

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION



# Acknowledgments

# MDOT SHA TEAM

Tara Penders Peter Sotherland Lisa Sirota

### CONSULTANT TEAM

Melissa Miklus Nathan George ollin Hayward

This plan was made possible by the contributions and support of the Mary-land Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, the Howard County Office of Transportation, and the various stakeholders who provided input throughout the project. These stakeholders and organizations were instrumental in developing the recommendations presented in this plan and the project team greatly appreciates the support they provided throughout the MD 32 Bicycle Alternate Route Study.



M UTMARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION. STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

n	ts

# Introduction

Needs & Purpose.					 														1
Study Area					 								•						1
In This Plan	•••		• •	•	 	•	•	 •	 •		 •	•	•	• •	•	•	•		1

3	

2

Opportunities + Constraints	2
Previous & Current Studies	3
Natural Resources	3
Previous & Current Studies	3
Natural Resources	3
Stormwater Management	3
Utilities	3
Opportunities & Constraints Maps	4
Recommended Alternatives	8
Recommendation Alternatives	9
Recommendation Maps	. 10

5

Next Steps	44
Implementation Strategies	45
Community Champions	45
Bicycle & Pedestrian Grant Programs	46
Preliminary Cost Estimate	47
Appendix	48

# Appendix

	-																															
Cost Estimate		•	•	•	•	•	•	•		• •	•		 	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	• •	 	 		•	•	•	•	•	4	9



# Introduction

### Overview

The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) is dedicated to providing safe bicycle facilities throughout the State of Maryland. Previously, MD 32 was identified as a candidate for dualization to reduce ongoing congestion in the region. The dualization project from MD 108 to Linden Church Road (Phase 1, Complete) and Linden Church Road to I-70 (Phase 2, In Progress) is permanently removing bicycle access to MD 32 by establishing through-highway access controls along the corridor between MD 108 and Burntwoods Road. Per the Maryland Annotated Code 8-601.1(a), "The Administrations may not construct any project that will result in the severance or destruction of an existing major route for bicycle transportation traffic, unless the project provides for construction of a reasonable alternative route or such a route already exists." In an effort to meet this requirement, MDOT SHA identified Ten Oaks Road as a potential replacement bicycle route for the MD 32 corridor.

# Purpose & Needs

The purpose of the MD 32 Bicycle Alternate Route Study is to 1) identify a viable and safe alternative bicycle route in order to address the elimination of existing bicycle related infrastructure along MD 32 associated with the dualization of this roadway and 2) identify potential improvements along the identified alternative route meant to enhance bicycle travel from a safety standpoint along the roadway. This study includes a thorough analysis of existing conditions and potential safety improvement opportunities along the alternative route, as well as existing constraints related to implementation. The study includes suggestions for limiting potential utility and right-of-way impacts, as well as next steps for implementation.

# Study Area

The study area for this evaluation includes Ten Oaks Road between MD 108 and Burntwoods Road. Needs along the corridor were defined based on the character of the roadway including average annual daily traffic (AADT), the typical section, and surrounding land use.

The northern section of the roadway, between Brighton Dam Road and Burntwoods Road, has an AADT of 5985 vehicles and is surrounded by rural, low-density residential land use. The 5.5 mile roadway segment generally allows for bicycle travel on the roadway. Given this consideration, a field study was completed to identify areas of concern for bicycle travel at pinch points along the route.

A pinch point is a roadway segment that presents challenges to a cyclist sharing the roadway with vehicles. Five roadway characteristics were considered as contributing factors to pinch point, including a narrow shouler, a turn lane conflict, a steep road grade, a steep slope along one side of the roadway, and limited site distance for drivers. For this study, a pinch point existed if two or more of these five characteristics were present in a segment.

Five pinch points were identified in this northern Ten Oaks Road segmeent as listed below.

- Pinch Point 1 West Side Ct.
- Pinch Point 2 West Side Rutherford Way
- Pinch Point 3 Both Sides Between Dayton Oaks School and Green Bridge Road
- Pinch Point 4 Both Sides Between Green Bridge Road & Aerie Ct.
- Pinch Point 5 West Side Between Talon Ct. & Smallwood Ct.

The southern section of Ten Oaks Road, between Brighton Dam Road and MD 108, has an AADT of 6635 vehicles. The surrounding residential and commercial land use becomes more dense as you progress toward the MD 108 intersection. The roadway also widens as you approach MD 108, congestion is much greater, and speeds increase compared to the northern section. As a result, this study considered a continuous improvement to separate bicyle and vehicular traffic. This section is referred to as Pinch Point 6 / Suburban Section.

# In This Plan

The following document presents an overview of the opportunities and constraints for installing new bicycle facilities along the project study area. An overview of the foldwork and desktop analysis performed to determine these opportunities and constraints is also included. Following a review of potential user-types for cycling along the corridor, the proposed alternatives are presented with detailed concept plans and anticipated impacts. Cost estimates for each alternative are included along with key considerations generated from previous analysis. Next steps for implementing the recommended alternatives are presented, including stakeholder engagement and project funding.

- Pinch Point 1 West Side Between Rye River Drive & Oakwood Overlook
- Pinch Point 2 West Side Between Oakwood Overlook Ct. &



# Opportunities + Constraints



### Overview

In order to develop concept-level designs for the Ten Oaks Road corridor, it was critical to understand the existing layout and traffic conditions of the project study area. MDOT SHA previously identified five pinch points along the northern and suburban section of Ten Oaks Road that presented additional challenges for cyclists. To determine the opportunities and constraints for new cycling infrastructure along the study corridor, several field visits were conducted to evaluate the pinch points, review the existing conditions, and identify potential conflicts. Additional analysis was conducted to identify opportunities and constraints related to natural resources, stormwater management, utilities, roadway design, right-of-way, and traffic. The concept plans on the following pages illustrate the final outcomes from this fieldwork and associated desktop analysis.

### **Study Area Description**

The study area for this study has been divided into the northern and suburban section. Detailed descriptions are provided below:

Northern Section - Traveling in a southerly direction, the northern section of Ten Oaks Road is primarily a two lane, open section roadway fronted by rural/low density land use development. Approximately twotenths of a mile north of the Triadelphia Road intersection, commercial development begins to appear such as front age improvements consisting of curb, gutter, a center turn lane, and sporadic sidewalk improvements along the east side of Ten Oaks Road. South of the Triadelphia Road intersection, Ten Oaks Road once again reverts to a two lane open section roadway fronted by rural/low density land use development for the most part. The roadway eventually passes Dayton Oak Elementary School before intersecting with Linthicum Road at a 4-way stop. At this juncture, Ten Oaks Road then heads slightly eastward, once again as a two lane open section roadway fronted by rural/low density land use development. The Linden Church Road intersection provides a connection with both eastbound/westbound MD 32 ramps. The northern section terminates at Brighton Dam Road which features a three-pronged roundabout.

**Suburban Section** - Traveling in an easterly direction, the southern segment of Ten Oaks Road continues as a two lane open section roadway fronted by rural/low density land use development; however, the roadway widens as land use becomes more intense approaching MD 108, including higher density residential development and commercial uses. The suburban section terminates at the three-legged signalized MD 108 intersection which ultimately connects with eastbound/ westbound MD 32 to the north.

