## PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

Three superstructure replacement options were proposed and are briefly described as follows:

Alternative	Pros	Cons
Do Nothing	• No present cost to the town to replace structure	<ul> <li>Poor structural components/scour critical condition need to be addressed</li> <li>Possible closure of the bridge if conditions continue to deteriorate or a severe scour event occurs</li> <li>Higher future construction costs due to inflation</li> <li>No guarantee that the 50% State grant reimbursement program will still be available</li> </ul>
1 – Steel Beams	• The location of the beams can be adjusted to simplify stage construction	<ul> <li>Least cost-effective alternative ~15% more.</li> <li>Longer construction duration due to cast-in-place deck.</li> <li>Longer lead times for steel beam fabrication ~ 6 to 8 months currently being quoted</li> </ul>
2 – NEXT Beams	<ul> <li>Shortest construction duration due to no cast-in-place deck</li> <li>Shallowest superstructure depth requiring the least changes to the vertical geometry to facilitate the ACOE GP-19 SV 1-foot of underclearance permit requirement</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Slightly more expensive than spread box beam ~3%</li> </ul>
3 – Spread Box Beams	<ul> <li>Most cost-effective alternative</li> <li>The location of the beams can be adjusted to simplify stage construction</li> </ul>	• Longer construction duration due to cast-in-place deck.

The proposed bridge rehabilitation will consist of Precast NEXT Beams, which is deemed to have the least maintenance, longer lifespan, and shorter construction duration, in addition to also being the most beneficial hydraulically.