## Exhibit 3.2.6

Patrick Engineering Concept Potable Water Line Cost Estimate



300 West Edwards Street Suite 200 Springfield, IL 62704-1907 Tel: (217) 525-7050 Fax: (217) 525-7053

December 18, 2009

Mr. Vasu Pinapati Tenaska Taylorville LLC 1044 North 115<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 400 Omaha, NE 68154-4446

Reference: Concept Potable Water Line Cost Estimate Taylorville Energy Center, Taylorville, IL

Dear Mr. Pinapati:

This letter report has been prepared for Tenaska Taylorville LLC (Tenaska) to summarize the services performed in developing an engineer's opinion of the probable cost to construct a potable water line from the City of Taylorville to the proposed Taylorville Energy Center (TEC) site north of the City. The following paragraphs detail:

- Design information
  - Proposed route location
  - Site visit and observations
  - Design input data
  - Potential design issues
- Cost estimates and limitations.

#### **DESIGN INFORMATION**

Patrick utilized the conceptual route developed under a separate scope of services as the base route for the water main. Patrick obtained additional information from Tenaska, the TEC plant engineering consultant (Kiewit-Burns & McDonnell, or KBM), and the City of Taylorville Water Department regarding the plant's required pressure and demand, the existing pressure, flow, and location of the main that will be extended to the TEC, and City specifications regarding water main construction. Patrick also reviewed State of Illinois regulations for water main construction (Title 35 Ill. Admin. Code Part 653), and conducted a site visit to assess local conditions that may impact construction of the water main.

<u>Proposed Route</u>. The proposed route begins on Old Oak Road, less than <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> mile from the City's Water Treatment Plant, where the City has an existing 8" PVC main along Old Oak Road. The proposed route travels north into agricultural fields west of the Glen Haven cemetery, up to Illinois Route 48, and follows the east side of Route 48 to County Road 1550 North (CR 1550N). The proposed route will then turn northwest and cross Route 48 and the Norfolk Southern Railroad right-of-way at a right angle. West of the railroad, the proposed route travels through agricultural fields up to the TEC property line. The route will extend west to County Road 1400 East (CR 1400E) and then along the east side of CR 1400E up to the pre-determined connection point. The total length of the water main is approximately 15,000 linear feet (2.8 miles) to the

KBM connection point. Approximately 20.5 acres may be required for construction (60-foot easement along 15,000 linear feet of water main), of which 3 acres is on the proposed TEC site. Drawings of the proposed water main route are provided as Attachment A.

<u>Site Visit and Observations</u>. Patrick's site visit was conducted on October 20, 2009. Patrick met with local Tenaska representatives to discuss the project, and then performed a "windshield" survey (notes and photographs) of the proposed water main route where accessible by local roads. The "windshield" survey indicated the following:

- Several underground utilities will be encountered along the proposed route. Telephone cable (along Old Oak Road, Illinois 48, and CR 1400E), a City water well pump house and raw water line, a ConocoPhillips petroleum pipeline, and an Illinois Consolidated fiber optic line were observed to either parallel or cross the proposed route.
- A deep agricultural drainage ditch needs to be crossed along CR 1400E. This ditch runs through the TEC site, and appears to be roughly 8-10 feet deep and 20-30 feet wide.

No other potential obstructions were noted along the route during the "windshield" survey.

<u>Design Input Data</u>. Per Tenaska, the water main will supply potable water for drinking, sanitary use, and occasional laboratory use for the TEC; the main will <u>not</u> supply fire protection water. KBM supplied the anticipated demand data – 15 gallons per day per person during construction (anticipated 1,000 construction workers maximum), 35 gallons per day per person during operations (anticipated 200 workers day shift, 50 workers night shift). From this data, and from Illinois public water supply regulations<sup>1</sup>, Patrick estimated the design flow (maximum hourly use) to be 100 gallons per minute (100 gpm). KBM indicated that during construction, peak water consumption of up to 500 gpm may be necessary. KBM also indicated that the water pressure from the incoming water main should be 80 pounds per square inch (80 psi).

The City of Taylorville supplied information to Patrick on the existing water main and their specifications and preferences for the water main. Patrick has assumed that the City will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the water main, and therefore the design should accommodate their requirements and recommendations.

The City indicated that they prefer the minimum size of the water main to be 8-inch diameter. The main may be constructed using PVC C900 SDR14 (200 psi pressure rating) or ductile iron pipe. The City requires hydrants every 600 feet; however, for cost estimating purposes, Patrick assumed that hydrants will not be allowed in the agricultural fields. (Ten additional hydrants with associated valves and fittings would be needed if the 600-foot spacing is required in fields.)

Patrick selected an 8-inch diameter PVC pipe for the pipeline. The 8-inch PVC pipe is the minimum acceptable size, and would be more cost-effective for the proposed length of the line compared to ductile iron. An 8-inch PVC C900 SDR14 pipe (7.76-inch inside diameter) would have the capacity to transport up to 1,180 gpm at the maximum recommended pipeline velocity of 8 feet per second (ft/sec).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Title 35, Ill. Admin. Code, Part 653: Design, Operation, & Maintenance Criteria.