# Previous & Current Studies

In 2016, the Howard County Department of Transportation (HCDOT) released the Clarksville Pike Streetscape Plan and Design Guidelines. The plan identifies Clarksville Pike (MD 108) as a priority corridor for streetscape improvements that will lead to sustainable, pedestrianoriented development. As part of HCDOT's efforts to implement the recommendations in the plan, they have engaged the services of an engineering firm to examine the portion of MD 108 surrounding the MD 32 interchange, including the intersection of MD 108 with Ten Oaks Road. The preliminary designs for the intersection have been developed and are incorporated into the recommended alternative maps presented in this study. No costs associated with the HCDOT plans are included.

## Natural Resources

Ten Oaks Road runs through a combination of rural and sub-urban areas in Howard County. The surrounding land includes waterways, wetlands, parks, forested areas, and 100-year flood plains. The presence of these natural resources create several site constraints that will require further analysis and coordination with multiple organizations.

For the study corridor, a request for review of Rare, Threatened, and Endangered species (RTE) records within the proposed work areas should be submitted to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) Wildlife and Heritage Division, MDNR Project Review Division (PRD - Fisheries Division), and the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Additionally, although the Ten Oaks corridor does not appear to directly impact existing wetlands, a wetland delineation should be performed to confirm any impacts to jurisdictional water resources. Any impacts identified would require coordination with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE): the submittal of a Joint Federal/State Permit Application (JPA) may be required as well.

Due to the proximity of forested areas, a Natural Resources Inventory/ Forest Stand Delineation (NRI/FSD) should be performed to identify forest/hedgerow boundaries, specimen trees (> 30 inches in Diameter at Breast Height), and right-of-way trees within and adjacent to the proposed work areas. Depending on the analysis, a MDNR Roadside Tree Permit and additional tree mitigation may be required.

Finally, a request for review of cultural and historical resources should be submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) to confirm if any cultural and historic resources exist within the proposed work areas.



### Stormwater Management

Stormwater management is critical to mitigating the effects of sediments, nutrients, and other contaminants found in stormwater runoff. In cases where potential improvements would increase the amount of impervious surface in the study area, stormwater management mitigation would be required as a result of the increased stormwater runoff. The state of Maryland has developed several comprehensive stormwater management treatments including but not limited to the following:

- Swales open drainage channels designed to detain and promote stormwater filtration
- Bio-retention ponds shallow depressions designed to collect stormwater before filtering through fabricated planting soil media
- Vegetated Buffers vegetated protective zones of variable width along the sides of existing waterways

Given the existing conditions around the Ten Oaks Road corridor, there are several site constraints that limit feasibility of implementing stormwater management for the project. Major site constraints include limited available right-of-way, guardrails, utility poles, and large trees. Existing roadway grades near Ten Oaks Road may require acquiring significant site grading to install stormwater facilities. If on-site implementation of stormwater management has been demonstrated to the maximum extent practicable, a waiver or variance may be sought for remaining stormwater requirements.

### Utilities

Throughout the study corridor, there are several utility poles located directly adjacent to the roadway. Relocations of these utility poles may be required based on the proposed improvements, requiring coordination with the utility companies and any other entities that use the poles to provide service. Analysis also revealed several additional utilities along the study corridor, including underground gas lines, water mains, storm inlets, storm manholes, and fire hydrants. There is a particularly high concentration of utilities near the intersection of Ten Oaks Road and MD 108 as a result of the large number of nearby businesses. These utilities will present several site constraints depending on the proposed improvements and will require extensive coordination with the corresponding owners.

**Opportunities & Constraints Maps** - The following maps contain summary notes and key features examined during the opportunities and constraints analysis described above.

# **OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS**

Northern Section Burntwoods Road to Pinch Point #4





# **OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS**

Northern & Suburban Section Pinch Point #4 to MD 108







# Recommended Alternatives

# Overview

The project team analyzed the existing conditions and previously reviewed opportunities and constraints to develop recommended alternative designs for the study area. For the purpose of this study, MDOT SHA determined that the most likely cyclists user type was "Enthused and Confident" based on field observations and roadway design. As a result, the recommended alternatives have been crafted to accommodate this user type.

Due to the prominent land-use types and the character of the roadway along the study corridor, several types of cycling infrastructure were considered for the proposed alternatives. The following four treatments were initially considered:

- » Route Signage
- » Pinch Point Treatment (Shoulder Bikeways, Bike-Climbing Shoulders)
- » Corridor/Shoulder Widening
- » Shared-Use Path (SUP)

Based on the determined user type, surrounding land uses, natural resources constraints, right-of-way constraints, and funding requirements, widening the roadway throughout the entire corridor was eliminated from consideration. The preliminary cost estimate for the roadway widening has been included in Appendix A for reference. Additionally and for many of the same reasons, the shared-use path alternative for the entire corridor was eliminated from consideration. However, a shared use path along the suburban section of the corridor was considered as a result of the concerns noted in this section.

For the remaining treatments, alternative concept plans, cost estimates, and anticipated impacts were developed.

# Alternative A - Route Signage

- The first alternative includes installing new route signage throughout the MD 32 corridor. While no new infrastructure will be provided for cyclists, the new signage will clearly delineate the bike route and make automobiles more aware of potential cyclists throughout the corridor. This option has the lowest cost and environmental impact of the three alternatives considered.

# Alternative B - Pinch Point 1-5 Treatments

- The second alternative focused on addressing specific sections along the corridor that are particularly difficult for cyclists to navigate due to a narrowed roadway and difficult sight lines. For these "pinch points," infrastructure improvements were developed to provide additional roadway space for cyclists and eliminate conflicts with automobile traffic. In many cases, multiple recommendations were created for a single pinch point to provide options with varying costs and environmental impacts. Recommendations included bikeable shoulders, offroad paths, and traffic circles.

## Alternative C - Pinch Point 6 SUP

- The third alternative focused on a corridor-wide treatment that would provide improved cycling infrastructure throughout the study area. With the roadway widening and a SUP throughout the entire corridor eliminated due to cost, treatments specifically tailored to the pinch point 6/suburban section were considered. Ultimately, a SUP on the north and south sides of the suburban section was chosen to alleviate concerns along the corridor, along with additional signage and roadway improvements noted in the alternatives above.





# SIGNAGE PLAN Alternative A Route Signage Throughout Entire Ten Oaks Road Corridor







# IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

\$35,724

NOTES

		EXISTING	IMPACI						
	TRAVEL LANES	VARIES	-	-					
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	-	_					
<del>;</del>	GUARDRAIL	YES	-	-					
	CULVERT	YES	-	-					
¢	UTILITIES	YES	-	-					
		EAST	WEST						
SHOULDI WII	ER/ROADWAY DENING								
POTEN		EAST	WEST						
IN (no survey co	IPACTS mpleted at this time)								

COST (see appendix A for detai

# PINCH POINT LAYOUT PLAN

The map below summarizes Pinch Point and Shared Use Path recommendations and their alternatives—blue lines indicate a facility on one side of the roadway, green lines show facilities on both sides, and the orange circle shows a third alternative at Pinch Point 4. At the right, the chart provides a side-by-side comparison of the benefits of each recommendation's alternatives. Detailed layout sheets begin on page 14.





# Alternative B1 | West, SINGLE-SIDE Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on West Side of Ten Oaks Road PINCH POINT 1



TEN OAKS ROAD



TIE IN TO EXISTING Driveway

Adjacent slope increases moving south may affect potential to fit stormwater management. Infiltration testing required due to no closed storm drain. Large offsite contributing drainage area limits facility efficiency.

Existing slopes on adjacent property preclude credit for disconnection of impervious surface. Grading for stormwater management would required significant impacts to adjacent property.

with Maryland D Natural Resources for a Roadsi Free Permit for tree trimming and d individual tree specimen trees e present in the proposed areas

Existing slopes on adjacent property preclude credit for disconnection of impervious surface. Grading for stormwater management would require additional ROW with significant impacts to adjacent property, including tree removal.

storm drain.





## IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	2,615 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	-	-
<del>}</del>	GUARDRAIL	YES	YES	236 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
	CULVERT	NO	_	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 4 POLES REQUIRED
SHOULDE	R/ROADWAY	EAST	WEST	٩
WI	DÉNING		$\bigcirc$	Pinch Point Criteria
	ITIAL ROW	EAST	WEST	- Shoulder Width
(no survey co	mpleted at this time)		4	- Sight Distance
	OF PROBABLE	\$398	3,498	- Road Grade

# PINCH POINT 2 Alternative B1 | East, SINGLE-SIDE Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on East Side of Ten Oaks Road







# IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	5,203 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
8,	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 1 TREE REQUIRED
<del>}~~?</del>	GUARDRAIL	NO	YES	126 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
H	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 6 POLES REQUIRED
		EAST	WEST	
WI	DENING	$\checkmark$		Pinch Point Criteria:
POTEN IM	ITIAL ROW PACTS	EAST	WEST	- Shoulder Width
(no survey cor	mpleted at this time)	5	1	- Sight Distance
OPINION OF PROBABLE COST (see appendix A for details)		\$842	2,651	- Road Grade

# Alternative B2 | DOUBLE-SIDED Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on West + East Side of Ten Oaks Road PINCH POINT 2







IMPACTS	AND FACILIT	Y SUMMARY
---------	-------------	-----------

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	4,103 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
8,	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 1 TREE REQUIRED
	GUARDRAIL	NO	YES	889 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 10 POLES REQUIRED
SHOULD	FR/ROADWAY	EAST	WEST	
WI	DENING			Pinch Point Criteria:
	NTIAL ROW 1PACTS	EAST	WEST 5	- Shoulder Width
(no survey co	mpleted at this time)	5		- Sight Distance
OPINION OF PROBABLE COST (see appendix A for details)		\$1,37	4,840	- Road Grade

# PINCH POINT 3 Alternative B1 | East, SINGLE-SIDE Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on East Side of Ten Oaks Road







#### IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY EXISTING IMPACT NOTES TRAVEL 11' | 10' LANES TREES + REMOVAL OF 1 TREES REQUIRED YES YES NATURAL RESOURCES <del>}\_\_\_\_</del> GUARDRAIL YES CULVERT NO Ŧ UTILITIES YES WEST EAST SHOULDER/ROADWAY WIDENING **Pinch Point Criteria:** EAST WEST POTENTIAL ROW IMPACTS - Shoulder Width - Sight Distance OPINION OF PROBABLE COST (see appendix A for details) - Road Grade \$257,113

# Alternative B2 | DOUBLE-SIDED Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on East + West Side of Ten Oaks Road



PINCH POINT 3





### IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	3,478 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
8,	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 1 TREES REQUIRED
	GUARDRAIL	YES	YES	526 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
H	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 4 POLES REQUIRED
		EAST	WEST	•
WI	DENING			Pinch Point Criteria:
POTEN IM	ITIAL ROW	EAST	WEST	- Shoulder Width
(no survey cor	mpleted at this time)	3	۷	- Sight Distance
OPINION (see apper	OF PROBABLE COST ndix A for details)	\$979	9,164	- Road Grade

# Alternative B1 | West, SINGLE-SIDE Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on West Side of Ten Oaks Road PINCH POINT 4

Widen Roadway on West Side and Shift Centerline to Provide Southbound Bicycle Climbing Lane and Northbound Shared Lane

and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required for impacts to a non-tidal waterway and 100-year adalain is the proposed work d work are

edgerows, and individual trees

Extend Culvert and Replace Headwall and Endwall

Perform infiltration testing due to no adjacent closed storm drain to connect facility underdrain. Site grading may allow stormwater management but would require additional ROW and potentially impact trees and utility poles.

Widen an Additional Foot to Accommodate Guardrail







### IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	5,006 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 1 TREE REQUIRED
<del>]</del>	GUARDRAIL	YES	YES	159 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
	CULVERT	YES	YES	1 CULVERT EXTENSION REQUIRED
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 2 POLES REQUIRED
	-R/ROADWAY	EAST	WEST	
WIDENING				Pinch Point Criteria
POTENTIAL ROW IMPACTS		EAST	WEST 4	- Shoulder Width

\$995,794

OPINION OF PROBABLE COST (see appendix A for details)

- Sight Distance
- Road Grade

# PINCH POINT 4 Alternative B2 | CIRCLE Traffic Circle at Linden Church Road

**Traffic Circles** - The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) began implementing modern roundabouts, also known as traffic circles or circular at-grade intersections, in 1993. They are an effective intersection design which reduces the numbers of intersection conflict points while operating at slower speeds. This type of intersection has successfully replaced many traditional intersections that had exhibited recurring crash problems and/or operational problems. Roundabouts operate continuously, but at much slower speeds than traditional intersections and normally result in very little delay. Normal operating speeds within roundabouts are between 20 and 30 mph.

**Reason for Implementation** - Constructed a traffic circle would significantly enhance safety for cyclists by slowing traffic approaching and leaving the pinch point area. Current traffic along Ten Oaks Road consistently travels at speeds in excess of the speed limit en route to MD 32. This high speed traffic, combined with sight distance issues around the end, present a consistent threat to cyclist using the corridor. Slowing the traffic with the proposed traffic circle design will create a lower stress enviornment for cylclists and decrease the chances of a crash resulting from a vehicle not seeing a cyclists along the road.

Coordination with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required for impacts to a non-tidal waterway and 100-year floodplain in the proposed work areas.

> Roadway Grade Approx. 6.5%

#### New Traffic Circle - Inscribed Circle Diameter = 110 Feet

Perform infiltration testing due to no adjacent closed storm drain. Additional ROW and site grading required to accommodate stormwater management. Verify existing conditions to determine extent of clearing required.

Coordination with Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) for Roadside Tree Permit is required for tree trimming and removal within ROW. Forests, hedgerows, and individual trees, including specimen trees, may be present in proposed work areas.



TIE IN WITH EXISTING 4-FOOT SHOULDERS

Tie In with Existing 4-Foot Shoulders

Investigate available credit in ROW for disconnection of non-rooftop runoff. Grading a stormwater facility would require additional ROW as well as tree and utility impacts. Stormwater management would require infiltration testing.



A ROUTE

RELOCATE UTILITY POLES

Relocate Driveway and Entrance Within Property Boundary

Notes General Stormwater





	IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY						
		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES			
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	4,187 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS			
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	-	-			
	GUARDRAIL	YES	-	-			
	CULVERT	YES	-	-			
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 4 POLES REQUIRED			
SHOULDE	ER/ROADWAY	EAST	WEST				
WI	DÉNING	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	Pinch Point Criteria			
<b>POTENTIAL ROW</b> <b>IMPACTS</b> (no survey completed at this time)		EASTWEST12		- Shoulder Width - Sight Distance			
OPINION OF PROBABLE COST (see appendix A for details)		\$1,106,923		- Road Grade			

# Alternative B3 | DOUBLE-SIDED Bicycle-Friendly Shoulder on East + West Side of Ten Oaks Road



Coordination with the Maryland epartment of the Environment (MDE) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required for impacts to a non-tidal waterway and 100-year floodplain in the proposed work areas.

