

Yolo County

PM00060

Federal Fiscal Year 2011/2012 Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program

Priority	County Location	Implementing Agency	State Bridge #	Facility Carried	Featured Intersected	Location	Sufficiency Rating	SD/FO Status**	ADT	Work Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost (\$/ft)	Total Participation Cost	Federal Share 88.53%	Running Federal Summary	Local Share	Running Local Summary	Notes
1	District 3	Yolo County	Develop next year's BPMP(PE)										\$ 105,000.00	\$ 105,000.00	\$92,956.50	\$92,956.50	\$12,043.50	\$12,043.50	

Total FY 11/12 (rounded) \$ 105,000.00 \$92,956.00 \$ 12,044.00

Yolo County

Federal Fiscal Year 2012/2013 Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program (Deck Seal)

Priority	County Location	Implementing Agency	State Bridge #	Facility Carried	Featured Intersected	Location	Sufficiency Rating	SD/FO Status**	ADT	Work Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost (\$/ft)	Total Participation Cost	Federal Share 88.53%	Running Federal Summary	Local Share	Running Local Summary	Notes
2	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0076	CR 102	Willow Slough Bypass	N/O CR 29	90.1	SD	7731	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	11,736	\$4.36	\$51,193.61	\$45,321.70	\$45,321.70	\$5,871.91	\$5,871.91	See 4/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "Fill cracks in bridge deck with methacrylate or similar material" Recommended 2/12/2002
3	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0146	CR 105	Willow Slough Bypass	N/O CR 29	88.7	SD	671	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	9,475	\$4.36	\$41,330.90	\$36,580.24	\$81,911.94	\$4,740.65	\$10,612.56	See 4/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "fill the deck cracks with methacrylate..." Recommended 1/22/1999
4	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0152	CR 22	Sacramento Willow Slough	0.8 Mi N/O I-80 Bridge	93.1	SD	4640	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	78,858	\$4.36	\$343,986.48	\$304,531.23	\$386,443.17	\$39,455.25	\$50,067.81	See 4/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the transverse deck cracks with methacrylate" Recommended 1/11/1999
5	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0038	CR 99	Union School Slough	0.01 Mi N/O CR 28	93.7	SD	2136	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	4,820	\$4.36	\$21,025.32	\$18,613.72	\$405,056.89	\$2,411.60	\$52,479.41	See 10/2007 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the transverse deck cracks with methacrylate" Recommended 1/11/1999
6	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0030	CR 89	Putah Creek	Solano/Yolo County Line	96.3	SD	1072	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	1,377	\$4.36	\$6,006.61	\$5,317.65	\$410,374.55	\$688.96	\$53,168.37	corners of deck, transverse cracks within 4" of abutment, and longitudinal cracks emanating from each abutment with soffit efflorescence. A September 2011 inspection confirmed this.
7	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0002	CR 86	Elk Slough	E/O SH 84	77.5	SD	1254	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	6,998	\$4.36	\$30,525.98	\$27,024.65	\$437,399.19	\$3,501.33	\$56,669.70	See 2/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the deck with methacrylate" Recommended 11/15/2000
8	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0025	CR 158	Slough 7	0.25 Mi E/O CR 98	91.4	SD	1550	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	7,353	\$4.36	\$32,074.52	\$28,395.57	\$465,794.77	\$3,678.95	\$60,348.65	See 4/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "Fill the cracks in the bridge deck with methacrylate or other acceptable material" Recommended 1/27/1999
9	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0151	CR 13	Cache Creek	1.2 Mi N/O SH 16	92	SD	1513	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	1,022	\$4.36	\$4,458.07	\$3,946.73	\$469,741.49	\$511.34	\$60,859.99	See 1/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the bridge deck with methacrylate... to fill the cracks in the bridge deck" Recommended 11/27/2002
10	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0001	CR 87	Colusa Basin Drainage Canal	.2 Mi N/O CR 13	82.8	SD	900	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	20,727	\$4.36	\$90,413.25	\$80,042.85	\$549,784.34	\$10,370.40	\$71,230.39	See 2/2010 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the deck with methacrylate" Recommended 1/27/1999
11	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0041	CR 99E	Chikahominy Slough	.51 Mi N/O CR 31	95.8	SD	290	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	8,622	\$4.36	\$37,610.03	\$33,296.16	\$583,080.50	\$4,313.87	\$75,544.26	See 1/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the bridge deck with methacrylate to fill the cracks..." Recommended 12/6/2000
12	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0113	CR 90A (Buckeye Rd)	South Fork Willow Slough	2.5 Mi E/O SH 505	80	SD	142	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	1,019	\$4.36	\$4,444.98	\$3,935.14	\$587,015.64	\$509.84	\$76,054.10	See 12/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the bridge deck with methacrylate to fill the cracks..." Recommended 12/14/2011
13	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0046	CR 24	Long Creek	0.25 Mi N/O	93.6	SD	780	Methacrylate Deck treatment	SQFT	4,435	\$4.36	\$19,345.91	\$17,126.94	\$604,142.57	\$2,218.98	\$78,273.07	See 12/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Treat the bridge deck with methacrylate." Recommended 12/12/2011
14	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0073	CR 90A	Replace failed Type A joints		96.9	SD	150	Methacrylate Deck	SQFT	4,572	\$4.36	\$19,943.52	\$17,656.00	\$621,798.57	\$2,287.52	\$80,560.60	bridge deck with methacrylate or similar material to

SUB TOTAL (deck seals)

