

APPENDIX E

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION AND SELECTION

Table of Contents

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------|---|
| E.1.0 | GENERAL..... 1 |
| E.2.0 | COST ESTIMATION PROCEDURES..... 3 |
| E.2.1 | Land and Utility Relocation Costs..... 3 |
| E.2.1.1 | General 3 |
| E.2.1.2 | Cost Basis..... 3 |
| E.2.2 | Road Crossings..... 4 |
| E.2.2.1 | General 4 |
| E.2.2.2 | Cost Basis..... 5 |
| E.2.3 | Basins..... 5 |
| E.2.3.1 | General 5 |
| E.2.3.2 | Cost Basis..... 5 |
| E.2.4 | Pump Stations 5 |
| E.2.4.1 | General 5 |
| E.2.4.2 | Cost Basis..... 6 |
| E.2.5 | Storm Drains 6 |
| E.2.5.1 | General 6 |
| E.2.5.2 | Cost Basis..... 6 |
| E.2.6 | Other Improvement Costing 6 |
| E.2.7 | Markups to Construction Cost 7 |
| E.3.0 | IMPROVEMENT CONCEPT DESIGN 9 |
| E.3.1 | Road Crossings..... 9 |
| E.3.1.1 | Methodology 9 |
| E.3.1.2 | Results..... 9 |
| E.3.2 | Basins..... 9 |
| E.3.2.1 | Methodology 9 |
| E.3.2.2 | Results..... 10 |
| E.3.3 | Pump Stations 10 |
| E.3.3.1 | Methodology 10 |
| E.3.3.2 | Results..... 11 |
| E.3.4 | Storm Drains and Force Mains 11 |
| E.3.4.1 | Methodology 11 |
| E.3.4.2 | Results..... 12 |
| E.3.5 | Channels 12 |
| E.3.5.1 | Methodology 12 |
| E.3.5.2 | Results..... 12 |
| E.4.0 | ALTERNATIVE COST ESTIMATION..... 13 |
| E.5.0 | ALTERNATIVE QUALITATIVE EVALUATION 15 |

E.6.0 ALTERNATIVE SELECTION 17

LIST OF TABLES

Table E-1 Sources for Unit Costs 21
Table E-2 Summary of Basis, Factor Adjusting For Construction of Storm Drain
Conduit in Urban Areas 27
Table E-3 Summary of Road Crossing Concept Designs 29
Table E-4 Summary of Basin Concept Designs 32
Table E-5 Summary of Pump Station Concept Designs 34
Table E-6 Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs 36
Table E-7 Summary of Channel Concept Designs 42
Table E-8 Alternative Costing Table 44
Table E-9 Selected Alternatives Summary 58

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure E-1 Cost per Square Foot of Flow Area vs. Flow Area of Culverts 76

E.1.0 GENERAL

Each developed alternative for drainage improvement was evaluated through the following general process:

- A set of general concept design level cost estimation procedures were developed for each generic type of improvement, specifically:
 - Road crossings (bridges, culverts, new or expanded)
 - Debris/sediment retention basins (new or expanded)
 - Stormwater detention/retention dams/basins (new or expanded)
 - Pump stations (new or expanded)
 - Storm drains (new or expanded, gravity or force main)

These procedures generally involved sizing the improvement, assessing easement/property purchase needs, and making engineering judgments as to site construction complexity (utility relocations, other issues).

- The individual improvements (new/expanded culverts; new/expanded pump stations; new/expanded detention, etc.) associated with each project were sized using refined hydrologic and hydraulic analyses.
- The improvement sizes and other site information were input into the developed cost estimation procedures to obtain an estimated construction cost for each improvement. Costs of individual improvements associated with each project were summed to develop estimated project total costs.
- Qualitative factors were then evaluated among alternatives for each project with multiple alternatives.
- Finally, the most favorable alternative was selected for each project.

This appendix will present the basic methodologies associated with this evaluation process.

This page was intentionally left blank.

E.2.0 COST ESTIMATION PROCEDURES

The basic sources used for unit costs for all cost analyses were cost data available from the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), the New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT), and bid tabs and other cost data provided by the City of El Paso and/or the El Paso Water Utilities (EPWU). Specific sources are detailed in Table E-1.

E.2.1 Land and Utility Relocation Costs

E.2.1.1 General

In many instances, a component of a drainage improvement alternative included the acquisition of land and/or the relocation of utilities. Land purchases were required for some of the new basins and some of the basin expansions. Utility relocations were accounted for in most cases when a conduit, channel, or culvert was newly installed or expanded.

E.2.1.2 Cost Basis

In the case of land acquisition, the property value was determined by accessing the county property records site (www.elpasocad.org) for the property of interest. An adjustment factor was applied to the assessed property value as stated on the records to calculate the estimated price of acquisition. If the property was in a developed area, the assessed value was multiplied by three. If the property was in an undeveloped area or an area with little development, the assessed value was multiplied by two.

The cost of utility relocation was included by different methods depending on the improvement in question. Each channel installation or widening was evaluated against historical data and estimated to require major, moderate, or no utility relocation. Primary evaluation factors included extent of widening and urbanization along the route. For projects expected to have minor effect on existing utilities, estimated construction costs were increased by 10 percent (%); for projects expected to have major effect on existing utilities, estimated construction costs were increased by 50%.

For conduit placement a markup factor was used which was a large multiple of the cost of conduit construction alone. This factor included a number of significant project elements that could not be estimated in detail: relocation of major utilities (water/sewer/electrical line), installation of curb and gutter, road repair, traffic control, etc.). The best sources for estimation of this factor were recent City of El Paso bid tabulations at http://www.elpasotexas.gov/financial_services/bid_tabs.asp. The factor estimation process included the following (see Table E-2):

- The over 500 bid tabs available on the website were reviewed for applicability to this project. Specifically, to be relevant, projects had to be

focused on installation of new large diameter conduits (36 inches or greater) through an existing urban area. Four projects were identified: Upper Valley Drainage Improvements Phase III, Carnegie Avenue Street and Drainage Improvements, Davis Drive Street and Drainage Improvements, and 3rd Avenue Street and Drainage Improvements;

- The total cost of each project was divided by a length of right-of-way disturbed associated with the project; and
- This unit cost (cost per length) was divided by the TxDOT unit cost for the conduit configuration per the website listed in Table E-1. The results showed a factor of roughly 11.1 for concrete box culverts (CBC), and 3.7 for reinforced concrete pipe (RCP).

In project cost estimation, these factors were only applied to the construction of a single barrel in a multiple barrel conduit.

E.2.2 Road Crossings

E.2.2.1 General

In many instances, a component of a drainage improvement alternative included the expansion/replacement of existing drainage structures under roads or railroads to meet project flood protection criteria (e.g. protection of road/railroad overtopping for the 100-year or 1% annual exceedance probability flood). The basic sources reviewed for cost per linear foot for each relevant crossing size (diameter, width/height) or configuration (CBC, RCP) are listed in Table E-1 and include the City of El Paso, TxDOT, and NMDOT.

During review of costs estimated for project alternatives, it became apparent that use of the TxDOT data led to some significant inconsistencies in conduit costs, i.e. small conduits could have costs per unit length higher than significantly larger conduits. To address this issue a scattergram of current costs was developed versus conduit area (see Figure E-1). From this figure, a conservative cost estimate of \$25 per square foot of conduit area per foot of length was used for road crossing structure cost.

In general, the estimation of construction cost for this improvement involved the following tasks:

- A hydraulic analysis was performed to estimate needed drainage structure size, shape, and material type to meet the desired flood protection criteria, given the height and width limitations associated with the particular crossing site. The methods used for this analysis were identical to those documented in Appendix B;
- This structure flow area was multiplied by \$25 per linear foot times the length of the conduit; and

- This structure cost was adjusted to reflect relative complexity of construction at the specific site, using the following subjective adjustment factors discussed in Section E.2.1 above.

E.2.2.2 Cost Basis

Table E-1 summarizes the sources of cost data used in developing road crossing cost estimates.

E.2.3 Basins

E.2.3.1 General

In many instances, a component of a drainage improvement alternative included the construction of a new or expanded basin for the retention of debris, sediment, or floodwater. The estimated cost of construction generally consisted of the following significant components:

- Cost of excavation;
- Cost of excess spoil disposal. For cases where an embankment was constructed to provide above ground detention, the estimated embankment volume was subtracted from the volume of excavation to obtain volume of excavation spoil;
- Cost of riprap for upstream and downstream slopes of embankments;
- Cost of principal outlet (for basins including aboveground storage); and
- An additional \$100,000 was added to costs to account for trash racks, and principal spillway inlet towers.

E.2.3.2 Cost Basis

Excavation unit cost was estimated at \$10 per cubic yard, derived from recent TxDOT bid tabs. The unit cost applied for disposal of excess excavation spoil was \$5 per cubic yard, derived from recent EPWU experience. The cost for principal outlet construction was based upon conduit cost and estimated length per cost basis described in Section E.2.2.

E.2.4 Pump Stations

E.2.4.1 General

Many of the drainage improvement alternatives required the addition or expansion of pump stations. In several instances, the elevation change across the area of interest was so small that the only way to achieve the required flow rate was to install a pump station.

E.2.4.2 Cost Basis

Cost estimates were put together for four “example” pump stations. The costs were based on past experience and history with pump station construction. They included the pumps, piping, major valves, power, controls, and the building. A curve was generated from these sample costs (dollars [\$] per gallons per minute [gpm] vs. gpm) so that a dollar value could be assigned based on the capacity required for the modeled pump station. As the capacity of the pump station increased, the cost per gpm decreased due to economies of scale. For example the cost to build a building, install the controls, supply the power, supply the other infrastructure would be required for any pump station construction. The increase of capacity by adding another pump or using larger pumps would have decreasing influence on the costs as the size increased.

E.2.5 Storm Drains

E.2.5.1 General

Most of the models of the alternatives required that new conduits be installed or that existing conduits be replaced with larger conduits. The storm drain conduits included both gravity and pressure lines. The conduits were typically RCP or CBC depending on the requirements for the design. Costs of the storm drains were not significantly sensitive to the specific material type, and within reason, differences in the sizes of the conduits. There was typically a significant price jump from RCP to CBC. The major costs were typically tied up in items such as excavation, bedding and backfill, utility relocation, street repair, curb and gutter repair, and traffic control.

E.2.5.2 Cost Basis

Storm drain conduits were priced based on TxDOT bid tabulations and then multiplied by a factor to determine the installation price per linear foot of conduit. The basis for this factor is described in Section E.2.1 above.

E.2.6 Other Improvement Costing

Severing Connections Between Lines. For some of the alternatives redirecting flow was required. The redirection generally required severing existing ties to connecting storm drain conduits. Costs considered for severing ties included excavation, severing the connection, plugging the affected lines, backfilling, and restoration. The costs were estimated using experience from other projects.

Curb Inlet. In at least one instance, a significant street flooding problem could be alleviated by installing curb inlets. The inlets provided the water a more efficient path to the channel. The costs were estimated using similar items from TxDOT along with engineering experience and judgment.

Flow Control Gates. For one solution, there was a requirement to keep the backwater from the Rio Grande from flooding the storm sewer system. Automatic gates were selected for this control. In other solutions, flow was only to be released back into channels from basins after the peak of a storm had passed. Automatic gates were also selected for these controls. The prices came from vendor information.

E.2.7 Markups to Construction Cost

Construction costs were estimated based on the best available data as described above. The subtotal for each component was increased by 35% because of the lack of detail at this stage of alternative evaluation. Property acquisition was the exception to this procedure. The estimated cost for property (per Section E.2.1) was not increased based on the 35% contingency.

This page was intentionally left blank.

E.3.0 IMPROVEMENT CONCEPT DESIGN

Tables E-3 through E-7 list the principal improvement components of each alternative. This section will describe the concept design of these improvements.

E.3.1 Road Crossings

E.3.1.1 Methodology

Road crossings for each watershed were analyzed using CulvertMaster. Characteristics such as existing invert elevations, length, dimensions, and material were used to develop a maximum capacity. The sources for this information included an earlier post-2006 flood study by URS Corporation (URS) (URS, December 2006) and an existing crossing structure database maintained by the City of El Paso. Each culvert was analyzed, and the maximum capacity was compared to the peak flow (cubic feet per second [cfs]) from the contributing watershed. This was used to develop an approximate return interval capacity for each culvert. A conceptual design was completed on all crossings that did not have a maximum capacity equal to or greater than the 100-year return period (1% annual exceedance probability) flood.

CulvertMaster was used to estimate the culvert size needed to pass the peak flow without overtopping of the structure (road) to be protected. Channel geometry downstream of each culvert was entered into CulvertMaster to account for tailwater effects. Design parameters entered into CulvertMaster include culvert size, material, and elevations at the inlet, outlet, and top of road. Design culvert sizes were proposed based on the geometry of the channel and the top of road elevation, to ensure that the road is returned to its original geometry after construction and the required culverts would fit properly. In some instances, the channel must be expanded at the culvert entrance to adjust for the proposed culvert widths.

E.3.1.2 Results

The material and dimensions of each existing and proposed crossing for selected alternatives are summarized in Table E-3. Other key parameters affecting cost, as well as estimated cost, are also provided in the table.

E.3.2 Basins

E.3.2.1 Methodology

Basins were sized to provide retention for debris flow or sediment, or detention/retention of stormwater to reduce downstream peak flows. Basin locations were determined by selecting sites that were vacant (no structure) or sites that were identified by the EPWU as potential basin sites. Sediment and debris volumes were estimated by an assumption that the top one foot of the full upstream delineated area of sediment/debris

(per the maps presented in Appendix C) would be retained. This volume is a rough estimate, chosen to provide a rational comparison between required basin sizes for varying watersheds. This estimate should be revised through field study by a qualified geologist for each of the selected debris/sediment basin sites during later design.

The storage volumes needed for stormwater detention/retention were estimated through use of the hydrologic models developed per Section 3.2 of this Plan. The existing or modified hydrologic models were run to produce hydrographs for the areas where new basins were proposed. In the more straightforward concept designs, basin characteristics (storage volume, spillway discharge rating) were input into Hydrologic Engineering Center-Hydraulic Modeling System (HEC-HMS) and altered in iterative manner until the design downstream peak flow was achieved. In the more complex basins (such as those located within the Central Region), concept designs included multiple alternative inflows (from conduits, channels, and local watersheds) and outflows (via gravity flow conduit, channel, or force main). In this case, inflow hydrographs produced by HEC-HMS for each proposed basin were then copied into Excel, and the basin size and outlet configuration(s) were developed using a water balance performed at the same time step as the HEC-HMS model. Elevation-outflow curves for each outlet structure were derived using standard hydraulic measures. When the water balance analysis was complete, the peak volume stored per the analysis was considered the proposed basin's storage capacity. Alternative combinations of outlet size and basin size were considered and engineering judgment and concept level cost analyses were applied to choose the most favorable combination.

The pond area previously estimated was then used as the maximum surface area of the reservoir and an excavation volume total could be calculated. Most ponds were designed to a depth between 10 feet and 20 feet with 1 horizontal to 1 vertical side slopes. These characteristics varied depending on the location of the pond. For cases where embankments were sized to allow for storage volume above ground, the embankment length and volume were estimated consistent with the terrain slope of the site, and the needed embankment height. Embankments were designed with 3 horizontal to 1 vertical side slopes.

E.3.2.2 Results

The dimensions of each proposed basin for selected alternatives are summarized in Table E-4. Other key parameters affecting cost, as well as estimated cost, are also provided in the table.

E.3.3 Pump Stations

E.3.3.1 Methodology

Pump stations were designed by analyzing the inflow hydrograph, checking the available storage (if any), and then determining the required capacity of the pump.

Pump stations, depending on available area, were designed either with a basin or a wet-well.

Basin Pump Station Design

Pump stations that were designed with a basin and force main were designed in conjunction with the basin using a spreadsheet-based water balance as described above. For each pump station, the inflow volume per time step was determined using HEC-HMS or a discharge hydrograph from an upstream reservoir. The available storage within the proposed pond was also approximated using available area and a proposed depth. A series of functions in Excel was then used to incrementally adjust the volume of stormwater in the basin over time based on the capacity chosen for the discharge pump. The outflow hydrograph would adjust to show the decrease in storage once the peak had passed. Finally, an iterative procedure was used to determine the discharge pump capacity required to keep the pond from exceeding its maximum volume. The required pump capacity, available head, and head losses were used to determine the required pressure for the pump and the minimum size of the force main needed to discharge flow from the pump.

Conduit Pump Station Design

Conduit pump stations must be designed to the maximum capacity of the conduit, unless the conduit is pressurized. A large pressurized conduit may have enough storage within the pipe to reduce the pump size. These unique systems have been looked at individually and adjustments to the pump capacities have been made. Head requirements were also estimated during analysis to select a pump and force main size.

E.3.3.2 Results

The capacity of each existing (if applicable) and proposed pump station for selected alternatives are summarized in Table E-5. Other key parameters affecting cost, as well as estimated cost, are also provided in the table.

E.3.4 Storm Drains and Force Mains

E.3.4.1 Methodology

Storm drains were either designed for gravity flow or as force mains.

Gravity Flow

Gravity flow storm drains were designed using FlowMaster. FlowMaster inputs include type of conduit, size, material, length, and slope. Multiple conduit types and sizes were selected to maintain a velocity between 6 and 8 feet per second (ft/s). Once a size was selected, the cover depth required along the route of the conduit was determined to ensure proper cover over the length of the conduit. The capacity of the conduit was checked using Manning's equations and hand calculations. Hydraulic gradients were also checked to ensure positive flow.

Force Mains

Force mains were analyzed using Excel spreadsheets, based upon the Hazen Williams Equation. Inputs for the Hazen Williams Equation are length of conduit, inlet and outlet invert elevations, discharge (cfs), and the C coefficient for the pipe material. The spreadsheet was then used to estimate the head required for each type of conduit and its velocity. A design velocity of 6 ft/s was used in all analyses. The pressure required for each conduit was also calculated to help size the force main and estimate needed standard of material.

E.3.4.2 Results

The dimensions of each existing (if applicable) and proposed storm drain for selected alternatives are summarized in Table E-6. Other key parameters affecting cost, as well as estimated cost, are also provided in the table.

E.3.5 Channels

E.3.5.1 Methodology

Where existing channels were estimated to lack 100-year return period (1% annual exceedance probability) capacity, a concept design was developed to provide additional capacity. This capacity was added either by channel widening or by lining an existing unlined channel. Where an existing backwater model Hydrologic Engineering Center-River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) was available, the model was used in concept design. Where no model was currently available, flow capacity was estimated using a normal depth assumption and FlowMaster (or equivalent) software was used for design. In general, because of citizen-expressed preference for natural channels, channels were designed to be unlined except in cases of urban channels with severe right-of-way restrictions.

E.3.5.2 Results

The dimensions of each existing (if applicable) and proposed channel for selected alternatives are summarized in Table E-7. Other key parameters affecting cost, as well as estimated cost, are also provided in the table.

E.4.0 ALTERNATIVE COST ESTIMATION

The improvements per the types and dimensions developed in concept design (Section E.3.0) were cost estimated per the procedures presented in Section E.2.0. The resulting costs are presented in Tables E-2 through E-7.

This page was intentionally left blank.

E.5.0 ALTERNATIVE QUALITATIVE EVALUATION

Qualitative factors were evaluated among alternatives for each project with multiple alternatives. Factors evaluated were both technical values (constructability, ease of maintenance, reliability, right-of-way, and safety) and community values (safety, aesthetics, opportunity for dual use, and compatibility with natural systems). This evaluation was performed in conjunction with representatives from the City and EPWU.

These qualitative factors significantly affected alternative selection. The technical values were applied as follows.

Constructability was considered to be the ease with which the defined alternative could be constructed. General knowledge concerning conditions at the site (density of urban area, ease of excavation, complexity of construction/design, and other site-specific issues) was applied.

