

UMTA Technical Assistance and Safety Program Office of Technical Assistance and Safety

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION LINHBARY

# 13D Rapid Rail Vehicles and Systems

HE 4221 .S34 1991

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Report No.			····	
	2. Government Acces	sion No. (NTIS)	3. Recipient's Cotolog !	No,
UMTA-MD-08-7001-91-1	PB-91-183-	-087	UMTRIS/UMTA S	ECTION 8
. Title and Subtitle			5. Report Date	F 1001
Light Rail Transit Capital Cost Study			April	. 5, 1991
			D. Ferforming Urgenizet	ion Lode
			8. Performing Organizati	an Report No.
7. Author's) Donald C. Schneck,	Richard M. Am	odei and		
Michael G. Ferreri			10 West Heading (TDA)	
Booz Allen & Hamilton Inc.			TO: WOR UNIT NO. (IRA:	(2)
Transportation Consulting Division			11. Contract or Grant No	<b>.</b>
1700 Market Street	aler -	CONTRACTOR OF	MD-08-7001	
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103		DEPARTIN	13. Type of Report and I	Period Covered
U.S. Department of Transp	ortation	TRANSPORT		
Urban Mass Transportation	Administratio	(UMTA)	1	
400 Seventh Street, S.W.		JUN	14. Joonsoring Agency C	Iode
Washington, D.C. 20590			UTS-11	
15. Supplementory Notes		-HERAR		
		- Landard - Andrews		
necessary to operate mass the initial effort at the rail mode of passenger ra	s transit busw is overall obj ail systems.	truct and procu ay and rail sys ective by conce The term light	re the various tems. The repo ntrating on the rail refers mor	assets rt documents light e to this
necessary to operate mass the initial effort at the rail mode of passenger ra- mode's relative simplicity vehicle weight or cost. systems can operate in mass Service can be operated and articulated vehicle and line with passenger deman over the past ten years, of the system operating a information that formed a	s transit busw is overall obj ail systems. Ty and operation with an overh- twed traffic at the single or multiple leets that per- the seven light were the focu- agencies respon- the basis of the	truct and procu ay and rail sys ective by conce The term light onal flexibilit ead power suppl nd various alig ulti-unit train rmit close serv ht rail systems s of this proje nded with perti his study.	re the various tems. The repo ntrating on the rail refers mor y rather than a y source, light nment configura s of standards ice level desig that were deve ct. However, on nent capital com	assets rt documents light e to this ctual rail tions. n in loped nly five st
<pre>necessary to operate mass the initial effort at the rail mode of passenger ray mode's relative simplicity vehicle weight or cost. systems can operate in mass Service can be operated the and articulated vehicle the line with passenger demand over the past ten years, of the system operating a information that formed the Nail System Light Rail Transit Busway</pre>	s transit busw is overall obj ail systems. Ty and operation with an overh- ixed traffic at in single or multiple the stat per ind. Seven light were the focus agencies respon- the basis of the	18. Dismibution Stored multi-unit train study.	re the various tems. The repo ntrating on the rail refers mor y rather than a y source, light nment configura s of standards ice level desig that were deve ct. However, or nent capital com- nent capital com- nent capital T rvice (NTIS) 1 Road	assets rt documents light e to this ctual rail tions. n in loped nly five st ilable to the echnical
<ul> <li>necessary to operate mass the initial effort at the rail mode of passenger ray mode's relative simplicity vehicle weight or cost.</li> <li>systems can operate in mass Service can be operated and articulated vehicle and line with passenger demand over the past ten years, of the system operating a information that formed and</li> <li>Key Words</li> <li>Rail System Light Rail Transit Busway</li> </ul>	s transit busw is overall obj ail systems. Ty and operation with an overh- ixed traffic at in single or multiple leets that per ad. Seven lig were the focu- agencies respon- the basis of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of the state of	18. Dismibution Stored public through Information Se Springfield, V (703) 487-4650	re the various tems. The repo ntrating on the rail refers mor y rather than a y source, light nment configura s of standards ice level desig that were deve ct. However, on nent capital com- nent capital com- ne	assets rt documents light e to this ctual rail tions. n in loped nly five st ilable to the echnical
<ul> <li>necessary to operate mass the initial effort at the rail mode of passenger ray mode's relative simplicity vehicle weight or cost.</li> <li>systems can operate in mass Service can be operated and articulated vehicle and articulated vehicle and articulated vehicle and over the pass ten years, of the system operating a information that formed and information that formed and information that formed and Light Rail Transit Busway</li> <li>19. Security Clossif. (of this report)</li> </ul>	20. Security Clear	<pre>truct and procu ay and rail sys ective by conce The term light onal flexibilit ead power suppl nd various alig ulti-unit train rmit close serv ht rail systems s of this proje nded with perti his study.</pre> 18. Distribution Stored public through Information Se 5285 Port Roya Springfield, V (703) 487-4650	re the various tems. The repo ntrating on the rail refers mor y rather than a y source, light nment configura s of standards ice level desig that were deve ct. However, or nent capital con nent capital con the National T rvice (NTIS) 1 Road irginia 22161	assets rt documents light e to this ctual rail tions. n in loped nly five st ilable to the echnical 22. Price (NTIS