PINCH POINT 4

WIDEN AN ADDITIONAL FOOT TO Accommodate Guardrail



Extend Culvert and Replace Headwall and Endwall (Both Sides)

RELOCATE UTILITY POLES ALONG BOTH SIDES

Replace and Extend Approx. 430 LF of Guardrail

WIDEN AN ADDITIONAL FOOT TO Accommodate Guardrail



Cont.

Increase Paved Lane Width to 15 Feet in Each Direction

Driveway

Perform infiltration testing due to no adjacent closed storm drain to connect facility underdrain. Site grading may allow stormwater management but would require additional ROW and potentially impact trees and utility poles.







### IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	8,152 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
Q,	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 2 TREES REQUIRED
	GUARDRAIL	YES	YES	992 LF GUARDRAIL ADDED
	CULVERT	YES	YES	1 CULVERT EXTENSION REQUIRED
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 10 POLES REQUIRED
		EAST	WEST	
WI	DENING		$\checkmark$	Pinch Point Criteria:
POTEN IM	ITIAL ROW IPACTS	EAST	WEST	- Shoulder Width
(no survey co	mpleted at this time)	4	4	- Sight Distance
OPINION (see apper	OF PROBABLE COST ndix A for details)	\$1,97	6,087	- Road Grade

# PINCH POINT 5 Alternative B1 | West, SINGLE-SIDE Bicycle Friendly Shoulder on West Side of Ten Oaks Road



Road most likely goes into super-elevation which limits contributing drainage area. Existing ditch could contribute to drainage area. Swale grading could impact surrounding utilities and adjacent tree line.

> Tie In To Existing Driveway

> > Tree clearing required. Coordination with Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) for Roadside Tree Permit is required for tree trimming and removal within ROW. Forests, hedgerows, and individual trees, including specimen trees, may be present in proposed work areas.

ROADWAY GRADE

TIE IN TO EXISTING

SHOULDER

Investigate available credit in ROW for disconnection of non-rooftop runoff. Site grading may allow stormwater management but require additional ROW, which could impact grading of adjacent property and surrounding trees.









# IMPACTS AND FACILITY SUMMARY

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   10'	YES	4,879 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 5 TREES REQUIRED
	GUARDRAIL	NO	-	-
	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 3 POLES REQUIRED
SHOU <u>LDE</u>	R/ROADWA <u>Y</u>	EAST	WEST	۹
WI	DENING			Pinch Point Criteria
POTENTIAL ROW		EAST	WEST	- Shoulder Width
(no survey cor	mpleted at this time)		4	- Sight Distance
OPINION (	OF PROBABLE	\$666	5.202	- Road Grade

#### Alternative C1 PINCH POINT 6 Bicycle Lanes + North Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road





		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   11'	YES	24,403 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	-	-
	GUARDRAIL	NO	-	-
H	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 20 POLES REQUIRED
		NORTH	SOUTH	
SHOULDI Wil	ER/ROADWAY DENING	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	
POTEN	NTIAL ROW	NORTH	SOUTH	
IM (no survey co	IPACTS mpleted at this time)	11	5	
OPINION ( see apper)	<b>OF PROBABLE</b> C <b>OST</b> ndix A for details)	\$3,186,18	1 (TOTAL)	

#### Alternative C1 PINCH POINT 6 Bike Lanes + North Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road





#### Alternative C1 PINCH POINT 6 Bike Lanes + North Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road



![](_page_20_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_6.jpeg)

Please refer to the table on page 33.

#### Alternative C2 PINCH POINT 6 Bike Lanes + South Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road

BUOR BHE

Existing slopes on adjacent property preclude credit for disconnection of impervious surface. Grading for stormwater facility would require additional ROW and infiltration testing ue to no closed storm drain connection.

RE ROLE

![](_page_21_Picture_2.jpeg)

STO ROUTE

![](_page_21_Picture_3.jpeg)

Widen Roadway to Provide 11-Foot-Wide Lanes and 4-Foot-Wide Bikeable Shoulders in Each Direction

Coordination with Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) for Roadside Tree mit is required for tree trimming and removal hin ROW. Forests, hedgerows, and individual ees, including specimen trees, may be present in proposed work areas.

![](_page_21_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_8.jpeg)

		EXISTING	IMPACT	NOTES
	TRAVEL LANES	11'   11'	YES	23,403 SF INCREASE FOR PAVED SHOULDERS
8,	TREES + NATURAL RESOURCES	YES	YES	REMOVAL OF 1 TREE REQUIRED
ţ	GUARDRAIL	NO	-	-
	CULVERT	NO	-	-
Ø	UTILITIES	YES	YES	RELOCATION OF 13 POLES REQUIRED
		NORTH	SOUTH	
SHOULDE WII	ER/ROADWAY DENING	$\checkmark$	$\bigotimes$	
POTEN	ITIAL ROW	NORTH	SOUTH	l
IM (no survey cor	IPACTS mpleted at this time)	2	10	
OPINION	OF PROBABLE			l
(see apper	COST ndix A for details)	\$3,210,89	8 (TOTAL)	

#### Alternative C2 PINCH POINT 6 Bike Lanes + South Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road

![](_page_22_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_3.jpeg)

<u>41</u>

### Alternative C2 PINCH POINT 6 Bike Lanes + South Side Shared-Use Path Along Ten Oaks Road

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_6.jpeg)

Please refer to the table on page 39.

![](_page_24_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Next Steps

# Implementation Strategies

This study identified a need for improving the bicycle comfort level along Ten Oaks Road between MD 108 and Burntwoods Road at specific locations. A range of concepts were identified to address these needs.

The improvements identified in this study could be funded through an MDOT SHA project, as prioritized by Howard County in their annual transportation priorities letter, or through the MDOT grant programs, as summarized on the following page. A phased implementation approach to establishing the Alternate MD 32 Bicycle Route is recommended as follows:

**1. Signage** - Signage to establish the bicycle route is identified as the first implementation priority. Design and construction of the signage concept in this report is estimated at \$35,724 and could be funded by an MDOT grant program or an MDOT SHA project.

**2. Prioritize Pinch Point Improvements** - Due to the rural nature and low traffic along Ten Oaks Road between Brighton Dam Road and Burntwoods Road, improvements at the five identified pinch points are identified as second priority. A public process for choosing and prioritizing improvements at the five pinch points is recommended. A combination of state and federal funding sources can be explored to advance improvements at each location.

**3.** Pinch Point 6 / Suburban Section Shared Use Path - The shared use path concepts along Ten Oaks Road, between Brighton Dam Road and MD 108, would address the narrow, more congested segment of Ten Oaks Road and is proposed as the high capital improvement priority. Both shared use path concepts are estimated at approximately \$3.2 million each. A combination of state and federal funding sources can be explored. MDOT SHA could work with HCDOT to coordinate improvements with their ongoing MD 108 project to ensure the new facilities noted in this study tie-in directly to the facilities being installed by HCDOT.

The phased approach noted above will enable concepts to be implemented through a flexible approach that can best leverage available funding opportunities.

# The Benefits of Community Champions

While the majority of the design, engineering, and implementation work for transportation projects are typically handled by government agencies, there is an immense benefit in establishing local "Community Champions" for the project early in the development process. The residents and local stakeholders near the project area should identify several local leaders to continually mobilize project support and serve as points of contact for agencies to disseminate major project information and updates. They can also engage additional third parties and local organizations that may not have been involved in the engagement process to date.

![](_page_24_Picture_12.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_13.jpeg)

# **Bicycle & Pedestrian Project Grant Programs**

MDOT Administers several grant assistance programs to promote transportation alternatives that facilitate access to everyday needs, support local economies, and enhance qualities of life.