Ease of maintenance was considered to be the relative likelihood of significant maintenance being required to retain the favorable functions (conveyance, environmental, etc.) associated with the project over time, i.e. the susceptibility of the alternative to flood (or other) damage, erosion, excessive sediment/debris deposition, etc. In general, alternatives with upstream sediment/debris basins in locations with significant sediment/debris risk were estimated to be easier to maintain than those lacking debris/sediment controls. Channels with non-erosive liners (rock, concrete) were estimated to be easier to maintain than vegetated channels, where steep slopes led to heightened erosion risk.

Reliability was considered to be the relative likelihood of the alternative successfully addressing the targeted issue (excessive flooding, erosion, deposition). In some cases, causes of the targeted issue were uncertain or difficult to fully address. A judgment was made to rate an alternative higher in reliability if that alternative successfully addressed more of the project uncertainty than another. In the easiest example to present, an alternative designed to prevent flooding from a 50-year flood (2% annual exceedance probability) was deemed less reliable than alternative designed to prevent flooding from a 100-year flood (1% annual exceedance probability).

Right-of-way (ROW) was considered to be the relative complexity of obtaining the needed ROW (property or easement purchase) for an alternative. Alternatives involving significant ROW acquisition in dense urban areas or in highly regulated areas were rated lower than those where ROW acquisition was confined to open land, or urban land not in active use.

Safety was considered to be the relative risk to public health and welfare associated with each project. Steep-sided, deep channels or basins in urban environments were rated less safe than more moderately sloped improvements. In urban areas, stormwater detention basins (which drain quickly following a flood) were generally rated

safer than stormwater retention basins (which can impound water for longer periods). In areas identified as susceptible to high risk of debris flow, alternatives that included debris control basins were rated safer than those that lacked debris control.

The community values qualitative factors considered were developed in public meetings with local stakeholder groups and include safety, aesthetics, dual use, and natural systems. **Safety** was considered as a technical qualitative factor. **Aesthetics** were considered to be improved relative to another project, if the project provided more of a visual asset to the community than a competing alternative. An alternative rated higher than another for **dual use** if the project provided more recreational (park) benefits in addition to flood reduction.

An alternative that minimized disturbance to an existing **natural system** was also rated favorably. This provided a relative favorable rating to projects that did not disturb natural arroyos.

Table E-8 provides a listing of each alternative, its associated estimated construction cost, and where needed for comparison among competing alternatives, its associated qualitative evaluation factors.

E.6.0 ALTERNATIVE SELECTION

Alternatives were selected during a series of meetings with the City, EPWU, and URS staff in which the information in Table E-8 was discussed. In general, alternatives were selected which:

- Addressed fully the identified root flooding issue: i.e. 100-year return period protection was generally selected over alternatives with lesser protection;
- Addressed fully existing community safety issues;
- Addressed other identified community concerns: i.e. alternatives that minimized disturbance to a natural system, had opportunities for improving community aesthetics, had opportunities for improving community dual use; and
- Were cost effective relative to comparably functional alternatives.

In the case of larger projects (in excess of \$5 to \$10 million in estimated cost), projects were divided into phases. Early phases were chosen which provided substantive improvement in safety and flood protection at relatively low cost; later phases allowed for full achievement of the desired flood protection. Selected projects and associated phases are shown in Table E-9.

This page was intentionally left blank.

TABLES

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-1. Sources for Unit Costs

| Item | Source | | TxDOT Bid Tabs | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|---|
| | Web Link | Statewide 12 month moving average bid | Statewide | El Paso | Abilene | |
| Excavation, Embankments, Etc. | | | | | | |
| Embankment and Berm Fill | "Draft Unit Cost Summary" Spreadsheet for Active El Paso Drainage Projects | | | | | |
| Excavation (Special) | http://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdot/geodist/ELP/cserve/bidprice/s_0101.htm | | | | | |
| Backfill (Type A) | | | | | | |
| CL C CONC FOR EXT STR (ABUT) | | | | | | |
| REMOV STR (PIPE) | | | | | | x |
| EXCAVATION (CHANNEL) | | | | | | |
| REMOVING CONC (MISC) | | | | | | |
| REMOVING CONC (RIPRAP) | | | | | | |
| Rework base material (6-inch) (ord comp) | | | | | | Based on average cost of rework base material for different soil types at 6-inch ordinary compaction from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt |
| (ASPH) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | x | | |
| CUT AND RESTORING PAV (CONC) | | | | | | |
| CUT AND RESTORING PAV (FLEX BASE) | | | | | | |
| Channel Lining | | | | | | |
| RIPRAP (CONC) (4 IN) | http://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdot/geodist/ELP/cserve/bidprice/s_0101.htm | | | x | | |
| RIPRAP (STONE PROTECTION)(24 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/distinfo/bidprice/avgd08.txt | | | | x | |
| Riprap (Stone Common) (Dry) (24in) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| (Dry) (24 IN) | | | | | | |
| CL A CONC (Misc) | | | | | | |
| CL A CONC (Misc) (6-inch) | | | | | | x |
| Gabions (3' x 3') (Galv) | | | | | | |
| Riprap (Stone Common) (Grout) (12in) | | | | | | |
| Gabion Mattress (Galv) (6 in) | | | | | | |
| Pipe and Box Culverts | | | | | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (12 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (18 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (24 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (30 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | x | | |

Table E-1. Sources for Unit Costs (Continued)

| Item | Source Web Link | TxDOT Bid Tabs | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------|---------|---------|
| | | Statewide 12 month moving average bid | Statewide | El Paso | Abilene |
| Pipe and Box Culverts (Continued) | | | | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (36 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (42 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (48 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (54 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (60 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (66 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (72 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (78 IN) | Interpolated cost from 72-inch RCP and 84-inch RCP from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| RC PIPE (CL III) (96 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 8 IN) | estimate based on cost of 12in, 15in, 18in from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 12 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 18 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 24 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 30 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 36 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 42 IN) | Interpolated cost from 36-inch CMP and 48-inch CMP from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 48 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| 60-inch CMP | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 66 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 72 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 96 IN) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CMP (GAL STL 168 IN) | Jow Menicucci (505-228-5198), Contech Sales Engineer, Albuquerque 10/28/08. Quote for 10 gage steel pipe. Cost includes freight to El Paso from plant. | | x | | |
| 35-inch X 24-inch CMPA | NMDOT average unit bid prices 2007 | | | | |
| 112-inch X 75-inch CMPA | Contech regional sales office quote 10/27/08 for 12 gage galvanized corrugated metal, Portland Oregon (Karen 866-400-3180 ext. 193) | | | | |
| 141.8-inch X 91.3-inch CMPA | Contech regional sales office quote 10/27/08 for 10 gage galvanized corrugated metal, Portland Oregon (Karen 866-400-3180 ext. 193) | | | | |
| 63-inch X 98-inch Ellipse | Avg price between a 91-inch x 58-inch RCP Ellipse and a 106-inch x 68-inch RCP Ellipse from http://www.dot.state.co.us/App_EEMA_CDB/CostData2006.txt | CDOT cost data 2006 | | | |

Table E-1. Sources for Unit Costs (Continued)

| Item | Source Web Link | TxDOT Bid Tabs | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------|---------|---------|
| | | Statewide 12 month moving average bid | Statewide | El Paso | Abilene |
| Pipe and Box Culverts (Continued) | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (2 FT X 2 FT) | actual cost of 3'x2' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (3 FT X 2 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (3 FT X 3 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (3 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (4 FT X 2 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (4 FT X 3 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (4 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (5 FT X 2 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (5 FT X 3 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (5 FT X 5 FT) | http://www.dot.state.tx.us/insdot/geodist/ELP/cserve/bidprice/s_0101.htm | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (6 FT X 2 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (6 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (6 FT X 5 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (6 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (6 FT X 10 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 3 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 5 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 6.5 FT) | actual cost of 7'x7' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (7 FT X 7 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 3 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 5 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 7 FT) | Interpolated cost from 8' x 6' CBC and 8' x 8' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (8 FT X 8 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |

Table E-1. Sources for Unit Costs (Continued)

| Item | Source Web Link | TxDOT Bid Tabs | | | |
|--|---|---|-----------|---------|---------|
| | | Statewide 12 month moving average bid | Statewide | El Paso | Abilene |
| Pipe and Box Culverts (Continued) | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 5 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 7 FT) | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 8 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (9 FT X 9 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 2 FT) | actual bid price of a 10'x4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 3 FT) | actual bid price of a 10'x4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 4 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 5 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 7 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | x | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 8 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10 FT X 10 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (10.5 FT X 3.5 FT) | Actual cost of 10' x 4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (11 FT X 1.5 FT) | Cost of one 6'x2' CBC and one 5'x2' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12 FT X 2 FT) | Cost of 2 6'x2' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12 FT X 3 FT) | Cost of 2 3'x6' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12 FT X 4 FT) | Cost of 2 6'x4' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12 FT X 6 FT) | ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12.5 FT X 5.5 FT) | Actual cost of 12' x 6' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | x | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (12.5 FT X 6 FT) | Actual cost of 12' x 6' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (13 FT X 6 FT) | Actual cost of 12' x 6' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (14 FT X 2 FT) | cost of two 6'x2' CBCs and one 3'x2' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (15.5 FT X 10 FT) | cost of three 10'x5' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (16 FT X 6 FT) | cost of two 8'x6' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (18 FT X 6 FT) | cost of two 9'x6' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (19 FT X 4 FT) | cost of one 10'x4' CBC and one 9'x4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | |

Table E-1. Sources for Unit Costs (Continued)

| Item | Source | | TxDOT Bid Tabs | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|---|-----------|---------|---------|
| | Web Link | | Statewide 12 month moving average bid | Statewide | El Paso | Abilene |
| Pipe and Box Culverts (Continued) | | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (20 FT X 4 FT) | cost of two 10'x4' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (20 FT X 5 FT) | cost of two 10'x5' CBCs from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (20 FT X 6 FT) | Actual cost of 20'x8' precast CBC from http://www.dot.state.co.us/App_EEMA_CDB/CostData2007.txt | CDOT cost data 2007 | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (22 FT X 4 FT) | cost of two 10'x4' CBCs and one 4'x2' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (22 FT X 6 FT) | cost of two 10'x6' CBCs and one 6'x2' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (24 FT X 4 FT) | cost of two 10'x4' CBCs and one 4'x4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| CONC BOX CULV (24 FT X 6 FT) | cost of two 10'x6' CBCs and one 6'x4' CBC from ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/cmd/cserve/bidprice/as1458.txt | | | | | |
| Bridges | | | | | | |
| | Based on various bridge projects around NM. | | | | | |
| Bridge with concrete abutment | Based on various bridge projects around NM. | | | | | |
| Railroad Bridge | Based on various bridge projects around NM. | | | | | |
| Dam-Related | | | | | | |
| ROLLER COMPACTED CONCRETE | Data from recent URS bids and TX NRCS Bidtabs | | | | | |
| Cementitious Material for RCC | | | | | | |
| Concrete Pressure Pipe (18-inch) | TX NRCS Bid Tabs | EFAL 1A Bid Tab | | | | |
| Concrete Pressure Pipe (30-inch) | TX NRCS Bid Tabs | Dam No. 13A | | | | |
| Concrete Pressure Pipe (54-inch) | TX NRCS Bid Tabs | Double Creek 3 - Rehab Bid Summary | | | | |
| Concrete Pipe Cradle | TX NRCS Bid Tabs | EFAL 1A Bid Tab | | | | |
| Conduit Abandonment | TX NRCS Bid Tabs | EFAL 1A Bid Tab | | | | |

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-2. Summary of Basis, Factor Adjusting For Construction of Storm Drain Conduit in Urban Areas

| El Paso Project | Total Cost | Length of Significant Conduit | Conduit Sizes Considered | Project Cost per LF | TxDOT Cost per LF | Factor (Project/TxDOT) | Factor, Based Upon Engineering Judgment after Evaluating Each of the Example Projects |
|--|-------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------------|---|
| Reinforced Concrete Pipe | | | | | | | |
| Upper Valley Drainage Improvements Phase III - Bid Phase I | \$3,600,947 | 3406 | 54-inch, 60-inch | \$1,057.24 | \$223.00 | 4.7 | 3.7 |
| Upper Valley Drainage Improvements Phase III - Bid Phase II | \$2,705,521 | 2450 | 42-inch, 48-inch | \$1,104.29 | \$190.00 | 5.8 | |
| Carnegie Avenue Street and Drainage Improvements - Base Bid I | \$2,997,275 | 2694 | 66-inch | \$1,112.57 | \$338.00 | 3.3 | |
| Carnegie Avenue Street and Drainage Improvements - Base Bid II | \$1,060,622 | 1124 | 54-inch, 60-inch | \$943.61 | \$223.00 | 4.2 | |
| Davis Drive Street and Drainage Improvements | \$807,539 | 986 | 24-inch, 30-inch, 36-inch | \$819.01 | \$92.00 | 8.9 | |
| 3RD Avenue Street and Drainage Improvements | \$998,333 | 1176 | 24-inch | \$848.92 | \$80.00 | 10.6 | |
| Concrete Box Culvert | | | | | | | |
| Upper Valley Drainage Improvements Phase III - Box R&R Line 66 | \$79,200 | 36 | 4 x 5 | \$2,200.00 | \$207.00 | 10.6 | 11.1 |

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-3. Summary of Road Crossing Concept Designs

| Project and Alternative | Location | Material and Dimensions of Existing Crossing | Dimensions of Proposed Crossing | Type | Length (ft) | Road Surface | ROW/Easement Issues | Utility Relocation | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| CE2_1 | Cambridge | 2 - 8' x 3' CBC | 2 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 70 | CONC | none | MINOR | \$205,000 | X | |
| | Cumberland | 2 - 8' x 3' CBC | 2 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 75 | CONC | none | MINOR | \$220,000 | X | |
| | Trowbridge | 5 - 5' x 2.5' CBC | 3 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 70 | CONC | none | MINOR | \$316,000 | X | |
| | Chester | 2 - 8' x 3' CBC | 72' wide | BRIDGE | 28 | CONC | none | none | \$1,318,000 | X | |
| CE6_5 Ph III | Cebada | n/a | 3 - 5' x 4' | CBC | 190 | CONC | MAJOR | MAJOR | \$1,214,000 | X | |
| MV1 | Bucher Rd | 1 - 48-inch RCP | 3 - 10' x 7' | CBC | 52 | ASPH | none | none | \$407,000 | X | |
| MV3 | Conduits for Feather Lake II | none | 2 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 200 | none | none | MAJOR | \$547,000 | X | |
| MV4 | Conduits for Middle Interceptor Basin | none | 4 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 1570 | none | none | MINOR | \$6,323,000 | X | |
| MV5 | Carl Longuemare | 2- 60-inch RCP | 3 - 10' x 9' | CBC | 40 | ASPH | none | none | \$401,000 | X | |
| | Southside | 2- 60-inch RCP | 3 - 10' x 9' | CBC | 40 | none | none | none | \$384,000 | | |
| MV8 | Mimosa | 1 - 108-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 10' | CBC | 62 | ASPH | none | none | \$456,000 | X | |
| MV9 | DS of Yarbrough | 1 - 36-inch RCP | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 47 | ASPH | none | none | \$95,000 | X | |
| MV10 | Independence | 3 - 5' x 5' CBC | 2 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 225 | ASPH | none | none | \$433,000 | X | Current crossing slopes to Playa Drain. |
| NE7_1 | Falcon Ave | 1 - 18-inch RCP | 5 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 100 | ASPH | none | none | \$177,000 | X | |
| | Waycross Ave | 1 - 12-inch RCP | 5 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 109 | ASPH | none | none | \$191,000 | | |
| | Wren | 1 - 18-inch RCP | 5 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 127 | ASPH | none | none | \$225,000 | | |
| | Lexington | 1 - 18-inch RCP | 7 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 114 | ASPH | none | none | \$283,000 | | |
| | Crossing South of Falcon Ave | 1 - 12-inch RCP | 7 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 23 | none | none | none | \$47,000 | | |
| NE8_1 | East of Diana | 5 - 8' x 4' CBC | 6 - 7' x 6' | CBC | 45 | none | none | none | \$402,000 | X | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph I | Alps | 5 - 6' x 3' CBC | 8 - 10' x 4' | CBC | 63 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$1,180,000 | X | |
| | Hollings | 5 - 6' x 3' CBC | 8 - 10' x 4' | CBC | 50 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$937,000 | | |
| | Hondo Pass | 4 - 6' x 3' CBC | 8 - 10' x 3' | CBC | 80 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$1,161,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph II | Wren | 1 - 18-inch CMP | 8 - 10' x 4' | CBC | 47 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$880,000 | | |
| | Raymond Telles | 5 - 6' x 3' CBC | 8 - 10' x 4' | CBC | 52 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$974,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph III | Sanders | 1 - 8' x 5' CBC | 4 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 75 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$905,000 | | |
| NE11_2 | Raymond Telles | 1 - 2' x 2' CBC | 2 - 6' x 3' | CBC | 49 | CONC | none | none | \$80,000 | | |
| NE14_1 | Morningside Circle | 3 - 36-inch CMP | 2 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 61 | ASPH | none | none | \$117,000 | | |
| | Byron Drive | 3 - 36-inch CMP | 2 - 5' x 3' | CBC | 67 | ASPH | none | none | \$89,000 | | |
| NW1_1 | Corona Del Sol | 1 - 36-inch RCP | 2 - 6' x 3' | CBC | 162 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$258,000 | X | |
| | Villa Del Sol | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 3 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 81 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$83,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| | Playa Del Sol | 1 - 24-inch RCP | 1 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 112 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$118,000 | | |
| NW5_1 | Transmountain | 4 - 6' x 6' CBC | 6 - 6' x 6' | CBC | 145 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$433,000 | X | TxDOT Responsibility, Add 2 barrels to existing. |
| NW6_1 | Desert Canyon Drive | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 2 - 7' x 6' | CBC | 110 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$402,000 | X | |
| | Shelby Dr | 2 - 8' x 6' CBC | 3 - 8' x 6' | CBC | 82 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$162,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing |
| NW7_1 | Franklin Hills | 2 - 8' x 4' CBC | 4 - 8' x 7' | CBC | 79 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$730,000 | X | |
| | Franklin Crest | 2 - 8' x 4' CBC | 3 - 9' x 8' | CBC | 77 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$679,000 | | |
| NW8_1 | Bird Rd. | 2 - 35' x 24' ARCH | 2 - 4' X 3' | CBC | 54 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$262,000 | | |
| | Frontera | 2 - 35' X 24' ARCH | 3 - 5' X 4' | CBC | 64 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$370,000 | | |
| | Sunland Park | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 5 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 121 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$581,000 | | Add 3 barrels to existing. |
| NW8_2 | Bird Rd. | 2 - 35' x 24' ARCH | 2 - 4' x 2' | CBC | 54 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$245,000 | X | |
| | Frontera | 2 - 35' X 24' ARCH | 3 - 4' x 4' | CBC | 64 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$336,000 | | |
| | Sunland Park | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 5 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 121 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$579,000 | | Add 3 barrels to existing. |
| NW12_1 | Railroad 1 | 44' wide | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 10 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$377,000 | | |
| | Pedestrian | 44' wide | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 8 | CONC | none | none | \$308,000 | | |
| | Power Station | 2 - 36-inch RCP | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 48 | ASPH | none | none | \$845,000 | | |
| | Dona Ana County Rd. | 2 - 36-inch RCP | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 111 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,688,000 | | |
| | Railroad 2 | No existing information | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 60 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$1,005,000 | | Bridge is buried. |