Form DOT F 1700.7 (8-72)

Reproduction of completed page authorized



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	1
INTRODUCTION	3
STATEMENT OF PURPOSE	5
Introduction	5
Background	6
Objectives	7
STUDY APPROACH	9
METHOD OF APPLICATION	13
Candidate Systems	13
Portland	13
Sacramento	14
San Jose	14
Pittsburgh	15
Los Angeles	15
Cost Elements	16
System Description	17
Guideway Elements	18
Yards and Shops	19
System Elements	20
Stations	21
Vehicles	21
Special Conditions	2 2
Right-of-Way	23
Project Soft Costs	24
RESULTS	25
Summary Cost Overview	2 6
System Cost Summaries	27
Comparative Unit Costs	3 0

# APPENDIX: CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



# List of Exhibits

Exhibit Number		Following Page
1	Range of Unit Costs (Guideway Elements)	19
2	Range of Unit Costs (Yards & Shops)	20
3	Range of Unit Costs (Systems)	20
4	Range of Unit Costs (Stations)	21
5	Range of Unit Costs (Vehicles)	22
6	Range of Unit Costs (Special Conditions)	23
7	Range of Unit Costs (Right-of-Way)	24
8	Range of Unit Costs (Soft-Costs)	24
9	Summary of Light Rail System Characteristics	25
10	Summary Costs and Percentages of "As Built" Project Costs by Category	26
11	Summary of System Unit Costs	26
12	Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District Capital Costs by Project Category	27
13	Sacramento Regional Transit District Capital Costs by Project Category	28
14	Santa Clara County Transportation Agency Capital Costs by Project Category	28
15	Port Authority of Allegheny County Capital Costs by Project Category	29
16	Los Angeles County Transportation Commission Capital Costs by Project Category	29



# List of Exhibits (continued)

Exhibit Number		Following Page
17	Guideway Costs Per Linear Foot	3 0
18	Summary Yards and Shops Costs and Features	31
19	Summary Systems Costs	32
20	Summary Stations Costs and Features	32
21	Summary of Special Conditions Costs	32
22	Summary of Right-of-Way and Related Costs	32
23	Summary of Project Soft Costs	33

- iii -

### PREFACE

This document was prepared for the Office of Technical Assistance and Safety of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration (UMTA). The study was conducted by the Transportation Consulting Division of Booz-Allen & Hamilton Inc. through a task order funding grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation, Urban Mass Transportation Administration. Guidance was provided through both the Office of Technical Assistance and Safety and the Office of Grants Management. Technical support was provided by Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade & Douglas in the development of the data collection format and Gibbs & Hill in the review of the cost input and unit cost results. The contents of this report are based on the project staff research and do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the U.S. Department of Transportation or the Urban Mass Transportation Administration.

This report was authored by Donald C. Schneck, Richard M. Amodei and Michael G. Ferreri of Booz-Allen with technical assistance from Dr. Fred Ducca and Ghassan Salameh of Booz Allen, Thomas Jenkins of Parsons Brinkerhoff, and David Weiss of Gibbs & Hill. Valuable insight and direction was contributed by Edward Thomas and Ron Jensen-Fisher of UMTA. The authors would like to express their appreciation for the assistance and information provided by the light rail transit systems that became a part of this Fixed Guideway Capital Cost Study. Employees and consultants of these agencies were very helpful in furnishing detailed construction cost information of each system element and then reviewing the initial results.