![](_page_25_Picture_2.jpeg)

### Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)

#### roads.maryland.gov/Index.aspx?PageId=144

• **Funding** - Federal TAP allocation administered by MDOT SHA (State Highway Administration) in coordination with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs).

- **Objective** Enhancing the cultural, aesthetic, historic, and environmental aspects of the intermodal transportation system.
- **Eligible Applicants** local governments, regional transportation authorities, transit agencies, natural resource or public land agencies, tribal governments, and other local and governmental entities with oversight of transportation or recreational trail.

• **Requirements** - 20% cash match, project must meet one of the nine TAP categories, comply with all applicable state and federal regulations and service a transportation purpose.

### Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)

roads.maryland.gov/Index.aspx?PageId=735

- Funding Federal TAP allocation administered by MDOT SHA.
- **Objective** Supporting infrastructure and non-infrastructure activities that enable and encourage children to safely walk, bicycle, or roll to school.
- **Requirements** 20% cash match, must benefit elementary and middle school children in grades K-8, and must be located within a 2 mile radius of a school.

#### **Recreational Trails Program**

www.sha.maryland.gov/Index.aspx?PageId=98

- Funding Federal TAP allocation administered by MDOT SHA
- **Objective** Developing community-based, motorized, and non-motorized recreational trail projects.
- **Preferred Projects** Connect communities with natural/cultural areas or tourism areas, have broad-based community support, link or complete existing trails, mitigate impacts on the natural environment, and involve youth conservation corps or service groups.

### Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC) Program

www.mwcog.org/transportation/planning-areas/land-use-coordination/tlcprogram

- **Funding** Administered by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG).
- **Objective** Providing technical assistance for local jurisdictions in planning matters relating to coordination of transportation and land use.

### Highway Safety Grants Program

www.mva.maryland.gov/safety/mhso/grantsmanagement.htm

![](_page_25_Picture_25.jpeg)

- **Funding** Federal allocation administered by MDOT MVA (Motor Vehicle Administration).
- **Objective** Reducing the number of motor
- vehicle-related crashes, deaths, and injuries on Maryland highways.
- **Requirements** Match one of the top safety priorities and implement the strategies identified in the Strategic Highway Safety Program.

![](_page_25_Picture_30.jpeg)

### **Bikeways Program**

www.mdot.maryland.gov/Bikeways

- **Funding** State transportation funds administered by MDOT TSO (Transportation Secretary's Office).
- **Objective** Promote biking as a fun, healthy, and environmentally-friendly transportation alternative.
- **Eligible Projects** Enhance bicycle access within 3 miles of a rail transit station or major bus transit hub, address bicycle network gaps, identified as a priority in County's most recent Annual Priority Letter, or enhance access within a Sustainable Community or designated Maryland Main Street.

![](_page_25_Picture_37.jpeg)

# MD 32 Preliminary Cost Estimate Summary

Alternate	Section	Location	Treatment	Cost
Alt. A	Norther & Suburban	Entire Corridor	Signage	\$ 35,724
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 1 (B1)	Roadway Widening (West)	\$ 398,498
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 2 (B1)	Roadway Widening (East)	\$ 842,651
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 2 (B2)	Roadway Widening (West & East)	\$ 1,374,840
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 3 (B1)	Roadway Widening (East)	\$ 257,113
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 3 (B2)	Roadway Widening (West & East)	\$ 979,164
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 4 (B2)	Roadway Widening (West)	\$ 995,794
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 4 (B3)	Traffic Circle	\$ 1,106,923
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 4 (B1)	Roadway Widening (West & East)	\$ 1,976,087
Alt. B	Northern	Pinch Point 5 (B1)	Roadway Widening (West)	\$ 666,202
Alt. C	Suburban	Pinch Point 6 / Suburban Section (C1)	Roadway Widening & Shared Use Path (North)	\$ 3,186,181
Alt. C	Suburban	Pinch Point 6 / Suburban Section (C2)	Roadway Widening & Shared Use Path (South)	\$ 3,210,898

![](_page_25_Picture_40.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_41.jpeg)

# Preliminary Cost Estimate

The concepts developed in this report include a wide range of treatments designed to improve the bicycle comfort level on Ten Oaks Road between MD 108 and Burntwoods Road at specific locations. In order to begin the process of implementing these improvements and seek out corresponding funding, cost estimates were developed for the alternatives identified.

In developing the cost estimates, the Cost Per Mile (CPM) methodology described in the MDOT SHA 2017 Highway Construction Cost Estimating Manual was used to determine the total costs for each improvement option. This method was chosen due to the conceptual nature of the current improvements. Additional planning and design work will be required to provide the sufficient engineering detail required for a final construction cost estimate. However, the cost estimates developed can be used by project stakeholders to help prioritize certain types of improvements and seek project funding in grant applications. The table to the left provides a summary of the cost estimates for each of the improvements presented in this report. As noted previously, due to the very large costs associated with widening the entire roadway and acquiring the associated ROW, the costs for the corridor widening alternate have not been included in the summary table. However, the cost estimate for the entire corridor widening has been included in the Appendix A - Cost Estimate for reference.

For additional details, assumptions, and clarifications, please refer to Appendix A - Cost Estimates.

![](_page_26_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Appendix

Cost Estimate

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate A - Signage

Cost Per N	lile Estimate				
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$0
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$0
Collector CPM	LM <sup>1</sup>	\$1,800,000	0	\$0	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	$LM^1$	\$100,000	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	0	\$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2.500	0	\$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam. Single Face	LF	\$25	0	\$0	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
Category 3 - Drainage					Ś0
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$0	
Stormwater Management	15	\$0	1	\$0	
	20	φo	-	ΨŪ	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	0	0	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$0
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	0	\$0	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	0	\$0	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5.00	0	\$0	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$2,400	0	\$0	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500	0	\$0	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	0	\$0	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$21.000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408.000	0	\$0	,
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	42	\$21,000	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$0
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	ŚO	÷
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	0	\$0	
Subtotal					\$21,000
Contingency				40%	\$8 400
Construction Total					\$29,400
				0.5-1	40
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$2,411
Project Planning Overhead Additive			L	12.3%	\$3,913
Total Cost					\$35.724
					,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #1 - Concept B1

Cost Per Mile Estimate					
ltem	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$45,349
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$113,373
Collector CPM	$LM^1$	\$1,800,000	0.05	\$90,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	$LM^1$	\$100,000	0.14	\$14,000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	665	\$998	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	235	\$5,875	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
Category 2 - Drainage					\$22.675
20% of Categories 2 4 5 8 6			20%	\$22.675	<i>322,073</i>
Stormwater Management	10	¢Ο	20%	\$22,075	
Stornwater Management	LJ	ŞΟ	0	ŞU	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	0	0	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$15,558
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	1,312	\$1,968	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	1,312	\$1,050	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5.00	1,312	\$6,560	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$2,400	1	\$2,400	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	108	\$1,080	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$500
Pedestrian /Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	М	\$1 /08 000	0	ŚO	<i>\$</i> 500
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	1	\$500	
				·	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$36,802
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$6,802	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	1	\$30,000	
Subtotal					\$234.256
Contingency				40%	\$93,702
Construction Total				-	\$327,958
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$26,893
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$43,647
Total Cost					\$398.498

