



Designation: F1675 – 13 (Reapproved 2017)

## Standard Practice for Life-Cycle Cost Analysis of Plastic Pipe Used for Culverts, Storm Sewers, and Other Buried Conduits<sup>1</sup>

This standard is issued under the fixed designation F1675; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon ( $\epsilon$ ) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

### 1. Scope\*

1.1 This practice establishes a procedure for using life cycle cost (LCC) analysis techniques to evaluate alternative drainage system designs, using plastic pipe that satisfy the same functional requirements.

1.2 The LCC technique measures the present value of all relevant costs to install, operate, and maintain alternative drainage systems such as engineering, construction, maintenance, rehabilitation, or replacement over a specified period of time. The practice also accommodates any remaining residual or salvage value.

1.3 The decision maker, using the results of the LCC analysis, can then identify the alternative(s) with the lowest estimated total cost based on the present value of all costs.

1.4 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

1.5 *This international standard was developed in accordance with internationally recognized principles on standardization established in the Decision on Principles for the Development of International Standards, Guides and Recommendations issued by the World Trade Organization Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) Committee.*

### 2. Referenced Documents

#### 2.1 Other Standards:

[TM-5-802-1 Economic Studies for Military Construction Design Applications \(12/86\)](#)<sup>2</sup>

[Federal Office of Management and Budget Guidelines and Discount Rates for Benefit-Cost Analysis of Federal Programs and state documents for guidelines or requirements](#)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This practice is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee F17 on Plastic Piping Systems and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee F17.62 on Sewer. Current edition approved Aug. 1, 2017. Published August 2017. Originally approved in 1996. Last previous edition approved in 2013 as F1675-13. DOI: 10.1520/F1675-13R17.

<sup>2</sup> Available from Headquarters, Department of the Army, Washington, DC.

<sup>3</sup> Available from Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC.

#### 2.2 ASTM Adjuncts:

Discount Factor Tables<sup>4</sup>

### 3. Terminology

#### 3.1 Definitions:

3.1.1 *common costs, n*—costs that are common to all alternatives in nature and amount, such as initial planning fees or future annual inspection costs.

3.1.2 *discount rate, n*—the investor's time value of money, expressed as a percent, used to convert costs occurring at different times, to equivalent costs at a common point in time.

3.1.3 *drainage project, n*—a project having a definable, functional drainage requirement that can be satisfied by two or more design or construction alternatives, or both.

3.1.4 *future costs, n*—costs required to keep the system operating that are incurred after the project is placed in service, such as operation, maintenance, rehabilitation, or replacement costs.

3.1.5 *inflation, n*—the general trend or rising prices that, over time, result in the reduction of the purchasing power of the dollar from year to year.

3.1.6 *initial cost, n*—the total of all costs; such as design costs, material purchase costs, and construction/installation costs, that are specific to each alternative and are incurred to bring each alternative to a point of functional readiness.

3.1.7 *maintenance cost, n*—the annual or periodic costs, such as inspection and cleaning to keep a drainage structure functioning for the project design life, but do not extend the material service life.

3.1.8 *material service life, n*—the number of years of service a particular material, system, or structure will provide before rehabilitation or replacement is necessary.

3.1.9 *project design life, n*—the planning horizon for the project, expressed as the number of years of useful life required of the drainage structure.

3.1.10 *rehabilitation cost, n*—the total of all costs incurred to extend the material service life of a specific alternative.

<sup>4</sup> Available from ASTM International Headquarters. Order Adjunct No. [ADJE091703](#).

\*A Summary of Changes section appears at the end of this standard

3.1.11 *replacement cost, n*—the total of all costs incurred to replace a material before the end of the project design life.

3.1.12 *terminal value, n*—the remaining value of the drainage structure in place at the end of the project design life.

#### 4. Summary of Practice

4.1 This practice outlines a procedure for conducting an LCC analysis of two or more drainage pipe alternatives using plastic pipe over a specified project design life. This practice identifies the project data and general assumptions needed for the analysis and the method of computation.