161,014 \$702,359.17 \$621,798.57 \$80,560.60

15	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0152	CR 22	Sacramento Bypass (Weir)	0.8 Mi N/O I-80 Bridge	93.1	SD	4640	Replace failed Type A joints	LS	1	\$90,958.00	\$90,958.00	\$80,525.11	\$702,323.68	\$10,432.89	\$90,993	Type A pourable seals in the joints of the bridge have failed. See work recommendation dated
16	District 3	Yolo County	Develop next year's BPMP										\$135,000	\$135,000	\$119,515.50	\$821,839	\$15,484.50	\$106,477.99	

SUB TOTAL (Joint Seal)

225,958.00 200,040.61 25,917.39
Total FY 12/13 (rounded) 928,317.00 821,839.00 106,478.00

**Yolo County
Federal Fiscal Year 2014/2015 Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program**

Priority	County Location	Implementing Agency	State Bridge #	Facility Carried	Featured Intersected	Location	Sufficiency Rating	SD/FO Status**	ADT	Work Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Total Participation Cost	Federal Share 88.53%	Running Federal Summary	Local Share	Running Local Summary	Notes
17	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0048	CR 99W	Bird Creek	.85 Mi SE/O CR 8	96.9		2141	Replace decayed bridge timber rail.	LS	1	\$173,938	\$173,938	\$153,987	\$153,987	\$19,951	\$19,951	See 2/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report: "The local agency should consider replacing the timber bridge rail." Rec Date 11/22/2002
18	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0036	CR 90	Cottonwood Slough	.15 Mi N/O CR 24	95.1		290	Install measures to prevent deck drainage from flowing under abutment, repair erosion damage at abutments	LS	1	\$96,261	\$96,261	\$85,220	\$239,207	\$11,041	\$30,992	See 12/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Provide a drainage system at both abutments to prevent water from flowing under the abutment diaphragms. Repair the scour at Abutment 1" Rec Date 12/12/2011.
19	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0118	CR 31	Chikahominy Slough	.27 Mi W/O CR 91A	93.7		675	Repair eroded slopes at abutments by placing rock slope protection.	LS	1	\$78,279	\$78,279	\$69,300	\$308,508	\$8,979	\$39,970	See 12/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Replace eroded slope at the left side of Abutment 2 which includes the eroded soil that supports the MBGR post." Rec Date 10/10/2001. "Repair slope protection and adjacent erosion trench." Rec Date 1/11/1999.
20	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0160	CR 88	North Fork Dunnigan creek	.7 Mi N/O CR 6	97		520	Repair failing embankment erosion control at channel upstream of the bridge.	LS	1	\$50,424	\$50,424	\$44,640	\$353,148	\$5,784	\$45,754	See 1/2011 Caltrans Inspection Report "Place scour protection along the roadway embankment upstream of the bridge." Rec Date 11/22/2002.
21	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0085	CR 32D	Branch Putah Creek	.1 Mi E/O CR 103	44.1		1815	Rehabilitation of deck drainage elements.	LS	1	\$46,580	\$46,580	\$41,237	\$394,385	\$5,343	\$51,097	See 1/2012 Caltrans Inspection Report "Install pipes in the 10 small holes along both sides of the deck to direct the deck drainage away from the concrete surfaces of the underside of the superstructure." Rec Date 4/14/2012. Note: per Yolo county inspector 22 holes total. (3"x1")
22	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0106	CR 87	Creek S14	.01 Mi S/O SH 128	88.5		100	Repair eroded downstream slopes near wing walls by placing rock slope protection.	LS	1	\$50,589	\$50,589	\$44,786	\$439,172	\$5,803	\$56,899	See 1/2006 Caltrans Inspection Report "Place rip-rap on both sides of culvert (downstream) to prevent future corrosion (sic)." Recommended 1/11/2006 Rip rap pl
23	District 3	Yolo County	22C-0094	CR 40A	Pine Creek	.14 Mi N/O SH 16	62.5		20	Embankment erosion repair. Replace MBGR elements & timber posts damaged by rot.	LS	1	\$50,969	\$50,969	\$45,123	\$484,295	\$5,846	\$62,745	See 1/2012 Caltrans Inspection Report "Repair and protect the sloughing embankments on both sides of Abutment 2." Rec Date 11/2/2007 "Replace the missing and rotten timber posts at the left side of Abutment 2." Rec date 7/31/1996 "MBGR bridge rail has rusted spots at random locations but there is no significant section loss. "
SUB TOTAL														\$547,040	\$484,295	\$62,745			

Total FY 14/15 \$547,040 \$484,295 \$62,745

**Yolo County
Federal Fiscal Year 2016/17 Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program**

24	District 3	Yolo County	Develop next year's BPMP(PE)											\$ 25,000.00	\$22,133	\$22,133	\$2,868	\$2,868	
----	------------	-------------	------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------	----------	----------	---------	---------	--

Total FY 2012/13 \$25,000 \$22,133 \$2,868

**Yolo County
Federal Fiscal Year "Beyond" Bridge Preventive Maintenance Program**

25																			
----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Total FY "Beyond" \$0 \$0 \$0

TOTAL (rounded) \$1,605,357 \$1,421,222 \$184,135

Objective Procedures for prioritizing projects

- 1st Priority Work that if not done immediately could result in life safety concerns
- 2nd Priority Work that if not done immediately could result in structural deterioration of an eminent nature.
- Other ranking considerations in priority order
 - 1 Importance of work to preserving structural integrity and ability of County to implement recommended work
 - 2 Rank in priority order by ADT
 - 3 Second rank in priority order by road classification
 - 4 Rank in priority order by SR; keep better maintained bridges maintained in a better condition to extend life
 - 5 Consider other work needed on a given bridge and maximize efficiency in terms of PE and CE by combining other less critical maintenance projects with critical ones