Table E-3. Summary of Road Crossing Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Material and Dimensions of Existing Crossing | Dimensions of Proposed Crossing | Type | Length (ft) | Road Surface | ROW/Easement Issues | Utility Relocation | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|
| NW12_2 | Railroad 1 | 44' wide | 48' wide | BRIDGE | 10 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$393,000 | X | |
| | Pedestrian | 44' wide | 48' wide | BRIDGE | 8 | CONC | none | none | \$318,000 | | |
| | Power Station | 2 - 36-inch RCP | 4 - 6' x 5' | CBC | 48 | ASPH | none | none | \$427,000 | | |
| | Dona Ana County Rd. | 2 - 36-inch RCP | 4 - 7' x 7' | CBC | 111 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,017,000 | | |
| | Railroad 2 | No existing information | 48' wide | BRIDGE | 60 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$1,078,000 | | Bridge is buried. |
| NW15_1 | River Bend Dr. | 3 - 48-inch RCP | 2 - 8' x 6' | CBC | 66 | ASPH | none | none | \$242,000 | X | |
| | Railroad Tracks | 18.3' wide | 44' wide | BRIDGE | 8.5 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$149,000 | | |
| NW17_1 | Train Tracks | 1 - 24-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 178 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$1,098,000 | X | |
| | Mulberry | 1 - 36-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 75 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$321,000 | | |
| | Lindbergh | 1 - 36-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 59 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$253,000 | | |
| | Country Club 2 | No existing information | 2 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 90 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$385,000 | | Existing culvert collapsed. |
| | Country Club 1 | No existing information | 2 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 70 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$300,000 | | Existing culvert collapsed. |
| | Lombardy | 1 - 48-inch RCP | 2 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 88 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$524,000 | | |
| | Sunset | 1 - 48-inch RCP | 2 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 73 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$434,000 | | |
| | Montoya Dr. | 1 - 18-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 7' | CBC | 64 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$499,000 | | |
| NW19_1 | Turnstone | 64' wide | 64' wide | BRIDGE | 50 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$1,310,000 | | |
| | Pedestrian | 59' wide | 60' wide | BRIDGE | 5 | ASPH | none | none | \$95,000 | | |
| | Frontera | 45' wide | 45' wide | BRIDGE | 32 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$582,000 | | |
| NW19_2 | Turnstone | 64' wide | 73' wide | BRIDGE | 50 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$1,490,000 | | |
| | Pedestrian | 59' wide | 73' wide | BRIDGE | 5 | ASPH | none | none | \$110,000 | | |
| | Frontera | 45' wide | 73' wide | BRIDGE | 32 | ASPH | none | MAJOR | \$940,000 | | |
| NW21_1 | 840 ft US of Dona Ana County Rd. | 1 - 96-inch CMP | 4 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 74 | none | none | none | \$768,000 | | |
| | Sunland Park | 1 - 72-inch CMP | 3 - 16' x 6' | CBC | 140 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$1,666,000 | | |
| | Unknown (before outlet) | 3 - 5' x 5' CBC | 4 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 45 | ASPH | none | none | \$488,000 | | |
| NW21_2 | 840 ft US of Dona Ana County Rd. | 1 - 96-inch CMP | 4 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 74 | none | none | none | \$768,000 | X | |
| | Sunland Park | 1 - 72-inch CMP | 3 - 16' x 6' | CBC | 140 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$1,666,000 | | |
| | Unknown (before outlet) | 3 - 5' x 5' CBC | 4 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 45 | ASPH | none | none | \$488,000 | | |
| NW22_1 | Northwestern | 1 - 23' x 9' ARCH | 2 - 12' x 10' | CBC | 126 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,121,000 | | |
| NW24_1 | Westwind Dr. | 1 - 9' x 8' CBC | 3 - 9' x 8' | CBC | 161 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$970,000 | X | Add 2 barrels to existing. |
| | Loma De Cristo Dr. | 1 - 9' x 9' CBC | 2 - 9' x 9' | CBC | 88 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$295,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| | Via Descanso | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 3 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 98 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$102,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| NW24_2 | Via Descanso | 2 - 6' x 4' CBC | 3 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 98 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$102,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| NW25_1 | Mesa | 2 - 4' x 4' CBC | 3 - 6' x 6' | CBC | 484 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$2,216,000 | | |
| | Resler | 2 - 48-inch RCP | 4 - 48-inch | RCP | 1677 | ASPH | MINOR | MAJOR | \$1,675,000 | | Add 2 barrels to existing. |
| | Westwind Dr. | 1 - 30-inch RCP & 1 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 6' x 5' | CBC | 95 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$123,000 | | |
| | El Puente | 2 - 42-inch RCP | 2 - 6' x 4' | CBC | 164 | ASPH | none | none | \$399,000 | | |
| | Northwind | 1 - 54-inch RCP | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 172 | ASPH | none | none | \$344,000 | | |
| NW25_2 | Mesa | 2 - 4' x 4' CBC | 5 - 4' x 4' | CBC | 484 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$1,056,000 | | Add 3 barrels to existing. |
| | Resler Dr. | 2 - 48-inch RCP | 3 - 48-inch | RCP | 1677 | ASPH | MINOR | MAJOR | \$1,362,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| | Westwind Dr. | 1 - 30-inch RCP & 1 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 95 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$100,000 | | |
| NW25_3 | Westwind Dr. | 1 - 30-inch RCP & 1 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 6' x 5' | CBC | 95 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$123,000 | X | |
| | Northwind | 1 - 54-inch RCP | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 172 | ASPH | none | none | \$344,000 | | |
| | Resler Dr. | 2 - 48-inch RCP | 3 - 48-inch | RCP | 1677 | ASPH | MINOR | MAJOR | \$1,362,000 | | Add 1 barrel to existing. |
| | Mesa | 2 - 4' x 4' CBC | 5 - 4' x 4' | CBC | 484 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$1,056,000 | | Add 3 barrels to existing. |
| NW26_1 | Mesa | 1 - 6' x 4' CBC | 2 - 8' x 6' | CBC | 478 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$1,900,000 | X | |
| NW32_1 | Kiely Road | 2 - 30-inch RCP | 6 - 30-inch RCP | RCP | 47 | ASPH | none | none | \$35,000 | | Add 4 barrels to existing culvert. |
| | Iron Drive | 3 - 30-inch RCP | 6 - 30-inch RCP | RCP | 38 | ASPH | none | none | \$20,000 | | Add 3 barrels to existing culvert. |

Table E-3. Summary of Road Crossing Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Material and Dimensions of Existing Crossing | Dimensions of Proposed Crossing | Type | Length (ft) | Road Surface | ROW/Easement Issues | Utility Relocation | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|--------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--|
| NW32_2 | Kiely Road | 2 - 30-inch RCP | 5 - 7' x 4' | CBC | 47 | ASPH | none | none | \$256,000 | | |
| | Iron Drive | 3 - 30-inch RCP | 6 - 6' x 6' | CBC | 38 | ASPH | none | none | \$311,000 | | |
| | Railroad 1 | 1 - 48-inch CMP | 33' wide | BRIDGE | 76 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$758,000 | | |
| | Railroad 2 | 1 - 24-inch CMP | 33' wide | BRIDGE | 72 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$719,000 | | |
| | Railroad 3 | 1 - 48-inch x 30-inch Ellipse | 4 - 6' x 5' | CBC | 128 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$628,000 | | |
| | Railroad 4 | 2 - 30-inch CMP | 5 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 61 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$314,000 | | |
| NW32_3 | Kiely Road | 2 - 30-inch RCP | 5 - 7' x 4' | CBC | 47 | ASPH | none | none | \$256,000 | X | |
| | Iron Drive | 3 - 30-inch RCP | 6 - 6' x 6' | CBC | 38 | ASPH | none | none | \$311,000 | | |
| NW33_1 | Railroad | 42' wide | 84' wide | BRIDGE | 18.5 | RAILROAD | none | none | \$620,000 | X | |
| | A P Ramirez Street | 4 - 36-inch RCP | 110' wide | BRIDGE | 40 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,410,000 | | |
| | Doniphan Drive | 2 - 6' x 6' CBC | 56' wide | BRIDGE | 70 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,259,000 | | |
| NW35_2 | IH-10 Off-Ramp | 13 - 9' x 5' CBC | 16 - 9' x 5' | CBC | 38.5 | ASPH | none | none | \$199,000 | X | Add 3 barrels to existing culvert. |
| | Kiely Road | 2 - 8' x 3' CBC | 58' wide | BRIDGE | 42 | ASPH | none | none | \$731,000 | | |
| | Vinton Road | Low-water crossing | 58' wide | BRIDGE | 42 | ASPH | none | none | \$731,000 | | |
| | Quejette Road | Low-water crossing | 58' wide | BRIDGE | 40 | ASPH | none | none | \$696,000 | | |
| WC1_1 | Zenith Drive | 1 - 72-inch CMP | 2 - 12' x 7' | CBC | 82 | ASPH | none | none | \$514,000 | | |
| WC2_1 | Paisano Drive | 44' wide | 50' wide | BRIDGE | 186 | ASPH | none | none | \$2,782,000 | X | Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| WC6_1 | Mesa Street | 2 - 4' x 4' CBC | 8 - 4' x 4' | CBC | 770 | ASPH | MAJOR | MINOR | \$7,246,000 | | Add 6 barrels to existing culvert. |
| | Wallington | 1 - 63-inch x 98-inch Ellipse | 3 - 10' x 8' | CBC | 60 | ASPH | none | MINOR | \$588,000 | | |
| WC6_2 | Mesa Street | 2 - 4' x 4' CBC | 8 - 4' x 4' | CBC | 770 | ASPH | MAJOR | MINOR | \$7,246,000 | X | Add 6 barrels to existing culvert. |
| WC7_1 | Paisano Drive | 13' wide | 40' wide | BRIDGE | 150 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,871,000 | X | Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| WC8_1 | University Avenue | 1 - 141.8-inch x 91.3-inch | 3 - 7' x 7' | CBC | 86 | ASPH | none | none | \$509,000 | X | |
| | Oregon Street | 2 - 84-inch CMP | 4 - 9' x 9' | CBC | 71 | ASPH | none | none | \$873,000 | | |
| WC8_2 | Campbell Street | 2 - 72-inch CMP | 2 - 10' x 9' | CBC | 71 | ASPH | none | none | \$472,000 | | |
| | Kansas Street | 2 - 10' x 5' CBC | 2 - 9' x 9' | CBC | 52 | ASPH | none | none | \$109,000 | | |
| | Mesa/Stanton Streets | 2 - 12.5' x 5.5' CBC | 3 - 8' x 7' | CBC | 400 | ASPH | none | none | \$1,035,000 | | |
| | Oregon Street | 2 - 84-inch CMP | 2 - 7' x 7' | CBC | 71 | ASPH | none | none | \$114,000 | | |
| WC9_1 | US Paisano Drive | 6 - 8' x 3' CBC | 10 - 12' x 4' | CBC | 42 | ASPH | none | none | \$786,000 | X | Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| | Paisano Drive | 4 - 7' x 7' CBC | 5 - 7' x 7' | CBC | 182 | ASPH | none | none | \$340,000 | | Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. Add 1 barrel to existing culvert. |
| | DS Paisano Drive | 4 - 6' x 4' CBC | 6 - 12' x 6' | CBC | 43 | ASPH | none | none | \$700,000 | | Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| EA1 Ph I | Edgemere Boulevard at Airway Boulevard | 1 - 7' x 4' CBC | 2 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 120 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$488,000 | X | |
| | Edgemere Boulevard at Robert E. Lee Road | 1 - 8' x 4' CBC | 2 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 165 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$669,000 | X | |
| | Robert E. Lee Road at Railroad Crossing | 1 - 92.4-inch x 65-inch ARCH | NA | NA | 60 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$26,000 | X | Current crossing is a french drain that will be removed and the channel connected. |
| EA3 Ph I | Lorne Channel at Lorne Road | 1 - 8' x 2' CBC | 1 - 10' x 3' | CBC | 80 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$154,000 | X | |
| EA8 Ph I | Bluff Channel at Esther Lama Drive | 1 - 10' x 5' CBC | 3 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 115 | CONC | none | MAJOR | \$1,081,000 | X | |

Table E-4. Summary of Basin Concept Designs

| Project and Alternative | Location | Footprint Area (Acres) | Depth of Excavation (ft) | Total Capacity of Basin (Ac-ft) | Volume of Excavation Required (Ac-Ft) | Embankment Height (ft) | Outlet Structure | Property Cost | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| CE1_1 | Austin High Pond | 2.5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 0 | none | \$348,345 | \$635,000 | X | |
| CE3_1 | Saipan Reservoir | 6.4 | 10 | 60 | 65 | 0 | Cost included in Pump Stations | \$0 | \$2,130,000 | | |
| CE3_2 | Saipan Reservoir | 6.4 | 10 | 60 | 65 | 0 | Cost included in Pump Stations | \$0 | \$2,130,000 | X | |
| CE6_1 | Copia Reservoir | 2.3 | 15 | 23 | 23.6 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$36,000 | \$807,000 | | |
| CE6_1 | Magnolia Reservoir | 1.4 | Sediment Removal | 4 to 6 | 4 | 0 | Existing Storm Drains will be utilized | \$0 | \$131,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | Copia Reservoir | 2.3 | 15 | 23 | 23.6 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$36,000 | \$807,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | Magnolia Reservoir | 1.4 | Sediment Removal | 4 to 6 | 4 | 0 | Existing Storm Drains will be utilized | \$0 | \$131,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | Piedras St. RR Pond | 5.7 | 20 | 83.8 | 84 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$1,820,000 | \$4,558,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | Copia Reservoir | 2.3 | 15 | 23 | 23.6 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$36,000 | \$807,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | Magnolia Reservoir | 1.4 | Sediment Removal | 4 to 6 | 4 | 0 | Existing Storm Drains will be utilized | \$0 | \$131,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | Piedras St. RR Pond | 5.7 | 20 | 83.8 | 84 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$1,820,000 | \$4,558,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | Copia Reservoir | 2.3 | 15 | 23 | 23.6 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$36,000 | \$807,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | Magnolia Reservoir | 1.4 | Sediment Removal | 4 to 6 | 4 | 0 | Existing Storm Drains will be utilized | \$0 | \$131,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | Piedras St. RR Pond | 5.7 | 20 | 83.8 | 84 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$1,820,000 | \$4,558,000 | | |
| CE6_5 Ph I | Copia Reservoir | 2.3 | 15 | 23 | 23.6 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$36,000 | \$807,000 | X | |
| CE6_5 Ph I | Magnolia Reservoir | 1.4 | Sediment Removal | 4 to 6 | 4 | 0 | Existing Storm Drains will be utilized | \$0 | \$131,000 | X | |
| CE6_5 Ph III | Piedras St. RR Pond | 5.7 | 20 | 83.8 | 84 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$1,820,000 | \$4,558,000 | X | |
| CE11_1 | Citrus Place Pond | 6.4 | 20 | 45 | | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$0 | \$4,912,000 | | |
| CE11_2 | Citrus Place Pond and Mills Ave. RR Pond | N/A | 20 | 45 | N/A | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$0 | \$7,335,000 | | |
| MV8 Ph I | Basin B | 24.8 | 2 | 50 | 50 | 0 | Cost included in Pump Stations | \$0 | \$1,634,000 | X | |
| MV3 | Feather Lake II property | 19.8 | 15 | 195 | 237 | 0 | Automated Gates (Cost included elsewhere) | \$0 | \$7,755,000 | X | |
| MV4 | Middle Drain Interceptor | 9.4 | 20 | 115 | 173 | 0 | Automated Gates (Cost included elsewhere) | \$1,806,000 | \$7,458,000 | X | |
| MV5 Ph I | Basin G | 15.4 | N/A | 55 | 154 | 0 | Cost included in Pump Stations | \$0 | \$5,044,000 | X | |
| MV10 | Basin C | 18.4 | 5 | 30 | 60 | 0 | Cost included in Pump Stations | \$0 | \$1,960,000 | X | |
| NE5_1 | West of US 54 | 8.1 | 20 | 225 | 262 | 3 | 50 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$9,270,000 | | |
| NE5_2 | West of US 54 | 4.2 | 9 | 50 | 69 | 3 | 50 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$2,836,000 | X | |
| NE5_2b | East of US 54 | 2.5 | 20 | 50 | 50 | 0 | none | \$948,000 | \$2,582,000 | | |
| NE5_4b | Museum Area | 3.6 | 9 | 40 | 49 | 3 | 50 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$72,000 | \$2,137,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph I | Basin 3 | 7.2 | 4 | 26 | 26 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$2,341,000 | \$3,194,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph II | Basin 2 | 1.5 | 10 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$765,000 | \$5,705,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph III | Basin 1 | 10.6 | 20 | 215 | 205 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$1,967,000 | \$8,664,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph IV | Basin 4 | 5.2 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 0 | Cost included in Storm Drains | \$273,000 | \$23,795,000 | | |
| NE14_1 | Clearview Debris | 2.8 | 8 | 20 | 45 | 0 | none | \$11,000 | \$1,481,000 | X | |
| NE14_2 | Clearview Debris and Detention | 6 | 14 | 84 | 128 | 0 | none | \$23,000 | \$4,189,000 | | |
| NE16_1 | Johnson Channel | 1 | 16 | 13.5 | 13 | 0 | none | \$82,000 | \$521,000 | X | |
| NW5_1 | East of Westside Masterplan | 6.0 | N/A | 38.8 | 93.1 | 6.5 | none | \$0 | \$3,092,000 | X | Developer's responsibility |
| NW5_2 | East of Westside Masterplan | 15.9 | N/A | 318.5 | 353.6 | 20 | 90 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$12,635,000 | | Developer's responsibility |
| NW6_2 | East of Franklin Hills St. | 4.4 | N/A | 69.8 | 37.3 | 16 | none | \$1,657,000 | \$3,988,000 | | |
| NW7_2 | East of Franklin Hills St. | 8.5 | 6.7 | 110.0 | 206.1 | 5 | none | \$126,000 | \$7,266,000 | | |
| NW12_1 | 400 ft NE of Dona Ana County Rd. | 0.9 | N/A | 1.8 | 0.9 | 2 | none | \$78,000 | \$129,000 | | |
| NW12_2 | 400 ft NE of Dona Ana County Rd. | 0.9 | N/A | 1.8 | 0.9 | 2 | none | \$78,000 | \$129,000 | X | |
| NW22_2 | South of Loop 375 | 20.7 | N/A | 248.0 | 264.9 | 12 | 60 ft - 18-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$577,000 | \$9,995,000 | X | Developer's responsibility |
| NW24_1 | Northeast of Via Descanso | 1.2 | N/A | 9.6 | 4.5 | 8 | none | \$60,000 | \$581,000 | X | Developer's responsibility |
| NW24_2 | Northeast of Via Descanso | 5.2 | N/A | 101.8 | 82.1 | 19.5 | 88 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$60,000 | \$3,399,000 | | |
| NW25_2 | North of Satellite Dr. | 1.3 | N/A | 11.9 | 10.2 | 9 | none | \$929,000 | \$1,509,000 | | |
| | Intersection of Cloudview Dr. & El Puente St. | 1.2 | N/A | 24.1 | 4.0 | 21 | none | \$10,000 | \$142,000 | | |
| NW25_3 | Intersection of Cloudview Dr. & El Puente St. | 1.2 | N/A | 24.1 | 4.0 | 21 | none | \$10,000 | \$142,000 | X | |

