA-CO-86-005	NORTHROP GRUN	MAN SEWER MANHOLE	00-7	A COLORADOR
WATER -	WETLAND BUFFER	SS-2 SS-3	401-54-SSM-004	80.17	-		MAA-SANITAR	Y SEWER MANHOLE		
STORM WATER	AIRPORT PROPERTY LINE	SS-4	401-54-SSM-005	79.65	70.48	MAA-CO-13-016	MAA-SANITAR	SEWER MANHOLE		
SANITY SEWER	US WATER	SS-5	401-54-SSM-001	82.47	72.42173.0	MAA-CO-10-001	MAA-SANITAR	Y SEWER MANHOLE		
NATURAL GAS		SS-6	AAC 9514	62.00	50.94 150.96	23064	AAC-SANITAR	SEWER MANHOLE	200 0	200 400
	WEILAND	SS-7	AAC 9513	58.00	49.20 49.22	23064	AAC-SANITARY	Y SEWER MANHOLE		FEFT
COMMUNICATION	SERVICE PLAZA SITE	SS-8	AAC 9515	64.00	51.27 / 51.51	23064	AAC-SANITARY	SEWER MANHOLE	SUALE IN	FEEI
DESIGNED: N DRAVIN: F CHECKED: K	IDC.				MARYLANI MARY FACIL	D DEPARTMENT OF TRA (LAND AVIATION ADMINI LITIES DEVELOPMENT & ENC	INSPORTATION ISTRATION BINEERING	PROJECT TITLE: SERVIC	E PLAZA UTILITIES	CONTRACT NO.:

Appendix B – Cost Estimates



ALIGNMENT / OPTION	DESCRIPTION	MAA Property	AMTRAK IMPACTS	CONSTRUCTION COST	PROGRAM COST	REMARKS
1	Force Main Combination	NO	NO	\$ 448,200	\$ 793,200	Force Main to a point where gravity is cost effective
1	Gravity to new Manhole	NO	NO	\$ 744,700	\$ 1,318,000	Maximizes grass and gravity location
1A	Gravity through Hill	NO	NO	*	*	Gravity not cost effective due to the hill.
1B	Gravity through parking lot and Kitten Branch	NO	NO	*	*	Gravity works but need to traverse Kitten Branch
2	Gravity Along Old Stoney Run to Manhole SS-8 (AAC 9515)	NO	TBD	\$ 303,000	\$ 536,200	Current utility corridor and crossing under AMTRAK. Jack and Bore required under AMTRAK
2A	Gravity to Manhole SS-6 (AAC 9514)	NO	TBD	*	*	Less existing utility congestion. Jack and Bore and steep slopes, harder access.
2B	Gravity to Manhole SS-7 (AAC 9513)	NO	TBD	*	*	Less existing utility congestion. Jack and Bore and steep slopes, more difficult access.
3	Gravity Along Aviation	NO	NO	\$ 420,500	\$ 744,200	In the ROW of Aviation Boulevard, little deeper than nominal excavation required.
4	Gravity Along Amtrak Way	NO	NO	\$ 385,600	\$ 682,400	In the ROW of Amtrak Way

* Not estimated at this time, see remarks.

Assumptions:

Gravity Sewer at .4% minimum slope

Gravity Sewer at 4' minimum cover

Amtrak agreement attainable

Land Acquisition Costs not included

Tenant Costs not included

Meter Costs not included

Normal excavation (no rock or extraordinary measures)

NG Meter Station can be reused for options that replace SS-1 and SS-2 (1 and 3)

2015 dollars

Service Station Sanitary Establishment Alignment/ Option 1- Force Main Combination