The water pressure at the existing City water main is less than 80 psi. Therefore, a booster pump station will be required at some point along the pipeline to increase the water pressure to the required 80 psi. The likely location of the booster station would be along County Road 1400 East, near the TEC site. Patrick anticipates that the booster station will be located within the road right-of-way and not on Tenaska property (preferred for City operation & maintenance).

The booster station is anticipated to be an aboveground structure with up to three (triplex) variable-speed pumps. A triplex pump station design could accommodate the larger flows anticipated during construction (up to 500 gpm) by operating each of the pumps in parallel. After construction, when anticipated flows would be on the order of 100 gpm, only one of the pumps would operate at any given time, but the station would have two backup pumps. The booster station may also include an optional tank to maintain pipeline system pressure during low demand periods.

A summary of the design parameters and process flow diagram is provided as Attachment B.

<u>Potential Design Issues</u>. As noted previously, there are some potential design issues to address (e.g., utility locations & crossings, booster pump station). None of the design issues appear to be a "fatal flaw" to the proposed design. Patrick anticipates that the main can be shifted to avoid parallel utilities, can be deepened at utility and ditch crossings, and the booster station can be designed to accommodate construction peak flows as well as be constructed within a road right-of-way.

#### COST ESTIMATE

Patrick developed estimated quantities of materials and prepared a cost estimate for the potable water main construction based on the previously discussed concept design, along with recommendations from the Illinois Department of Agriculture "Pipeline Construction Standards and Policies for Agricultural Impact Mitigation".

To develop costs, Patrick utilized 2009 Means Heavy Construction Cost Data adjusted for regional conditions, costs from prior applicable projects, vendor costs, or costs estimated from experience. The cost estimate provided is in December 2009 (current) dollars.

Construction of the water main is an estimated \$943,000. A budgetary estimate of \$189,000 is included for surveying, engineering design (geotechnical, mechanical, structural, and civil) and permitting. Construction engineering support and documentation by an engineer's representative is estimated at \$75,000. Land acquisition costs for the pipeline easement are estimated at \$10,000. A 15% contingency (\$141,000) is also included to account for miscellaneous cost items that the concept design level of detail does not include.

The total estimated cost for the potable water main construction project is \$1.35 million. The design is conceptual, so costs are expected to be accurate within a range of plus or minus 30 percent (+/- 30%) – i.e., the project cost range may be between \$0.94 million and \$1.75 million. An itemized cost table is provided as Attachment C. Construction costs appear to be consistent

Tenaska Taylorville LLC December 18, 2009

with recent water main project bids obtained for various locations in northern and southern Illinois.

#### LIMITATIONS

Patrick's concept design and opinion of cost is based upon the current available information from Tenaska and the City of Taylorville. If future conditions arise that necessitate changes to the design and project cost, such conditions may not be accurately represented in Patrick's opinion of cost.

Patrick is pleased to have had this opportunity to provide engineering services to Tenaska. Please contact either of the undersigned if you require further information regarding this report.

Sincerely,

#### PATRICK ENGINEERING INC.

Mut EM-

Matthew E. Minder, P.E. Project Engineer

MEM/mem

Enclosures: As noted

P:\Tenaska\20953.074\Water\ltr-rpt121809.doc

Burger

Chris Burger, P.E. Vice President

# ATTACHMENT A

## PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWINGS







# ATTACHMENT B

## DESIGN PARAMETERS SUMMARY DATA & PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM



		Project No	20953.074			
		Project	Tenaska – Taylorv	ille Energy	Center	
		Calculated by	MEM	Date	10/22/0	)9
		Checked by	JX	Date	10/28/0	)9
Title	Potable Water Line Design		She	et 1	of	3
					·	

#### **Problem Statement:**

Provide preliminary design of the potable water line extension from the City of Taylorville's existing water line on Old Oak Road to the proposed Taylorville Energy Center (TEC).

Existing utilities were noted alongside and across the proposed route of the water line:

- 1. Existing telephone buried cable (along west side of Old Oak Road, along east side of Illinois 48, along east side of County Road 1400 East).
- 2. Existing ConocoPhillips petroleum pipeline (across Old Oak Road).
- 3. Existing City raw water line from water well field (across Old Oak Road).
- 4. Existing IL Consolidated Communications fiber optic line (along east side of Illinois 48).

The general location of the existing utilities were noted, but were not surveyed. Thus, the potential obstructions to construction of the water line are unknown until accurate locations can be obtained from the utility companies.

#### Given:

- 1. Preliminary route of potable water line (see plan / profile sheets)
- 2. Data from Burns & McDonnell:
  - a. Day shift = 200 persons
    - b. Night shift = 50 persons
    - c. Construction workers = 1,000 persons
    - d. Construction demand = 15 gallons/person per day
    - e. Delivery pressure = 80 psi at TEC
    - f. End Point:
- 3. Data from City of Taylorville:

a. Old Oak Road is served by an 8" water main branching off a 10" main from the Water Treatment Plant.