Table E-4. Summary of Basin Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Footprint Area (Acres) | Depth of Excavation (ft) | Total Capacity of Basin (Ac-ft) | Volume of Excavation Required (Ac-Ft) | Embankment Height (ft) | Outlet Structure | Property Cost | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---|---------------|--------------|-----------------------|---|
| NW28_1 | Existing basin E of Thunderbird Dr and Torrey Pines Dr | 1.2 | 9.8 | 23.9 | 20.17 | 10.0 | none | \$0 | \$659,000 | X | |
| NW29_1 | US of Silver springs and Castlerock | 4.0 | N/A | 60.3 | 28.52 | 15.0 | 75 ft - 30-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$489,414 | \$4,905,000 | X | |
| NW30_1 | Intersection of Mesa Hills and Double Tree | 2.2 | 4.7 | 16.1 | 14.9 | 7.5 | none | \$34,000 | \$521,000 | X | Cost to be provided by EPWU. |
| NW31_1 | E of Remington Dr | 1.7 | N/A | 10.3 | 7.43 | 6.0 | none | \$114,000 | \$417,000 | | |
| NW31_2 | Confluence of Flow Path No. 45 and Flow Path No. 45B | 22.0 | N/A | 528.9 | 380.2 | 24.0 | 106 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$13,868,000 | X | Basins may also be constructed as part of NW34_2. |
| | S of Westway Blvd | 16.5 | N/A | 378.8 | 200.2 | 23.0 | 102 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$7,765,000 | | |
| NW32_1 | E of Lovena Way | 14.2 | N/A | 212.6 | 159.6 | 15.0 | 70 ft - 18-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$270,000 | \$6,515,000 | | |
| NW34_1 | Confluence of Flow Path No. 45 and Flow Path No. 45B | 23.0 | N/A | 573.9 | 441.2 | 25.0 | 110 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$15,991,000 | | |
| | S of Westway Blvd | 25.8 | N/A | 619.8 | 484.3 | 24.0 | 106 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$17,379,000 | | |
| NW34_3 | Confluence of Flow Path No. 45 and Flow Path No. 45B | 10.3 | N/A | 134.3 | 142.9 | 13.0 | none | \$0 | \$5,248,000 | | |
| | S of Westway Blvd | 9.6 | N/A | 135.0 | 101.2 | 14.0 | none | \$0 | \$3,947,000 | | |
| NW35_1 | DS of De Alva | 37.3 | N/A | 895.3 | 662.52 | 24.0 | 106 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$1,865,000 | \$25,934,000 | | |
| WC1_1 | N of Zentith Dr | 1.6 | N/A | 9.4 | 5.1 | 6.0 | 36 ft - 36-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$78,000 | \$297,000 | | Developer Responsibility |
| | NW of Stanton Dr | 0.9 | N/A | 6.1 | 2.93 | 7.0 | 38 ft - 18-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$44,000 | \$176,000 | | Developer Responsibility |
| WC1_2 | N of Zentith Dr | 5.4 | N/A | 108.3 | 53.23 | 20.0 | none | \$271,000 | \$2,476,000 | X | Developer Responsibility |
| | NW of Stanton Dr | 3.7 | N/A | 56.0 | 42.8 | 15.0 | 75 ft - 18-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$187,000 | \$1,903,000 | | Developer Responsibility |
| WC3_1 | E of Crimson Cloud Ln and Stanton St | 1.7 | N/A | 8.7 | 17.1 | 5.0 | 35 ft - 54-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$87,000 | \$687,000 | X | Developer Responsibility |
| WC4_1 | E of Stanton St and Buckingham Dr | 0.8 | N/A | 3.2 | 4.5 | 4.0 | none | \$222,000 | \$375,000 | X | Developer Responsibility |
| WC8_1 | DS of Robinson Ave and Kingery Dr | 2.6 | N/A | 31.0 | 14.37 | 12.0 | none | \$0 | \$569,000 | X | |
| WC8_2 | DS of Robinson Ave and Kingery Dr | 7.7 | 7.5 | 173.6 | 174.43 | 22.5 | 100 ft - 18-inch Concrete Pressure Pipe | \$0 | \$6,504,000 | | |
| EA2 | Sunmount Channel at Upstream Viscount Boulevard | 2 | 10 | 20 | 20 | 0 | none | \$0 | \$653,000 | X | |
| EA5 | Eastwood/Album Park Pond | 4.25 | 20 | 85 | 85 | 0 | none | \$0 | \$2,777,000 | X | |
| EA9 Ph I | RV Channel at Upstream Paseo Del Este Boulevard | 5.5 | 15 | 80 | 80 | 0 | none | \$3,155,850 | \$5,769,000 | X | |
| EA10 Ph I | Mercantile Channel at Upstream Paseo Del Este Boulevard | 9.5 | 15 | 140 | 140 | 0 | none | \$67,766 | \$4,642,000 | X | |

Table E-5. Summary of Pump Station Concept Designs

| Project and Alternative | Location | New Pump Station or Expansion of Existing Pump Station | Existing Pump Station Capacity (cfs) | Proposed Pump Station Capacity Increase | | Unit Cost (\$/gpm) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--|
| | | | | cfs | gpm | | | | |
| CE3_1 | Saipan | New | 0 | 20 | 9000 | 151 | \$1,831,000 | | |
| CE3_2 | Saipan | New | 0 | 20 | 9000 | 151 | \$1,831,000 | X | |
| CE6_1 | Magnolia Pond | New | 0 | 293 | 131500 | 65 | \$11,544,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | Cebada System | New | 0 | 293 | 131500 | 68 | \$12,077,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | RR Pond | New | 0 | 355 | 159300 | 65 | \$13,987,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | Cebada System | New | 0 | 293 | 131500 | 68 | \$12,077,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | RR Pond | New | 0 | 255 | 114400 | 75 | \$11,593,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | Cebada System | New | 0 | 646 | 289900 | 55 | \$21,537,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | RR Pond | New | 0 | 425 | 190700 | 60 | \$15,457,000 | | |
| CE6_5 Ph II | RR Pond | New | 0 | 425 | 190700 | 60 | \$15,457,000 | X | |
| CE11_3 | Dallas Pump Station | New | 0 | 380 | 170500 | 60 | \$13,820,000 | | |
| CE11_4 | Dallas Pump Station | New | 0 | 115 | 51600 | 80 | \$5,573,000 | | |
| CE11_5 Ph I | Dallas Pump Station | New | 0 | 115 | 51600 | 80 | \$5,573,000 | X | |
| CE11_5 Ph II | Dallas Pump Station | Expansion | 115 | 255 | 114500 | 50 | \$7,728,000 | X | |
| MV3 | Feather Lake II | New | 0 | 25 | 11200 | 151 | \$2,287,000 | X | |
| MV4 | Middle Drain Interceptor | New | 0 | 25 | 11200 | 151 | \$2,287,000 | X | |
| MV5 Ph II | Basin G | New | N/A | 820 | 368000 | 60 | \$29,809,000 | X | Assumed new pump station would be constructed. |
| MV7 | Basin A | New | 390 | 525 | 235600 | 60 | \$19,076,000 | X | CH2MHill design and URS cost. |
| MV8 Ph I | Basin B | New | 0 | 165 | 74100 | 75 | \$7,498,000 | X | |
| MV8 Ph II | Basin B | Expansion | 165 | 165 | 74100 | 52 | \$5,198,000 | X | |
| MV10 | Basin C | New | 0 | 160 | 71800 | 75 | \$7,271,000 | X | |
| NE9/NE10_1 Ph IV | Threadgill | New | 0 | 10 | 4500 | 200 | \$1,212,000 | | |

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-6. Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Structure Dimensions | Proposed Dimensions | Type | Length (ft) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|
| CE3_1 | Saipan Entering | none | 1-48-inch | RCP | 1654 | \$826,000 | | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-54-inch | RCP | 514 | \$719,000 | | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-60-inch | RCP | 89 | \$128,000 | | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-48-inch | RCP | 983 | \$341,000 | | |
| CE3_2 | Saipan Entering | none | 1-48-inch | RCP | 1654 | \$826,000 | X | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-54-inch | RCP | 514 | \$719,000 | X | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-60-inch | RCP | 89 | \$128,000 | X | |
| | Saipan Entering | none | 1-48-inch | RCP | 983 | \$341,000 | X | |
| CE6_1 | Copia Entering | none | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 580 | \$2,842,000 | | |
| | Copia Discharge | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 520 | \$260,000 | | |
| | Magnolia System | none | 1 - 4.5' x 3.5' | CBC | 2341 | \$4,210,000 | | |
| | RR Pond Discharge | none | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 5941 | \$2,968,000 | | |
| CE6_2 | Copia Entering | none | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 580 | \$2,842,000 | | |
| | Copia Discharge | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 520 | \$260,000 | | |
| | Cebada System | none | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 2305 | \$1,151,000 | | |
| | Magnolia System | none | 1 - 5' x 3.5' | CBC | 2341 | \$5,262,000 | | |
| | RR Pond Discharge | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 5941 | \$2,968,000 | | |
| CE6_3 | Copia Entering | none | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 580 | \$2,842,000 | | |
| | Copia Discharge | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 520 | \$260,000 | | |
| | Cebada System | none | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 2305 | \$1,151,000 | | |
| | Magnolia System | none | 1 - 5' x 4.5' | CBC | 2341 | \$8,068,000 | | |
| | RR Pond Discharge | none | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 5941 | \$2,968,000 | | |
| CE6_4 | Copia Entering | none | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 580 | \$2,842,000 | | |
| | Copia Discharge | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 520 | \$260,000 | | |
| | Cebada System | none | 1 - 54-inch | RCP | 2304 | \$3,224,000 | | |
| | Magnolia System | none | 1 - 5' x 4' | CBC | 2341 | \$6,314,000 | | |
| | RR Pond Discharge | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 5941 | \$2,968,000 | | |
| CE6_5 Ph I | Copia Entering | none | 2 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 580 | \$2,842,000 | X | |
| | Copia Discharge | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 520 | \$260,000 | X | |
| CE6_5 Ph II | Magnolia System | none | 1 - 5' x 4' | CBC | 2341 | \$6,314,000 | X | |
| | RR Pond Discharge | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 5941 | \$2,968,000 | X | |
| CE11_3 | North Segment 1 | 1 - 7' x 5' CBC | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 4800 | \$2,479,000 | | |

Table E-6. Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Structure Dimensions | Proposed Dimensions | Type | Length (ft) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------|------|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------|
| CE11_4 | North Segment 1 | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 4800 | \$2,398,000 | | |
| | North Segment 2 | none | 1 - 7' x 5' | CBC | 2500 | \$11,239,000 | | |
| CE11_5 Ph I | North Segment 1 | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 4800 | \$2,398,000 | X | |
| | North Segment 2 | none | 1- 7' x 5' | CBC | 2500 | \$11,239,000 | X | |
| MV5 | Basin G Pump Conduit | none | 6 - 72-inch | RCP | 668 | \$2,197,000 | X | |
| MV6 | Alameda Storm Drain | none | 2 - 6' x 5' | CBC | 8750 | \$42,879,000 | X | |
| MV8 Ph I | Basin B Pump Conduit | none | 1 - 72-inch | RCP | 590 | \$825,000 | X | |
| MV8 Ph II | Basin B Pump Conduit | none | 1 - 72-inch | RCP | 590 | \$825,000 | X | |
| MV10 | Basin C Pump Conduit | none | 1 - 72-inch | RCP | 770 | \$1,077,000 | X | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph I | Into Basin 3 | none | 1 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 1275 | \$5,732,000 | | |
| | Basin 3 to Threadgill | none | 1 - 3' x 2' | CBC | 300 | \$495,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph II | Into Basin 2 | none | 1 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 386 | \$1,735,000 | | |
| | Basin 2 to Threadgill | none | 1 - 3' x 2' | CBC | 2010 | \$3,313,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph III | Basin 1 to Threadgill | none | 1 - 3' x 2' | CBC | 3341 | \$5,507,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_1 Ph II | Into Basin 4 | none | 1 - 5' x 5' | CBC | 386 | \$1,735,000 | | |
| | Basin 4 to Threadgill | none | 1 - 3' x 2' | CBC | 2010 | \$3,313,000 | | |
| NW27_1 | Pump Station 14 to Pump Station 13 | Unknown | 1 - 72-inch | RCP | 7775 | \$10,874,000 | | |
| | Pump Station 13 to Outlet Rio Grande | Unknown | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 140 | \$70,000 | | |
| NW27_2 | Pump Station 14 to Doniphan Ditch | Unknown | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 334 | \$167,000 | X | |
| | Pump Station 13 to Doniphan Ditch | Unknown | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 131 | \$65,000 | | |
| NW31_3 | Remington to IH-10 | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 4530 | \$6,539,000 | | |
| WC1_1 | Castellano Drive | none | 2 - 33' x 5' | CBC | 2040 | \$22,721,000 | | |
| WC8_1 | Campbell to Mesa | none | 2 - 29' x 7' | CBC | 1375 | \$18,841,000 | X | |
| EA1 Ph II | Cielo Vista Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 1370 | \$1,026,000 | X | |
| | Cielo Vista Drive | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 2275 | \$2,159,000 | X | |
| | Catalina Way | none | 1 - 8' x 4' | CBC | 1470 | \$3,304,000 | X | |
| EA3 Ph II | Wexford Drive & Dungarvan Drive | none | 1 - 30-inch | RCP | 550 | \$275,000 | X | |
| | Cardigan Drive & Darin Road | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 1240 | \$681,000 | X | |
| | Kinross Avenue, Darin Road, Shannon Place & Limerick Road | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 2080 | \$1,558,000 | X | |
| | Shannon Place & Limerick Road | none | 1 - 8' x 3' | CBC | 680 | \$1,528,000 | X | |

Table E-6. Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Structure Dimensions | Proposed Dimensions | Type | Length (ft) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--|---|---------------------|------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|
| EA4 Ph I | McRae Boulevard & Wedgewood Drive | 1 - 18-inch RCP, 1 - 24-inch RCP, 1 - 30-inch RCP | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 2085 | \$1,562,000 | X | |
| | McRae Boulevard | 1 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 2420 | \$2,297,000 | X | |
| | Wedgewood Drive | 1 - 36-inch RCP, 1 - 42-inch RCP | 1 - 8' x 5' | CBC | 900 | \$2,158,000 | X | |
| | McRae Boulevard | 3 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 9' x 5' | CBC | 1200 | \$3,057,000 | X | |
| EA4 Ph II | Everwood Street & Gum Lane | none | 1 - 30-inch | RCP | 335 | \$167,000 | X | |
| | Garwood Court, Sugarberry Drive, Hemlock Street & Bois D Arc Drive | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 1370 | \$753,000 | X | |
| | Springwood Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 920 | \$689,000 | X | |
| | Sugarberry Drive | none | 1 - 54-inch | RCP | 750 | \$599,000 | X | |
| | Springwood Drive | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 1000 | \$949,000 | X | |
| EA5 | Wedgewood Drive | none | 1 - 54-inch | RCP | 2700 | \$2,158,000 | X | |
| | Ballymote Drive & Zanzibar Road | none | 1 - 66-inch | RCP | 3875 | \$4,065,000 | X | |
| EA6 Ph I | Sam Snead Drive & Bert Yancey Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 1300 | \$974,000 | X | |
| | Lee Trevino Drive & Sam Snead Drive | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 3300 | \$3,132,000 | X | |
| | Octubre Drive & Frank Beard Drive | none | 1 - 66-inch | RCP | 4000 | \$4,196,000 | X | |
| | Sam Snead Drive | none | 1 - 7' x 4' | CBC | 330 | \$643,000 | X | |
| | Sam Snead Drive | none | 1 - 9' x 5' | CBC | 800 | \$2,398,000 | X | |
| | Sam Snead Drive | none | 1 - 10' x 5' | CBC | 1350 | \$4,248,000 | X | |
| EA6 Ph II | Yarbrough Drive | none | 1 - 66-inch | RCP | 1870 | \$1,962,000 | X | |
| | Ashwood Drive to Gran Cima Lane to Pico Norte Park | 1 - 60-inch RCP | 1 - 9' x 5' | CBC | 2800 | \$8,392,000 | X | |
| EA6 Ph III | Pebble Hills Boulevard | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 1350 | \$1,281,000 | X | |
| | Eads Place | none | 1 - 7' x 4' | CBC | 2000 | \$3,896,000 | X | |

Table E-6. Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Structure Dimensions | Proposed Dimensions | Type | Length (ft) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|
| EA6 Ph IV | Ivanhoe Drive | none | 1 - 54-inch | RCP | 2000 | \$1,598,000 | X | |
| | Pebble Hills Boulevard | none | 1 - 66-inch | RCP | 670 | \$703,000 | X | |
| | Gaston Drive | none | 1 - 7' x 4' | CBC | 2000 | \$3,896,000 | X | |
| EA6 Ph V | Bywood Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 1600 | \$1,199,000 | X | |
| | Bywood Drive | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 1600 | \$1,518,000 | X | |
| EA7 Ph I | Lee Trevino Drive & Pellicano Drive | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 2350 | \$1,291,000 | X | |
| | Cedar Oak Drive, Wilkinson Drive, Allen Bradley Drive, James Watt Drive & Bessemer Drive | 2 - 42-inch RCP | 1 - 48-inch, 2 - 48-inch | RCP | 6650 | \$4,983,000 | X | |
| | Bessemer Drive | none | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 500 | \$475,000 | X | |
| | Lee Trevino Drive | 2 - 48-inch RCP | 1 - 10' x 4' | CBC | 1500 | \$4,496,000 | X | |
| EA7 Ph II | Lee Trevino Drive, Rojas Drive & Gateway Boulevard West | none | 1 - 54-inch | RCP | 5050 | \$4,036,000 | X | |
| | Kaiser Drive | 1 - 18-inch RCP | 1 - 8' x 5' | CBC | 1000 | \$2,398,000 | X | |
| EA7 Ph III | Vista del Sol Drive & Dale Douglas Drive | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 3700 | \$2,033,000 | X | |
| | Common Drive | none | 1 - 42-inch | RCP | 2000 | \$1,299,000 | X | |
| | Bessemer Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 1350 | \$1,011,000 | X | |
| EA8 Ph I | Zaragoza Road & Tie-in to Bluff Channel | 2 - 36-inch RCP, 2 - 42-inch RCP, 3 - 48-inch RCP | 1 - 48-inch, 4 - 48-inch | RCP | 3700 | \$2,772,000 | X | |
| | Rojas Drive | 2 - 36-inch RCP | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 1350 | \$1,281,000 | X | |

Table E-6. Summary of Storm Drain/Force Main Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Structure Dimensions | Proposed Dimensions | Type | Length (ft) | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--|---|---------------------|------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|----------|
| EA8 Ph II | Rojas Drive & Henry Brennan Drive | none | 1 - 36-inch | RCP | 3100 | \$1,703,000 | X | |
| | George Dieter Drive & Rojas Drive | none | 1 - 48-inch | RCP | 2950 | \$2,210,000 | X | |
| | Peter Cooper Drive & Henry Brennan Drive | 1 - 18-inch RCP, 1 - 54-inch RCP, 2 - 42-inch RCP, 2 - 36-inch RCP, 1 - 42-inch RCP | 1 - 60-inch | RCP | 4750 | \$4,508,000 | X | |

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-7. Summary of Channel Concept Designs