The Fixed Guideway Capital Cost Study is an attempt to develop a capital cost data base of actual unit costs to construct and procure the various assets necessary to operate mass transit busway and rail systems. This report documents the initial effort at this overall objective by concentrating on the light rail transit mode of passenger rail systems. The term light rail refers more to this mode's relative simplicity and



operational flexibility rather than actual vehicle weight or cost. With an overhead power supply source, light rail systems can operate in mixed traffic and various alignment configurations. Service can be operated in single or multi-unit trains of standard and articulated vehicle fleets that permit close service level design in line with passenger demand. Seven light rail systems that were developed over the past ten years, were the focus of this project. However, only five of the system operating agencies responded with pertinent capital cost information that formed the basis of this study.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the results of the study to document actual construction and related developmental costs for the most recentlyconstructed light rail transit systems in the United States. With the successful opening of the San Diego Trolley in 1981, other U S cities have followed with the development of their own light rail systems. Through the decade of the 1980's, a total of seven light rail systems were constructed or significantly reconstructed.

- San Diego inaugurated initial line service in 1981;
- Buffalo began service in 1985;
- Portland opened service in 1986;
- Sacramento initiated service in 1987;
- San Jose opened their first segment in 1987;
- Los Angeles initiated service (1990) to Long Beach; and,
- Pittsburgh reopened service on their line in 1988.

These new light rail systems represent an important investment of public funds in the passenger transportation industry. The documentation of the actual component capital costs of these systems represents an opportunity to help prepare realistic capital cost estimates in the planning and engineering of the next set of systems.

This project has been sponsored by UMTA, of the U. S. Department of Transportation to document the actual construction and procurement costs of all component assets and related developmental costs for each system. The study objectives included an examination of unit cost characteristics that could be pertinent to the planning of similar systems, such as the distribution of costs by component categories, consistent unit cost ranges, and commonalities of component types and capacity requirements for a light rail system. The Office of Technical Assistance and Safety, Capital Development Division directed the study with the assistance of the Office of Grants Management Planning Analysis and Support Division.

This fixed guideway capital cost study is intended to provide a data base of actual unit costs for the various asset components used in the construction of light rail transit systems. The transit authorities operating these recently-completed light rail systems supplied the basic component cost data and then examined the translation of their cost data into the reporting structure for interpretational consistency. The resulting component cost information is intended to assist agencies in the planning and engineering stages to better prepare capital cost estimates for proposed new systems or lines.

This study and resulting report did not attempt to evaluate or explain the unit cost variances among the systems or the effectiveness of component type and capacity decisions. There are many reasons for these differences that reach beyond the analytical scope and objectives of this study. The size of this study sample did not support the establishment of statistically significant norms or variances in each of the cost categories. This was likely due to the unique characteristics of each system that exceed standard unit cost and capacity calculations. This report should not be construed as a follow-up to the UMTA Report "Urban Rail Transit Projects: Forecast Versus Actual Ridership And Costs". There was no explicit or implied effort to prepare any cost effectiveness comparisons of these systems. In addition, no attempt was made to critique the planning, engineering, procurement, construction management and construction costs incurred in the development of each system.

## **STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

#### Introduction

This fixed guideway capital cost study represents the first in a series of studies to examine the actual costs of major transit capital investments. This report presents the results of the first task to focus on the recent light rail projects that have been developed during the 1980's. Following studies will utilize this basic analysis structure and apply it to the other transit fixed guideway modes that have been implemented recently.

The information presented in this report should be used in line with the objectives posed for the study. The range of component unit costs should not be confused with any measures of efficiency since there remain other cost sensitive factors that lie outside those measured here. Further, the basic design philosophy of each system will directly affect unit and total costs. For example, some systems adopt a minimum cost design approach while others add amenities to attract higher market share. Station designs are a good example of these different developmental approaches. These effects on unit and total component costs do not easily conform to the quantitative focus of this study.

The component cost ranges produced in this report should provide a test for reasonableness of planning-level capital cost estimates and some guidance on the number and type of assets required for a light rail project. The cost ranges could also be used as a measure of project complexity and overall service levels and passenger carrying capacity -- the more complex and/or greater ridership demand, the more likely the project costs would tend toward the higher end of each component cost range. In addition, site conditions and interpretational provisions will have some direct effect upon the unit cost results. These effects should all be considered with the use of the information presented in this report.