- b. The 8" main terminates approximately 1,060 feet north of Lincoln Trail Road.
- c. The 10" main from the WTP supplies ~800 gpm to customers east of the WTP @ pressure of 70 psi.
- d. A 6" main is the minimum size the City allows.
- e. One or more hydrants may be added along the line for periodic flushing.
- f. The City specifications for water line pipe are provided on Sheet 6.
- g. The City provided a map showing new water main construction west of the WTP. A 16" main will pass roughly 1.5 miles south of the Tenaska facility. The 16" main should be in service prior to construction of Tenaska potable water supply pipeline. This could provide an alternate supply for the TEC site.
- h. City specifications letter (see attached)

#### 4. Illinois Public Water Supply regulations, Title 35, Part 653: Design, Operation, & Maintenance Criteria.

- a. Minimum water pressure = 20 psi
- b. Minimum usage = at least 50 gallons/person per day
- c. Avg. daily rate of usage (ADRU) = 2x average daily usage (expressed in gpm)
- d. Maximum daily rate of usage (MDRU) = 1.5x avg daily rate of usage
- e. Maximum hourly rate of usage (MHRU) = 2x avg. daily rate of usage

#### Assumptions:

- 1. Pipeline design will start at existing end of Taylorville water main, and end prior to the water meter at TEC.
- 2. Booster pump(s), if required along the water main, shall be operated and maintained by the City.

#### Methodology:

#### Design Flow

During construction, Burns & McDonnell indicate a demand of 15 gpd/person x 1000 persons = 15,000 gallons/day ADRU = 2x15,000 gpd / 1440 minutes/day = 20.8 gpm MDRU = 1.5 x 20.8 gpm = 31gpm

 $MHRU = 2 \times 20.8 \text{ gpm} = 42 \text{ gpm}$ 



	Project No	20953.074			
	Project	Tenaska – Taylorville	e Energy	Center	
	Calculated by	MEM	Date	10/22/	09
	Checked by	JX	Date	10/28/	09
Title Potable Water Line Design		Sheet	2	of	3

During operations, base demand off of 8-hour day shift = 50 gpd/person x 200 persons = 10,000 gallons/day shift = 30,000 gallons/day

ADRU = 2x30,000 gpd / 1440 minutes/day = 42 gpm

MDRU = 1.5 x 42 gpm = 63 gpm

MHRU = 2 x 42 gpm = 84 gpm - round to 100 gpm to account for potential growth

Therefore, use 100 gpm as the design capacity for the water main.

Line / Pump Sizing:

Per attached email, the hydrant tests at connection point indicate the static pressure is 64 psi. (147.7ft)The flow through one 2.5" nozzle is 920 gpm with tested pressure of 30 psi. 920 gpm = 2.05 ft/s

Velocity through the 2.5" orifice.

 $2.05/(3.14*(2.5/24)^2)=60.2$  ft/sec

Using Jet's kinetic energy equation, Friction head loss:

$$E_f = (\frac{1}{C_v^2} - 1)(\frac{V_0^2}{2g_c})$$

$$E_f = (\frac{1}{0.82^2} - 1)(\frac{60.2^2}{2*32.2}) = 27 \, ft$$

The total dynamic head is: 30\*2.308+27=96.24 feet. Based on the hydrant test, using the above two points from the tests, assume the flow and system pressure has linear relation.

# USING AFT FATHOM TO MODEL THE SYSTEM AND ESTIMATE THE HEAD LOSS AT THE END OF THE SYSTEM:

INPUT

Pipe ID: 8" Nominal C900 PVC DR14 (Pressure Class 200 psi), average ID = 5.91 inches Pipe Length = 15,000 feet Estimated Equivalent Length of Fittings (elbows, valves, hydrants, etc.) = 5% of total = 750 feet Total equal length: 15,000+750=15,750 ft.

Assume the pump is at city property.

#### Scenario 1:

As a conservative assumption, assume the future usage before booster pump is 300 gpm with 20 psi pressure. (Maximum Booster pump scenario)

Since the design flow rate is 100 gpm, using 4" pipe. (2.6ft/sec)

Output,

From attached sheet, the static pressure before booster pump is 685 feet-610 feet=85 feet (37 psi) with 104 gpm. The required pressure is 80psi.

Therefore the booster pump is: 80psi-37psi = 43 psi @ 100 gpm

Pump estimated hp: Assume 40% overall efficiency, the estimate hp is:

$$hp = \frac{\Delta PQ}{1714*0.4}$$
$$= \frac{43*100}{1714*0.4} = 6.2hp$$

P:\Tenaska\20953.074\Calcs\Tenaska-PotableH2O.doc



Project No	20953.074				
Project	Tenaska – Taylorvill	e Energy	Center		
Calculated by	MEM	Date	10/22/0	)9	
Checked by	JX	Date	10/28/0	)9	
_	Sheet	3	of	3	-

#### Title Potable Water Line Design

#### Scenario 2.

Assume there will be no other future water usage besides the designed 100 gpm.

Output,

From attached sheet, the static pressure before booster pump is 749.6 feet-610 feet=139.6 feet (60 psi) with 104 gpm. The required pressure is 80psi.