	ESTIMATING LEVEL:		Budget	~		Concept	□ 30%	60%		100%	6 Bid
ITEM	DESCRIPTION					UNIT	UNIT COST	QUANTITY		TOTAL	COMMENT
1	Mobilization/Demobilizat	ion				LS	\$8,775.00	1		\$8,775.00	
2	Temporary Items (includes I	NOT	r in parking lot)			LS	\$8,775.00	1		\$8,775.00	
3	MOT for road crossing					DAY	\$2,500.00	3		\$7,500.00	
4	Pavement Demolition and R	lepa	ir			SY	\$75.00	500		\$37,500.00	Assumes 6/6 section at 6' width
5	8" SDR35 Sanitary Line Inst	allat	tion (Gravity)			LF	\$75.00	1000		\$75,000.00	Includes excavation/backfill
6	2" force main					LF	\$150.00	500		\$75,000.00	Includes complete installation
7	Duplex Grinder Pump					LS	\$35,000.00	1		\$35,000.00	·
8	Jack and Bore Sanitary Line)				LF	\$500.00	0		\$0.00	includes casing and pipe
9	Jack and Bore Set up					LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0.00	
10	Sanitary Manholes and boot	s				EA	\$4.000.00	5		\$20.000.00	
11	SWM					LS				\$0.00	Assume none needed
12	Erosion and Sediment Cont	rol				LF	\$5.00	1000		\$5,000.00	
										+=,====	Potentially could get away with
13	Pump Around					IS	\$15,000,00	1		\$15,000,00	outage
	r amp / round						\$10,000.00			<i><i><i>ϕϕϕ</i>.</i></i>	includes removal, reuse of
											metering station (not sure if
14	replacement of SS-1 to SS-	2				IF	\$150.00	200		\$30,000,00	feasible)
15	Easement						φ100.00	200		\$0.00	Not Included
16	Sanitary Meter Station									\$0.00	Assume tenant supplied
10	Canitary Meter Clation									\$0.00	
	Length of Pipe in Payed Are) ac	cost included in Item 4)					750		\$0.00	
	Length of tipe intraved Are	103 (-			100		\$0.00	
									-	\$0.00	
									-	\$0.00	
									-	\$0.00	
									-	ψ0.00	
									-		
-	-				-						
-	-				-						
SUBTOTAL	A (Conoral Itom Subtota	n			-					\$217 550	
SUBIUIAL	A (General Item Subtota	1	PAS (Motonya)			10	\$10,000,00	0		\$317,550 ¢0	
0	special Systems					19	\$10,000.00	0		\$0 \$0	
		-	CASS		-	L3	\$5,000.00	0		φU	
		-	CCTV						-		
		-	BGE						-		
		-	Verizon		-			-			
		-	VOILEN		-			-			
SUBTOTAL	B (Special Systems Sub	tota	al)							\$0	
Special Syst	tems Planning Contingenc	v (1	5% of B)					15%		\$0	
SUBTOTAL	C.	<u>y (i</u>	5766127		-			1070		\$317 550	
Plannning C	Contingency (30% of C)				-			30%		\$95,265	
Design Cont	tingency (25% of C)							25%	-	\$79,388	
SUBTOTAL	D							2070		\$492 203	
General Cor	nditions (15% of D)							15%		\$73,830	
SUBTOTAL	F				-			1070		\$566.033	
Construction	n Quality Control Plan (3%	of F	=)		-			3%		\$16,981	
Miscellaneo	us Work Allowance (10%))					10%	-	\$56,603	
SUBTOTAL	E (Construction Cost Es	tim) (ata)		-			10 /8		\$50,003	
SOBIOTAL Entimoted D	Provide For (10% of F)	um	alej		_			109/		\$63,017	
Estimated D					╟──			10%	⊢	\$03,902 \$76,754	
Estimated D	M Ego (2% of E)				╟──			1∠70 20/	⊢	¢10,104 ¢10,700	
				_	┢			2%		\$12,792 \$702.405	
SUBIUIAL					┢			00/		\$153,125 ¢0	
CRAND TO	TAL (Brogram Cost Esti-	met		_				0%		¢702.000	
GRAND TO		nat			-		Course Fred	I		\$/93,200	there in stallation a //s = :!!!! = =
Level of Acc		+			┢╴	General	Square Foot		-	comparison with ot	ther installations/facilities
List of Sole	Source Items				3				5		
Included in t	this Contract	2			4				6		
List of Assur	motions										