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Channel Material and Dimensions (ft) ¹¹ | Proposed Channel Material | Proposed Bottom Width (ft) | Proposed Depth (ft) | Side Slopes | Length of Improvements (ft) | Property Cost | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|--|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------|
| CE6_5 Ph III | Cebada System | none | CONC | 11 | 4 | 1 | 2305 | \$0 | \$1,649,000 | X | |
| MV5 Ph I | Carl Longuemare to Basin G | EARTH b=14 d=13 z=1.5 | EARTH | 14 | 15 | 1.5 | 4692 | \$0 | \$407,000 | X | Re-grading |
| MV11 | North Loop to Center | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | EARTH | 35 | 10 | 2 | 2949 | \$0 | \$401,000 | X | |
| | Lining for Crossings (North Loop to Center) | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | CONC | 35 | 10 | 2 | 80 | \$0 | \$24,000 | | |
| | Center to Eastland | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | EARTH | 35 | 10 | 2 | 8816 | \$0 | \$1,198,000 | | |
| | Lining for Crossings (Center to Eastland) | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | CONC | 35 | 10 | 2 | 160 | \$0 | \$193,000 | | |
| | Eastland to Pendale | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | CONC | 15 | 10 | 2 | 3416 | \$0 | \$2,836,000 | | |
| | Pendale to Burgandy | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | EARTH | 35 | 10 | 2 | 10604 | \$0 | \$1,441,000 | | |
| | Lining for Crossings (Pendale to Burgandy) | EARTH b=15 d=10 z=2 | CONC | 35 | 10 | 2 | 140 | \$0 | \$169,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph I | Alps to Hollings | CONC b=25 d= 4.5 z=2 | EARTH | 75 | 4.5 | 2 | 2000 | \$3,423,000 | \$4,048,000 | X | |
| | Hollings to Hondo Pass | none | EARTH | 75 | 4 | 2 | 75 | \$236,000 | \$269,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph II | Sanders to Wren | CONC b=25 d= 4.5 z=2 | CONC | 30 | 4.5 | 1 | 1105 | \$0 | \$1,074,000 | | |
| | Wren to Alps | CONC b=25 d= 4.5 z=2 | EARTH | 75 | 4.5 | 2 | 2140 | \$6,613,000 | \$7,282,000 | | |
| NE10/NE9_2 Ph III | Threadgill to Sanders | CONC b=25 d= 4.5 z=2 | EARTH | 75 | 4.5 | 2 | 1401 | \$5,069,000 | \$5,507,000 | | |
| NW_8_1 | Sunset to 100 ft US of Bird | EARTH b=30 d=3 z=3.3 | EARTH | 38 | 3 | 2 | 3340 | \$0 | \$107,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 100 ft US of Bird to Bird | EARTH b=30 d=3 z=3.3 | CONC | 38 | 3 | 2 | 100 | \$0 | \$73,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Bird and 100 ft US of Frontera | EARTH b=20 d=3.5 z=3.5 | CONC | 20 | 6 | 2 | 150 | \$0 | \$107,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Bird to 100 ft US of Frontera | EARTH b=20 d=3.5 z=3.5 | EARTH | 20 | 6 | 2 | 3900 | \$0 | \$314,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Frontera and 100 ft US of Sunland Park | EARTH b=19 d=4.5 z=3 | CONC | 20 | 6 | 2 | 150 | \$0 | \$104,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Frontera to 100 ft US of Sunland Park | EARTH b=19 d=4.5 z=3 | EARTH | 20 | 6 | 2 | 3930 | \$0 | \$218,000 | | Flow Master |
| | US of Sunset | EARTH b=9 d=1 z=6.5 | EARTH | 9 | 2.5 | 2 | 1200 | \$0 | \$28,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW8_2 | Sunset to 100 US of Bird | EARTH b=30 d=3 z=3.3 | EARTH | 38 | 3 | 2 | 3340 | \$0 | \$108,000 | X | Flow Master |
| | 100 ft US of Bird to Bird | EARTH b=30 d=3 z=3.3 | CONC | 38 | 3 | 2 | 100 | \$0 | \$114,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Bird and 100 ft US of Frontera | EARTH b=20 d=3.5 z=3.5 | CONC | 25 | 5.5 | 2 | 150 | \$0 | \$336,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Bird to 100 ft US of Frontera | EARTH b=20 d=3.5 z=3.5 | EARTH | 25 | 5.5 | 2 | 3900 | \$0 | \$107,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Frontera and 100 ft US of Sunland Park | EARTH b=19 d=4.5 z=3 | CONC | 24 | 5.5 | 2 | 150 | \$0 | \$73,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 50 ft DS of Frontera to 100 ft US of Sunland Park | EARTH b=19 d=4.5 z=3 | EARTH | 24 | 5.5 | 2 | 3930 | \$0 | \$222,000 | | Flow Master |
| | US of Sunset | EARTH b=9 d=1 z=6.5 | EARTH | 9 | 2.5 | 2 | 1200 | \$0 | \$28,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW12_1 | DS of Dona Ana County Rd. | EARTH b=10 d=3 z=1.7 | EARTH | 12 | 8 | 2 | 3820 | \$0 | \$802,000 | | Flow Master |
| | 100 ft US and 50 ft DS of each of the 5 crossings. | EARTH b=10 d=3 z=1.7 | CONC | 12 | 8 | 2 | 750 | \$0 | \$814,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW12_2 | DS of Dona Ana County Rd. | EARTH b=10 d=3 z=1.7 | EARTH | 16 | 8 | 2 | 3820 | \$0 | \$935,000 | X | Flow Master |
| | 100 ft US and 50 ft DS of each of the 5 crossings. | EARTH b=10 d=3 z=1.7 | CONC | 16 | 8 | 2 | 750 | \$0 | \$895,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW13_1 | US of White Spur Drain | EARTH b=9 d=1 z=6.5 | EARTH | 20 | 4 | 2 | 1050 | \$0 | \$107,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW13_2 | US of White Spur Drain | EARTH b=9 d=1 z=6.5 | EARTH | 30 | 4 | 2 | 1050 | \$0 | \$151,000 | X | Flow Master |
| NW14_1 | US of Doniphan Dr. | CONC b=6 d=3 z=1.25 | CONC | 6 | 3.5 | 1.25 | 1290 | \$0 | \$758,000 | X | Flow Master |
| NW19_1 | White Spur Drain to Frontera Rd. | EARTH b=36 d=6.5 z=1.55 | EARTH | 45 | 7 | 2 | 6345 | \$0 | \$970,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW19_2 | White Spur Drain to Frontera Rd. | EARTH b=36 d=6.5 z=1.55 | EARTH | 45 | 7 | 2 | 6345 | \$0 | \$1,055,000 | X | Flow Master |
| NW21_1 | Frontera Rd. to outlet | EARTH b=35 d=6.5 z=0.4 | EARTH | 35 | 7 | 2 | 9075 | \$0 | \$1,007,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW21_2 | Frontera Rd. to outlet | EARTH b=35 d=6.5 z=0.4 | EARTH | 45 | 7 | 2 | 9075 | \$0 | \$1,464,000 | X | Flow Master |
| NW22_1 | 385 ft DS of Rancho Norte Dr. | EARTH b=25 d=10 z=3 | CONC | 12.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 40 | \$0 | \$90,000 | | Flow Master |
| NW22_2 | 385 ft DS of Rancho Norte Dr. | EARTH b=25 d=10 z=3 | CONC | 12.5 | 10 | 1.5 | 40 | \$0 | \$90,000 | X | Flow Master |
| NW31_2 | US of Remington | none | EARTH | 10 | 3 | 2 | 2240 | \$55,000 | \$180,000 | X | FlowMaster |
| NW32_2 | Residential Area | EARTH b=0 d=2 z=7 | EARTH | 15 | 5 | 2 | 950 | \$165,000 | \$242,000 | | FlowMaster |
| | Lovena to Iron | EARTH b=0 d=2 z=23 | EARTH | 15 | 4.5 | 2 | 1700 | \$0 | \$124,000 | | FlowMaster |
| NW32_3 | Residential Area | EARTH b=0 d=2 z=7 | EARTH | 15 | 5 | 2 | 950 | \$165,000 | \$242,000 | X | FlowMaster |
| NW34_2 | Tom Mays to De Alva | EARTH b=0 d=1.5 z=41 | EARTH | 30 | 3 | 2 | 1600 | \$0 | \$120,000 | X | FlowMaster |

¹ b=bottom width, d=depth, z=side slopes (H:1)

Table E-7. Summary of Channel Concept Designs (Continued)

| Project and Alternative | Location | Existing Channel Material and Dimensions (ft) ¹¹ | Proposed Channel Material | Proposed Bottom Width (ft) | Proposed Depth (ft) | Side Slopes | Length of Improvements (ft) | Property Cost | Total Cost | Preferred Alternative | Comments |
|-------------------------|---|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|
| NW34_3 | Diversion US of Tom Mays to FP44 Trib | none | EARTH | 20 | 12 | 2 | 1700 | \$0 | \$730,000 | | FlowMaster |
| NW35_2 | IH-10 to Quejette | EARTH b=2 d=6.7 z=2.85 | EARTH | 20 | 9.5 | 2 | 2250 | \$0 | \$404,000 | X | FlowMaster |
| | Quejette to confluence with FP45A | EARTH b=2 d=4 z=3.7 | EARTH | 20 | 9.5 | 2 | 1800 | \$0 | \$456,000 | | FlowMaster |
| WC2_1 | 650 ft US of IH-10 to Rio Grande | EARTH b =17 d=6 z=3 | EARTH | 24 | 9 | 1.5 | 900 | \$0 | \$141,000 | X | FlowMaster. Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| WC7_1 | US of Paisano to Rio Grande | CONC b=13 d=10 z=0 | CONC | 20 | 5 | 2 | 800 | \$33,000 | \$1,036,000 | X | FlowMaster. Coordinate with TxDOT to be constructed as part of the Border Hwy project. |
| WC8_1 | Robinson Road | Asphalt Road | CONC | 77.5 | NA | NA | 130 | \$0 | \$133,000 | X | Concrete lining of Robinson Road. Calculated using unit cost of concrete per unit length. |
| WC8_2 | Campbell to Mesa | EARTH b=16 d=4 z=0 | EARTH | 16 | 6.5 | 0 | 1265 | \$0 | \$95,000 | | FlowMaster |
| EA1 Ph I | Robert E. Lee at Railroad Crossing | none | CONC | 4 | 4 | 1.5 | 80 | \$0 | \$22,000 | X | Remove Existing French Drain |
| EA3 Ph I | Lorne Channel from Limerick Road to Lorne Road | CONC b=8 d=2 z=1 | CONC | 10 | 3 | 0 | 1050 | \$0 | \$383,000 | X | |
| | Lorne Channel from Lorne Road to Pond | CONC b=3 d=3 z=1 | CONC | 10 | 3 | 0 | 700 | \$0 | \$254,000 | X | |
| EA8 Ph I | Bluff Channel from Rojas Drive to Esther Lama Drive | CONC b=10 d=4 z=1.5 | CONC | 20 | 4 | 1.5 | 1000 | \$0 | \$791,000 | X | |
| EA9 Ph II | RV Channel from Paseo Del Este Boulevard to Pine Springs Drive | EARTH b=50 d=5.17 z=0 | CONC | 20 | 4 | 1 | 1350 | \$0 | \$881,000 | X | |
| | RV Channel from Rojas Drive to RV Drive | EARTH b=50 d=2.83 z=0 | CONC | 30 | 4 | 1 | 500 | \$0 | \$431,000 | X | |
| | RV Channel from RV/Mercantile Channel Junction to IH-10 Bridge Crossing | EARTH b=40 d=2 z=1 | CONC | 40 | 2 | 1 | 750 | \$0 | \$714,000 | X | |
| EA10 Ph II | Mercantile Channel from Paseo Del Este Boulevard to Mercantile Avenue | EARTH b =45.67 d=5 z=0 | CONC | 20 | 5 | 1 | 2000 | \$0 | \$1,424,000 | X | |

¹¹ b=bottom width, d=depth, z=side slopes (H:1)