#### 5. Significance and Use

5.1 LCC analysis is an economic method to evaluate alternatives that are characterized by differing cash flows over the designated project design life. The method entails calculating the LCC of each alternative capable of satisfying the functional requirements of the project and comparing them to determine which have the lowest estimated LCC over the project design life.

5.2 The LCC method is particularly suitable for determining whether the higher initial cost of an alternative is economically justified by reductions in future costs (for example, operating maintenance, rehabilitation, or replacement) when compared to an alternative with lower initial costs but higher future costs. If a design alternative has both a lower initial cost and lower future costs than other alternatives, an LCC analysis is not necessary to show the former is the economically preferable choice.

#### 6. Procedure

6.1 The procedure for performing an LCC analysis for drainage pipe applications is as follows:

6.1.1 Identify project objectives, alternatives, and constraints (6.2).

6.1.2 Establish basic assumptions (6.3).

6.1.3 Compile data (6.4).

6.1.4 Compute life cycle cost for each alternative (7.1).

6.1.5 Evaluate results (7.2).

6.2 *Project Objectives, Alternatives, and Constraints:*

6.2.1 Specify the design objective that is to be accomplished, identify alternative systems or designs that accomplish that objective, and identify any constraints that may limit the options to be considered.

6.2.2 An example is the design of a storm water drainage system for a residential development project. The system must satisfy mandated drainage system objectives, such as specified rainfall intensities and storm water runoff limits. Available alternatives, such as different pipe materials and varying configurations of catch basins, ponds, or underground detention chambers may have different initial costs as well as expected future costs. The system design may be constrained by structural and hydraulic limits such as minimum and maximum slopes and depth of burial, limits on surface flows on streets, etc.

6.3 *Basic Assumptions:*

6.3.1 Establish the uniform assumptions to be made in the LCC analysis of all alternatives. These assumptions include the selection of the discount rate, the treatment of inflation, general inflation rate, the project design life, and the desired comprehensiveness of the analysis.

6.3.2 *Discount Rate*—The discount rate selected should reflect the owner’s time value of money. That is, the discount rate should reflect the rate of interest that makes the owner indifferent between paying or receiving a dollar now or at some future time. The discount rate is used to convert costs occurring at different times to equivalent costs at a common point in time.

6.3.2.1 There is no single correct discount rate for all owners. Selection of the discount rate should be guided by the rate of return on alternative investment opportunities of comparable risk (that is, the opportunity cost of capital), or, in the case of some public organizations, on mandated or legislated federal or state requirements. (See Federal Office of Management and Budget.)

6.3.2.2 The discount rate may include general price inflation over the study period. This discount rate is referred to as the “nominal” discount rate in this practice. The discount rate may also be expressed as the real earning power of money over and above general price inflation, referred to as the “real” discount rate.

6.3.2.3 A nominal discount rate ( $d_n$ ) and the corresponding real discount rate ( $d_r$ ) are related as follows:

$$d_r = \frac{1+d_n}{1+I} - 1 \text{ or } d_n = (1+d_r)(1+I) - 1 \quad (1)$$

where:

$I$  = the rate of general price inflation.

6.3.2.4 The same discount rate should be used in evaluating each design alternative. **Annex A1** contains a procedure to follow in developing the discount rate. This procedure may be applied by those who wish to select their own values as well as those who are required to follow mandated or legislated requirements.

6.3.3 *Inflation*—This practice is designed only to accommodate a uniform rate of general inflation. Calculate the LCC in constant dollar terms (not including general inflation) or in current dollar terms (including general inflation). If the latter is used, a consistent projection of general price inflation shall be used throughout the LCC analysis, including adjustment of the discount rate to incorporate general inflation (6.3.2.2). The percentage change in GNP deflator and the Producers Price Index are two broad indicators of general inflation.

6.3.3.1 If the user desires or is required to treat inflation on an incremental (differential) basis, or uniquely to each individual cost component (for example, energy costs), consult either TM-5-802-1 or Discount Factor Tables<sup>4</sup>, respectively.