Service Station Sanitary Establishment Alignment 1/ Option 1 - Northrop Grumman Gravity Gravity

	ESTIMATING LEVEL:		Budget	\checkmark		Concept	□ 30%	60%		L 100%	6 Bid
ITEM	DESCRIPTION					UNIT	UNIT COST	QUANTITY		TOTAL	COMMENT
1	Mobilization/Demobilizati	on			T	LS	\$14,722,50	1	Γ	\$14,722,50	
2	Temporary Items (includes I	ЛОТ	in parking lot)			LS	\$14,722,50	1		\$14,722,50	-
3	MOT for road crossing					DAY	\$2,500,00	3		\$7,500,00	
4	Pavement Demolition and R	enai	r		-	SY	\$75.00	533		\$40,000,00	Assumes 6/6 section at 6' width
	avenient Demonition and R	сра	1			01	φ/0.00		-	φ+0,000.00	Includes excavation/backfill for
Б	9" SDR25 Soniton / Line Inst					15	\$250.00	1550		\$297 500 00	Includes excavation/backiii ioi
5	o SDR35 Sanitary Line Inst	allat	on (Gravity)		_		\$250.00	1330		\$307,300.00 \$0.00	up to 25
0	2 Torce main						\$150.00	0		\$0.00	
/	Duplex Grinder Pump				_	LS	\$35,000.00	0		\$0.00	in studen en state en state e
8	Jack and Bore Sanitary Line				_	LF	\$500.00	0		\$0.00	includes casing and pipe
9	Jack and Bore Set up				_	LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0.00	-
10	Sanitary Manholes and boot	s			_	EA	\$4,000.00	6		\$24,000.00	
11	SWM				_	LS				\$0.00	Assume none needed
12	Erosion and Sediment Contr	ol				LF	\$5.00	1550		\$7,750.00	
											Potentially could get away with
13	Pump Around					LS	\$1,500.00	1		\$1,500.00	outage
											includes removal, reuse of
											metering station (not sure if
14	replacement of SS-1 to SS-2	2				LF	\$150.00	200		\$30,000.00	feasible)
15	Sanitary Meter Station and E	ase	ment			LS				\$0.00	Assume tenant supplied
										\$0.00	
	Length of Pipe in Payed Are	as (i	cost included in Item 4)					800		\$0.00	-
	Longar of ripe in ravea rae	40 (000		\$0.00	
					-	_				\$0.00	
					-					00.00	-
					_	-				\$0.00	-
						_				\$0.00	_
					_	_					-
					_	_					-
											_
					_						
					_						
			0								
SUBTOTAL	A (General Item Subtota	I)								\$527,695	
S	pecial Systems		BAS (Metasys)			LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0	
			FAS (Honeywell)			LS	\$5,000.00	0		\$0	
			CASS								
			CCTV								
			BGE								
			Verizon								
SUBTOTAL	B (Special Systems Sub	tota	l)							\$0	
Special Syst	ems Planning Contingenc	y (1	5% of B)					15%		\$0	
SUBTOTAL	C									\$527,695	
Plannning C	ontingency (30% of C)							30%		\$158,309	1
Design Cont	ingency (25% of C)							25%		\$131,924	
SUBTOTAL	D									\$817.927	
General Cor	ditions (15% of D)							15%		\$122,689	
SUBTOTAL	F							1070	-	\$940.616	
Construction	Quality Control Plan (3%	of F	:)					3%		\$28,218	
Missellense	Vork Allowance (10%)		-)			-		109/		\$20,210	-
	E (Construction Cost E	/IE						10%	H	φ34,00∠ \$1,002,000	1
SUBIUIAL	F (Construction Cost Es	um	ate)		_			4.00/		\$1,062,696	
Estimated D	HILE (10% OF F)				-			10%		\$106,290	
Estimated C	IVII F EE (12% OF F)				-			12%	┡	\$127,548	
Estimated P	M Fee (2% of F)	_						2%	L	\$21,258	
SUBTOTAL	G									\$1,317,992	
Escalation F	actor (do not use)							0%		\$0	
GRAND TO	TAL (Program Cost Estir	nate	e)							\$1,318,000	
Level of Acc	uracy 🗹		Quantity Take-Off			General	Square Foot			Comparison with ot	her installations/facilities
List of Sole S	Source Items	1			З	3			5		
Included in t	his Contract	2			4	4			6		
List of Assur	notions	1							<u>د</u>		

