

Appendix G
Cost Engineering



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. INTRODUCTION
- 2. BASIS OF ESTIMATE
- 3. MCACES REPORT
- 4. PROJECT COST AND ABBREVIATED RISK ANALYSIS REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The cost estimate for the Lower Colma Flood Protection Project's Feasibility Report was developed using the Micro-Computer Aided Cost Estimating System (MCACES), Second Generation (MII) software and the USACE established Civil Works Work Breakdown Structure (CWWBS). The estimate used quantities provided by the Civil Design Section, and was based on USACE cost estimating standards, and the cost estimating knowledge and judgment of USACE cost engineers as they apply to civil works projects.

Table 1: First Costs Table Tentatively Selected Plan

		Lov	ver Co	lma Creek CAP	103		
		Flood	l Prote	ction Feasibility	Study		
			April	2022 Price Level			
	Feas	sibility	y Repo	rt Cost Estimate	Summar	y	
Feat.	Description	Qty	UoM	Subtotal	Cont. %	Cont \$\$	Total Cost
Acct.							
01	LANDS AND DAMAGES	1	LS	\$1,344,000	5.0%	\$67,000	\$1,411,000
				,		,	, ,
06	FISH& WILDLIFE	1	LS	\$500,000	30.0%	\$150,000	\$650,000
00	FACILITIES	•		\$200,000	20.070	\$120,000	4020,000
11	FLOODWALLS	1	LS	\$7,135,000	35.0%	\$2,497,000	\$9,632,000
18	CULTURAL	1	LS	\$115,000	30.0%	\$35,000	\$150,000
	RESOURCE						
	PRESERVATION						
30	PLANNING,	1	LS	\$1,348,000	35.0%	\$472,000	\$1,820,000
	ENGINEERING AND			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
	DESIGN						
21	CONSTRUCTION	1	LS	\$620,000	25 00/	\$217,000	6927 000
31	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	1	LS	\$620,000	35.0%	\$217,000	\$837,000
	THE HEADTH IN						
	TOTAL			\$11,062,000	31.1%	\$3,438,000	\$14,500,000

2. BASIS OF ESTIMATE

BASIS/FACTS/ASSUMPTIONS

The basis for the estimate was the scoping documents provided by the Project Delivery Team (PDT). The unit costs for the construction features were computed by estimating the equipment, labor, material, and production rates suitable for the project.

EFFECTIVE PRICE LEVEL

The cost estimate effective price level is April 2022.

OVERTIME

The estimate assumed that the work will be done during 8-hour shifts, 5 days a week and that no overtime will be required.

ACQUISITION PLAN

The acquisition plan is unknown at this time; however, the cost estimate was developed assuming Invitation for Bid (IFB) competitive bidding, under multiple contracts with a prime contractor and subcontractors. It is assumed that construction will take four to five years to complete, and there will be a five separate contracts, one for each reach.

SITE ACCESS

There are no site access issues for the Contractor for this project, therefore no additional cost impacts have been applied to the IGE for this element.

CONSTRUCTION METHOD

No special construction technologies are required for the job.

UNUSUAL CONDITIONS

No unusual conditions are anticipated.

EQUIPMENT /LABOR AVAILABILITY AND DISTANCE TRAVELED

The project is located within San Mateo County, California. All labor and equipment are assumed available within a 100-miles radius in order to allow for fair competition.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

No special environmental concerns beyond those stated in the construction window.

LABOR RATES

The labor rates used are from the Davis-Bacon wage rates tables for the San Francisco Bay Area, California.

EQUIPMENT RATES

Equipment rates are based upon the latest approved U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Engineer Pamphlet (EP) 1110-1-8, Vol. 07, Construction Equipment Ownership and Operation Expense Schedule.

MATERIAL COSTS

Material prices were obtained from vendor and supplier quotes, discussions with USACE personnel and local government agencies, historical cost data from previous projects, and the MCACES Unit Price Book.

CONTINGENCIES

During development of the cost estimates, sufficient contingencies developed via PDT discussions during Abbreviated Risk Analysis (ARA) were applied to develop the Total Project First Cost. The breakdown of items within each account. The contingency factors used in the two alternatives are summarized in Table 1 and in the Total Project Cost Summary (TPCS).



