

Unit Costs for Non-State Highway Reconstructions with Federal Funds

PLEASE NOTE: If possible, do not use these unit costs alone to estimate your project costs. These costs have not been updated prior to the 2022-27 TIP update solicitation and they may not apply to some projects which include exceptional, unusual, or innovative features, and they cannot substitute for good engineering judgment and expertise.

CDTC's unit costs for non-state reconstruction projects were last updated and refined in September 2009 for use in the 2010-15 TIP update. During the 2013-16, 2016-21 and now the 2019-24 TIP updates, there has been a greatly decreased emphasis on reconstruction projects. Because of this and the fact that the process of applying these unit costs to candidate projects has been demonstrably successful, these costs have not been overhauled since. However, construction costs have inflated since then. According to the Federal Highway Administration, National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI), inflation has been about 16.5% between September 2009 and November 2018. Therefore, the unit costs in this document have been increased by 16.5% from those used by CDTC in September 2009.

There is a large difference between what a local government would pay to resurface a road on its own and what it would cost to resurface the same road with federal-aid funds. There are several reasons for this, the greatest of which probably is that if federal funds are used, much more substantial repairs are done than a local government would do on its own. These more substantial repairs include enhanced design features and, in most cases, reconstruction rather than resurfacing.

Therefore, CDTC has developed estimated unit costs to reflect these facts. These costs will be applied to any candidate projects before evaluation or inclusion on the TIP. They are also being applied to existing TIP projects for which no design work has yet yielded an updated cost. Since these costs are intended to be averages, they are expected to reasonably predict the costs for rehabilitation of roads on a system-wide basis. However, it is the nature of an average that it doesn't reflect any exceptions to any given project. So if there are particular features of a given project that would increase or decrease the cost, CDTC may be able to incorporate adjustments to the cost for that project, if these adjustments can be properly defended. For example, in a rare case of a non-state road already satisfying state design standards, if core samples of pavement indicate that resurfacing will last ten years (the minimum federal requirement), then CDTC might apply a unit cost for resurfacing instead of reconstruction.

Projects have been broken into four types based on the character (not necessarily location) of the road as follows:

Urban Core: These include projects in downtown areas which include extensive sewer and utility work caused by the road repair. It's also expected that sanitation and storm sewers are combined and need to be separated. The work includes reconstruction of the road, sidewalks, transit amenities, street lighting, and intersections, but not intersection widening. Urban core unit costs were refined in 2009. The refined unit costs are reflected in the table below and documented an addendum to this document.

Other Urban: The differences between these roads and the Urban Core roads are that these already have separated sewers and require less extensive utility relocations. These roads have storm drainage by a closed system exclusively.

Suburban: These roads are generally newer than urban roads. They may or may not already include curbs and sidewalks. If sanitary sewers exist, they are separated from the storm sewers and often the sanitary sewers and water lines are newer and not located under the driving pavement. Some conversion from open to closed drainage may be required. If they don't include sidewalks and multi-use paths, they likely would be upgraded to include either or both. Intersection work would be an additional cost.

Rural: These roads aren't in heavily populated areas. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations are assumed to be provided through the use of shoulders. There are no sanitary sewers or closed storm sewers. Intersection work would be an additional cost.

The costs in the charts below include 12% for supervision of construction and 18% for engineering. Right-of-Way cost is assumed to be negligible except in the cases of intersection widening and new sidewalks/multi-use paths in which case it is included, and in the case of realignment for which it is not estimated. The length of any extensive turn lanes or ramps should be included in the lane-mileage. An inflationary factor of approximately 10% is included to reflect expected construction prices in the fifth year of the TIP.

Reconstruction Unit Costs By Road Type

Road Type	Cost/Ln-Mi
Urban Core	\$2.6M to \$6.0M
Other Urban	\$2.1M
Suburban (Sidewalks/Multi-Use Path Exist)	\$1.5M
Suburban (Sidewalks/Multi-Use Path Don't Exist)	\$2.1M
Rural	\$0.8M

Costs For Additional Treatments

Additional Treatment	Cost
Realignment	Contact NYSDOT Region 1 for cost estimation case-by-case.
Intersection Widening	\$0.6M per Intersection Approach

Addendum Regarding Unit Costs for Urban Core Projects

Introduction

With the large cost difference between the two categories of urban roads in CDTC's unit costs, CDTC staff has undertaken the task of refining the costs of urban core road reconstruction, so as not to overestimate or underestimate the cost of projects that fall between these two categories. All costs shown in this section have not been inflated from September 2009 to November 2018.