6.3.4 *Project Design Life*—Establish the project design life (3.1.9) from mandated public policy, legislated requirements, or selection by the owner based on situation requirements. Use the same design life for each alternative under comparison and for all categories of cost under consideration. The potential for future obsolescence, that is, the potential that future changes may modify drainage system requirements, should be considered in selecting project design life.

6.3.5 *Comprehensiveness*—The appropriate degree of precision and detail to use in an LCC analysis is dependent upon the intended use of the analysis. A less comprehensive or detailed analysis may be sufficient to roughly rank many alternatives, whereas a more comprehensive analysis may be necessary to select from among a few close alternatives. In any case, omitting significant factors from an LCC analysis diminishes the usefulness of the results.

6.3.6 *Sensitivity Analysis*—No analysis is more precise than the accuracy of the data and assumptions used in the calculation. When there is uncertainty regarding basic assumptions (for example, cost estimates, design life, discount rate, etc.) calculate the LCC for a range of assumptions. The results of these calculations will show the user the extent to which the results are sensitive to variations of the key assumptions.

6.4 *Compiling Data*—Compile the data specific to each alternative under consideration.

6.4.1 *Initial Costs*—The estimated dollar amount of all costs is required to bring the alternative system to a point of functional readiness.

6.4.2 *Material Service Life*—Material service life is the number of years of service expected of the alternative under study, which varies depending upon the pipe material, the environment, effluent, and application. Potential changes in environmental conditions which may affect the material service life should be considered. Use job site tests, published reports, manufacturer product data, and local experience to establish service life for each material. If material service life is less than the project design life (3.1.9), the analysis shall include the future cost to sufficiently extend the service life through rehabilitation or replacement, in order to at least equal the project design life.

6.4.3 *Future Costs*—Cost estimates should be made for all significant items that are estimated to be required to allow the drainage system to satisfy performance requirements over the project design life. Common costs (1.1) may be excluded without affecting the relative ranking of the alternatives under study. The cost estimates should be made in constant dollars (not including inflation) in the same time frame as the estimate of initial costs.

6.4.3.1 *Operating Cost*—Operating cost is an estimate of the annual cost for labor, power, and consumable materials and supplies required to operate a drainage system. Except for pumped systems, most drainage systems do not have significant annual operating costs.

6.4.3.2 *Maintenance Cost*—Maintenance cost includes cost estimates and the frequency of any inspection, cleaning, and minor repair necessary to keep the system operating at capacity during the project design life.

6.4.3.3 *Rehabilitation Cost*—Rehabilitation cost is the cost of major repairs to extend the material service life to equal or exceed the project design life. If more than one rehabilitation is anticipated, the years in which the rehabilitation are planned should be noted.

6.4.3.4 *Replacement Cost*—Replacement cost is the timing and cost estimate for complete replacement of any drainage system component. Take care to see if the service life of the replaced material or component will at least equal the remain-

ing project design life. If not, rehabilitation or further replacement will be necessary.

6.4.3.5 *Terminal Value*—Terminal value is the value of the drainage system at the end of the project design life. The potential residual or salvage value of a drainage system is dependent upon some of the factors considered in establishing project design life. For example, if a storm sewer is being evaluated and a long project design life (75 years) is used, consideration should be given to risk of future obsolescence. If the likelihood of functional obsolescence is high, then there may be no residual or salvage value. If, however, it is expected the material could be removed and either reused or sold, then the net cash value (in constant dollars) represents the terminal value. It is not recommended to use a residual value to reflect an economic value for any remaining material life in excess of the project design life. As an alternative, if the functional requirements of the system under design are for an indefinite period, then consideration should be given to increasing the project design life to an appropriately higher value, where the residual value would not significantly affect the comparison of the various alternatives.

## 7. Calculations

7.1 *Computing Life Cycle Costs*—To compute the LCC for a drainage system, all relevant cost flows over the design life of the project are discounted back to the present and summed.