North and South Floodwall Alternative includes an I-wall (sheetpile) floodwall, approximately 3 to 4.5 feet above grade at WQCP at the north side of the WQCP adjacent to the right-bank of Creek, as well as a second shorter approximately two-foot-high floodwall south of plant adjacent to San Francisco Bay. At Pump Station 4, a perimeter sheetpile floodwall, approximately 2 feet above grade, would be constructed, with stop log gate for vehicular access and early warning system so that plant operators would know when to seal the stop log gate.

Estimated by SPN
Designed by
Prepared by Mike Vo
Preparation Date 2/4/2022
Effective Date of Pricing 2/4/2022
Estimated Construction Time Days

This report is not copyrighted, but the information contained herein is For Official Use Only.

Cost Progression USACE Report

Description

All Construction WBS Accounts
LOWER COLMA CREEK CONSTRUCTION COST
TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION FENCE
TRAFFIC CONTROL
MOBILIZATION AND DEMOBILIZATION
STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION PLAN
CLEARING AND GRUBBING
CONSTRUCTION TRAILER
FLOOD WALL 1 NORTH (500 YEAR EVENT)
FLOOD WALL 2 SOUTH (500 YEAR EVENT)
PUMP STATION 4: FULL PERIMETER T-WALL (500 YEAR EVENT)
PUMP STATION 4: SMALL INNER T-WALL (500 YEAR EVENT)

Quantity	UOM	ProjectCost
		7,134,933.76
1.0000	JOB	7,134,933.76
1.0000	JOB	27,173.73
1.0000	JOB	174,713.02
1.0000	JOB	564,193.00
1.0000	JOB	202,620.89
1.0000	JOB	57,709.00
1.0000	JOB	68,733.33
1.0000	JOB	4,180,497.78
1.0000	JOB	1,438,578.78
1.0000	JOB	238,153.78
1.0000	JOB	182,560.43

\$15,583

PREPARED: 4/17/2022

**** TOTAL PROJECT COST SUMMARY ****

PROJECT: Lower Colma Floodwall Feasibility Study

PROJECT NO: P2 xxxxxx

LOCATION: South San Francisco, CA

This Estimate reflects the scope and schedule in report;

Lower Colma Floodwall Feasibility Study

DISTRICT: SPN

POC: CHIEF, COST ENGINEERING, WARREN TAN

ESTIMATED TOTAL PROJECT COST:

Civil	Works Work Breakdown Structure		ESTIMAT	ED COST					CT FIRST CO: nt Dollar Bas					PROJECT COS LY FUNDED)	ST
								gram Year (l fective Price		2022 1 OCT 21					
										Spent Thru:	TOTAL FIRST				
WBS	Civil Works	COST	CNTG	CNTG	TOTAL	ESC	COST	CNTG	TOTAL	1-Oct-21	COST	INFLATED	COST	CNTG	FULL
NUMBER	Feature & Sub-Feature Description	(\$K)	(\$K)	<u>(%)</u> E	_(\$K)_	_(%)_	(\$K)	(\$K)	(\$K)	_(\$K)_	(\$K)	<u>(%)</u>	(\$K)	(\$K)	(\$K)
Α	В	С	D	E	F	G	Н	1	J		K	L	М	N	o
03	RESERVOIRS	\$0	\$0 -		\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0
04	DAMS	\$0	\$0 -		\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0
05	LOCKS	\$0	\$0 -		\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0
06	FISH & WILDLIFE FACILITIES	\$500	\$150	30.0%	\$650	0.0%	\$500	\$150	\$650	\$0	\$650	8.0%	\$540	\$162	\$702
07	POWER PLANT	\$0	\$0 -		\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0
08	ROADS, RAILROADS & BRIDGES	\$0	\$0 -		\$0		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	-	\$0	\$0	\$0
11	LEVEES & FLOODWALLS	\$7,135	\$2,497	35.0%	\$9,632	0.0%	\$7,135	\$2,497	\$9,632	\$0	\$9,632	8.0%	\$7,709	\$2,698	\$10,407
18	CULTURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION	\$115	\$35	30.0%	\$150	0.0%	\$115	\$35	\$150	\$0	\$150	8.0%	\$124	\$37	\$162
	CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE TOTALS:	\$7,750	\$2,682	_	\$10,432	0.0%	\$7,750	\$2,682	\$10,432	\$0	\$10,432	8.0%	\$8,373	\$2,897	\$11,270
01	LANDS AND DAMAGES	\$1,344	\$67	5.0%	\$1,411	0.0%	\$1,344	\$67	\$1,411	\$0	\$1,411	8.0%	\$1,452	\$73	\$1,525
30	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN	\$1,349	\$472	35.0%	\$1,820	0.0%	\$1,349	\$472	\$1,820	\$0	\$1,820	4.2%	\$1,405	\$492	\$1,897
31	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	\$620	\$217	35.0%	\$837	0.0%	\$620	\$217	\$837	\$0	\$837	6.4%	\$659	\$231	\$890
	PROJECT COST TOTALS:	\$11,063	\$3,438	31.1%	\$14,500		\$11,063	\$3,438	\$14,500	\$0	\$14,500	7.5%	\$11,890	\$3,693	\$15,583