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #2 - Concept B1

Cost Per Mil	e Estimate				
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$92,875
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
					6222.400
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)	1	ć1 000 000	0.10	ć100.000	\$232,188
	LM	\$1,800,000	0.10	\$180,000	
Milling/Resurracing CPM	LM	\$100,000	0.44	\$44,000 ¢0	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15 ¢50	0	\$0 ¢0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50 \$150	0	ېن د م	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	Cł	\$130	0	ېن د م	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	51	\$130	0	ېں د	
		\$45 \$16	0	ېن د م	
5 Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	ېU د ۸ ۵۵۵	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	3,325	\$4,988 ¢0	
Traffic Barrier W. Beern, Single Face	EA	\$2,500 ¢25	120	ېں دع عم	
Franc Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	128	\$3,200	
Single Face F-shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	ŞÜ	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$46,438
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$46,438	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	0	\$0	
Category A. Structures					ŚŌ
Rridge Over Water	CE.	\$220	0	0	
Bridge Over Mater	SF	\$320 \$200	0	0	
Bridge Dock Deplacement	3F CF	\$200 ¢115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Peolecoment	3F SE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge SuperStructure Replacement	ЭГ СГ	\$200 ¢25	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Woullied Concrete)	ЭГ СГ	\$23 ¢45	0	0	
Bruge Kellioval	SF	245 6225	0	0	
Box Cuiverts	35	Ş525	0	U	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$18,919
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	1,304	\$1,956	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	1,304	\$1,043	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5.00	1,304	\$6,520	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$3,900.00	1	\$3,900	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500.00	1	\$2,500	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10.00	300	\$3,000	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$1.000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	N/I	\$1 <u>40</u> 8 000	0	¢Ω	91,000
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	2	\$1,000	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$103,931
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$13,931	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	3	\$90,000	
Subtotal					\$495,350
Contingency				40%	\$198,140
Construction Total					\$693,491
Admin/Overhead				Q 70/	\$56 966
Aurinin Overhead Project Planning Overhead Additive				8.2%	\$50,800
rioject Hamming Overneau Additive			I	12.3/0	<i>332,23</i> 4
Total Cost					\$842,651

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #2 - Concept B2

ltom	
Catagory 1 Proliminary	
Lategory 1 - Premining y	
4010 UI Caleguiles 2, 4, 3 & 0	
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)	
Collector CPM	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	
Removal of Existing Pavement	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	
Curb and Gutter	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	
Thermonlastic Pavement Markings	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment Single Face	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam Single Face	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	
Category 3 - Drainage	
20% of Categories 2. 4. 5 & 6	
Stormwater Management	
Category 4 - Structures	
Bridge Over Water	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	
Bridge Deck Replacement	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	
Bridge Removal	
Box Culverts	
Category 7 - Landscaping	
Turfgrass Establishment	
Refertilizing	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	
Tree Branch Pruning	
Tree Root Pruning	
Category 8 - Trattic	
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	
Mainline Signing	
Cotogory 9 Utilition	
6% of Categories 2 4 5 and 6	
U/O OF CALEGOTIES 2, 4, 3, and 0 Electric / Telecom Poles	
Subtotal	
Contingency	
Construction Total	
Admin/Overhead	
Project Planning Overhead Additive	
Total Cost	

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #3 - Concept B1

Cost Per M	ile Estimate				
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$33,51
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
Categories 2. 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$83.78
Collector CPM	IM <sup>1</sup>	\$1.800.000	0.04	\$72.000	1
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	I M <sup>1</sup>	\$100.000	0.1	\$11.000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LIVI	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	I F	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SE	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermonlastic Pavement Markings	JE	\$1.50	525	¢788	
Traffic Barrier W-Ream End Treatment Single Face	EV.	\$2.50	0	\$0 \$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Ream Single Face		¢٦٢	0	ος ¢0	
Single Face E-Shane Concrete Barrier	LF 1 F	ديږ ۵۵۵	0	υς 60	
Single race r-Shape concrete barrier	LF	<b>Ş200</b>	U	ŲÇ	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$16,75
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$16,758	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	0	\$0	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SE	\$320	0	0	γu
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Penlacement	51 CE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Penlacement	SE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	51 SE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SE	\$25 ¢4E	0	0	
	JF SE	\$45 \$225	0	0	
DUX CUIVEILS	51	<i>J</i> JZJ	0	0	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$11,05
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	720	\$1,080	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	720	\$576	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5	720	\$3,600	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$1,500	1	\$1,500	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	180	\$1,800	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$1.000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	М	\$1,408,000	0	ŚO	91,000
Mainline Signing	EV.	\$500 \$500	2	\$1 000	
	24	<b>2300</b>	2	Ŷ±,000	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$5,027
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$5,027	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	0	\$0	
Subtotal					\$151,14
Contingency			Γ	40%	\$60,45
Construction Total					\$211,6
Admin/Overhead			L	8.2%	\$17,35
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$28,16
Total Cost					\$257,11

Adda Fatimate					
Mile Estimate	11	Unit Coat	Ouentitu	Cash	
	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	40%	\$120.220
			L	40%	\$125,220
					\$287 950
		\$1,800,000	0.12	\$216,000	\$207,550
		\$100,000	0.12	\$210,000	
		\$100,000 ¢1E	0.34	\$34,000	
		\$I3	0	30 ¢0	
	CY	\$50 ¢150	0	ېں د	
	CT CV	\$150	0	ېں د	
	SY	\$130	0	\$0 ¢0	
	LF	\$45	0	Ş0	
	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
	LF	\$1.50	2,300	\$3,450	
	EA	\$2,500	5	\$12,500	
	LF	\$25	880	\$22,000	
	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
					\$64,610
			20%	\$64,610	
	LS	\$0	0	\$0	
					\$35,100
	SF	\$320	0	\$0	
	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
	SF	\$115	0	\$0	
	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
	SF	\$25	0	\$0	
	SF	\$45	0	\$0	
	SF	\$325	108	\$35.100	
				,,	
					\$60,934
	SY	\$1.50	3.568	\$5.352	
	SY	\$0.80	3,568	\$2,854	
	SY	\$5	3,568	\$17,840	
	LS	\$18.607.20	1	\$18,607	
	15	\$5,000	- 1	\$5,000	
	L5 I F	\$10	1.178	\$11 280	
		ΥTO	1,120	γ <b>11,200</b>	
					\$1,000
	М	\$1,408.000	0	\$0	÷_,000
	EA	\$500	2	\$1,000	
		+-00	-	, <i>5</i> 00	
					\$229.383
			6%	\$19,383	+0,000
	POLE	\$30.000	7	\$210.000	
	, OLL	<i>430,000</i>	,	<i>7210,000</i>	
					\$808.197
			Г	40%	\$323.279
			I		\$1,131,475
					, ,,
			<b>[</b>	8.2%	\$92,781
				12.3%	\$150,584
			-		
					\$1,374,840

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #3 - Concept B2

Cost Per Mile Estimate					
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$96,824
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			-		
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$242,060
Collector CPM	LM1	\$1,800,000	0.1	\$198,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	LM	\$100,000	0.3	\$26,000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	Ş0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	Ş0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	Ş0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	Ş0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	1,540	\$2,310	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	530	\$13,250	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	Ş200	0	Ş0	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$48.412
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$48,412	,
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	1	\$0	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	0	0	
Catagory 7 Landscaping					¢22.790
Category 7 - Lanuscaping	cv	¢1 E0	1 552	67 270	322,780
	ST CV	\$1.30	1,552	\$2,320 ¢1 242	
Turo D Soil Stabilization Matting	S1 CV	\$0.80 ¢E 0	1,552	\$1,242 \$7,760	
Trop Shruh and Decempial Installation & Establishment	51	\$5.0 \$4.200.0	1,552	\$7,700 \$4,200	
	10	\$4,200.0	1	\$4,200 \$2,500	
Tree Post Druning		\$2,300.0	1	\$2,300 \$4.7E0	
	LF	\$10.0	475	Ş4,750	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$1,000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0	\$0	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	2	\$1,000	
Catagony 9 Ittilition					\$164 F24
Category o - Utilities			6%	\$11 ED1	\$104,524
u/o ui categuries 2, 4, 0, allu o Elactric / Talacom Dalac	DOLE	¢20.000	0% F	\$14,524	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$50,000	5	\$150,000	
Subtotal					\$575,599
Contingency				40%	\$230,240
Construction Total					\$805,839
Admin/Overhead			I	8,2%	\$66.079
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$107.246
					, , =
Total Cost					\$979,164