#### **Background**

Capital cost estimates are key ingredients in determining the cost effectiveness, financial capacity and overall engineering feasibility of major capital investments. Fixed guideway transit systems, which involve Federal funding are developed in accordance with the Major Capital Investment Policy This policy established a structured decision-making process that requires the careful development of costs, benefits and impacts of proposed systems. Reliable capital cost estimates are an important element of the investment decision process. The project development study process for major capital investments includes system planning, alternatives analysis and preliminary engineering. Since capital cost estimates are key ingredients to the decisions reached in each of the project study phases, the results of this study are intended to help guide the preparation of these capital costs through the availability of pertinent unit cost information and the typical asset requirements of a fixed guideway transit project.

An important aspect of the cost estimation procedures is the development of "Composite Unit Costs for Sections and Stations." The purpose of this study is to improve the accuracy and comparative compatibility of the capital cost estimates of the various systems under study. The benefit to the industry is the opportunity to check the reasonableness of planning-level cost estimates with the actual experience of building similar systems nationwide.

Good methods and reliable cost information are particularly important when comparing cost effectiveness and financial impacts among alternative capital investment projects. These comparisons require cost information that is compatible among alternative investments and reasonably in line with actual construction and procurement costs of each proposed system under study. More certainty of cost estimates and less variation 'o actual costs is more critical given the limited governmental

funding capacity and the expanded funding demand posed by the increased number of new systems requesting these capital funds.

In the recent past, preliminary capital cost estimates have often underestimated the actual costs and possibly blurred the alternative cost effectiveness decision. More importantly, underestimated capital costs have in the past stretched project financing plans, since required contributions from each funding source increased upon implementation -sometimes beyond the capacity of certain funding mechanisms. On the Federal side, funding priorities were necessary to accommodate project cost increases, which sometimes led to decreased or delayed funding elsewhere. State and local funding sources were less able to directly absorb capital cost increases, leading to more difficult funding decisions.

The differences between planning estimates and actual construction cost results often include other impacts of ongoing project development, such as:.

- Changes in the scope of the project;
- Changes in design standards;
- Unforeseen complexities in field conditions;
- Expanded environmental & community responsibilities; and
- Difficulties in implementation.

The sum of these cost impacts, coupled with the underestimation of unit costs and omission of some asset requirements, identifies most of the causes behind the underestimation of capital costs. A data base of actual project experiences on quantities and unit costs for major capital investments should help improve the degree of confidence in planninglevel capital cost estimates.

#### **Objectives**

The size and complexity of the issues behind the underestimation of planning-level capital cost estimates required a careful review of causal

factors. The technical analysis was focused on where the most benefit could be achieved from an examination of actual project development experience. The objectives of the study were then defined as:

- To provide UMTA with the unit cost information to check the reasonableness of the capital cost estimates for major capital projects at the various stages of development;
- To provide local and state transportation planning agencies and consultants with experience-based cost information that could be used in generating more accurate and consistent capital cost estimates; and
- To reduce some of the original data collection effort needed to generate unit capital cost data for each study.

These objectives were then used to guide the study in the documentation and analysis of actual capital costs of five recent light rail transit projects.

## **STUDY APPROACH**

The study approach concentrated on the development of a data base of actual unit capital costs that could be drawn from actual system development experience. The two key requirements of the data base were the consistent definition of capital asset components and the identification of actual construction and procurement costs at the same level of detail. The workplan structure to meet these technical needs and the overall study objectives included six tasks:

- Identify candidate systems;
- Develop data collection guide;
- Complete data collection survey;
- Prepare file structure and layout;
- Refine data base results; and
- Publish the results.

This task structure was followed in the conduct of the study with varying levels of effort required for each candidate system.

This project focused on the recently constructed light rail transit systems designed and built over the last ten years. Light rail systems were selected as the initial system mode for this analysis, since more systems have been constructed within this system definition and the resulting data base would be the most complete.

There were several steps followed to assemble the complete data base. These included:

- 1. Definition of a comprehensive list of cost categories and subsets;
- 2. Development of a data collection guide form;
  - 9



- 3. Submission of the data collection guide form to target systems for completion;
- Checking of returned forms for completeness and/or misunderstandings;
- 5. Follow-up phone calls and, in several cases, site visits to fill in missing data and clarification of misunderstandings;
- 6. Entry of data into spreadsheet data base;
- 7. Return of spreadsheet to target systems for checking and verification; and
- 8. Editing and finalization of data base.