CHIEF, COST ENGINEERING, WARREN TAN
PROJECT MANAGER, ROBERT GRIMES
CHIEF, REAL ESTATE, CESPD-SPK
CHIEF, PLANNING, TOM KENDALL
CHIEF, ENGINEERING, SON HA
CHIEF, OPERATIONS, NICK MALASAVAGE
CHIEF, CONSTRUCTION, JERE HARPER
 CHIEF, CONTRACTING, MARY FRONCK
 CHIEF, PM-PB, xxxx
CHIEF, DPM, xxxx

Filename: TPCS_Lower Colma_Alt 2_North and South Wall & PS4_6Jun.xlsx

TPCS

**** TOTAL PROJECT COST SUMMARY ****

**** CONTRACT COST SUMMARY ****

Lower Colma Floodwall Feasibility Study PROJECT:

South San Francisco, CA

LOCATION:

This Estimate reflects the scope and schedule in report; Lower Colma Floodwall Feasibility Study DISTRICT: SPN

POC: CHIEF, COST ENGINEERING, WARREN TAN

PREPARED: 4/17/2022

С	ivil Works Work Breakdown Structure		ESTIMAT	ED COST			PROJECT I (Constant I		-		TOTAL PF	ROJECT COST (FULL)	Y FUNDED)	
			nate Prepare ive Price Lev	el:	17-Apr-22 1-Oct-21		n Year (Budç re Price Leve		2022 1 OCT 21					
WBS	Civil Works	COST	CNTG	RISK BASED CNTG	TOTAL	ESC	COST	CNTG	TOTAL	Mid-Point	INFLATED	COST	CNTG	EUU.
NUMBER		_(\$K)_	(\$K)	_(%)_	(\$K)_	(%)	(\$K)	(\$K)_	(\$K)	Date	(%)_	(\$K)_	_(\$K)_	FULL _(\$K)
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	P	<u> </u>	M	N	0
	PHASE 1 or CONTRACT 1													
03	RESERVOIRS	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0
04	DAMS	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$(
05	LOCKS	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$1
06	FISH & WILDLIFE FACILITIES	\$500	\$150	30.0%	\$650	0.0%	\$500	\$150	\$650	2024Q3	8.0%	\$540	\$162	\$70
07	POWER PLANT	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$1
08	ROADS, RAILROADS & BRIDGES	\$0	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$(
11	LEVEES & FLOODWALLS	\$7,135	\$2,497	35.0%	\$9,632	0.0%	\$7,135	\$2,497	\$9,632	2024Q3	8.0%	\$7,709	\$2,698	\$10,40
18	CULTURAL RESOURCE PRESERVATION	\$115	\$35	30.0%	\$150	0.0%	\$115	\$35	\$150	2024Q3	8.0%	\$124	\$37	\$162
	CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE TOTALS:	\$7,750	\$2,682	34.6%	\$10,432	-	\$7,750	\$2,682	\$10,432			\$8,373	\$2,897	\$11,270
01	LANDS AND DAMAGES	\$1,344	\$67	5.0%	\$1,411	0.0%	\$1,344	\$67	\$1,411	2024Q3	8.0%	\$1,452	\$73	\$1,52
30	PLANNING, ENGINEERING & DESIGN													
	1.0% Project Management	\$78	\$27	35.0%	\$105	0.0%	\$78	\$27	\$105	2023Q3	3.8%	\$80	\$28	\$10
	1.0% Planning & Environmental Compliance	\$78	\$27	35.0%	\$105	0.0%	\$78	\$27	\$105	2023Q3	3.8%	\$80	\$28	\$10
	7.0% Engineering & Design	\$543	\$190	35.0%	\$732	0.0%	\$543	\$190	\$732	2023Q3	3.8%	\$563	\$197	\$76
	1.4% Reviews, ATRs, IEPRs, VE	\$109	\$38	35.0%	\$146	0.0%	\$109	\$38	\$146	2023Q3	3.8%	\$113	\$39	\$15
	1.0% Life Cycle Updates (cost, schedule, risks)	\$78 \$78	\$27	35.0% 35.0%	\$105	0.0%	\$78 \$78	\$27 \$27	\$105 \$105	2023Q3 2023Q3	3.8% 3.8%	\$80	\$28 \$28	\$10 \$10