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #4 - Concept B1

Cost Per Mile Estin	mate				
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$132,314
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			-		
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$283,985
Collector CPM	LM <sup>1</sup>	\$1,800,000	0.13	\$234,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	LM <sup>1</sup>	\$100,000	0.39	\$39,000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	2,990	\$4,485	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	160	\$4,000	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$66,157
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$66,157	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	1	\$0	
Category 4 - Structures					\$46.800
Bridge Over Water	SE	\$320	0	0	940,000
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SE	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SE	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SE	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Benoval	SE	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	144	\$46,800	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$35,272
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	1,600	\$2,400	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	1,600	\$1,280	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5	1,600	\$8,000	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$10,092	1	\$10,092	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	1,100	\$11,000	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$1,000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0	\$0	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	2	\$1,000	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$19.847
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$19 847	<i>, _ 0,0 .1</i>
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	0	\$0	
					4-6-6-
Subtotal			r	4001	\$585,375
Lontingency				40%	\$234,150
Construction fotal					\$819,525
Admin/Overhead			[	8.2%	\$67,201
Project Planning Overhead Additive			[	12.3%	\$109,067
Total Cost					\$995,794

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #4 - Concept B2

ltom	
Catagory 1 Broliminary	
Category 1 - Preliminary	
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6	
Categories 2. 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders	5)
Collector CPM	- /
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	
Removal of Existing Pavement	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	
Curb and Gutter	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	
Category 3 - Drainage	
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6	
Stormwater Management	
Category 4 - Structures	
Bridge Over Water	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	
Bridge Deck Replacement	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	
Bridge Removal	
Box Culverts	
Category 7 - Landscaping	
lurfgrass Establishment	
Refertilizing	
Type D Soll Stabilization Matting	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	
Tree Branch Pruning	
Category 8 - Traffic	
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	
Mainline Signing	
Category 8 - Utilities	
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6	
Electric / Telecom Poles	
Subtotal	
Contingency	
Construction Total	
Admin/Overhead	
Project Planning Overhead Additive	
Total Cost	

# MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study Alternate B - Pinch Point #4 - Concept B3

Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$230,8
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$419,1
Collector CPM	LM <sup>1</sup>	\$1,800,000	0.19	\$342,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	I M <sup>1</sup>	\$100.000	0.45	\$45.000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	3.125	\$4.688	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment. Single Face	EA	\$2.500	3	\$7.500	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam. Single Face	LF	\$20	1.000	\$20.000	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$115.4
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$115.428	÷==0)4
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	1	\$0	
Category 4 - Structures					\$157,9
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	486	\$157,950	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$83,0
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	4,720	\$7,080	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	4,720	\$3,776	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5	4,720	\$23,600	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$23,634	1	\$23,634	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$5,000	1	\$5,000	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	2,000	\$20,000	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$500
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0	\$0	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	1	\$500	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$154,6
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$34,628	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	4	\$120,000	
Subtotal					\$1,161,
Contingency				40%	\$464,6
Construction Total					\$1,626,
Admin/Overhead			1	8.2%	\$133,3
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$216,4

![](_page_28_Figure_10.jpeg)

#### MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study

Alternate B - Pinch Point #5 - Concept B1

Cost Per Mile Estimate					
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$74,109
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)					\$185,273
Collector CPM	$LM^1$	\$1,800,000	0.1	\$144,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	$LM^1$	\$100,000	0.4	\$38,000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	SY	\$130	0	\$0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45	0	\$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SF	\$16	0	\$0	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	LF	\$1.50	2,182	\$3,273	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2,500	0	\$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	0	\$0	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$37,055
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$37,055	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	0	\$0	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	\$0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	\$0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	\$0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	\$0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	0	\$0	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$83,572
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	6,240	\$9,360	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	6.240	\$4.992	
Type D Soil Stabilization Matting	SY	\$5	6.240	\$31.200	
Tree. Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$25.800	1	\$25.800	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$2,500	1	\$2,500	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	972	\$9.720	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$500
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0	\$0	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	1	\$500	
				·	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$11,116
6% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6			6%	\$11,116	
Electric / Telecom Poles	POLE	\$30,000	0	\$0	
		1 /		1 -	
Subtotal					\$391,625
Contingency				40%	\$156,650
Construction Total					\$548,275
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$44,959
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$72,968
			ļ		
Total Cost					\$666,202

#### MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study

Alternate B - Additional Cost Items

Cost Per Mile Estimate					
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$0
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6					
					ćo.
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)		¢1 000 000	0.00	¢ο	ŞU
Collector CPM		\$1,800,000	0.00	ېن د م	
Removal of Evicting Curb and Cuttor		\$100,000	0.0	30 ¢0	
Removal of Existing Payament		\$13	0	30 \$0	
Removal of Existing Favement	CV	\$30	0	0Ç ()	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	sv	\$130	0	\$0 \$0	
Curb and Gutter	IF	\$45	0	\$0 \$0	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	SE	\$16	0	\$0 \$0	
Thermonlastic Pavement Markings	IF	\$1.50	0	\$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	EA	\$2.500	0	\$0	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	LF	\$25	0	\$0	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	\$0	
		,			
Category 3 - Drainage					\$40,000
20% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			20%	\$0	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$40,000	1	\$40,000	
Category 4 - Structures					\$0
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	0	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Replacement	SF	\$115	0	0	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	SF	\$200	0	0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SF	\$25	0	0	
Bridge Removal	SF	\$45	0	0	
Box Culverts	SF	\$325	0	0	
Category 7 - Landscaping					Ś0
Category 7 - Total	LS	\$0.00	1	0	
					_
Category 8 - Traffic					\$17,000
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0	\$0	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	34	\$17,000	
Cotogony 9 Utilities					¢0
Given a continues			6%	¢0	οų
Electric / Telecom Poles		\$30,000	070	30 \$0	
	FULL	<b>JJUUU</b>		ŲΟ	
Subtotal					\$57,000
Contingency				40%	\$22,800
Construction Total					\$79,800
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$6,544
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$10,620
Tatal Cast					606 0C4
l otal Cost					\$96,964

#### MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study

Alternate C1 - North Side Shared Use Path

	COSt Per IVIIIe Esti
Item	
Category 1 - Preliminary	
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6	
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulder	rs)
Collector CPM	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	
Removal of Existing Pavement	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	
PCC Pavement (For Driveways)	
Curb and Gutter	
5" Concrete Sidewalk	
Shared Use Path Asphalt Surface 1.5"	
Shared Use Path Asphalt Base 2.5"	
Shared Use Path GAB 4"	
Shared Use Path Excavation	
Thermoplastic Pavement Markings	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam End Treatment, Single Face	
Traffic Barrier W-Beam, Single Face	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	
Category 3 - Drainage	
30% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6	
Stormwater Management	
Category 4 - Structures	
Bridge Over Water	
Bridge Over Roadway or Highway	
Bridge Deck Replacement	
Bridge Superstructure Replacement	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	
Bridge Removal	
Box Culverts	
Category 7 - Landscaping	
Turfgrass Establishment	
Refertilizing	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	
Tree Branch Pruning	
Tree Root Pruning	
Category 8 - Traffic	
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	
Mainline Signing	
Category 8 - Utilities	
10% of Categories 2, 4, 5, and 6	
Electric / Telecom Poles	