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|---|--|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Hills System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Hills Channel (Inlets) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE1_1 | Multiple street intersections along Government Hills Channel do not have sufficiently sized drainage inlets. Undersized inlets restrict water from entering the channel and contribute to localized flooding at the crossings. | Expand the street inlets at Altura, Hastings, Cambridge and Cumberland to allow street flow to enter the channel without flooding surrounding properties. Also, add Austin High Pond upstream from the channel to decrease the flow entering the street inlets. | Austin High Pond | \$ 850,000 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Intersection drain modifications (4) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Property acquisition (2 acres) Site #1 (x2) | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Hills Channel (Crossings) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE2_1 | Multiple culverts along Government Hills Channel are undersized and contribute to channel flooding in localized areas. | Enlarge culverts at Cambridge, Cumberland, Chester and Trowbridge to increase the overall capacity of the Government Hills Channel to convey the 100-year storm. | Culverts | \$ 2,060,000 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Bridges | | | | | | | | | |
| Government Hills Outfall | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE3_1 | The Government Hills System consists of a 90in pressurized conduit that outfalls into the Rio Grande. The design capacity is 375 cfs but has been reduced to 50cfs. The reduction in flow is a direct result of multiple tie-ins along the system which cause a drop in pressure and reduce the total capacity of the conduit. Also the water surface elevation of the Rio Grande causes the system to back up and cause flooding at drainage inlets. | The Government Hills System will be modified to reflect as built conditions. This will enable the system to remain Pressurized from Boone St. Basin to The Rio Grande River. The flow through the 90" conduit will increase from a current capacity of 50 cfs to a design capacity of 375 cfs. All tie-ins must be removed or redesigned to maintain the required pressure. Approximately 12 tie-ins were identified. Eight of which will have manual gates installed. The other four will be severed and re-directed. An automatic gate and sensor will also be installed at the outfall of the conduit which will keep water from the Rio Grande out of the system when water surface elevations are high. | Saipan Reservoir | \$ 6,410,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Saipan Pump Station | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm sewer conduit | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Sever tie-ins and install manual gates (8) | | | | | | | | | |
| CE3_2 | The Government Hills System will be modified to reflect as built conditions. This will enable the system to remain Pressurized from Boone St. Basin to The Rio Grande River. The flow through the 90" conduit will increase from a current capacity of 50 cfs to a design capacity of 375 cfs. All tie-ins must be removed or redesigned to maintain the required pressure. Approximately 12 tie-ins were identified. Eight of which will have Automatic gates installed. The other four will be severed and re-directed. An automatic gate, and sensor will also be installed at the outfall of the conduit which will keep water from the Rio Grande out of the system when water surface elevations are high. | The Government Hills System will be modified to reflect as built conditions. This will enable the system to remain Pressurized from Boone St. Basin to The Rio Grande River. The flow through the 90" conduit will increase from a current capacity of 50 cfs to a design capacity of 375 cfs. All tie-ins must be removed or redesigned to maintain the required pressure. Approximately 12 tie-ins were identified. Eight of which will have Automatic gates installed. The other four will be severed and re-directed. An automatic gate, and sensor will also be installed at the outfall of the conduit which will keep water from the Rio Grande out of the system when water surface elevations are high. | Saipan Reservoir | \$ 6,670,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Saipan Pump Station | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm sewer conduit | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Sever tie-ins and install automatic gates (8) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Automatic gate at outlet (90') | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Cebada System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cebada and Magnolia Systems | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.1 | | The Magnolia Reservoir system is separated from the Cebada Reservoir System by severing the connecting 60' line. The existing outfall to Cebada Reservoir will be cleared of crossing conduits which will allow for an increase in flow. A 4.5 x 3 box conduit will also be added at Magnolia Rd and I-10 to convey water to a proposed 295 cfs pump station. The proposed pump station will discharge the water into the Rio Grande. A proposed increase in storage at Magnolia Reservoir and a Weir will further separate the systems and will greatly reduce flooding. Protection Level - 25-year | Storm drains | \$ 22,760,000 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Copia Reservoir | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Magnolia Reservoir expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Magnolia PS (25-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.2 | | The Magnolia Reservoir system is separated from the Cebada Reservoir System by severing the connecting 60' line. The existing outfall to Cebada Reservoir will be cleared of crossing conduits which will allow for an increase in flow. A 293 cfs pump station with a 42" discharge conduit will convey water from Cebada to a proposed 84 acre-ft capacity pond, which will be located south of I-10 in an existing rail yard. A 5 x 2.5 box conduit with a 0.6 % slope will also be added at Magnolia Rd and I-10 to convey water to the proposed railroad pond. A 355 cfs pump with a 48 inch force main will discharge water from the railroad pond into the Rio Grande. An increase in storage for Magnolia Reservoir and a Weir will further separate the systems and greatly reduce flooding. Protection Level - 50-year | Copia property acquisition (X3) | \$ 44,040,000 | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Storm drains 50 yr | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Piedras St. RR Pond (50-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Copia Reservoir | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Magnolia Reservoir expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Piedras St. RR Pond PS | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.3 | The Cebada system is a complex network of reservoirs and conduits that receive flow from multiple dams located on the side of the Franklin Mountains. The network is divided by I-10. The northern areas is primarily street flow and the south area is primarily conduit flow. The southern area has very little slope and does not convey water through the system properly. This back up is carried through the TXDOT reservoir structures and ultimately cause massive flooding at I-10 and at Cebada Reservoir. I-10 has been identified as a critical route and should not be compromised during any storm event. | The Magnolia Reservoir system is separated from the Cebada Reservoir System by severing the connecting 60' line. The existing outfall to Cebada Reservoir will be cleared of crossing conduits which will allow for an increase in flow. A 293 cfs pump station with a 42" discharge conduit will convey water from Cebada to a proposed two chamber 84 acre-ft capacity pond, which will be located south of I-10 in an existing rail yard. A 5 x 4.5 box conduit with a 0.2 % slope will also be added at Magnolia Rd and I-10 to convey water to the proposed railroad pond. A 255 cfs pump with a 42 inch force main will discharge water from the railroad pond into the Rio Grande. An increase in storage for Magnolia Reservoir and a weir will further separate the systems and greatly reduce flooding. Protection Level - 50-year | Copia property acquisition (X3) | \$ 44,460,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | RR property acquisition (x2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm drains (50-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Piedras St. RR Pond (50-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Copia Reservoir | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Magnolia Reservoir expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.4 | | The Magnolia Reservoir system is separated from the Cebada Reservoir System by severing the connecting 60' line. The existing outfall to Cebada Reservoir will be cleared of crossing conduits which will allow for an increase in flow. A 645 cfs pump station with a 54" discharge conduit will convey water from Cebada to a proposed 84 acre-ft capacity pond, which will be located south of I-10 in an existing rail yard. A 5 x 4 box conduit with a 0.6 % slope will also be added at Magnolia Rd and I-10 to convey water to the proposed railroad pond. A 425 cfs pump will discharge water from the railroad pond into the Rio Grande. An increase in storage for Magnolia Reservoir and a weir will further separate the systems and greatly reduce flooding. Protection Level - 100-year | Copia property acquisition (X3) | \$ 58,100,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | RR property acquisition (x2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm drains (100-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Piedras St. RR Pond (100-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Copia Reservoir | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Magnolia Reservoir expansion | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.5 Phase I | | The Magnolia Reservoir system is separated from the Cebada Reservoir System by severing the connecting 60' line. The existing outfall to Cebada Reservoir will be cleared of crossing conduits which will allow for an increase in flow. A Trapezoidal Concrete lined channel with an 11ft base and 1 to 1 side slope will discharge water from Cebada to a proposed 84 acre-ft capacity pond, which will be located south of I-10 in an existing rail yard. A 5 x 4 box conduit with a 0.6 % slope will also be added at Magnolia Rd and I-10 to convey water to the proposed railroad pond. A 425 cfs pump will discharge water from the railroad pond into the Rio Grande. An increase in storage for Magnolia Reservoir and a weir will further separate the systems and greatly reduce flooding. Protection Level - 100-year | Copia property acquisition (X3) | \$ 36,890,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Storm drains (100-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Piedras St. RR Pond PS | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.5 Phase II | | | Culverts | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Channels | | | | | | | | | |
| CE6.5 Phase III | | | Piedras St. RR Pond (100-yr) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | RR property acquisition (x2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|--|---|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Dallas System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dallas Reservoir and Outlet | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_1 | | Dams 8, 9, and 10 will have a storage increase creating more storage upstream. The existing lines will be increase and the inlets will be modified. Both improvements will increase conveyance through the system. A new pond will also be created near the Rio Grande which will serve as a sump for a 350 cfs pump station. 100-yr protection. | Site research, storm water management, safety/traffic control plans, and debris removal | \$ 44,850,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Removal of selected portions of Lines A and D | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Pavement removal and replacement | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Excavation of unclassified material for Citrus Place Pond and reservoir expansions | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Line A improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Line D improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm water pollution prevention plan with best management practices included | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Water utility relocations | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Sanitary sewer utility relocations | | | | | | | | | |
| Preliminary opinions of probable construction cost of 350 cfs pump station | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_2 | The Dallas Reservoir does not properly discharge flow into the Rio Grande when river levels are high. This causes a back up and flooding occurs along the system at multiple locations. | Dams 8, 9, and 10 will have a storage increase creating more storage upstream. All the existing conduits will remain in place but will have inlet upgrades. A new pond will also be created in the Rail yard. The pond will drain to a new pond near the Rio Grande which will serve as the sump for a 350 cfs pump station. 100-yr protection | Storm drain | \$ 40,930,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Removal of selected portions of Lines A and D | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Pavement removal and replacement | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Excavation of unclassified material for Citrus Place Pond and Mills Ave. RR Pond | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Line A improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Line D improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Storm water pollution prevention plan with best management practices included | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Water utility relocations | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Sanitary sewer utility relocations | | | | | | | | | |
| Preliminary opinions of probable construction cost of 350 cfs pump station | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_3 | | Remove existing eastern discharge conduit in Dallas reservoir and add a 380 cfs pump station. Discharge flow from the pump station into a new 42 in. force main which runs along the same path as the existing eastern conduit. Instead of tying in to Line D or the Cebada system, the new force main will discharge into the Rio Grande separately. 50-yr protection. | Storm drains | \$ 16,380,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Sever lines (2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Dallas Pump Station | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_4 | | Add a 115 cfs pump station which discharges into a new 42 in. force main running parallel to the existing eastern discharge conduit at Dallas Reservoir. Sever tie-ins of eastern discharge conduit to Line D and Cebada System and construct an extension of the line from the point where the tie-in to the Cebada system was severed. 50-yr protection. | Storm drains | \$ 19,290,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Sever lines (2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Dallas Pump Station | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_5 Phase I | | Phase 1 of Alternative 5 includes adding a 115 cfs pump station which discharges into a new 42 in. force main running parallel to the existing eastern discharge conduit at Dallas Reservoir. Sever tie-ins of eastern discharge conduit to Line D and Cebada System and construct an extension of the line from the point where the tie-in to the Cebada system was severed. 100-yr protection. | Storm drains | \$ 27,020,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Sever lines (2) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Dallas Pump Station | | | | | | | | | |
| CE11_5 Phase II | | Phase 2 of Alternative 5 includes upgrading the proposed 115 cfs pump station from Phase 1 to a 370 cfs pump station. | Dallas Pump Station improvements | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| McKelligon Dam Outfall | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CE13_1 | The McKelligon Dam discharges through a series of smaller reservoirs before finally discharging through a 48" Conduit onto Louisiana St. The discharge flows directly towards houses and causes erosion along the road. | An energy dissipater is proposed to reduced the velocity of the water and force it to enter the road correctly. This would keep the water away from surrounding houses. | Energy dissipaters and diversion | \$ 10,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Mesa Drain Downstream | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mesa Drain Storage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV2 | There is a need for additional detention storage along the upper portion of Mesa Drain Interceptor. | This project involves constructing a parapet wall along the banks of Mesa Drain from Le Barron Rd to Feather Lakes. The wall would bring the elevation of the channel banks to 3668 feet and would then allow Feather Lake to also fill to 3668 feet (thereby using most of the Feather Lake capacity). | Construct 7173 feet of 2 foot high parapet wall and 855 feet of 5 foot high parapet wall | \$ 4,780,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Mesa Drain Upstream and Downstream | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mesa Drain Concrete Lining | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV11 | Mesa Drain is significantly undersized (< 10 year) | This project involves three capacity remedies for Mesa Drain. They are a) expand Mesa Drain 20 feet in width on the south side of the channel where feasible; b) line portions of the channel with concrete that cannot be expanded; and c) line 20 feet upstream of all crossings with concrete. | Expand Mesa Drain from North Loop Drive to Center Way (2,949 feet), from Center Way to Eastland Street (8,816 feet), and from Pendale Road to Burgundy Drive (10,604 feet). Line 20 ft upstream of all crossings Add concrete lining to Mesa Drain from Eastland Street to Pendale Road (3,416 feet). | \$ 6,260,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Basin G | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Feather Lake II Improvements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV3 | The Middle Drain is contributing flow to the Mesa Drain Interceptor causing capacity and tailwater issues. There is need for additional storage along the Interceptor System in Mission Valley. | This project involves excavating the City owned Feather Lake II property so that it can be utilized as detention storage for the Middle Drain. All flow would be diverted to the basin via conduit and would exit to the Mesa Drain Interceptor controlled by automatic gates. In addition, a small pump station would be installed to drain the portion of the basin that is below the elevation of the Mesa Drain Interceptor channel. The basin will be sized to capture the 100 year flow from Middle Drain. | Excavation of Featherlake II 18.26 acre footprint 18 feet deep 5 feet already excavated Install 2 - 6 ft x 4 ft CBC Install 25 cfs pump station Install 2 - 36 inch automated flow gates | \$ 10,720,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Middle Drain Interceptor Storage | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV4 | The Franklin Drain is contributing flow to the Middle Drain Interceptor causing capacity and tailwater issues. There is a need for additional storage along the Interceptor System in Mission Valley. | This project involves creating a detention basin along the Middle Drain Interceptor to be used as detention storage for the Franklin Drain. All flow would be diverted to the basin via conduit and would exit to the Middle Drain Interceptor controlled by automatic gates. In addition, a small pump station would be installed to drain the portion of the basin that is below the elevation of the Middle Drain Interceptor channel. The basin will be sized to capture the 100 year flow from Franklin Drain. | New detention basin 8.65 acre footprint 20 feet deep Property for basin Install 4 - 6 ft x 4ft CBC Install 25 cfs pump station Install 2 - 36 inch automated flow gates | \$ 16,200,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Basin G Improvements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV5 Phase I | The current configuration and capacity of Basin G is causing tailwater to significantly restrict the capacity of the major drains and Interceptor System in Mission Valley. There is a need for additional storage in Basin G. | Excavate existing Basin G area to a depth of 20 ft, replace the undersized crossings at Carl Longuemare and Southside, and re-grade the Franklin Drain Interceptor so that water will flow to the basin from both the Playa Drain and the Interceptor System. | Excavate Basin G to depth of 20 feet. Base elevation: 3645 feet Re-grade Franklin Interceptor so that water will flow to Basin G | \$ 33,270,000 | | | | | | | | |
| MV5 Phase II | | Upgrade the existing pump station at Basin G by installing new pumps (820 cfs capacity total) and installing new conduits to the Rio Grande River. | Replace 2 undersized crossing Carl Longuemare (3 - 10ft x 9 ft CBC) Southside (3 - 10ft x 9 ft CBC) Upgrade pump station with new pumps (820 cfs total capacity) Install conduits from pump station to Rio Grande River | | | | | | | | | |
| Basin A | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alameda Drive Storm Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV6 | There are flooding issues on Alameda Dr. (SH20) between Paisano Dr. and El Paso Dr. | This project involves installing a storm drain system along the affected area of Alameda Drive that empties into Playa Drive just north of the intersection with Delta Drive. | Install 8750 feet of 2- 6 ft x 5 ft CBC storm sewer along Alameda Drive. | \$ 42,880,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Basin A Improvements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV7 | The pump station at Basin A does not have capacity for the 100 year storm based on the CH2MHILL peak inflow of 985.09 cfs. Additional flow is contributed back into the Playa Drain. | (CH2MHILL-01/2007) Replace 3 undersized pumps (130 cfs each) with pumps sized for the 100 year storm. | (CH2MHILL-01/2007) Upgrade pump station with 3 new pumps (175 cfs each) | \$ 19,080,000 | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Basin B Pump Station | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV8 Phase I | Basin B currently acts as detention storage for the upper portion of the Playa Drain and the neighborhoods surrounding the basin. After leaving the basin, water flows through a conduit and enters the lower portion of the Playa Drain where it contributes to the capacity problems of the drain. | Phase I of this project involves installing a pump station and conduits in the portion of Basin B west of Mimosa Ave to pump water from Basin B to the Rio Grande River. Basin B would be excavated and re-graded so that the water will flow to the western portion of the basin, where the pump station will be located. In addition, the culvert under Mimosa Ave would be replaced by larger culverts that are sloping in the correct direction. | Install new pump station (165 cfs total capacity) | \$ 16,440,000 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install conduit for pump station | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Excavate Basin B an additional 2 ft and grade slope so that water flows to the pump station | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install culverts under Mimosa Ave 2 - 10 ft x 10 ft CBC | | | | | | | | | |
| MV8 Phase II | | Phase II of this project involves upgrading the pump station at Basin B by adding a new pump and conduit for added capacity | Upgrade pump station (165 cfs total capacity added) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install conduit for pump station | | | | | | | | | |
| Basin G | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Playa Drain Crossing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV9 | The following crossing on Playa Drain has significantly less capacity than the upstream cross section (14% of Channel Capacity): Crossing just downstream of Yarbrough Dr. (1 - 36" RCP) | This project involves removing the undersized culvert and replacing it with culverts having the same capacity as the upstream cross section. The proposed culverts are sized so that they will not interfere with the channel width or road surface elevation. | Replace one crossing structure (2 - 5 ft x 5 ft CBC) | \$ 100,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Basin C Pump Station | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MV10 | Basin C is currently serving as a detention area for water from surrounding neighborhoods. After leaving the basin, water enters the Playa Drain where it contributes to the capacity problems of the drain. | This project involves excavating Basin C so that it is 3 feet below the elevation of the Playa Drain and installing a pump station to pump water from the basin to the Rio Grande River. In addition, new culverts would be installed under Independence Dr. allow water to enter the basin from Playa Drain. | Excavate Basin C to a depth 3 feet below the channel elevation in Playa Drain | \$ 10,740,000 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install culverts from Playa Drain to Basin C (2 - 6 ft x 4 ft CBC) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install new pump station (160 cfs total capacity) | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Install conduit for pump station | | | | | | | | | |
| Northeast Ponding System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northeast Channel Number 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE3/ NE2_1 | Northeast Channel No. 2 is significantly undersized (<10 year) with undersized crossings and serious erosion problems. | This alternative involves expanding and adding concrete lining to the entire length of Northeast Channel No. 2. In addition, all undersized crossings will be removed and replaced. | NE Channel No. 2 expansion and crossing improvements (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) Expand channel to rectangular shape 23 - 33 ft Bottom width Remove and replace 6 undersized crossings | \$ 16,530,000 | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| NE3/ NE2_2 | | This alternative involves constructing a Detention basin and expanding and adding concrete lining to the entire length of Northeast Channel No. 2. In addition, all undersized crossings will be removed and replaced. | Detention basin (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) 269 Ac-ft capacity 19 ft High embankment NE Channel No. 2 expansion and crossing improvements (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) Expand channel to rectangular shape 23 - 33 ft Bottom width Remove and replace 6 undersized crossings | \$ 31,950,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE3/ NE2_3 | | This alternative involves constructing a diversion channel from Northeast Channel No. 2 to Northeast Channel No. 1 and making improvements to Northeast Channel No. 1. | Diversion channel from NE Channel No. 2, to NE Channel No. 1 (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) NE Channel No. 2 expansion and crossing improvements (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) Expand channel to rectangular shape 23 - 33 ft bottom width Remove and replace 6 undersized crossings Improve NE Channel No. 1 (Moreno Cardenas Inc.) | \$ 40,980,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE3/ NE2_4 Phase I | | Phase 1 of alternative 4 is already in progress and involves the expansion and lining of a portion of Northeast Channel No. 2. | NE Channel No. 2 expansion and improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| NE3/ NE2_4 Phase II | | Phase 2 of alternative 4 involves the expansion and lining of the portion of Northeast Channel No. 2 not improved in Phase 1. | NE Channel No. 2 expansion and improvements | | | | | | | | | |
| NE3/ NE2_4 Phase III | | Phase 3 of alternative 4 involves the construction of a debris basin west of US 54 and further monitoring of storm events. | Debris basin and monitoring of storm events | | | | | | | | | |
| NE3/ NE2_4 Phase IV | Phase 4 of alternative 4 involves adding detention storage to the debris basin constructed in Phase 3 | Adding detention storage to debris basin | | \$ 39,880,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Range Dam System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Electric Ditch Diversion Channel and Fairbanks Drive | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE5_1 | 1. Flooding on Fairbanks Drive 2. High sediment load from Castner Range. 3. Flow in Fairbanks Drive bypasses the entrance to Electric Ditch Channel resulting in downstream flooding. | This alternative involves constructing a debris basin with detention storage west of US 54 (vacant land) to address issues 1 and 2. Additionally, cross sectional inlets would be installed on Electric Ditch Channel and the outlet of the culvert under US 54 would be improved to address issue 3. | New debris basin with detention storage (West of US 54) 225 Ac-ft capacity 20 ft deep 3 ft high embankment | \$ 10,620,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Add cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel/ Improve outlet of US 54 Culvert | | | | | | | | | |
| NE5_2 | | This alternative involves constructing a debris basin west of US 54 (vacant land) to address issue 2. Additionally, cross sectional inlets would be installed on Electric Ditch Channel and the outlet of the culvert under US 54 would be improved to address issue 3. | New debris basin (West of US 54) 50 Ac-ft capacity 9 ft deep 3 ft high embankment Improve outlet of US 54 Culvert | \$ 4,190,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Add cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel | | | | | | | | | |
| NE5_2b | | This alternative involves constructing a debris basin east of US 54 (residential area) to address issue 2. Additionally, cross sectional inlets would be installed on Electric Ditch Channel and the outlet of the culvert under US 54 would be improved to address issue 3. | New debris basin (East of US 54) 50 Ac-ft capacity 20 ft deep | \$ 3,930,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ● | ○ |
| | | Property for debris basin | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Add cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel/ Improve outlet of US 54 Culvert | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE5_4b | | This alternative involves constructing a debris basin near the Border Patrol Museum (city property) to address issue 2. Additionally, cross sectional inlets would be installed on Electric Ditch Channel and the outlet of the culvert under US 54 would be improved to address issue 3. | New debris basin (Museum Area) 40 Ac-ft capacity 9 ft deep 3 ft high embankment | \$ 3,490,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ○ |
| | | Property for debris basin | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Add cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel/ Improve outlet of US 54 Culvert | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE5_5 | | This alternative involves adding cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel and improving the outlet of the culvert under US 54 to address issue 3. | Add cross sectional inlets to Electric Ditch Channel/ Improve outlet of US 54 Culvert | \$ 1,350,000 | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● | ○ | ● | ● |
| Fort Bliss Sump System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Railroad Drive Ditch Upstream of Junction with Tobin Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE7_1 | The following crossings on Railroad Channel are undersized: Falcon Ave (1-18" RCP) Waycross Ave (1-12" RCP) Wren Dr (1-18" RCP) Lexington Dr (1-18" RCP) Crossing S. of Falcon Ave (1-12" RCP). | This alternative involves removing and replacing all five undersized crossings. The proposed culverts would not interfere with the elevation of the road surface and would not extend beyond the outer channel banks. | Replace five crossing structures 1. Falcon Ave (5 - 4' x 2' CBC) 2. Waycross Ave (5 - 4' x 2' CBC) 3. Wren Dr (5 - 4' x 2' CBC) 4. Lexington Dr (7 - 4' x 2' CBC) 5. Crossing S. of Falcon Ave (7 - 4' x 2' CBC) | \$ 920,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Railroad Drive Ditch from Junction with Tobin Drain to Fort Bliss Sump | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE8_1 | 1. The following crossing on Railroad Channel Downstream is undersized East of Julian Dr. (5 - 8' x 4' CBC). | This alternative involves removing and replacing the undersized crossing. The proposed culvert would not interfere with the elevation of the road surface and would not extend beyond the outer channel banks. | Replace one crossing structure East of Julian Dr. (6 - 7' x 6' CBC) | \$ 400,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE8_2 | | This alternative involves removing the undersized crossing completely and would require the abandonment of the dirt road that currently utilizes the crossing. | Remove crossing structure | \$ 70,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|--|--|---|---|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Threadgill/Tobin Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE10/ NE9_1 Phase I | 1. Tobin Drain is significantly undersized with the exception of the far downstream end. 2. Crossings capacities are well below the 10-year flow. | Phase 1 of project 1 involves construction of basin 3 | New detention Basin 3 26 Ac-ft capacity 4 ft deep | \$ 64,790,000 | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ● |
| | | | Property for Basin 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Inlet/Outlet conduits for Basin 3 1 - 5' x 5' CBC inlet conduit 1 - 3' x 2' CBC outlet conduit | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Phase 2 of project 1 involves construction of an underground detention basin and conversion of the area into a parking lot. | New underground CMP detention Basin 2 10.4 Ac-ft capacity 10 ft deep | | | | | | | | | |
| Property for Basin 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inlet/Outlet conduits for Basin 2 1 - 5' x 5' CBC inlet conduit 1 - 3' x 2' CBC outlet conduit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phase 3 of project 1 involves construction of detention basin 1. | | New detention Basin 1 215 Ac-ft capacity | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Property for Basin 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Outlet conduits for Basin 1 1 - 3' x 2' CBC outlet conduit | | | | | | | | | | |
| Phase 4 of project 1 involves construction of a covered detention basin (Basin 4) under the Ivvin High School baseball field. The basin would require a pump station to move the water to Tobin Drain. | | New underground detention Basin 4 50 Ac-ft capacity 10 ft deep | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 10 cfs pump station | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Property for Basin 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE10/ NE9_1 Phase IV | Phase 4 of project 1 involves construction of a covered detention basin (Basin 4) under the Ivvin High School baseball field. The basin would require a pump station to move the water to Tobin Drain. | Inlet/Outlet conduits for Basin 4 1 - 5' x 5' CBC inlet conduit 1 - 2' x 2' CBC outlet conduit | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Expand Tobin Drain from Alps to Hollings b = 75 ft d = 4.5 ft z = 2 ft and Construct new portion of Tobin Drain parallel to Hollings from Hollings to Hondo Pass b = 75 ft d = 4 ft z = 2 ft | \$ 24,220,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| | | Property for phase 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Replace three crossing structures Alps (8 - 10 ft x 4 ft CBC) Hollings (8 - 10 ft x 4 ft CBC) Hondo Pass (8 - 10 ft x 3 ft CBC) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE10/ NE9_2 Phase II | 1. Tobin Drain is significantly undersized with the exception of the far downstream end. 2. Crossings capacities are well below the 10-year flow. | Phase 2 of project 2 involves expanding the portion of Tobin Drain from Wren to Alps and expanding and lining the portion of Tobin Drain from Sanders to Wren. In addition, the two undersized crossings will be removed and replaced with the largest culverts that can be installed without interfering with the width of the channel or the elevation of the road surface. | Expand Tobin Drain from Wren to Alps b = 75 ft d = 4.5 ft z = 2 ft and Expand and line Tobin Drain from Sanders to Wren b = 30 ft d = 4.5 ft z = 1 ft | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Property for phase 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Replace two crossing structures Wren (7 - 10 ft x 4 ft CBC) Raymond Telles (7 - 10 ft x 3 ft CBC) | | | | | | | | | |
| NE10/ NE9_2 Phase III | Phase 3 of project 2 involves expanding the portion of Tobin Drain from Threadgill to Sanders. In addition, the undersized crossing will be removed and replaced with the largest culverts that can be installed without interfering with the width of the channel or the elevation of the road surface. | Expand Tobin Drain from Threadgill to Sanders b = 75 ft d = 4.5 ft z = 2 ft | Property for phase 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Replace one crossing structure Sanders (4 - 10 ft x 4 ft CBC) | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Range Dam Outlet Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE11_2 | 1. The following crossing on Range Dam Outlet Channel is undersized (< 10 - year): Raymond Telles Dr. (1 - 2' x 2' CBC) 2. Downstream junction of Range Dam Outlet Channel and Tobin Drain Channel identified by EPWU as issue and thus included in cost table. | This alternative involves removing and replacing the undersized crossing. The proposed culvert would not interfere with the elevation of the road surface and would not extend beyond the outer channel banks. In addition, the downstream junction would be modified. This alternative addresses issues 1 and 2. | Replace one crossing structure Raymond Telles Dr. (2 - 6' x 3' CBC) Modify downstream junction | \$ 1,430,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Northgate Diversion Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE6_1 | | This alternative involves construction of a detention basin to reduce the peak flow in the Northgate Diversion Channel. | Northgate Diversion Dam (Dorado Engineering Inc.) 200 Ac-ft capacity 35 ft High embankment | \$ 3,160,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE6_2 | 1. Flooding and erosion issues at the intersection of Hondo Pass Avenue and Hondo Pass Drive. | This alternative involves expanding and defining the existing channel to convey flow to the Northgate Dam Impounding Area. | Northgate Diversion Channel (Dorado Engineering Inc.) Rectangular concrete lined channel 10 ft Bottom width 5 ft Deep | \$ 810,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE6_3 | | This alternative involves the installation of pipes to convey flow to the Northgate Dam Impounding Area. | Northgate Diversion Pipe (Dorado Engineering Inc.) 2 - Reinforced concrete pipes 66 in Diameter | \$ 740,000 | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ |
| Clearview Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE14_1 | 1. The following crossings on Clearview Channel are undersized (< 10 - year): Morningside Circle (3 - 36" CMP) Byron Drive (3 - 36" CMP) 2. There is a sediment problem in the upstream portion of Clearview Channel. | This alternative involves removing and replacing both of the undersized crossings and construction of a debris basin. The proposed culvert would not interfere with the elevation of the road surface and would not extend beyond the outer channel banks. This alternative would address issues 1 and 2. | Replace two crossing structures Morningside Circle (2 - 6' x 4' CBC) Byron Drive (2 - 5' x 3' CBC) Property for debris basin New debris basin 20 Ac-ft capacity 8 ft deep | \$ 1,690,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NE14_2 | | This alternative involves constructing a debris basin with detention storage to capture all of the sediment and runoff from the upstream portion of the watershed. This alternative would address issues 1 and 2. | New debris basin with storage 84 Ac-ft capacity 14 ft deep Property for debris basin with storage | \$ 4,190,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Johnson Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NE16_1 | 1. Erosion along Lincoln Ave due to flows in the downstream portion of Johnson Channel. 2. One undersized crossing was identified on Johnson Channel beneath a dead-end road in a vacant lot, but is not causing any serious problems. | This alternative involves the construction of a retention basin on vacant lots at the lower end of Johnson Channel and removal of the undersized crossing. | New retention basin 13.5 Ac-ft capacity 16 ft deep Property for retention basin | \$ 520,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Doniphan System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Doniphan Ditch | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW8_1 | 3 undersized crossings and undersized channel. | Increase culvert size, increase channel capacity. Divert flow north to White Spur Drain. | Increase 3 culvert crossings | \$ 2,160,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Increase channel capacity | | | | | | | | | |
| NW8_2 | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making a linear "Heritage Park/ Loop Trail." | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making a linear "Heritage Park/ Loop Trail." | Grade section north of Sunset Dr. to drain to White Spur Drain | \$ 2,150,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | | | Increase 3 culvert crossings | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Increase channel capacity | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Grade section north of Sunset Dr. to drain to White Spur Drain | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Doniphan Ditch | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW12_1 | 5 undersized crossings and undersized channel. | Increase crossing sizes, increase channel capacity, and create sediment basin. | Increase 5 bridge crossings | \$ 5,970,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Increase channel capacity | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Add sedimentation basin | | | | | | | | | |
| NW12_2 | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making a linear "Heritage Park/ Loop Trail." Create sedimentation basin. | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making a linear "Heritage Park/ Loop Trail." Create sedimentation basin. | Increase 2 culvert crossings | \$ 5,190,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| | | | Increase 3 bridge crossings | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Increase channel capacity | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Add sedimentation basin | | | | | | | | | |
| Keystone Dam Outlet | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW27_1 | Outlet pipe discharges to Keystone Dam outlet conduit. | Add conduit separate from, but parallel to keystone outlet conduit, to take residential flow to Rio Grande. | Add 1 conduit | \$ 10,940,000 | ○ | ○ | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NW27_2 | | Add conduits that discharge to Doniphan Ditch. | Add 2 conduits | \$ 230,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Flow Paths System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 38 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW1_1 | 3 crossing undersized. | Increase culvert size | Increase 3 culvert crossings | \$ 460,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 40 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW5_1 | 1 crossing undersized and part of channel undersized. Upstream sediment and debris flow. | Increase culvert size and construct debris/sediment basin (option to add some detention) | Increase 1 culvert crossing | \$ 3,530,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● |
| | | | Create debris/sediment basin (NW_DEB1) | | | | | | | | | |
| NW5_2 | | Create sediment/detention upstream to reduce peak flow | Create sediment/detention upstream to reduce peak flow (NW_DEB1) | \$ 12,840,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Flow Path Number 39A Redirect | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW22_1 | 1 undersized crossing and historical blow-out of berm redirecting flow. | Increase culvert size and add concrete lining to berm where flow is redirected. | Increase 1 arch crossing | \$ 1,210,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● |
| | | | Add concrete lining to berm where flow is redirected | | | | | | | | | |
| NW22_2 | | Create sediment/detention upstream to reduce peak flow at divergence point. | Create sediment/detention upstream to reduce peak flow (NW_SED7) | \$ 10,090,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Add concrete lining to berm where flow is redirected | | | | | | | | | |
| Keystone System | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ridge View | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW6_1 | 2 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert size | Increase 2 box culvert crossings | \$ 560,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● |
| NW6_2 | | Create sediment/detention basin upstream. | Create sediment/detention basin upstream (NW_SED6) | \$ 3,990,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| High Ridge | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW7_1 | 2 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert sizes. | Increase 2 box culvert crossings | \$ 1,410,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● |
| NW7_2 | | Create sediment/detention basin upstream. | Create sediment/detention basin upstream (NW_SED5) | \$ 7,270,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Ojo De Agua | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW24_1 | 3 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert sizes and create a sediment basin. | Increase 3 box culvert crossings | \$ 1,950,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | ○ | ● |
| | | | Create sediment basin (NW_SED1) | | | | | | | | | |
| NW24_2 | | | Create sediment/detention basin and up-size crossing upstream of confluence. | Create sediment/detention basin upstream (NW_SED1) | \$ 3,500,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Increase 1 box culvert crossing | | | | | | | | | |
| Arroyo 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW25_1 | 5 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert sizes. | Increase 5 culvert crossings | \$ 4,760,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NW25_2 | | | Create 2 detention basins along channel and upsize crossings accordingly. | Create 2 detention basin along channel | \$ 4,170,000 | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | | Increase 3 culvert crossings based on detention outflow | | | | | | | | |
| NW25_3 | Create 1 detention basin and upsize crossing accordingly. | Create 1 detention basin at El Puente (NW_DET2) | \$ 3,030,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| | | | Increase 4 culvert crossings. | | | | | | | | | |
| Arroyo 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW26_1 | 1 undersized crossing. | Increase crossing capacity. | Increase 1 long culvert. | \$ 1,900,000 | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|---|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | | |
| Montoya System | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Montoya Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW17_1 | 8 undersized crossings. | Increase crossing sizes. | Increase 8 culvert crossings | \$ 3,810,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Doniphan Ditch | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW13_1 | Undersized channel (no crossings). | Increase channel capacity to convey 100-yr flow. | Increase channel capacity to convey flow | \$ 110,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW13_2 | | Increase channel capacity to detain some volume. | Increase channel to detain some volume, making it part of the "Heritage Park/Loop Trail" | \$ 150,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| White Spur Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW14_1 | Undersized channel. | Increase channel capacity to convey flow. | Increase channel capacity to convey flow | \$ 760,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| White Spur Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW15_1 | 2 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert and bridge sizes. | Increase 1 bridge crossing Increase 1 culvert crossing | \$ 390,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Montoya Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW19_1 | 3 undersized crossings and undersized channel. | Increase crossing sizes and increase channel capacity | Increase 3 bridge crossings | \$ 2,960,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW19_2 | | | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making it part of the "Heritage Park/ Loop Trail" | Increase 3 bridge crossings Increase 6,300 ft of channel capacity | \$ 3,600,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| Montoya Drain | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW21_1 | 3 undersized crossings and undersized channel. | Increase culvert size, increase channel capacity, and incorporate an automatic gate at confluence with river. | Increase 3 culvert crossings | \$ 4,130,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW21_2 | | | Increase channel to detain some volume while upsizing some crossings, making a linear "Heritage Park/Loop Trail", and incorporate an automatic gate at confluence with river. | | | | | | | | | | Increase 3 culvert crossings Increase 9000 ft of channel capacity Add an automatic gate |
| Oxidation System | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spring Crest Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW28_1 | Upstream debris and sediment flow. | Create debris/sediment basin. | Create debris/sediment basin (NW_SED2) | \$ 660,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Silver Springs Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW29_1 | Upstream sediment flow. | Create sediment/detention basin. | Create sediment/detention upstream (NW_SED3) | \$ 4,910,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mesa Hills Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW30_1 | Known sediment/debris issues. | Purchase and enhance existing debris/sediment basin. | Improve existing debris/sed basin | \$ 520,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Vinton System | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path 45A | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW31_1 | The flowpath is the roadway, and does not contain the flow. | Construct retention basin upstream. | Construct 1 retention basin (NW_DET5) | \$ 420,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW31_2 | | | Construct a diversion channel to FP45 and a sediment/detention basin on FP45. | Construct a channel upstream of Remington Drive to drain south to FP45. | \$ 21,810,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| NW31_3 | | | Construct a storm drain system in Southwood Street from Remington Drive to IH-10. | Construct a storm drain system. | \$ 6,540,000 | ○ | ○ | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ● |
| Flow Path 45A | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW32_1 | The channel is undersized and there are 6 undersized crossings. | Construct detention basin upstream and increase 2 culvert sizes | Increase 2 culvert crossings in residential area (Iron and Kiely Streets). | \$ 6,570,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW32_2 | | | Construct 1 detention basin (NW_DET4) | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW32_2 | | Increase culvert and channel sizes | Increase 2 bridge crossings | Increase 4 culvert crossings | \$ 3,350,000 | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ○ |
| | | | | Increase 2650 ft of channel capacity | | | | | | | | | |
| NW32_3 | | Increase 2 culverts and channel sizes | Increase 2 culvert crossings in residential area (Iron and Kiely Streets). | \$ 810,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | | |
| | | | Increase 950ft of channel capacity in residential area. | | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW | |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|---|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vinton Arroyo (Flow Path 45) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW33_1 | There are 3 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert and bridge sizes | Increase 3 bridge crossings. | \$ 3,290,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Vinton Arroyo (Flow Path 45) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW34_1 | The channel is undersized, and upstream sediment flow. | Construct 2 sediment/detention basins upstream. | Construct 2 sediment/detention basins (NW_SED10 and NW_SED11) | \$ 33,370,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW34_2 | | Increase channel size. | Increase 1600 ft of channel capacity | \$ 120,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW34_3 | | Construct 2 sediment basins and divert flow south to Flow Path 44 Trib. | Construct a 1700ft channel upstream of Tom Mays Drive to drain south to FP44 Trib. Construct 2 sediment basins | \$ 9,930,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| Vinton Arroyo (Flow Path 45) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| NW35_1 | The channel is undersized and there are 4 undersized crossings. | Construct detention basin upstream. | Construct 1 detention basin (NW_DET3) | \$ 25,934,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| NW35_2 | | Increase crossing and channel sizes. | Increase 4500 ft of channel capacity. | \$ 3,220,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ |
| | | | Add 3 bridges. Increase 1 culvert crossing. | | | | | | | | | | |
| West Central System | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Paragon Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC3_1 | Upstream debris flow. | Create debris basin upstream. | Construct 1 debris basin (WC_DEB1) | \$ 690,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC1_1 | Upstream debris flow and crossing undersized. | Increase culvert size and construct 2 debris basins along debris paths. | Increase 1 culvert crossing | \$ 23,710,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | |
| | | | Increase 1 storm drain system | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Construct 2 debris basins (WC_DEB2 and WC_DEB3) | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC1_2 | | Create two debris/detention basins upstream. | Construct 2 debris/detention basins (WC_DEB2 and WC_DEB3) | \$ 4,380,000 | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| Canterbury Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC4_1 | Upstream debris flow. | Construct debris basin. | Construct 1 debris basin (WC_DEB4) | \$ 380,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC6_1 | 2 undersized crossings. | Increase the capacity of 2 culverts. | Increase 2 culvert crossings | \$ 7,830,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | |
| WC6_2 | | Increase the capacity of 1 culvert. | Increase Mesa St. crossing | \$ 7,250,000 | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| Flow Path Number 20 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC2_1 | Channel and crossing are undersized. | Increase crossing and channel capacity. | Increase 1 box culvert crossing (bridge) | \$ 2,920,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Increase 900 ft of DS channel capacity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC7_1 | Channel and crossing are undersized. | Increase culvert size, increase channel capacity. | Increase 1 box culvert crossing | \$ 2,910,000 | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Increase 800 ft of DS channel capacity | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC8_1 | A portion of the channel is undersized, 2 culverts are undersized, and upstream sediment flow. | Increase culvert size, install storm drain, construct sediment basin. | Increase 2 culvert crossings | \$ 20,930,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| | | | Construct 1 low water crossing | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Construct a storm drain system | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC8_2 | Create sediment/detention basin upstream, upsize necessary culverts and channel. | | Create 1 Sediment basin upstream (WC_SED1) | \$ 8,330,000 | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ○ | ○ | |
| | | | Upsize 1265 ft of channel | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Increase 4 culvert crossings | | | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|--|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Flow Path Number 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WC9_1 | 3 undersized crossings. | Increase culvert size. | Increase 3 box culvert crossings | \$ 1,830,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Phelps Dodge Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fort Bliss Spur Drain Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA1_1 | Undersized culvert crossings. | Increase culvert size at Edgemere Blvd./Airway Ave. and Edgemere Blvd./Robert E. Lee crossings. | Culverts: 2-8'x4' CBC at Edgemere Blvd./Airway Ave. and 2-8'x4' CBC at Edgemere Blvd./Robert E. Lee Crossing; Remove French Drain at Railroad Crossing and connect concrete channel Add Storm Drain System including 48" RCP, 60" RCP, and 8'X4' CBC | \$ 7,710,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Phelps Dodge Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sunmount Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA2_1 | Undersized culvert crossing. | Create Retention Basin at Sunmount Channel Downstream before Sunmount/Viscount Culvert Crossing. | 20 Ac-ft detention basin | \$ 650,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Phelps Dodge Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lorne Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA3_1 | Undersized channel and flooding problems upstream of channel. | Increase channel capacity and add storm drain system. | Increase channel capacity down to retention basin Add storm drain system within streets to reduce street flooding issues. | \$ 4,840,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Phelps Dodge Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| McRae | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA4_1 | Street flows flooding at Interstate crossing. | Add drop inlets and storm drain, and increase capacity of existing storm drain. | Add to existing storm drain system to increase capacity and reduce street and commercial flooding by getting flows to Giles Basin Dam for effectively. Add new storm drain system to reduce street by getting flows to Giles Basin Dam for effectively. | \$ 12,230,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Phelps Dodge Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Zanzibar | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA5_1 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Add storm drain system to surrounding areas of Eastwood Park. | Storm drain system consisting of 54" RCP and 66" RCP Excavation of pond of 85 Ac-ft storage capacity, within Eastwood to handle flows from surrounding residential areas | \$ 9,000,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Lomaland Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pico Norte | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA6_1 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Add storm drain system to surrounding areas of Pico Norte Park. | Storm drain system consisting of 48" RCP to 66" RCP, 7'X4' CBC, 9'X5' CBC, and 10'X5' CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas Storm drain system consisting of 66" RCP and 9'X5' CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas Storm drain system consisting of 60" RCP and 7'X4' CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas Storm drain system consisting of 54" RCP, 66" RCP and 7'X4' CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas Storm drain system consisting of 48" RCP and 60" RCP to handle flows from surrounding residential areas | \$ 40,030,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Lomaland Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jesuit Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA7_1 | Runoff flooding streets because it does not enter Jesuit Basin effectively. | Add storm drain system and increase capacity of existing storm drain system. | Addition of 36" RCP, 48" RCP, 60" RCP and 10'X4' CBC storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Lee Trevino and James Watt Addition of 54" RCP and 8'X5' CBC storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Kaiser Dr and Gateway West Addition of 36" RCP, 42" RCP and 48" RCP storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Bessemer Dr and Lee Trevino | \$ 22,020,000 | | | | | | | | |