The development of the data collection guide was accomplished through a cooperative effort of industry professionals representing system operators, funding agencies, engineering and planning firms, and study professionals. The guide was important because it formalized the initial definition of asset components and established the minimum level of unit cost detail. Summary asset categories were included at appropriate subtotal levels to provide more comparative unit cost information, and accommodate systems with a more consolidated level of cost information. The data collection guide was then distributed to each of the candidate systems for Continuous interaction between project staff and system completion. operating staff was necessary to clarify the request; assist in the interpretation of special conditions; and adapt the original data base structure and component definitions to better fit the composition of the available cost information.

The data base file structure was constructed around the format of the data collection guide. As the  $d_{a+a}$  collection guides were returned, the cost information was entered into the data system for review and analysis. The data file was prepared in a Lotus 1-2-3 spreadsheet system for ease of

access in this project and later additions of other fixed guideway transit modes. A Lotus 1-2-3 add-in system Impress, was used to prepare the final data base and exhibit graphics for final publication.

Cost values were entered into the data base at the finest level of detail provided by each agency. Costs and quantities at the subsystem level were subtotaled into system level costs. Unit costs were calculated at each level of cost detail available. Unit costs were then updated into a constant 1990 dollar value using published construction cost indices. These 1990 dollar values were then normalized using nationwide cost indices to standardize the unit cost values from each city and form a more comparative cost basis.

The individual category unit costs were indexed to reach a consistent level of comparability. Individual unit costs were indexed in two separate ways. The first method involved inflating the costs to a consistent time basis. All costs were inflated to a Year 1990 base using the following formula and the historical cost indices published by *Means Construction Cost Data*.

Cost in Year 1990 = Index in Construction Year \* Construction Year Cost

Means Construction Cost Indices are published annually by the R.S. Means Company, Inc. and are also available through the Engineering News-Record. City Cost Indices from the same 1990 Means report were then applied to the Year 1990 unit costs to normalize to a consistent nationwide comparative cost basis. The total weighted average construction cost indices were applied, representing all construction types and including both material and installation costs.

Nationwide Average Unit Cost = Unit Cost in City A \* Cost Index for City A

The nationwide average cost basis of 100 represents the 30 major city cost average as of January 1, 1990. This provides the unit cost comparative basis for the fixed guideway capital cost categories. The cost index for each of the five light rail cities that were used in this study are the following values.

- Portland 99.0
- Sacramento 91.0
- San Jose 80.0
- Pittsburgh 99.4
- Los Angeles 87.6

These five light rail cities all have nationwide cost indices that are less than 100, which indicates that construction costs in those cities exceed the 30 major city cost average as of January 1990. This results in nationwide 1990 unit costs that are consistently lower than the city 1990 unit costs for the same capital cost category.

The data base in Appendix A - E includes all three of the basic costs: 1) actual cost; 2) 1990 costs for each city; and 3) 1990 by city normalized to the nationwide average. Costs presented in the body of the report are 1990 costs normalized to the nationwide comparative basis for each city.

## **METHOD OF APPLICATION**

The estimation of capital costs in project planning is typically based on the definition of alignment conditions, capital asset requirements and unit cost measures of each asset category. The unique alignment conditions and their impact on unit capital costs should be represented by the cost ranges measured for each component. Therefore, development of the study data base concentrated on actual unit capital costs and quantities that should help guide the capital cost estimates under development for the current round of cities considering light rail transit systems.

#### Candidate Systems

This study concentrated on the actual construction and procurement costs of the light rail transit systems developed over the past few years. Of these seven systems, five were able to provide the type of actual capital cost information necessary for this project. A general description of these five systems, their size, type, complexity and operating characteristics are presented below. System developmental conditions and other unique local conditions and expectations should be carefully considered before drawing any conclusions about the relative costs and how they may be applied to other system plans.