Construction Total

Admin/Overhead Project Planning Overhead Additive

#### MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study

Alternate C2 - South Side Shared Use Path

Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Category 1 - Preliminary				40%	\$287,4
40% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			I		
Categories 2, 5 & 6 - Roadway (Grading, Paving & Shoulders)	1	4			\$718,5
Collector CPM	LM	\$1,800,000	0.12	\$216,000	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	LM	\$100,000	0.52	\$52,000	
Removal of Existing Curb and Gutter	LF	\$15	0	\$0 ¢0	
Removal of Existing Pavement	CY	\$50	0	\$0 ¢0	
Removal of Existing Sidewalk	CY	\$150	0	\$0 ¢0	
Such and Suther	Si	\$130	0	\$0 ¢0	
Curb and Gutter	LF	\$45 \$16	200	ېں د ۹ ۵۰۵	
S CONCrete Sidewalk	SF	\$10	300	\$4,800	
Shared Use Path Asphalt Base 2.5"	TON	\$125	1,443	\$180,375	
Shared Use Path Asphalt Base 2.5	IUN	\$95	2,398	\$227,810	
Shared Use Path GAB 4	SY	\$13	1,812	\$23,550	
Shared Use Path Excavation		\$30	302	\$9,060	
Traffia Develop Traffings	LF	\$1.50 ¢2.500	3,305	\$4,958 ¢2	
Traffic Parrier W. Beam, Single Face	EA	\$2,500 ¢25	U	\$U ¢0	
Iranic barner W-Beam, Single Face		\$25 \$200	U	ېU د م	
Single Face F-Shape Concrete Barrier	LF	\$200	0	ŞU	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$215,
30% of Categories 2, 4, 5 & 6			30%	\$215,568	
Stormwater Management	LS	\$0	1	\$0	
Catagory A. Structuros					ć0
Dridge Over Water	C.C.	6220	0	έΩ	ŞU
Bridge Over Water	SF	\$320	0	\$0 \$0	
Bridge Over Roadway of Highway	SF	\$200	0	۶0 د م	
Bridge Superstructure Benlacement	SE	\$200	0	30 \$0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SE	\$200	0	\$0 \$0	
Bridge Deck Overlay (Latex Modified Concrete)	SE	\$45	0	\$0 \$0	
Broge Renoval	SF	\$325	0	\$0 \$0	
		7		÷-	
Category 7 - Landscaping					\$52,0
Turfgrass Establishment	SY	\$1.50	10,280	\$15,420	
Refertilizing	SY	\$0.80	10,280	\$8,224	
Tree, Shrub and Perennial Installation & Establishment	LS	\$11,150	1	\$11,150	
Tree Branch Pruning	LS	\$5,000	1	\$5,000	
Tree Root Pruning	LF	\$10	1,230	\$12,300	
Category 8 - Traffic					\$272,
Pedestrian/Ornamental Lighting (Both Sides of Road)	MI	\$1,408,000	0.2	\$267,520	
Mainline Signing	EA	\$500	9	\$4,500	
Catagory 8 - I Itilities					\$2/11
10%  of Categories 2.4.5 and 6			10%	\$71 856	,14CÇ
Flactric / Talacom Polas		\$30,000	0	\$270.000	
	FULE	<b>230,000</b>	5	<i>γ</i> ∠70,000	
Subtotal					\$1,887
Contingency				40%	\$755,
Construction Total					\$2,642
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$216.
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$351
				12.570	Ψ001)

Mile Estimate					
	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
				40%	\$298,316
					4-4
	1	¢4,000,000	0.12	624.0 000	\$745,790
	LM <sup>-</sup>	\$1,800,000	0.12	\$216,000	
	LM-	\$100,000	0.52	\$52,000	
	LF	\$15 ¢50	0	\$0 ¢0	
	CY	\$50	0	\$0 ¢0	
	CY	\$150	0	\$0 ¢0	
	51	\$130	0	\$0 ¢0	
		\$45 \$16	205	ېں د 4 م	
		\$10 \$12F	295	\$4,720 \$101 E00	
	TON	\$125 \$0E	1,552	\$191,500 \$241,870	
	cv	\$95 \$12	1 024	\$241,070 \$25 012	
	51 CV	¢30 \$12	221	\$0.630 \$23,012	
		\$30 \$1.50	3 272	\$5,050 \$5,058	
		\$2 EUU	0,372	۵۵۵, <i>د</i> ډ م	
		,200 ¢2⊑	0	ος (	
		\$200	0	ος \$0	
		Ş200	0	ŲΟ	
					\$223 737
			30%	\$223 737	<i>\$223,131</i>
	IS	\$0	0	\$223,737 \$0	
	20	ψũ	Ū	ψŪ	
					\$0
	SF	\$320	0	\$0	÷.
	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
	SF	\$115	0	\$0	
	SF	\$200	0	\$0	
	SF	\$25	0	\$0	
	SF	\$45	0	\$0	
	SF	\$325	0	\$0	
			-	<i>+</i> -	
					\$36,808
	SY	\$1.50	10,360	\$15,540	
	SY	\$0.80	10,360	\$8,288	
	LS	\$2,400	1	\$2,400	
	LS	\$5,000	1	\$5,000	
	LF	\$10	558	\$5,580	
					\$313,760
	MI	\$1,408,000	0.2	\$309,760	
	EA	\$500	8	\$4,000	
					\$254,579
			10%	\$74,579	
	POLE	\$30,000	6	\$180,000	
					\$1,872,990
				40%	\$749,196
					\$2,622,186
				0.20/	6245.040
				8.2%	\$215,019
				12.3%	\$348,976
					\$2 196 101
					22,100,101

#### MD 32 Alternate Bicycle Route Study

Removed Alternate - Roadway Widening & ROW Acquisition

Cost Per Mile E	stimate				
Item	Unit	Unit Cost	Quantity	Cost	
Categories 1-8					\$30,263,573
Collector CPM	LM <sup>1</sup>	\$5,600,000	5.1	\$28,724,747	
Milling/Resurfacing CPM	$LM^1$	\$100,000	15.4	\$1,538,826	
Category 3 - Drainage					\$40,000
Stormwater Management	LS	\$40,000	1	\$40,000	
Category 8 - Utilities					\$1,815,814
6% of CPM cost			6%	\$1,815,814	
Subtotal					\$32,119,388
Contingency				40%	\$12,847,755
Construction Total					\$44,967,143
			l		
Admin/Overhead				8.2%	\$3,687,306
Project Planning Overhead Additive				12.3%	\$5,984,497
				1	
Total Cost					\$54,638,946

# Assumptions & Clarifications

- 1. Assumed resurfacing of existing lane where widening.
- 2. Estimate does not include quantities or costs for retaining walls or noise barriers.
- 3. Assumed no additional lighting as part of concept improvements.
- 4. Right-of-way (ROW) costs not included in estimates. See parcel impact map for potential ROW impacts.
- 5. Utility costs can vary significantly based on final design; additional analysis required to refine current utility cost estimates.
- 6. Cost estimates prepared are in 2019 dollars; inflation has not been factored into current estimates.