

TABLE 9A-6: Canal Lining Technologies and Cost Estimates

Notes and Assumptions

1 Data Source:

this analysis shows¹ Swihart, J., Haynes, J., *Canal Lining Demonstration Project, Year 10 Final Report*, Bureau of Reclamation
Denver Technical Service Center Civil Engineering Services, Pacific Northwest Region, November 2002
(unit costs have been increased by 75% to account for initial costs in 1990 and other tech. service costs)

2 Construction Cost Includes:

- a contractor mobilization/demobilization
- b supply of liner materials
- c subgrade preparation
- d installation
- e contractor OH and profit

Type of Lining	Construction Cost \$/sq.ft.	Maintenance Cost \$/sq.ft.	Seepage Reduction %	Durability years
Fluid Applied Membrane	\$ 5.02	\$ 0.01	90%	12.5
Concrete Alone	\$ 4.08	\$ 0.01	75%	50
Exposed Geomembrane	\$ 2.68	\$ 0.01	90%	17.5
Geomembrane with Concrete Cover	\$ 4.45	\$ 0.01	95%	50

Chose Concrete lining technique because:

- 1 known technology
- 2 low cost, good seepage efficiency, long life, easy to repair
- 3 ditch shapes can be made standard for easy maintenance

A MRGCD Main Canals (concrete lining)

Canal Shape	Trapezoidal
Typ. Canal Dimensions	bottom w = 25 ft., height = 8 ft., side slopes are 3:1
Sq ft. per foot	41.5
Cost per foot	\$ 169.22

B MRGCD Lateral Canals (concrete lining)

Canal Shape	Trapezoidal
Typ. Canal Dimensions	bottom w = 6 ft., height = 4 ft., side slopes are 3:1
Sq ft. per foot	14.5
Cost per foot	\$ 59.12

C Non MRGCD Main Canals (concrete lining)

Canal Shape	Trapezoidal
Typ. Canal Dimensions	bottom w = 10 ft., height = 5 ft., side slopes are 3:1
Sq ft. per foot	20.5
Cost per foot	\$ 83.59

D Non MRGCD D-Canals (concrete lining)

Canal Shape	Trapezoidal
Typ. Canal Dimensions	bottom w = 4 ft., height = 4 ft., side slopes are 3:1
Sq ft. per foot	12.2
Cost per foot	\$ 49.75