7.1.1 Find the present value (*PV*) of each cost category [for example, initial cost (*IC*), operating and maintenance (*M*), rehabilitation or repair (*R*) and terminal value (*T*)] using the appropriate discount formula in this section. Then sum these present values to find *PVLCC*, for example,

$$PVLCC = PVIC + PVM + PVR - PVT \quad (2)$$

7.1.2 Initial costs are assumed to occur in the base year (year zero). No discounting is required.

7.1.3 Future costs expected to occur at a single point in time (for example, rehabilitation costs) may be discounted to present value by multiplying the estimated current cost of the item by the single present value factor as follows:

$$PVA_s = A_s \left( \frac{1}{1 + d_r} \right)^n \quad (3)$$

where:

$A_s$  = single amount,

$d_r$  = real discount rate (Annex A1), and

$n$  = number of years from year zero to time of future single amount expenditure.

NOTE 1—The factor developed in Eq 3 is generally known as the present value factor and may be found in financial tables of discount rates.

7.1.4 Future costs expected to occur in about the same amount (in constant dollars) from year to year (for example, operating or maintenance costs) may be discounted to present value as follows:

$$PVA_r = A_r \frac{(1 + d_r)^n - 1}{d_r (1 + d_r)^n} \quad (4)$$

where:

$A_r$  = recurring annual amount,

$d_r$  = real discount rate (Annex A1), and  
 $n$  = number of years.

NOTE 2—The factor developed in Eq 4 is generally referred to as the Uniform Present Worth factor and may be found in financial tables of discount rates.

### 7.2 Comparing Life Cycle Costs:

7.2.1 After calculating the LCC for each alternative, compare them to determine which alternative has the lowest LCC.

7.2.2 If the functional performance of the two alternatives is equal, (or if performance differences are recognized in the computation), the alternative(s) with the lowest estimated LCC is economically preferred.

7.2.3 The effect of variations in key assumptions on the life cycle costs may be developed by a sensitivity analysis. By varying the discount rate, material service life, and the timing and magnitude of future costs, the decision maker determines which factors have the greatest effect on the life cycle cost of each alternatives.

## 8. Keywords

8.1 cost analysis; discount rate; drainage system; engineering economics; least cost; life-cycle cost; material service life; present value analysis; project design life

## ANNEX

### (Mandatory Information)

#### A1. DISCOUNT RATE PROCEDURE

A1.1 *General*—This procedure guides the user in developing a real discount rate, that is, the long-term rate of return over and above the general rate of inflation. This procedure may be used by those who are required to use rates specified by mandate or legislated requirement, as well as those who desire to select their own values. The procedure does not recommend any specific rates. That selection is up to the user and should be made based on the considerations described, in 6.3.2.1.

1. Is there a discounted rate that must be used by policy, mandate or legislated requirements? (check one):
  - 1(a)  Yes, if yes, the discount rate is \_\_\_\_%.
  - 1(b)  No, proceed to Question 2.

2.  Does the discount rate in 1(a) include inflation? (check one):
  - 2(a)  Yes, if yes, the inflation rate is \_\_\_\_% (proceed to 3).
  - 2(b)  No. The rate shown in 1(a) is "real" discount rate (excludes general inflation) and may be used as " $d_r$ " Eq 3 and Eq 4.
3. If no discount rate is mandated, there are two approaches possible:
  - 3(a) Select a long-term percentage rate of return on invested money, over and above the general rate of inflation. This value may be used as " $d_r$ " in Eq 3 and Eq 4.
  - 3(b) Select a nominal discount rate (including general inflation): \_\_\_\_% =  $d_n$ .
  - 3(c) Select a long-term rate of general inflation: \_\_\_\_% =  $I$ .
  - 3(d) Calculate the real discount rate,  $d_r$  for use in Eq 3 and Eq 4.

$$d_r = \frac{1 + d_n}{1 + I} - 1$$

## SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Committee F17 has identified the location of selected changes to this standard since the last issue (F1675–09) that may impact the use of this standard.

(I) Deleted non-mandatory appendix application of practice problem.

*ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.*

*This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.*

*This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org). Permission rights to photocopy the standard may also be secured from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, Tel: (978) 646-2600; http://www.copyright.com/*