	1.0% Contracting & Reprographics 1.0% Engineering During Construction	\$78 \$78	\$27 \$27	35.0% 35.0%	\$105 \$105	0.0%	\$78 \$78	\$27 \$27	\$105 \$105	2023Q3 2024Q3	3.8% 6.4%	\$80 \$82	\$28 \$29	\$10
	1.0% Engineering During Construction 2.0% Planning During Construction	\$78 \$155	\$27 \$54	35.0% 35.0%	\$105 \$209	0.0%	\$78 \$155	\$27 \$54	\$105 \$209	2024Q3 2024Q3	6.4%	\$82 \$165	\$29 \$58	\$11 \$22
	1.0% Adaptive Management & Monitoring	\$155	\$27	35.0%	\$209 \$105	0.0%	\$155 \$78	\$54 \$27	\$209 \$105	2024Q3 2023Q3	3.8%	\$80	\$56 \$28	\$22 \$10
	1.0% Project Operations	\$78 \$78	\$27	35.0%	\$105 \$105	0.0%	\$76 \$78	\$27 \$27	\$105 \$105	2023Q3 2023Q3	3.8%	\$80	\$28	\$10
	7.0% Project Operations	\$10	Φ21	33.070	\$103	0.070	φιο	Ψ21	\$103	2023Q3	3.070	φου	\$20	\$10
31	CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT													
	7.0% Construction Management	\$543	\$190	35.0%	\$732	0.0%	\$543	\$190	\$732	2024Q3	6.4%	\$577	\$202	\$77
	0.0% Project Operation:	\$0	\$0	35.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$0	0	0.0%	\$0	\$0	\$
	1.0% Project Management	\$78	\$27	35.0%	\$105	0.0%	\$78	\$27	\$105	2024Q3	6.4%	\$82	\$29	\$11
	CONTRACT COST TOTALS:	\$11,063	\$3,438		\$14,500		\$11,063	\$3,438	\$14,500			\$11,890	\$3,693	\$15,58

Abbreviated Risk Analysis

Project (less than \$40M): Lower Colma Creek CAP 103

Alternative: Alt A

Project Development Stage/Alternative: Feasibility (Recommended Plan)

Risk Category: Low Risk: Typical Construction, Simple

Total Estimated Construction Contract Cost = \$ 3,232,602

	<u>CWWBS</u>	Feature of Work	<u>E</u> :	stimated Cost	<u>%</u>	Contingency	\$ Contingency	<u>Total</u>
	01 LANDS AND DAMAGES	Real Estate	\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
1		Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early war	ni⊢\$	5,528,000		35%	\$ 1,921,608 \$	7,449,608
2		Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early war	ni \$	7,135,000		35%	\$ 2,480,223 \$	9,615,223
3		Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electri	Ci \$	72,041,000		107%	\$ 77,039,458 \$	149,080,458
4						0%	\$ - \$	-
5						0%	\$ - \$	-
6						0%	\$ - \$	-
7						0%	\$ - \$	-
8			\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
9			\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
10			\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
11			\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
12	All Other	Remaining Construction Items	\$	(81,471,398)	0.0%	0%	\$ (9,850,934) \$	(91,322,332)
13	30 PLANNING, ENGINEERING, AND DESIGN	Planning, Engineering, & Design	\$			0%	\$ - \$	-
14	31 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Construction Management	\$	-		0%	\$ - \$	-
XX	FIXED DOLLAR RISK ADD (EQUALLY DISPERSED TO ALL, MUS	BT INCLUDE JUSTIFICATION SEE BELOW)					\$ _	