Therefore the booster pump is: 80psi-61psi = 19 psi @ 100 gpm

Pump estimated hp: Assume 40% overall efficiency, the estimate hp is:

$$hp = \frac{\Delta PQ}{1714*0.4}$$
$$= \frac{20*100}{1714*0.4} = 3.0hp$$

#### **Conclusions:**

The designed booster pump is in the range from 3.0 hp(no other water usage in line) to 6.2 hp. (Assume additional 300 gpm water usage @20 psi inline.)

#### Minder, Matt

From:	Pinapati, Vasu [vpinapati@TENASKA.com]
Sent:	Wednesday, October 14, 2009 7:00 PM
To:	Minder, Matt; Gerking, Kyle T.
Cc:	Burger, Chris

Subject: FW: Potable water consumption/pressure for TEC

From: Dean, Tom [mailto:tdean@burnsmcd.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2009 5:33 PM
To: Pinapati, Vasu
Cc: Jurczak, Jim; Brewer, Steven J.; Vala, Justin J.; 52297; Tyson.Bundy; angelina.randolph@kiewit.com
Subject: FW: Potable water consumption/pressure for TEC

Vasu,

See below information to answer your questions on potable water consumption.

Tom Dean, PE, PMP Project Manager, Process & Industrial Group Burns & McDonnell Direct: 816-822-3873 Main: 816-333-9400 Mobile: 816-286-9383 Fax: 816-822-3416 www.burnsmcd.com Proud to be one of FORTUNE's 100 Best Companies To Work For

From: Wiebe, Layne
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2009 2:00 PM
To: Dean, Tom; Jones, Clarence; Gallagher, David; Jurczak, Jim; Schilling, Don A; Leis, Darrell
Subject: RE: Potable water consumption/pressure for TEC

Recommendation is about 11,000 gal/day. 80psig supply pressure at the site supply point. Construction demand of 15 gpd/person. For the 1,000 construction personnel this would be 15,000 gpd. Nighttime usage can be figured off of the chart below based upon your assumed staffing numbers for the night shift.

	no. people	gal/day*	total	
day shift	200	35	7000	
night shift	50	35	1750	
SubTotal	g		8750	gal/day
growth factor			25%	
Total			11,000	gal/day

Layne Wiebe Associate Mechanical Engineer, Energy Group Burns & McDonnell Direct: 816-822-3988 Main: 816-333-9400 www.burnsmcd.com

#### 10/15/2009

#### Minder, Matt

From:water department [water@ctitech.com]Sent:Wednesday, October 28, 2009 8:22 AMTo:Minder, Matt; Pinapati, Vasu; kgerking@tenaska.comCc:Mayor Brotherton; Jack Brown; Joe Greene

Subject: Re: Potable Water Line - Additional Questions

Matt - The issue of ownership for the line will have to go before the City Council and Mayor, with the main size and booster calculations and specifications to be reviewed by the City Engineer Joe Greene of Greene and Bradford. I will cc both this e-mail.

The hydrant at the end of the main on Old Oak Road tests at 920 gpm with 30 psi flow pressure through one 21/2" nozzle. Static pressure is 64 psi.

The City would prefer an 8" line.

The City Water Dept. specifications state that a hydrant be located every 600 feet, although I need to review the easements to see if above ground appurtanences are allowed. A hydrant outside the property would allow us a good flush point without having to gain access to the plant property.

----- Original Message -----From: <u>Minder, Matt</u> To: <u>Pinapati, Vasu</u>; <u>kgerking@tenaska.com</u>; <u>water@ctitech.com</u> Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2009 2:18 PM Subject: Potable Water Line - Additional Questions

Gentlemen – we have a few additional questions we need you to clarify as we finish the design. Please respond at your earliest convenience. Thank you.

All:

It is presumed that the water main and the booster station (we believe we will need one to supply the required pressure of 80 psi at the plant) will be operated & maintained by the City, but initially paid for by the developer. Is this correct?

David:

- Do you have a hydrant test showing flow & pressure at the end of the line on Old Oak Road? A 3-point test is preferred if you have it. If not, can you provide some estimates as to flow/pressure at the end of this line?
- Does the City have a preference to use 6-inch or 8-inch pipe for the line out to the plant? 8-inch line may be more beneficial if later there were to be more users.
- Does the City prefer some number of hydrants (for example, every 1,000 feet?) along the line to allow periodic flushing? Or would just one hydrant at the end of the main be ok?

Vasu, Kyle:

- Is there any need for the City to provide fire protection water? I thought the answer to this was no, but please verify. If we do need to provide, what amount of flow is needed (500 gpm or more?)
- Currently we are designing for a 50 gpm flow.

Matthew E. Minder, P.E. Patrick Engineering Inc. 300 W. Edwards St., Ste. 200 Springfield, IL 62704 Phone: 217-525-7051 x 7712 Fax: 217-525-7053 Email: mminder@patrickengineering.com

Patrick Engineering Inc. Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in the above e-mail message or messages (which includes any attachments) may contain confidential, proprietary, or legally privileged information. It is intended only for the use of



# Taylorville City Water Dept.



2222 Lincoln Trail Taylorville, IL. 62568 217-287-1441 Fax 217-824-8859 E-mail water@ctitech.com

Matt Minder Patrick Engineering Inc. 300 W. Edwards St. Suite 200 Springfield, IL. 62704-1907

Dear Matt,

Enclosed you will find a hand sketched map (sorry our autocad is down) showing the routing of the transmission lines and sizes that would feed the proposed route for the water main to be extended to the Tenaska property.