**Portland** - Regional public transportation is operated by the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (Tri-Met). Portland's light rail system was opened in September 1986 and was christened "MAX", for metropolitan area express. The 15-mile east-west alignment is mostly at-grade with some elevated sections along joint highway alignments. The line utilizes reserved rights-of-way in city streets, arterials and highway medians to connect the city of Gresham and other eastern suburbs with central Portland. Passenger access is through 25 at-grade stations that provide spacing of less than one mile and easy walk-on accessibility for most of the alignment length. Only 5 stations offer park-and-ride facilities, but almost all stations have coordinated bus

·
transfer facilities. A 26 vehicle articulated fleet operates the full service schedule requirement of 22 peak vehicles with the remaining 4 for scheduled maintenance.

Sacramento -- The Sacramento Light Rail Project became operational with the opening of the first phase in 1987. This first phase includes both the Northeast and Folsom Lines connected through downtown Sacramento. This phase is mostly composed of a single-track main line with double-track passing sections along about 40% of the length. The alignment utilizes unused freeway and abandoned railroad rights-ofway for most of its length. There are 101 grade crossings along this first phase development, indicating the limited investment in guideway The downtown portion was constructed within city streets in elements. both a dedicated transit mall and a mixed traffic operation. The design philosophy was a low-cost approach using off-the-shelf technology and atgrade construction to minimize total project capital costs. However, Sacramento did note a preference for double track designs for the existing and proposed lines, and a priority for the existing line conversion to double track. A total of 28 passenger stations are included in this phase, with seven suburban stations offering parking facilities, and six with bus transfer facilities.

San Jose -- The Guadalupe Corridor Project, opened in December 1987, connects the cities of San Jose and Santa Clara with the surrounding suburban areas. The initial phase of the light rail system consists of a 20mile North Line that is mainly located along the median area of major roadways and along a transitway through downtown San Jose. The alignment is at-grade along the full length and includes very little in new structural requirements. Only one bridge and two overpasses in new guideway facilities were necessary to connect the full length of the alignment. Almost the entire line is double-tracked with only two small sections of single-track operation. There are presently 22 stations in operation with the planned expansion to 30 upon completion  $\Im$  the proposed full line length to the southern sections of San Jose. This S $\cap$ uth Line extension will add ten more miles of right-of-way to this light rail

system, but since construction was not completed at the time of this study and actual final construction costs were not available, this section was not included in our project. However, some of the original system elements and support facilities included in this study for the North Line were designed to include this additional South Line operational needs and corresponding cost impacts.

**<u>Pittsburgh</u>** -- The Port Authority of Allegheny County (PAT) has extensively rehabilitated the previous trolley car alignment and built new extensions to the South Hills Light Rail Line. The expanded service is referred to as Stage I and includes 12.5 miles of new alignment construction and 12 miles of complete right-of-way rehabilitation. The downtown Pittsburgh service is now operated in a 1.6 mile subway alignment, that is fully grade separated and free of traffic congestionrelated delay. The suburban alignment includes sections of new trackage over previously unused rail right-of-way and rebuilt trackage and structure along the existing right-of-way. The availability of unused rail alignments provided some low-cost opportunities that contrast with the high-cost subway alignment in the downtown business district area. Transfer connections are provided to local bus services at nine suburban stations plus to regional and busway services at downtown stations. Service and passenger levels have increased when the new and rehabilitated services were implemented and continue to expand. A Stage II plan will next consider expansion of this light rail network into other high density travel areas.

<u>Los Angeles</u> - The Metro Blue Line connects Long Beach with downtown Los Angeles along a 22.6-mile, mostly at-grade (approximately 80%), and dedicated alignment, that includes a subway section and connection to the Metro Red Line (currently under construction) in downtown Los Angeles. This line was constructed as the first part of a regional network of rail service, serving the entire Los Angeles area. Initial service was inaugurated in July, 1990 over almost the full le. gth, and since February, 1991, into the tunnel connection in central Lo<sup> $\circ$ </sup> Angeles. There are 28 highway, 4 pedestrian and two at-grade railroad

crossings that required warning and control systems. The full alignment is double-tracked except for the one-directional loop in downtown Long Beach. The Blue Line was designed as a modern and more state-of-the-art rail line including connections with other planned lines along its length. There are 22 stations with only 5 offering parking facilities. One station is underground with connections to the Red Line, three on elevated sections, and one combined aerial/at-grade station with a link to the planned Green Line. The service and ridership levels were anticipated at fairly high rates, which required sophisticated control and support systems for this light rail line.