	Totals					
	Real Estate	\$ -	0%	\$	-	\$ -
-	Total Construction Estimate	\$ 3,232,602	2215%	\$	71,590,355	\$ 74,822,957
	Total Planning, Engineering & Design	\$ -	0%	\$	-	\$ -
	Total Construction Management	\$ -	0%	\$	-	\$ -
	Total Excluding Real Estate	\$ 3,232,602	2215%	\$	71,590,355	\$ 74,822,957
			Bas	se	50%	80%

	Base	50%	80%
Confidence Level Range Estimate (\$000's)	\$3,233k	\$46,187k	\$74,823k

3/10/2022

Meeting Date:

Fixed Dollar Risk Add: (Allows for additional risk to be added to the risk analsyis. Must include justification. Does not allocate to Real Estate.

Lower Colma Creek CAP 103 Alt A

Feasibility (Recommended Plan) Abbreviated Risk Analysis **Meeting Dates:** 10-Mar-22

17-Mar-22

Risk Register

Risk Element	Feature of Work	Concerns	PDT Discussions & Conclusions (Include logic & justification for choice of Likelihood & Impact)	Impact	Likelihood	Risk Level
Project Ma	nnagement & Scope Growth			Maximum Proje	ct Growth	40%
PS-1	Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warning	Refined alignment to be determined	Bedrock is not very shallow and should be ok based on proposed alignment. If unknown underground utilities are discovered, they may need to be relocated, or the alignment may need to be pushed further into the adjacent marsh, which could increase environmental mitigation cost. Sheetpile driving that meets hard material could slow construction. Subsurface sampling showed no hard material at the intended embedment depth, but sampling is limited, so there is a possibility of encountering.	Moderate	Unlikely	1
PS-2	Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system	Refined alignment to be determined	Bedrock is not very shallow and should be ok based on proposed alignment. If unknown underground utilities are discovered, they may need to be relocated, or the alignment may need to be pushed further into the adjacent marsh, which could increase environmental mitigation cost. Sheetpile driving that meets hard material could slow construction. Subsurface sampling showed no hard material at the intended embedment depth, but sampling is limited, so there is a possibility of encountering.	Moderate	Unlikely	1
PS-3	Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electrical, floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system	Costs are conceptual and parametric but refinement would not change plan selection and would likely only increase the cost.	Floodproofing costs were obtained from the North Atlantic Coastal Comprehensive Study and are parametric costs, which may not apply sufficiently to a wastewater treatment facility. Uncertainty is high and further refinement would likely increase the cost. For electrical raising, this cost was provided by the non-federal-sponsor based on similar constructed projects and is a conceptual cost, which is likely to rise based on further refinement. This is not the tentatively selected plan and is outside of the scope of the CAP cost limit. The cost to raise exits and walkways out of the flood depths has not been included and would only raise the cost further. Early warning system costs has also been excluded, as it is neglible compared to overall cost.	Significant	Very LIKELY	5

PS-4 0 Negligible PS-5 0 Negligible PS-6 0 Negligible PS-7 0 Negligible PS-8 0 Negligible PS-9 0 Negligible	Unlikely Unlikely Unlikely Unlikely	0 0 0
PS-6 0 PS-7 0 Negligible PS-8 0 Negligible	Unlikely	
PS-7 0 Negligible PS-8 0 Negligible		0
PS-8 0 Negligible	Unlikely	
		0
DS 0 0	Unlikely	0
Negligible Negligible	Unlikely	0
PS-10 0 Negligible	Unlikely	0
PS-11 0 Negligible	Unlikely	0
PS-12 Remaining Construction Items Possible mitigation Possible mitigation Possible mitigation Possible mitigation There is a rough order of magnitude cost included for mitigation. This has a 30% contingency added to it based on it being a rough cost estimate. There is a small possibility that actual mitigation could exceed this cost estimate.	Possible	1
PS-13 Planning, Engineering, & Design No concerns No concerns No concerns A standard percentage cost estimate was applied initially of 35%. This is a simple project and design. After the Abbreviated CSRA, this estimate will decrease. The project was justified even with the higher estimate.	Unlikely	0
PS-14 Construction Management No concerns No concerns A standard percentage cost estimate was applied initially of 35%. This is a simple project and design. After the Abbreviated CSRA, this estimate will decrease. The project was justified even with the higher estimate. Negligible	Unlikely	0
Acquisition Strategy Maximum Pro	ject Growth	30%
Part of the WQCP footprint near Colma Creek on the north side of the bank is owned by the State of California. If the City of South San Francisco does not already have a sufficient existing easement, they will need to acquire a permanent easement for this tract. There is a unlikely possibility that real estate will not be able to be attained, or will take prolonged coordination to attain which will cause delays and added project management costs. Significant Significant	Unlikely	2
AS-2 Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system Part of the WQCP footprint near Colma Creek on the north side of the bank is owned by the State of California. If the City of South San Francisco does not already have a sufficient existing easement, they will need to acquire a permanent easement for this tract. There is a unlikely possibility that real estate will not be able to be attained, or will take prolonged coordination to attain which will cause delays and added project management costs. Significant	Unlikely	2
Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electrical, AS-3 floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system Negligible	Unlikely	0