The size of main needs to be configured hydraulically and reviewed by the City Engineer to ensure proper flow, but our design specifications do not change for 8" water main and above. We specify use of ductile iron pipe, Class 52, slip joint with ductile iron restrained joint fittings, or AWWA C900, DR14 slip joint with ductile iron mechanical restrained joint fittings. Specifications for restrained joints are EBAA Mega-lug® or equal.

The existing 8 inch water main on Old Oak road terminates 1060 ft. north of Lincoln Trail, it is fed from a 10 inch main that runs from the treatment plant, the Cherokee St. Tower which is located roughly in the center of town is connected to the Water Treatment Plant by a 14 inch cast iron line and the High School Tank currently under construction will be fed from a 16 meth ductile iron line that runs to the Treatment Plant.

If you need any further particular information, please feel free to contact me.

David Speagle DJSp

Water Superintendent

Cc: Mayor Greg Brotherton Jack Brown City Engineer Joe Greene TAYLORVILLE ENERGY CENTER CONCEPT POTABLE WATER MAIN PROCESS FLOW DIAGRAM

> CITY WATER TREATMENT PLANT



## ATTACHMENT C

## POTABLE WATER MAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECT ITEMIZED COST TABLE

Calculated By: JWD 12/16/09 Checked By: MEM 12/17/09

# TENASKA TAYLORVILLE LLC POTABLE WATER LINE - CONCEPT DESIGN ENGINEER'S OPINION OF PROBABLE PROJECT COST

Generatic Internet         1	ltem	Quantity	Units	15	Unit Cost	Cost	Assumptions	Source
78         Fied         S         10,300         21         Acre         5         500         3         10,500         Eevide, pibe dia. *         Dominal, 4*         Deciding below pipe           1         16,17         CY         5         500         5         10,700         2*         Decivity, haurch, 12*         above pipe           1         16,17         CY         5         5600         5         10,000         CY         S         dealog         7         Decidie iron with ust restraint           1         14,650         CY         5         2005         5         11,000         V         Decidie iron with ust restraint           1         S         5         0,050         Mueller Centurion brand         Decidie iron with ust restraint           1         S         2         10,050         S         31,000         V         V         Decidie iron with ust restraint           1         15         EA         5         10,000         Nueller Centurion brand         Nueller Centurion brand           1         15         EA         5         11,000         V         S         Nueller Centurion brand           1         15         5         3,000         Kerstar	neral Conditions	-	SJ	¢)	-	4	Mob/demob, traffic control, testing, disinfection, temp access roads	Patrick Estimate
21         Acre         5         500         5         10.500         27         Wide, pipe 5' deep, pipe dia. 8' nominal. 4' bedding below pipe           16.157         CY         5         6.835         5         110.700         32' wide, pipe 5' deep, pipe dia. 8' nominal. 4' bedding below pipe           14.650         L         5         5         56.200         SPMCo.         29'         EA         5         110.700         32' wide, pipe 5' deep, pipe dia. 8' nominal. 4' bedding below pipe           14.650         L         5         10.00         2.900         B' Picco.         29'         EA         5         10.00         29'         EA         5         10.00         20'         14.100         2''         5         10.00         2''         5         10.00         2''         5         10.00         2''         5         10.00         2''         5         10.00         2'''         5         10.00         2'''         2''''         2'''''         2''''''         2''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''	tements	- 82	Rod	es es	—	10		Tenaska
1         1         2         5         5         200         2         4         0         2         4         0         2         4         0         0         2         4         0         0         2         4         0	p Damage	21	Acre	ŝ	_	9		Patrick Estimate
16:157         CY         5         6.65         5         110.700         22* wide, pipe 5 deep, pipe dia, 8* normial, 4* bedding below pipe           Pendish         2.100         CY         5         2.62.00         5         10.700         2* wide, pipe         4         5         10.700           Pendish         2.9         EA         5         17.00         5         2.4900         FPUC 500 SDR14           Pendish         2.9         EA         5         1.8600         Ducilie iron with surf restrain         2*         2*         3         2.005         5         3         2.005         5         3         2.005         5         3         2.005         5         3         2.005         5         3         2.005         5         3         3         3         2         3         3         2         3 </td <td>tallation</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	tallation				-			
21/00         CY         5         56.200         4* Polov, haunch, 12* above pipe           14560         L         5         100         CY         5         56.200         57 History         23         56.200         57 History         23         56.200         57 History         23         50         Ducilia from with ust restraint           1         15         EA         5         1000         5         13.000         Meller. Centurion brand           15         EA         5         1005         5         15.400         6*         6*           16         EA         5         1005         5         14.100         8* x 6*         6*           17         CY         5         2.100         8* x 6*         6*         6*         6*           18         14.10         CY         5         2.100         8* x 6*         6*         6*         6*           14.11         CY         5         2.100         8* x 6*         7.100         8*         7.00         8*         7.00           14.11         CY         5         2.300         6* x 6*         7.000         8*         7.00         8*         7.00         8*         7	avation	16,157	CΥ	s.	-	110		MHC 2009 31 23 16.13 0090 pg 211