Table E-8. Alternative Costing Table (Continued)

| Project No & Alternative | Issue to be Addressed | Description of Alternative | Component | Total Cost (Rounded to \$10,000) | Constructability | Maintenance | Reliability | Safety | Aesthetics | Dual Use | Natural Systems | ROW |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------|-----------------|-----|
| | | | Description | | | | | | | | | |
| Americas Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bluff Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA8_1 | Runoff from surrounding commercial areas flooding streets because of ineffective routing to Bluff Channel. | Add storm drain system, and increase capacity of existing storm drain. | Increase size of Bluff channel to a 20' bottom width from Rojas Dr to Esther Lama Dr and upgrade crossing at Esther Lama Dr to 3-10'X5' CBC Addition of 24" RCP to 60" RCP storm drain system added to surrounding commercial lots and streets to prevent flooding in Zaragoza Rd. and George Dieter DR. and also IH-10 George Dieter intersection. | \$ 14,350,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Americas 10 Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| RV Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA9_1 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Add detention/debris basins, and concrete line channels to IH-10. | Concrete line channels below proposed basins and concrete line earthen channels between concrete sections. Add detention/debris basin (75 Ac-ft) capacity above Paseo Del Este Blvd. to eliminate sediment and crossing capacity issues downstream. | \$ 7,800,000 | | | | | | | | |
| Americas 10 Basin | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mercantile Channel | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EA10_1 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Add drop inlets and storm drain, and increase capacity of existing storm drain. | Concrete line channels below proposed basins and concrete line earthen channels between concrete sections. Add detention/debris basin (140 Ac-ft) capacity above Paseo Del Este Blvd. to eliminate sediment and crossing capacity issues downstream. | \$ 6,070,000 | | | | | | | | |

This page was intentionally left blank.