These five light rail transit systems were able to supply actual capital cost information in the format necessary for this study data base. The cost information provided by each agency reflected the full construction and systems procurement costs for the assets described in these candidate descriptions and supported by the detail in the appended data base listings for each system.

#### Cost Elements

The development of the project data base utilized fairly standard asset component definitions and requested capital cost information at the system and subsystem level. These system and subsystem definitions formed the basis to the structure of the project cost information request. The completion of the information requests by each agency required some flexibility in the level of detail and category definitions of the original request, since unique conditions were encountered in the design, construction and procurement for every light rail system. The individual contracting mechanisms and work scope within each construction or procurement contract directly affected the level of cost detail available for this capital cost data base. For example, when construction bids were contracted for certain line sections, some contractors provided the component cost details for the individual subsystems, while others were not required and submitted only total cost proposals. Only through

extensive research were the operating agencies able to generate the actual cost details, including appropriate subsystem change orders.

The structure of the resulting study data base reflected a consistent format at the subsystem level of detail for every light rail line. The data base format was established under nine major cost categories:

- 0.00 System description;
- 1.00 Guideway elements;
- 2.00 Yards and shops;
- 3.00 System elements;
- 4.00 Stations;
- 5.00 Vehicles;
- 6.00 Special conditions;
- 7.00 Right-of-way; and
- 8.00 Project soft costs.

These eight cost elements were each divided into the related system and subsystems included within each cost category. Units of measure were defined at each of the cost levels from subsystem up to system and category costs. The majority of guideway and right-of-way unit costs were measured in terms of linear feet, while the systems unit costs were mainly measured in terms of each system component. Unit costs which are calculated on either a per mile or per linear foot of guideway basis are defined by overall guideway length, as opposed to track miles, since the actual subsystem cost information was not available by single track and double track sections. In other words, a one mile section of guideway was presented in a combined or average guideway type mile, whether it is a single track or a double track section. The guideway elements were segmented into the various alignment grades and track construction types.

<u>System Description</u> - A general information section was included at the beginning of each project information request to summarize the overall characteristics of each light rail system. Areas covered in this section include network or line size, service levels and

staffing levels by general categories. The intention of this section was to gauge the system sizing and service level complexities to better understand some of the unit cost differences among the rail systems and the individual asset components. The size and service section quantifies the length and breadth of the line, stations, and auto access facilities; revenue vehicles available and scheduled for service at peak and midday time periods; and, frequency of peak and off-peak services. Staffing levels were also included to size the system manpower requirements by functional area of light rail operation.

**Guideway Elements** -- This asset category includes the alignment components of track and structural requirements along the entire right-of-way. Capital cost information was requested for each alignment grade and track construction technique. Generally, there are two types of track construction for passenger rail systems - - direct fixation and ballast base. These two main construction techniques were segmented further for mixed traffic track alignments such as embedded and in-pavement ballasted. The alignment grades included all relevant categories that represented significant cost impact such as:

- At-grade;
- Elevated structure;
- Elevated, retained fill;
- Elevated fill;
- Subway; and
- Retained cut.

The asset requirements and capital cost of most all guideway elements were covered by guideway types. Each of these guideway elements were measured in linear feet. Special trackwork and structures were treated separately and noted for each system. The unique construction and operating conditions posed by each system make this category the highest overall cost component of these light rail passenger systems.

Exhibit 1 presents the summary of guideway costs which represented on average, 33% of total project costs, exclusive of the planning/engineering/developmental type soft costs. This summary of actual guideway unit costs presents the number of data entries or observations for each guideway element, plus the minimum, mean, maximum, and range of unit cost values. The unit costs presented in this summary represent the constant dollar values in 1990 dollars, calculated from the original construction cost and year of construction, and then normalized to the nationwide comparative standard using the *Means* construction cost indices.

Guideway element costs in total, ranged from a minimum of \$428 per linear foot to a maximum of \$1,508 per linear foot. This leads to a wide cost range of over \$1,000, which illustrates the extensive cost variation from a mainly single track at-grade alignment to the more sophisticated, higher service volume systems that include mainly grade separated and some subway alignment. The mean or average guideway cost of \$1,016 per linear foot is pertinent if the planned alignment is not sufficiently defined to select one of the more specific unit cost values. The lowest cost guideway was the ballasted track type on an at-grade alignment, while the highest expense guideway was as expected, the direct fixation track type in a subway alignment. The unit cost details are also provided to summarize the individual unit cost information as calculated from the original actual costs submitted by each agency.