Rather than examine as many projects as possible with recent lettings, CDTC studied in greater detail four projects with recent lettings for which specific information could be obtained. These projects are A334 (Pearl Street Phase 3), R110 (Third Street and Third Avenue), R155 (Congress Street) and S144 (State Street Streetscape).

Procedure for Comparing Project Scope

The scope of these four projects were checked for the inclusion of 38 different improvements. These improvements are split into six categories Pavement/Operations (16), Pedestrian (7), Bicycle (2), Transit (2), Drainage/Utilities (7) and Streetscape/Aesthetics (4). The scopes of the projects were compared and the differences noted.

Procedure for Comparing Project Cost

Unit costs for these projects were calculated, using a slightly greater accuracy than previously. Lengths and lanes (used to calculate lane-miles) were taken from documents used in the engineering phases of these projects. One of the factors that increased the costs of urban reconstructions has been the inclusion of a small amount of side streets in the reconstruction. These numbers were available and can be used to calculate the true unit costs of these projects. However, when a project is added to the TIP, side streets are not considered in the cost. Therefore, the unit costs used here are calculated using only the mileage for the mainline road. They will then be applicable to the mileage of candidate projects. Any costs for work or right-of-way that are not part of a normal urban reconstruction were removed from the total project cost first.

Matching Project Scope and Cost

The scopes of project R155 and A334 were similar. They differed in few minor improvements, which tended toward a net difference of zero. Another difference in the scopes of these projects was the magnitude of some of the improvements that were made to both projects. The only way this could be known to CDTC was by interviewing someone with detailed knowledge of both projects, in this case, consultants. Ultimately, the scope for A334 was slightly greater in magnitude and had a slightly greater cost, greater by 15%.

S144 was about 20% higher in cost than these two projects. It was difficult to determine any cause for the difference in cost, since the scopes appeared to be similar. Superpave was used in the cost for all three projects. Perhaps the difference is in the extent of some of the more expensive improvements. Unlike R155 and A334, the difference in degree of these repairs could not readily be known. The aggregate unit cost of these three projects was calculated weighing each cost by the lane-miles. The total unit cost is \$5.1M per lane-mile.

The scope of project R110 was less substantial, differing in a few costly categories. Its cost was less by about a factor of two. The total unit cost is \$2.2M per lane-mile.

Conclusion

This research has revealed that not all Urban Core projects are the same in cost or scope. Some of these differences in scope can be determined by examining the scope for the presence of the 38 different construction items shown on the next page.

It is therefore assumed that all or most candidate projects will either be similar to one of these (A334/R155/S144 or R110) or in between them in scope. Therefore, a reasonable cost can be assigned to each candidate that's consistent with other projects, either \$2.2M or \$5.1M per lane-mile or something in between.

This research also revealed that even among projects with seemingly the same construction items in their scope, there can be variance in the cost due to the extent of the work for specific items. In retrospect, these differences could be determined with more research, and the costs refined further. However, it would be impractical to attempt to obtain information for candidate projects that would enable their scope to be refined to that extent. Thus, there is known uncertainty in these cost estimates.

List of Possible Improvements for Urban Reconstruction

Pavement/Operations

- Reconstruction
- Resurfacing
- Shoulder/ Lane Widening
- Curve Realignment
- Center Turn Lane
- Raised Median
- Intersection Operational Improvements
- Signals
- Traffic Signs
- Driveway Access
- ROW Purchase
- Curb
- Safety Widening
- Guiderail
- Geometric Improvements
- Clear Zone

Pedestrian

- Sidewalk
- Retaining Wall
- Crosswalks
- Textured Crosswalks
- Pedestrian Signals
- Pedestrian Island
- Pedestrian Facilities (ADA curb cuts, etc.)

Bicycle

- Bike Lanes
- Bicycle Facilities

Transit

- Bus Shelters
- Bus Turnouts

Drainage/Utilities

- Closed Drainage
- Drainage/Storm Water/Sewer Improvements
- Paved Gutters
- Major Culvert Reconstruction
- Storm Water/Sewer Main Separation
- Water Main Improvements
- Utility Improvements/Relocations

Streetscape/Aesthetics

- Street Trees/Landscaping
- Lighting
- Streetscape (brick pavers, street printing, benches, bollards, etc.)
- Traffic Calming Devices (bulb outs, etc.)