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Central | Government Hills | CE_1 | CE1 | Multiple street intersections along Government Hills Channel do not have sufficiently sized drainage inlets. Undersized inlets restrict water from entering the channel and contribute to localized flooding at the crossings. | Expand the street inlets at Altura, Hastings, Cambridge and Cumberland to allow street flow to enter the channel without flooding surrounding properties. Also, add Austin High Pond upstream from the channel to decrease the flow entering the street inlets. | \$850,000 |
| Central | Government Hills | CE2_1 | CE2 | Multiple culverts along Government Hills Channel are undersized and contribute to channel flooding in localized areas. | Enlarge culverts at Cambridge, Cumberland, Chester and Trowbridge to increase the overall capacity of the Government Hills Channel to convey the 100-year storm. | \$2,060,000 |
| Central | Government Hills | CE3_2 | CE3 | The Government Hills System consists of a 90-inch pressurized conduit that outfalls into the Rio Grande. The design capacity is 375 cfs but has been reduced to 50 cfs. | The Government Hills System will be modified to reflect as built conditions. This will enable the system to remain pressurized from Boone Street Basin to the Rio Grande River. The flow through the 90-inch conduit will increase from a current capacity of 50 cfs. | \$6,672,000 |
| Central | Cebada | CE6_5 Phase I | CE4 Phase 1 | Conveyance problems through Cebada Reservoir and Magnolia systems cause major flooding on IH-10 and on Cebada Road. | Clearing and relocating of existing utilities in Cebada Outfall Conduit (In Progress). Expansion of Magnolia Reservoir (In Progress). Construct Copia Street Pond | \$4,740,000 |
| Central | Cebada | CE6_5 Phase II | CE4 Phase 2 | Conveyance problems through Cebada Reservoir and Magnolia systems cause major flooding on IH-10 and on Cebada Road. | Magnolia storm drains, Pump Station and Force Main to Rio Grande. | \$24,739,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| Central | Cebada | CE6_5 Phase III | CE4 Phase 3 | Conveyance problems through Cebada Reservoir and Magnolia systems cause major flooding on IH-10 and on Cebada Road. | Railroad Pond and Concrete lined channel from Cebada to RR Pond. | \$7,407,000 |
| Central | Dallas | CE11_5 Phase I | CE5 Phase 1 | The Dallas Reservoir does not properly discharge flow into the Rio Grande when river levels are high. This causes a back up and flooding occurs along the system at multiple locations. | Add a 115 cfs pump station which discharges into a new 42-inch force main running parallel to the existing eastern discharge conduit at Dallas Reservoir. Sever tie-ins of eastern discharge conduit to Line D and Cebada System and construct an extension of the line from the point where the tie-in to the Cebada System was severed. 50-year protection. | \$19,290,000 |
| Central | Dallas | CE11_5 Phase II | CE5 Phase 2 | The Dallas Reservoir does not properly discharge flow into the Rio Grande when river levels are high. This causes a back up and flooding occurs along the system at multiple locations. | Increase capacity of pump station from 115 cfs to 370 cfs. | \$7,728,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin A | MV7 | MV1 | The pump station at Basin A does not have capacity for the 100-year storm event. Additional flow is contributed back into the Playa Drain. | Upgrade the existing pump station at Basin A by installing new pumps (525 cfs total capacity). | \$19,076,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|----------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| Mission Valley | Mesa Drain Upstream and Downstream | MV11 | MV10 | Mesa Drain is significantly undersized. | Expand Mesa Drain 20 feet in width on the south side of the channel where feasible. Also, line portions of channel with concrete that cannot be expanded and line 20 feet upstream of all crossings with concrete. | \$6,262,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin A | MV8 Phase I | MV2 Phase 1 | Basin B currently serves as detention storage for the upper portion of the Playa Drain and the neighborhoods surrounding the basin. | Install a new pump station (165 cfs total capacity) and conduit in the portion of Basin B west of Mimosa Avenue to pump water to the Rio Grande River. Excavate and regrade the slope in Basin B so that water flows to the pump station. Install new culverts. | \$10,413,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin A | MV8 Phase II | MV2 Phase 2 | Basin B currently serves as detention storage for the upper portion of the Playa Drain and the neighborhoods surrounding the basin. | Expand pump station by installing an additional 165 cfs pump and conduit. | \$6,023,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV_3 | MV3 | The Middle Drain is contributing flow to the Mesa Drain Interceptor causing capacity and tailwater issues. There is need for additional storage along the Interceptor System in Mission Valley. | Excavate the City-owned Feather Lake II property and divert all flow from the Middle Drain to it via conduit. Install a small pump station at basin. Flow back into the Mesa Drain Interceptor from the basin will be controlled by automatic gates. | \$10,724,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV4 | MV4 | The Franklin Drain is contributing flow to the Middle Drain Interceptor causing capacity and tailwater issues. There is a need for additional storage along the Interceptor System in Mission Valley. | Create a detention basin along the Middle Drain Interceptor and divert flow from the Franklin Drain to it via conduit. Install a small pump station at basin. Flow back into the Middle Drain Interceptor from the basin will be controlled by automatic gate. | \$16,203,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV5 Phase I | MV5 Phase I | The current configuration and capacity of Basin G is causing tailwater to significantly restrict the capacity of the major drains and Interceptor System in Mission Valley. There is a need for additional storage in Basin G. | Excavate existing Basin G area to a depth of 20 feet, replace the undersized crossings at Carl Longuemare and Southside, and re-grade the Franklin Drain Interceptor so that water will flow to the basin from both the Playa Drain and the Interceptor System. | \$6,236,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV5 Phase II | MV5 Phase 2 | The current configuration and capacity of Basin G is causing tailwater to significantly restrict the capacity of the major drains and Interceptor System in Mission Valley. There is a need for additional storage in Basin G. | Upgrade the existing pump station at Basin G by installing new pumps (820 cfs capacity total) and installing new conduits to the Rio Grande River. | \$27,038,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin A | MV6 | MV6 | There are flooding issues on Alameda Drive (SH 20) between Paisano Drive and El Paso Drive. | Install a storm drain system along the affected area of Alameda Drive that empties into Playa Drain just north of the intersection with Delta Drive. | \$42,879,000 |
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV9 | MV7 | The following crossing on Playa Drain is undersized: Just downstream of Yarbrough Drive (one 36-inch RCP). | Remove the undersized culvert and replace it with a culvert having the same capacity as the upstream cross section. The replaced culvert will not interfere with the channel width or road surface elevation. | \$95,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| Mission Valley | Basin G | MV10 | MV8 | Basin C is currently serving as a detention area for water from surrounding neighborhoods. After leaving the basin, water enters the Playa Drain where it contributes to the capacity problems of the drain. | Install a new pump station (160 cfs total capacity) and conduits at Basin C to pump water from the basin to the Rio Grande River. Excavate the basin so it is three feet below the channel elevation of Playa Drain. Install new culverts under Independence Drive. | \$10,741,000 |
| Mission Valley | Mesa Drain Downstream | MV2 | MV9 | The elevation of the channel banks along the lower portion of Mesa Drain is preventing the top portion of the Feather Lake capacity from being utilized. | Construct a parapet wall along both sides of Mesa Drain from Le Barron Rd to Feather Lake to raise the channel bank elevation. | \$4,777,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE7_1 | NE1 | The following crossings on Railroad Channel are undersized: Falcon Avenue (one 18-inch RCP), Waycross Avenue (one 12-inch RCP), Wren Dr (one 18-inch RCP), Lexington Dr (one 18-inch RCP), Crossing S. of Falcon Avenue (one 12-inch RCP). | Replacement of five crossing structures. | \$922,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE8_1 | NE2 | The following crossing on Railroad Channel Downstream is undersized: east of Julian Drive (five 8-foot by 4-foot CBCs). | Replacement of one crossing structure. | \$402,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------------|--------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE10/NE9_2 Phase I | NE3 Phase 1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tobin Drain is significantly undersized with the exception of the far downstream end. 2. Crossing capacities are well below the 10-year flow. | Expansion of channel from Alps to Hollings. Construction of new portion of Tobin Drain parallel to Hollings from Hollings to Hondo Pass. Replacement of three crossing structures. | \$7,595,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE10/NE9_2 Phase II | NE3 Phase 2 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tobin Drain is significantly undersized with the exception of the far downstream end. 2. Crossing capacities are well below the 10-year flow. | Expansion of the portion of Tobin Drain from Wren to Alps. Expansion and lining of Tobin Drain from Sanders to Wren. Replacement of two crossing structures. | \$10,210,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE10/NE9_2 Phase III | NE3 Phase 3 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tobin Drain is significantly undersized with the exception of the far downstream end. 2. Crossing capacities are well below the 10-year flow. | Expansion of Tobin Drain from Threadgill to Sanders. Replacement of one crossing structure. | \$6,412,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE11_2 | NE4 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following crossing on Range Dam Outlet Channel is undersized (<10-year): Raymond Telles Drive (one 2-foot by 2-foot CBC). 2. Downstream junction of Range Dam Outlet Channel and Tobin Drain Channel identified by EPWU as issue and thus included in cost table. | Remove and replace undersized crossing and modify downstream junction. | \$1,430,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--|---|-------------|
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE14_1 | NE5 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The following crossings on Clearview Channel are undersized (<10-year): Morningside Circle (three 36-inch CMPs), Byron Drive (three 36-inch CMPs). 2. There is a sediment problem in the upstream portion of Clearview Channel. | Replace two crossing structures and construct new sediment basin. | \$1,686,000 |
| Northeast | Fort Bliss Sump | NE_16_1 | NE6 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Erosion along Lincoln Avenue due to flows in the downstream portion of Johnson Channel. 2. One undersized crossing was identified on Johnson Channel. | Construct new retention basin. | \$521,000 |
| Northeast | Northeast Ponding | NE3/NE2_4 Phase I | NE7 Phase 1 | Northeast Channel No. 2 is significantly undersized (< 10-year) with undersized crossings and serious erosion problems. | Expansion and lining of portion NE Channel 2 in progress. | \$7,020,000 |
| Northeast | Northeast Ponding | NE3/NE2_4 Phase II | NE7 Phase 2 | Northeast Channel No. 2 is significantly undersized (<10-year) with undersized crossings and serious erosion problems. | Expansion and lining of remaining channel. | \$9,513,000 |
| Northeast | Northeast Ponding | NE3/NE2_4 Phase III | NE7 Phase 3 | Northeast Channel No. 2 has high sediment loads due to large upstream deposits. | Construction of sediment basin. | \$7,933,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|--------------|
| Northeast | Northeast Ponding | NE3/NE2_4 Phase IV | NE7 Phase 4 | Northeast Channel No. 2 is significantly undersized. | Construction of detention with Phase 2 sediment basin. | \$15,416,000 |
| Northeast | Range Dam | NE5_2 | NE8 Phase 1 | 1. Flooding on Fairbanks Drive. 2. High sediment load from Castner Range. | Construction of sediment. Improve US 54 culvert outlet. | \$2,836,000 |
| Northeast | Range Dam | NE5_2 | NE8 Phase 2 | Flow in Fairbanks Drive bypasses the entrance to Electric Ditch Channel resulting in downstream flooding. | Construction of cross sectional inlets. | \$1,350,000 |
| Northeast | Range Dam | NE6_3 | NE9 | Flooding and erosion issues at the intersection of Hondo Pass Avenue and Hondo Pass Drive due to flow from Northgate Diversion Channel. | Installation of pipes to convey flow to Northgate Dam. | \$736,000 |
| Northwest | Doniphan Ditch | NW8_2 | NW1 | This section of Doniphan Ditch is severely undersized with undersized crossings. | Increase the capacity of three culvert crossings. Increase the capacity of the channel to detain some volume. Grade the section north of Sunset Drive to drain to White Spur Drain. | \$2,150,000 |
| Northwest | Keystone Dam | NW6_1 | NW10 | Ridge View Channel has two undersized crossings. | Increase capacity of two box culverts. | \$564,000 |
| Northwest | Keystone Dam | NW24_1 | NW11 | Ojo De Agua Arroyo has three undersized crossings. Identified upstream sediment source. | Increase capacity of three box culverts. Construct sediment basin. | \$1,947,000 |
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW13_2 | NW12 | Northern section of Doniphan Ditch is undersized. | Increase the capacity of the channel. | \$151,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|-----------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|---|--|--------------|
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW17_1 | NW13 | North section of Montoya Drain has eight undersized crossings. | Increase capacity of eight culverts. | \$3,814,000 |
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW19_2 | NW14 | Mid section of Montoya Drain has three undersized culverts and the channel is undersized. | Increase the capacity of three culvert crossings. Increase the capacity of the channel to detain some volume. | \$3,595,000 |
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW21_2 | NW15 | Lower section of Montoya Drain has three undersized culverts and the channel is undersized. This section of the drain is in New Mexico. | Increase the capacity of three culvert crossings. Increase the capacity of the channel to detain some volume. | \$4,590,000 |
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW14_1 | NW16 | East extent of White Spur Drain is undersized. | Increase channel capacity. May need a storm drain system due to limited ROW. | \$758,000 |
| Northwest | Montoya Drain | NW15_1 | NW17 | White Spur Drain has two undersized crossings. | Increase capacity of crossings. | \$391,000 |
| Northwest | Oxidation Dam | NW30_1 | NW18 | Mesa Hills Channel has known sediment/debris issues. | Purchase and enhance existing debris/sediment basin. | \$521,000 |
| Northwest | Oxidation Dam | NW29_1 | NW19 | Silver Springs Channel has identified upstream sediment source. | Construct detention basin or dam. | \$4,905,000 |
| Northwest | Doniphan Ditch | NW12_2 | NW2 | This section of Doniphan Ditch has five undersized crossings and the channel is undersized. There is a known sediment issue. | Increase the capacity of three culvert crossings and two bridge. Increase the capacity of the channel to detain some volume. Construct a sediment basin. | \$5,192,000 |
| Northwest | Vinton | NW31_2 | NW21 | For the upper portion of Flow Path No. 45A, the roadway serves as the channel and does not contain the flow. | Construct a diversion channel to FP 45 and a sediment/detention basin on FP 45. | \$21,812,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|---------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| Northwest | Vinton | NW32_3 | NW22 | The lower portion of Flow Path No. 45A has six undersized culverts and the channel is undersized. | Increase the capacity of the two culvert crossings and the channel in the residential area only. | \$809,000 |
| Northwest | Vinton | NW33_1 | NW23 | The lower portion of Flow Path No. 45 has three undersized crossings. | Increase the capacity of three crossings. | \$3,288,000 |
| Northwest | Vinton | NW35_2 | NW24 | The mid portion of Flow Path No. 45 has four undersized crossings and the channel is undersized. | Increase the capacity of the four crossings and the channel. | \$3,217,000 |
| Northwest | Vinton | NW34_2 | NW25 | For the upper portion of Flow Path No. 45 the channel is undersized and there is identified upstream sediment source. | The detention/sediment basin is to be constructed as part of PRJ_NW31. Increase the capacity of the channel based on the outflow from the detention basin. | \$120,000 |
| Northwest | Oxidation Dam | NW28_1 | NW20 | Spring Crest Channel has identified upstream debris and sediment sources. | There is an existing debris/sediment basin. Would need maintenance permit or easement. | \$659,000 |
| Northwest | Doniphan Ditch | NW27_2 | NW3 | Pump station outlet pipes discharges to Keystone Dam outlet conduit. | Install conduits that discharge to Doniphan Ditch. | \$232,000 |
| Northwest | Flow Paths | NW1_1 | NW4 | Flow Path No. 38 has three undersized crossings. | Increase the capacity of three culvert crossings. | \$458,000 |
| Northwest | Flow Paths | NW22_2 | NW5 | Flow Path No. 39A has one undersized crossing and historical blow out of berm redirecting flow. | Create sediment/detention upstream to reduce peak flow at divergence point. Concrete line 90-degree bend in channel. | \$10,850,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| Northwest | Flow Paths | NW5_1 | NW6 | Flow Path No. 40 has one undersized crossing and part of channel undersized. Identified upstream sediment and debris source. | Increase culvert Size and construct a debris basin. | \$3,525,000 |
| Northwest | Keystone Dam | NW25_3 | NW7 | Arroyo 4 has four undersized crossings. | Construct detention basin, increase capacity of four culvert crossings. | \$3,027,000 |
| Northwest | Keystone Dam | NW26_1 | NW8 | Arroyo 5 has one undersized crossing. | Increase capacity of one long culvert. | \$1,900,000 |
| Northwest | Keystone Dam | NW7_1 | NW9 | High Ridge Channel has two undersized crossings. | Increase capacity of two box culverts. | \$1,409,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC4_1 | WC1 | Canterbury Channel has an identified upstream debris source. | Construct a debris basin. | \$375,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC1_2 | WC2 | Flow Path No. 20 has identified upstream debris sources. There are two undersized culverts. | Construct two debris/detention basins. | \$4,379,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC2_1 | WC3 | The lower portion of Flow Path No. 20 has an undersized culvert and channel. | Increase capacity of channel and crossing. | \$2,923,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC6_2 | WC4 | Flow Path No. 21 has one undersized crossing. | Increase the capacity of the Mesa Street crossing. The other crossing is a low water crossing. | \$7,246,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC7_1 | WC5 | The lower portion of Flow Path No. 21 has an undersized culvert and channel. | Increase crossing and channel capacity. | \$2,907,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|--|--|--------------|
| West Central | West Central | WC8_1 | WC6 | For the upper portion of Flow Path No. 23, the channel and six culverts are undersized. There is an identified upstream sediment source. | Increase the capacity of two CBC culverts. Construct one low water crossing. Construct a storm drain system to bypass the undersized portion of the channel and three culverts. | \$20,925,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC9_1 | WC7 | The lower portion of Flow Path No. 23 has three undersized culverts and discharges to Americas Canal. | Increase capacity of three crossings. | \$1,825,000 |
| West Central | West Central | WC3_1 | WC8 | Paragon Channel has an identified upstream debris source. | Construct a debris basin. | \$687,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA1_1 | EA1 Phase 1 | Undersized culvert crossings, street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding. | Culverts: Two 8-foot by 4-foot CBC at Edgemere Boulevard/Airway Avenue and two 8-foot by 4-foot CBC at Edgemere Boulevard/Robert E. Lee Crossing; Remove french drain at Railroad Crossing and connect concrete channel. | \$1,215,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA1_1 | EA1 Phase 2 | Undersized culvert crossings, street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding. | Add storm drain system including 48-inch RCP, 60-inch RCP, and 8-foot by 4-foot CBC. | \$6,490,000 |
| East | Americas Ten Basin | EA10_1 | EA10 Phase 1 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Build sediment/detention basin upstream of Paseo del Este Drive. | \$4,642,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------|
| East | Americas Ten Basin | EA10_1 | EA10 Phase 2 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Concrete line channels below proposed sediment/detention basin and concrete line earthen channels between concrete sections. | \$1,424,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA2_1 | EA2 | Undersized culvert crossing. | Construction of sediment basin. | \$653,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA3_1 | EA3 Phase 1 | Undersized channel and flooding problems upstream of channel. | Increase channel capacity down to retention basin. | \$792,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA3_1 | EA3 Phase 2 | Undersized channel and flooding problems upstream of channel. | Add storm drain system within streets to reduce street flooding issues. | \$4,043,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA5_1 | EA4 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 54-inch RCP and 66-inch RCP. | \$8,999,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA4_1 | EA5 Phase 1 | Street flows flooding at Interstate crossing. | Add to existing storm drain system to increase capacity and reduce street and commercial flooding by getting flows to Giles Basin Dam more effectively. | \$9,074,000 |
| East | Phelps Dodge | EA4_1 | EA5 Phase 2 | Street flows flooding at Interstate crossing. | Add new storm drain system to reduce street by getting flows to Giles Basin Dam more effectively. | \$3,158,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA6_1 | EA6 Phase 1 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 48-inch RCP to 66-inch RCP, 7-foot by 4-foot CBC, 9-foot by 5-foot CBC, and 10-foot by 5-foot CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas. | \$15,590,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA6_1 | EA6 Phase 2 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 66-inch RCP and 9 foot by 5-foot CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas. | \$10,353,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|--------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--|--|--------------|
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA6_1 | EA6 Phase 3 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 60-inch RCP and 7-foot by 4-foot CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas. | \$5,177,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA6_1 | EA6 Phase 4 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 54-inch RCP, 66 inch RCP and 7-foot by 4-foot CBC to handle flows from surrounding residential areas. | \$6,197,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA6_1 | EA6 Phase 5 | Street flows travel too far over flat slopes causing flooding, street closures and damage. | Storm drain system consisting of 48-inch RCP and 60-inch RCP to handle flows from surrounding residential areas. | \$2,717,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA7_1 | EA7 Phase 1 | Runoff flooding streets because it does not enter Jesuit Basin effectively. | Addition of 36-inch RCP, 48-inch RCP, 60-inch RCP and 10-foot by 4-foot CBC storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Lee Trevino and James Watt. | \$11,244,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA7_1 | EA7 Phase 2 | Runoff flooding streets because it does not enter Jesuit Basin effectively. | Addition of 54-inch RCP and 8-foot by 5-foot CBC storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Kaiser Dr and Gateway West. | \$6,434,000 |
| East | Lomaland Basin | EA7_1 | EA7 Phase 3 | Runoff flooding streets because it does not enter Jesuit Basin effectively. | Addition of 36-inch RCP, 42-inch RCP and 48-inch RCP storm drain system to capture flows from residential and commercial areas before flooding at Bessemer Dr and Lee Trevino. | \$4,343,000 |

Table E-9. Selected Alternatives Summary (Continued)

| Region | System | Project Number | New Project Number | Issue to be addressed | Description of Improvements | Total Cost |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------|
| East | Americas Basin | EA8_1 | EA8 Phase 1 | Runoff from surrounding commercial areas flooding streets because of ineffective routing to Bluff Channel. | Increase size of Bluff Channel to a 20-foot bottom width from Rojas Dr to Esther Lama Dr and upgrade crossing at Esther Lama Dr to three 10-foot by 5-foot CBCs. | \$5,926,000 |
| East | Americas Basin | EA8_1 | EA8 Phase 2 | Runoff from surrounding commercial areas flooding streets because of ineffective routing to Bluff Channel. | Addition of 24-inch RCP to 60-inch RCP storm drain system added to surrounding commercial lots and streets to prevent flooding in Zaragosa Road and George Dieter Drive and also IH-10 George Dieter intersection. | \$8,422,000 |
| East | Americas Ten Basin | EA9_1 | EA9 Phase 1 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Build sediment/detention basin upstream of Paseo del Este Drive. | \$5,769,000 |
| East | Americas Ten Basin | EA9_1 | EA9 Phase 2 | Undersized crossings, unfinished earthen channels, and sediment transfer clogging culverts. | Concrete line channels below proposed sediment/detention basin and concrete line earthen channels between concrete sections. | \$2,026,000 |

This page was intentionally left blank.

FIGURES

This page was intentionally left blank.

Figure E-1. Cost per Square Foot of Flow Area vs. Flow Area of Culverts