Service Station Sanitary Establishment Alignment/ Option 2 - Gravity towards Rail along Stoney Run

	ESTIMATING LEVEL:		Budget	1		Concept	□ 30%	60%		□ 100%	Bid
ITEM	DESCRIPTION					UNIT	UNIT COST	QUANTITY		TOTAL	COMMENT
1	Mobilization/Demobilizati	on				LS	\$6,075.00	1		\$6,075.00	
2	Temporary Items (includes N	ЛОТ	in parking lot)			LS	\$6,075.00	1		\$6,075.00	
3	MOT for road crossing					DAY	\$2,500.00	0		\$0.00	
4	Pavement Demolition and R	epai	r			SY	\$75.00	200		\$15,000.00	Assumes 6/6 section at 6' width
5	8" SDR35 Sanitary Line Insta	allat	ion (Gravity)			LF	\$75.00	600		\$45,000.00	Includes excavation/backfill
6	2" force main					LF	\$150.00	0		\$0.00	Includes complete installation
7	Temporary Utility Support					LS	\$15,000.00	1		\$15,000.00	
8	Jack and Bore Casing					LF	\$550.00	150		\$82,500.00	includes casing and pipe
9	Jack and Bore Set up					LS	\$30,000.00	1		\$30,000.00	
10	Sanitary Manholes					EA	\$4,000.00	3		\$12,000.00	
11	SWM					LS	A- - - -			\$0.00	Assume none needed
12	Erosion and Sediment Contr	ol				LF	\$5.00	600		\$3,000.00	kitten branch crossing
13	Pump Around					LS	\$40,000.00	0		\$0.00	
14	Easement					LS				\$0.00	Not Included
15	Sanitary Meter Station					LS				\$0.00	Assume tenant supplied
										\$0.00	
	Length of Pipe in Paved Are	as (cost included in Item 4)					300		\$0.00	
										\$0.00	
										\$0.00	
										\$0.00	
										\$0.00	
SUBTOTAL	A (General Item Subtotal	N								\$214 650	
SUBTUTAL	Special Systems	ή –	BAS (Metasys)			15	\$10,000,00	0		\$0	
	pecial Oysterns		EAS (Hopeywell)			19	\$5,000,00	0		0¢ 0	
			CASS			- 10	\$3,000.00	0		ΨΟ	
			CCTV								
			BGE								
			Verizon								
SUBTOTAL	B (Special Systems Sub	tota	1)							\$0	
Special Syst	tems Planning Contingency	y (1	5% of B)					15%		\$0	
SUBTOTAL	C									\$214,650	
Plannning C	contingency (30% of C)							30%		\$64,395	
Design Cont	tingency (25% of C)							25%		\$53,663	
SUBTOTAL	D									\$332,708	
General Cor	nditions (15% of D)							15%		\$49,906	
SUBTOTAL	E									\$382,614	
Construction	Quality Control Plan (3%	of E	=)					3%		\$11,478	
Miscellaneo	us Work Allowance (10% c	of E						10%		\$38,261	
SUBTOTAL	F (Construction Cost Es	tim	ate)							\$432,353	
Estimated D	esign Fee (10% of F)							10%		\$43,235	
Estimated C	MI Fee (12% of F)						J	12%	∥	\$51,882	l
Estimated PM Fee (2% of F)								2%	1	\$8,647	l
SUBTOTAL G										\$536,118	
Escalation F	actor (do not use)		`					0%	-	\$0	
GRAND TO	IAL (Program Cost Estin	nate	e)				Ļ			\$536,200	
Level of Acc	uracy 🗹		Quantity Take-Off			General	Square Foot			Comparison with ot	her installations/facilities
List of Sole S	Source Items	1			3				5		
Included in t	his Contract	2			4				6		
List of Assur	mptions				_						