Negligible	Unlikely	0
Negligible	Unlikely	0
ximum Projec	t Growth	15%
Significant	Possible	3
Significant	Possible	3
Negligible	Unlikely	0
Negligible Negligible	Unlikely	0
	•	
Negligible	Unlikely	0
Negligible Negligible	Unlikely	0
x ;	Negligible Negligible Negligible Negligible Negligible Negligible Negligible Negligible Significant	Negligible Unlikely Negligible Unlikely

	1			,	T	1
CE-9	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
CE-10	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
CE-11	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
CE-12	Remaining Construction Items			Negligible	Unlikely	0
CE-13	Planning, Engineering, & Design			Negligible	Unlikely	0
CE-14	Construction Management			Negligible	Unlikely	0
Specialty C	Construction or Fabrication			Maximum Proje	ct Growth	50%
SC-1	Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early	N/A	Subsurface testing for buried cultural artifacts could reveal artifacts, which would need to be excavated and reburied or documented. This would add to the cost. If listed species are identified prior to or during construction, a monitor or more stringent construction windows could increase the cost.	Moderate	Possible	2
SC-2	Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system	NIA	Subsurface testing for buried cultural artifacts could reveal artifacts, which would need to be excavated and reburied or documented. This would add to the cost. If listed species are identified prior to or during construction, a monitor or more stringent construction windows could increase the cost.	Moderate	Possible	2
SC-3	Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electrical, floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system	Alternative 3 includes specialty construction, which could cause the cost estimate to increase. It is not the TSP, so there is no risk this would change the selected plan.	Raising the electrical system is highly specialized work. Floodproofing this type of infrastructure could also be considered specialty construction and may require custom fabrication, which could increase the cost estimate.	Significant	Very LIKELY	5
SC-4	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-5	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-6	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-7	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-8	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-9	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-10	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0

SC-12 Remaining Construction Name SC-13 Remaining Construction Name SC-14 Construction Management SC-14 Construction Management SC-14 Construction Management SC-14 Construction Management SC-15 Construction Management SC-16 Construction Management SC-17 Construction Management SC-18 Negligible Utrikely O Technical Design & Quantities No concerns No con				1		
SC-12 SC-13 Planning, Engineering, & Design SC-14 Construction Management Negligible Unlikely Technical Design & Quantities Maximum Project Growth T-1 Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early varing system Alternative 2: NSS Floodwalls + PS4+ early varing system No concerns Negligible Unlikely T-2 Alternative 2: NSS Floodwalls + PS4+ early varing system No concerns Negligible Unlikely No concerns Negligible Unlikely T-3 No concerns Negligible Unlikely No concerns Negligible Unlikely No concerns Negligible Unlikely T-4 O Negligible Unlikely O	SC-11	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
SC-14 Construction Management SC-14 Construction Management Technical Design & Quantities Maximum Project Growth 20% Maximum Project Growth Negligible Utrikely 0 Alternative 1: North Floocwall + PS4+ early warring system No concerns Negligible Utrikely 0 Alternative 2: NAS Floodwalls + PS4+ early warring system No concerns Negligible Utrikely 0	SC-12	Remaining Construction Items		Negligible	Unlikely	0
Technical Design & Quantities Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warring T-1 Alternative 2: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warring system Alternative 2: North Floodwalls + PS4+ early warring a system Alternative 3: Norstructural Plan raising electrical, floodproofing, elevated exts/walkways, early warring system T-4 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-5 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-6 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-7 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-8 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	SC-13	Planning, Engineering, & Design		Negligible	Unlikely	0
Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warning system Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system Alternative 3: Norstructural Ptan- raising electrical, floodproding, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system No concerns No concerns Negligible Unlikely O	SC-14	Construction Management		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-1 warning Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system Alternative 3: Nos Tructural Plan-rising electrical, floodprofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system Negligible Unlikely No concerns Negligible Unlikely O Negligible Unlikely O Negligible Unlikely O Negligible Unlikely O T-5 O Negligible Unlikely O	Technical	Design & Quantities		Maximum Proje	ct Growth	20%
T-2 warning system Alternative 3: Norstructural Plan- raising electrical, floodprofring, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system No concerns Negligible Unlikely	T-1		No concerns	Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-3 indoorproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system Negligible Unlikely 0 T-6 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-7 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	T-2		No concerns	Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-4 1	T-3	floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early	No concerns	Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-5 T-6 O Negligible Unlikely O	T-4	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-6 T-7 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-9 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	T-5	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-7 0 T-8 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-10 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	T-6	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-8 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 T-10 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	T-7	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-9 0 Negligible Unlikely 0 Negligible Unlikely 0	T-8	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-10 V	T-9	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
Negligible Unlikely 0	T-10	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-11 0	T-11	0		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-12 Remaining Construction Items Negligible Unlikely 0	T-12	Remaining Construction Items		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-13 Planning, Engineering, & Design Negligible Unlikely 0	T-13	Planning, Engineering, & Design		Negligible	Unlikely	0
T-14 Construction Management Negligible Unlikely 0	T-14	Construction Management		Negligible	Unlikely	0
Cost Estimate Assumptions Maximum Project Growth 25%	Cost Estin	ct Growth	25%			