14/560         LF         \$          17/00         \$          249         \$          17/00         \$          249         \$          17/00         \$          249         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          17/00         \$          18/00         Duclide icon with ust restraint         \$          17/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$          11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00         11/00         \$             11/00         \$             11/00	lding	2,100	ς	69	26.75 \$		4" below, haunch, 12" above pipe	MHC 2009 31 23 23 16 0200 & 0500 pg 228
bends)         29         EA         5         1640         5         18.600         Ducilie iron withrust restraint           15         E         5         1.005         5         1.100         6"           16         E         5         1.005         5         1.100         6"           17         L         S         2.005         5         2.000         5         6.000           14.119         CY         S         2.000         S         2.000         5         6.000           14.119         CY         S         2.000         S         0.015         2.000           11         LS         S         2.000         S         6.000         6.000         6.000           11         LS         S         1.000         S         6.000         6.000         6.000           11         LS         S         1.000	9	14,690	5	69		249	8" PVC C900 SDR14	MHC 2009 33 11 13.25 4540 pg 314; adjusted for SDR14 wall pipe
58         EA         5         1/30         Kuller Centurion brand           15         EA         5         1/30         6         1/4100         6***           16         EA         5         1/30         6         1/4100         6***           16         EA         5         1/4100         8***         1/4100         8***           17         LS         5         1/4100         5         31/300         8*         1/4100         8***           14         LI         LS         5         2,000         5         2,000         5*         2,000         1/4100         8***         1/4100         8***         1/4100         8***         1/4100         1/4110<	ings (22.5°, 45°, 90° bends)	29	EA	ŝ		18	Ductile iron w/thrust restraint	Patrick Estimate
15         EA         S         2.075         S         31.200         Meller. Centurion brand           15         EA         5         1,025         5         1,100         5* × 5*           16         E         5         1,025         5         1,100         5* × 5*           16         E         5         1,100         5* × 5*         3         1,100         5* × 5*           17         15         E         3         1,100         1         3         1,200         5           1         5         2         105         5         3,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe         5           1         1         CY         5         2,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe         5           1         1         1         5         2,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe         5           0         1         1         1         5         2,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe         5           0         1         1         1         5         3,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe         5           0         1         1         1         5         2,300	bint Restraints	58	EA	\$		6	-	MHC 2009 33 11 13.25 8730 pg 315
15         EA         S         1,025         S         15,400         6''           90         EA         5         14,100         7' x 6''         5         14,100         7' x 6''           15         EA         5         166         5         14,100         6''         5           16         EA         5         166         5         41,00         6''         5           17         CY         5         2,100         5         33,300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe           14,119         CY         5         2,000         5         2,000         5         2,000           14,119         CY         5         2,000         5         2,000         5         5,000           14,119         CY         5         2,000         5         2,000         5         5,000           0         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1           0         200         1         5         2,000         5         5,000         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1         1	rants	15	EA	s	2,075 \$		Mueller Centurion brand	MHC 2009 33 12 19 10 2080 pg 319
15         EA         5         14100         8* x 6*           15         EA         5         14100         8* x 6*           16         EA         5         14100         8*           17         LC         5         14.00         8*           16         EA         5         14.00         8*           17         LC         5         2.00         5         2.00           18         2         2.00         5         2.00         5         2.00           11         LC         5         2.00         5         2.00         5         2.00           0         14.910         LF         5         2.00         5         2.00         5         2.00           0         14.910         LF         5         2.00         5         2.00         5         2.00           0         220         LF         5         2.00         5         2.00         5         2.00         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5	ate Valve & Box	15	EA	\$	1,025 \$	15,400	6"	MHC 2009 33 12 16,10 3814 pg 318
90         EA         5         14100         8           15         EA         5         2100         5         31.500           16         EA         5         2100         5         31.500           17         19         CY         5         2.000         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe           1         1         CY         5         2.000         5         3.300           1         1         CY         5         2.000         5         3.000           1         1         LS         5         2.000         5         0.000           0         1         LS         5         10.000         5         10.000           0         1         LS         5         10.000         5         2.0000         5         2.0000           0         220         LF         5         3.00         6.406 a 20° forg         8"PVC main           0         27         SY         5         3.00         6.406 a 20° forg         6.409 ard           0         27         SY         5         3.00         6.406 a 20° forg         6.409 ard           10A         27         SY	96	15	EA	s		14	8" × 6"	MHC 2009 33 11 13 15 8240 pg 313