Service Station Sanitary Establishment Alignment/ Option 3 - Gravity Along Aviation

	ESTIMATING LEVEL:	Budget	~		Concept	□ 30%	60%		□ 100%	Bid		
ITEM	DESCRIPTION					UNIT	UNIT COST	QUANTITY		TOTAL	COMMENT	
1	Mobilization/Demobilizati	on				LS	\$8,220.00	1		\$8,220.00		
2	Temporary Items (includes N	ЛОТ	in parking lot)			LS	\$8,220.00	1		\$8,220.00		
3	MOT for road crossing					DAY	\$2,500.00	3		\$7,500.00		
4	Pavement Demolition and R	epa	ir			SY	\$75.00	733		\$55,000.00	Assumes 6/6 section at 6' width	
											Includes excavation/backfill for	
5	8" SDR35 Sanitary Line Insta	allat	ion (Gravity)			LF	\$95.00	1500		\$142,500.00	6.5' depth + MOT	
6	2" force main					LF	\$150.00	0		\$0.00	Includes complete installation	
7	Duplex Grinder Pump					LS	\$35,000.00	0		\$0.00		
8	Jack and Bore Sanitary Line					LF	\$500.00	0		\$0.00	includes casing and pipe	
9	Jack and Bore Set up					LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0.00		
10	Sanitary Manholes and boot	s				EA	\$4,000.00	6		\$24,000.00		
11	SWM					LS				\$0.00	Assume none needed	
12	Erosion and Sediment Contr	ol				LF	\$5.00	1500		\$7,500.00		
											Potentially could get away with	
13	Pump Around					LS	\$15,000.00	1		\$15,000.00	outage	
											includes removal, reuse of	
											metering station (not sure if	
14	replacement of SS-1 to SS-2	2				LF	\$150.00	200		\$30,000.00	feasible)	
15	Sanitary Meter Station/Ease	mer	nt			LS				\$0.00	Assume tenant supplied	
										\$0.00		
	Length of Pipe in Paved Area	as (cost included in Item 4)					1,100		\$0.00		
			,							\$0.00		
										\$0.00		
										\$0.00		
										\$0.00		
SUBTOTAL	A (General Item Subtotal	I)								\$297,940		
S	Special Systems	Í	BAS (Metasys)			LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0		
			FAS (Honeywell)			LS	\$5,000.00	0		\$0		
			CASS									
			CCTV									
			BGE									
			Verizon									
SUBTOTAL	B (Special Systems Sub	tota	al)							\$0		
Special Syst	tems Planning Contingency	y (1	5% of B)					15%		\$0		
SUBTOTAL	. C									\$297,940		
Plannning C	Contingency (30% of C)							30%		\$89,382		
Design Cont	tingency (25% of C)							25%		\$74,485		
SUBTOTAL	. D									\$461,807		
General Cor	nditions (15% of D)							15%		\$69,271		
SUBTOTAL	. E									\$531,078		
Construction	n Quality Control Plan (3%	of E	Ξ)					3%		\$15,932		
Miscellaneo	us Work Allowance (10% c	of E)					10%		\$53,108		
SUBTOTAL	F (Construction Cost Es	tim	ate)							\$600,118		
Estimated D	esign Fee (10% of F)							10%		\$60,012		
Estimated C	MI Fee (12% of F)							12%		\$72,014		
Estimated P	M Fee (2% of F)							2%		\$12,002		
SUBTOTAL	G									\$744,147		
Escalation F	actor (do not use)							0%		\$0		
GRAND TO	TAL (Program Cost Estin	nat	e)							\$744,200		
Level of Acc	curacy 🗹	T	Quantity Take-Off			General	Square Foot		Comparison with other installations/facilities			
List of Sole \$	Source Items	1			3	3			5	÷		
Included in t	his Contract	2			4	1			6			
List of Assur	motions	1			u				<u> </u>			