EST-1	Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warning	Prime and Subcontractor markup could be greater than estimated	this would increase the cost of construction	Moderate	Possible	2
EST-2	Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system	Prime and Subcontractor markup could be greater than estimated	this would increase the cost of construction	Moderate	Possible	2
EST-3	Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electrical, floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system	Prime and Subcontractor markup could be greater than estimated	this would increase the cost of construction	Moderate	Possible	2
EST-4	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-5	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-6	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-7	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-8	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-9	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-10	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-11	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-12	Remaining Construction Items			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-13	Planning, Engineering, & Design			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EST-14	Construction Management			Negligible	Unlikely	0
External P	Project Risks Maximum Project Growth					20%
EX-1	Alternative 1: North Floodwall + PS4+ early warning	Weather, funding constraints, inflation, supply chain issues, material costs, or workforce availability and other outside factors could impact construction schedule and productivity, increasing cost of construction.	Rain or storms or wet ground could impact the construction schedule. Generally for CAP, the funding can be dropped in full, or by FY. The recent infrastructure bill greatly increased the CAP funding from previous years by orders of magnitude. This decreases the liklihood of funding not becoming available to construct. Workforce availability, supply chain issues, increased material costs, and inflation are more likely to occur than these other outside factors.	Moderate	Possible	2

EX-2	Alternative 2: N&S Floodwalls + PS4 + early warning system	Weather, funding constraints, inflation, supply chain issues, material costs, or workforce availability and other outside factors could impact construction schedule and productivity, increasing cost of construction.	Rain or storms or wet ground could impact the construction schedule. Generally for CAP, the funding can be dropped in full, or by FY. The recent infrastructure bill greatly increased the CAP funding from previous years by orders of magnitude. This decreases the liklihood of funding not becoming available to construct. Workforce availability, supply chain issues, increased material costs, and inflation are more likely to occur than these other outside factors.	Moderate	Possible	2
EX-3	Alternative 3: Nonstructural Plan- raising electrical, floodproofing, elevated exits/walkways, early warning system	Weather, funding constraints, inflation, supply chain issues, material costs, or workforce availability and other outside factors could impact construction schedule and productivity, increasing cost of construction.	Rain or storms or wet ground could impact the construction schedule. Generally for CAP, the funding can be dropped in full, or by FY. The recent infrastructure bill greatly increased the CAP funding from previous years by orders of magnitude. This decreases the liklihood of funding not becoming available to construct. Workforce availability, supply chain issues, increased material costs, and inflation are more likely to occur than these other outside factors.	Moderate	Possible	2
EX-4	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-5	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-6	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-7	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-8	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-9	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-10	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-11	0			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-12	Remaining Construction Items			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-13	Planning, Engineering, & Design			Negligible	Unlikely	0
EX-14	Construction Management			Negligible	Unlikely	0