15         EA         S         2,100         S         31,500         Br.           70         14,119         CY         5         2,300         Excavated solis - bedding and pipe           71         LS         5         2,300         Excavated solis - bedding and pipe           71         LS         5         2,300         Excavated solis - bedding and pipe           71         LS         5         2,000         5         10,000           7         LS         5         10,000         5         10,000           7         LS         5         2000         5         10,000           7         LS         5         30,000         10,000         10,000           7         LS         5         30,000         10,000         10,000           7         SY         5         30,000         14,910 ftolges 20° to 24° steel casing pipe & 8° PVC main           7         SY         5         30,000         16,600         16,000           7         SY         5         30,000         14,910 ftolges 20° to 24° steel casing pipe & 8° PVC main           7         SY         5         30,000         14,910 ftolgor         16° stolges 20° stolges 3° stolg	oint Restraints	90	ΕA	ŝ	_	17		MHC 2009 33 11 13.25 8730 pg 315
30         EA         5         156         5         4.700           1         CY         \$         2.339         \$         3.300         Excavated soils - bedding and pipe           1         1         ES         \$         2.000         \$         2.300           1         1         LF         \$         2.000         \$         2.300           0         14,910         LF         \$         2.000         \$         2.300           0         11,910         LF         \$         0.15         \$         2.300           0         1         LS         \$         0.1000         \$         10.000           0         1         LS         \$         0.000         \$         10.000           0         1         LS         \$         0.000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$         2.0000         \$	terfly Valve	15	EA	s	_	31	8	MHC 2009 33 12 16:10 3180 pg 318
14:119         CY         S         2:38         Constraint of the state of the odding and pipe           Prise         14:510         LS         S         2:000         S         2:000         S         2:000           Prise         14:510         LS         S         0.015         S         2:000         S         S         2:000         S	ant Restraints	30	Ā	s		4		MHC 2009 33 11 13,25 8730 pg 315
Dist         1         LS         S         2000         S         2000           Dist         14910         LF         S         0.15         S         2.300           On         14.910         LF         S         0.15         S         2.300           On         14.910         LF         S         0.000         S         10.000         Procession           On         12.0         LF         S         2000         S         10.000         Howession         Howession         Howession           On         227         LS         S         2000         Les         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main           Display         S         7.56         S         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main           Display         S         7.50         S         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main           Display         S         7.50         S         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main           Display         S         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main           Display         S         300         Kwidex 20' to 24' stael casing pipe & 8' PVC main	kfill	14,119	ζ	s		g		MHC 2009 31 23 16 13 3000 pg 213
Diss         11,910         LF         S         0.15         S         2:300           Highway/Raitroad         1         LE         S         10:000         S         10:000         S         10:000           on         220         LF         S         2000         S         10:000         S         10:000           on         27         SY         S         0:000         S         2000         Mides 20" to 24" steel casing pipe & 8" PVC main           27         SY         S         0:000         S         2000         Mides 20" to 24" steel casing pipe & 8" PVC main           27         SY         S         7.500         Arrepair will be needed every 100"         Arrepair will be needed every 100"           10         21         Arrepair will be needed every 100"         4.510 ft long x 60 wide         Arrepair will be needed every 100"           100         21         Arrepair will be needed every 100"         4.530%           100         21         Arrepair will be needed every 100"         4.530%           100         100         4.510 ft long x 60 wide         2.530         4.530%           100         100         4.500 ft long x 60 wide         2.5439         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (+30%)	ock Removal	-	S	s	-			Patrick Estimate
I Highway / Railroad           On         1         10000         5         000         50000         5         500         Mole x 20 Iong         5         7         5         7         7         5         7          7	ection Wire & Stations	14,910	5	s	_	N		Patrick Estimate
0         1         LS         \$         10,000         \$         10,000         Fer to the sector of the sector	k and Bore Beneath Highway / Railroad							
on         220         LF         \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Icking Pits	1	rs	69	10,000 \$	10,000		Patrick Estimate
1         LS         \$200,000         S         200,000         Kelverground itplex pump station, 15 tip pumps           27         57         57         5         7.560         5         300         6 wide x 20 <sup>1</sup> long           15         EA         5         7.500         5         300         6 wide x 20 <sup>1</sup> long           15         EA         5         7.500         A repair will be needed every 1000 <sup>1</sup> 1           10N         15         EA         5         55.18         13.300         14.9101 llong x 50 <sup>1</sup> wide           10N         16         5         3.300         6 wide x 20 <sup>1</sup> long         14.9101 llong x 50 <sup>1</sup> wide           10N         10         5         17.500         A repair will be needed every 1000 <sup>1</sup> 1           10N         5         5.330         14.9101 llong x 50 <sup>1</sup> wide         20 <sup>1</sup> so <sup>1</sup> so <sup>2</sup>	Ick & Bore Installation	220	Ц	÷	300 \$	66,000	Includes 20" to 24" steel casing pipe & 8" PVC main	Patrick Estimate