Service Station Sanitary Establishment Alignment/ Option 4 - Gravity Along Amtrack Way

	ESTIMATING LEVEL:		Budget	9	Concept	□ 30%	□ 60%		□ 100%	Bid
ITEM	DESCRIPTION				UNIT	UNIT COST	QUANTITY		TOTAL	COMMENT
1	Mobilization/Demobilizati	on			LS	\$7,590.00	1		\$7,590.00	
2	Temporary Items (includes M	лот	in parking lot)		LS	\$7,590.00	1		\$7,590.00	
3	MOT for road crossing				DAY	\$2,500.00	2		\$5,000.00	
4	Pavement Demolition and R	epai	r		SY	\$75.00	67		\$5,000.00	Assumes 6/6 section at 6' width
										Includes excavation/backfill for 5'
5	8" SDR35 Sanitary Line Inst	allati	ion (Gravity)		LF	\$75.00	2750		\$206,250.00	depth
6	2" force main				LF	\$150.00	0		\$0.00	Includes complete installation
7	Duplex Grinder Pump				LS	\$35,000.00	0		\$0.00	
8	Jack and Bore Sanitary Line				LF	\$500.00	0		\$0.00	includes casing and pipe
9	Jack and Bore Set up				LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0.00	
10	Sanitary Manholes and boot	s			EA	\$4,000.00	7		\$28,000.00	
11	SWM				LS				\$0.00	Assume none needed
12	Erosion and Sediment Contr	ol			LF	\$5.00	2750		\$13,750.00	
										Potentially could get away with
13	Pump Around				LS	\$7,500.00			\$0.00	outage
14	Easement				LS				\$0.00	Not Included
15	Sanitary Meter Station				LS				\$0.00	Assume tenant supplied
									\$0.00	
	Length of Pipe in Paved Are	as (d	cost included in Item 4)				100		\$0.00	
									\$0.00	
									\$0.00	
									\$0.00	
									\$0.00	
SUBTOTAL	A (General Item Subtota	I)							\$273,180	
S	pecial Systems		BAS (Metasys)		LS	\$10,000.00	0		\$0	
			FAS (Honeywell)		LS	\$5,000.00	0		\$0	
			CASS							
			CCTV							
			BGE							
			Verizon							
			n		_					
SUBTOTAL	B (Special Systems Sub	tota	ll)				1=0/		\$0	
Special Syst	ems Planning Contingenc	y (1	5% of B)	_			15%		\$0	
SUBIUIAL Diagonating C							200/	_	\$273,180	1
Planning C	inconcy (30% of C)			<u> </u>			30%		\$81,954 ¢c0.205	
Design Cont				_			25%		\$08,295	
SUBIUIAL	U ditiona (15% of D)				-		150/		\$423,429	4
General Con				_			15%		\$03,514	
SUBIUIAL	Cuelity Centrel Dien (20)	of F	-				20/		\$466,943	
Construction	Quality Control Plan (3%						3%		\$14,608	
NISCEIIANEOL	us work Allowance (10% C			_			10%		\$48,094	
SUBIUIAL	r (Construction Cost Es	uma	ale)				109/	-	\$550,246 \$55,005	1
Estimated D	MI Foo (12% of F)	—⊩	_	l	10%	-	\$00,U25	╢────		
						l	12%	-	000,U3U	╢────
							2%	-	\$11,005	1
SUBTOTAL G							09/	-	\$002,305 \$0	1
CRAND TO	TAL (Program Cost Estin	not					0%	-	04	1
GRAND TO					0	Caucaro Esst		_	9002,400	heringtelletions (fr 1111
Level of Acc		1			General	Square Foot		-	comparison with ot	her installations/facilities
List of Sole S	Source Items			⊩	3			5		
included in t	nis Contract	2			4			6		
List of Assur	nptions	1								