27         SY         5         10.60         5         300         6' wide x 2D' long           27         SY         \$         7.56         \$         300         6' wide x 2D' long           21         LS         S         5         5.00         S' repair will be needed every 1000'           10N         21         Acre         S         675,18         S         13,300           11N         Acre         S         675,18         S         13,300         14,310 ft long x 60 wide           11N         Acre         S         552,380         14,310 ft long x 60 wide         S         1300           11N         DESIGN & PERMITTING - 20% OF TOTAL         S         952,380         14,310 ft long x 60 wide         S           ING DESIGN & PERMITTING - 20% OF TOTAL         S         188,373         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (-30%)           CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         S         75,429         ESTIMATED PROJECT PROBELIC COST           PROLECT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         S         741,430         ESTIMATED PROJECT MAXINUM COST (+30%)           PROLECT TOTAL         S         141,430         ESTIMATED PROJECT MAXINUM COST (+30%)	ster Station	1	ΓS		\$200,000 \$	200,000	Aboveground, triplex pump station, 15 hp pumps	Patrick Estimate
27         SY         5         7.90         6 wide x.20 long           15         EA         5         650         5         7.500         Arepair will be needed every 1000'           10N         21         Acre 5         675,18         5         330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide           TION         3         3         35,2300         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         400'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         406 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         406 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         406 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         406 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         406 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         400 x 90'           TION         5         35,330         14.914 x 90'         657 x 90'           CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         5         75,429         657 x 90'           CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         5         741,430         657 x 90'	set Repair - Base	27	۶۲	ക			6 wide x 20' long	MHC 2009 32 11 23.23 0100 pg 275
Repair         15         EA         5         500         3         7.500         A repair will be needed every 1000'           CONSTRUCTION         21         Acre         \$         673.18         \$         13.300         14.310 ft long x 60 wide           CONSTRUCTION         21         Acre         \$         657.3.18         \$         13.300         14.310 ft long x 60 wide           COST ADJUSTMENT FOR LOCALITY - 1% DISCOUNT         \$         \$         \$         \$         95.230           V. ENGINEERING DESIGN & PERMITTING - 20%. OF TOTAL         \$         \$         \$         \$         \$           V. ENGINEERING DESIGN & PERMITTING - 20%. OF TOTAL         \$         \$         188.573         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIUM COST (-30%)           RUCTION ENGINEERING SUPPORT & DOCUMENTATION - 8% OF TOTAL         \$         75.429         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIUM COST (-30%)           GENCY FOR CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         \$         7.14.330         ESTIMATED PROJECT MAXIMUM COST (+30%)	et Repair - Asphalt	27	S۲	s			6' wide x 20' long	MHC 2009 32 12 16.13 0120 pg 276
CONSTRUCTION         21         Acre         5         675.18         5         13300         14.910 ft long x 60 wide           COST ADJUSTMENT FOR LOCALITY - 1% DISCOUNT         5         92.339         14.910 ft long x 60 wide         5         92.349           COST ADJUSTMENT FOR LOCALITY - 1% DISCOUNT         5         92.349         5         92.349         5           Y. ENGINEERING DESIGN & PERMITTING - 20% OF TOTAL         5         18.573         5         5         5           RUCTION ENGINEERING SUPPORT & DOCUMENTATION - 8% OF TOTAL         5         75.429         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIUM COST (-30%)           GENCY FOR CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         5         75.429         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIUM COST (+30%)           GENCY FOR CONCEPT LEVEL DESIGN - 15% OF TOTAL         5         74.14.30         ESTIMATED PROJECT MAXIMUM COST (+30%)	d Tile Repair	15	EA	\$	200 \$	7,500	A repair will be needed every 1000	Patrick Estimate
s         952.350         5         952.350           7: 1% DISCOUNT         \$         9.5.231         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (-30%);           RING - 20% OF TOTAL         \$         186.573         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (-30%);           & DOCUMENTATION - 8% OF TOTAL         \$         75.423         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (+30%);           GN - 15% OF TOTAL         \$         75.423         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (+30%);           GN - 15% OF TOTAL         \$         75.423         ESTIMATED PROJECT MINIMUM COST (+30%);           GN - 15% OF TOTAL         \$         71.430         ESTIMATED PROJECT MAXIMUM COST (+30%);	ding	51	Acre	ŝ		13	14,910 ft long x 60' wide	MHC 2009 32 92 19.14 1500 pg 298
- 1% DISCOUNT <b>\$ (9.524)</b> TING - 20% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 188,573</b> & DOCUMENTATION - 8% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 75,429</b> GN - 15% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 134,230</b> ESTIN	TAL - CONSTRUCTION				S			
TING - 20% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 188,573</b> EST & DOCUMENTATION - 8% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 75,429</b> GN - 15% OF TOTAL <b>\$ 13,4230</b> ESTIN ESTIN <b>\$ 1,342,288</b>	ANS COST ADJUSTMENT FOR LOCALI	<u>TY - 1% DIS</u>	SCOUNT		S			
\$ 75,429 \$ 141,430 AL \$ 1,348,298	RVEY, ENGINEERING DESIGN & PERM.	ITTING - 20	% OF TO	TAL	S	188,573		): \$943,809
	NSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SUPPOR	T & DOCUN	<b>JENTATIC</b>	J N - 8% C	DF TOTAL \$	75,429		[; \$1.348.298
\$ 1,348,298	<b>DNTINGENCY FOR CONCEPT LEVEL DE</b>	SIGN - 15%	6 OF TOT	٩L	S	141,430	ESTIN	): \$1,752,787
				PROJE	ECT TOTAL \$	1,348,298	-	