Yards and Shops -- Maintenance of the rail system components requires specialty shops for each major asset category. Unit costs were requested for each shop and particular system support function. In cases where system development was more complex, detailed cost information was available by shop; however, in some systems, yard and shop construction was contracted out as a "package" and cost information was only available at a summary level. The capital cost information request included fourteen yard and shop areas that encompassed the full range of system support needs. Flexibility was designed into the request to accommodate both detailed and summary level responses.

RANGE OF UNIT COST	S		EXHIB	NT 1		
			UNIT CO	NST SUM	MARY	
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	5	\$428	\$1,016	\$1,508	\$1,079
1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	62	\$413	\$665	\$1.205	\$792
DIRECT FIXATION		1	\$696	\$696	\$696	8
BALLASTED IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		2 2	\$350 \$526	\$1.557	\$679 \$2.588	\$329
EMBEDDED		4	\$583	\$1,452	\$3,714	S3,131
1.02 GUIDEWAY - ELEVALED SIHUGIUHE	Linear Feet	<b>9</b> (	<b>2410</b>	\$1,768	\$3,041	\$2,631
BALLASTED		n w	611,18	\$2,746	\$4,516	32,340
IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED EMBEDDED		2	\$506	\$1.936	\$3.365	\$2.859
1.03 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED, RETAINED FILL	Linear Feet	2	\$847	\$1,009	\$1,172	\$325
DIRECT FIXATION BALLASTED		2	\$847	\$1.009	\$1.172	\$325
IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						
EMBEDDED 1.04 GUIDEWAY • ELEVATED FILL	Linear Feet	1	\$516	\$616	\$616	8
DIRECT FIXATION BALL ASTED			7123	7 17 2	2129	Ş
IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		1	010¢	010¢	0100	3
EMBEDDED * 1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	l inear Feet	6	\$6 320	UPP 25	CR 657	800 03
DIRECT FIXATION		2	\$6,329	\$13,530	\$20,730	
BALLASTED IN: PAVEMENT BALLASTED		-	64.730	057 A30	057 52	(05)
EMBEDDED		. 1	\$506	\$506	\$506	8
1.06 GUIDEWAY - RETAINED CUT	Linear Feet	3	\$329	\$3,354	\$5,410	\$5,081
DIRECT FIXATION BALLASTED		2	625\$	\$2,870	\$5,410	\$5,081
IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						1
1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guideway	8	\$2.81	11.46\$	\$65.41	\$62.61
1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway					
1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guideway	4	\$15.71	\$25.02	\$35.32	\$19.60
1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	Linear Feet	1	\$4,389	\$4,389	\$4,389	\$0

Note: Unit Capital Costs Formalized to the 30 City National Average in 1990 Dollars



Exhibit 2 presents the unit cost summary for yards and shops components. The overall total category costs varied significantly from a minimum of about \$4.1 million to a high of \$42.8 million. This extremely wide cost range demonstrates that there are many factors affecting the cost of light rail yards and shops. The extent of maintenance facility and shop equipment requirements are at least partially driven by system design, capacity and complexity decisions. However, even when the yard and shop costs were measured on a guideway length or revenue vehicle unit cost basis, there was only a minor direct cost relationship to either This yards and shops component cost information unit cost measure. should therefore, be carefully applied in any planning level capital cost efforts, since there appeared to be little direct cost relationship among the standard unit capacity measures. The more detailed line item information about the 14 individual shop categories did not provide any better unit cost support, since the breakout of the cost information was very inconsistent. Therefore, these individual shop costs should only be used as an indication of prior actual experience.

**System Elements** - The system needs were clearly defined by asset component and within four general functional categories.

- Signal system;
- Electrification;
- Communications; and
- Fare collection.

Capital cost information was normally available for each functional category, since these components are typically procured and/or installed through separate contracts.

As demonstrated in Exhibit 3, systems costs are somewhat more predictate and related overall, to the linear feet of each system. Systems costs ranged from \$179 per linear foot to a maximum of \$878 per linear foot. This cost range is indicative of the level of systems sophistication

EXHIBIT 2

			UNIT C	NUS ISO:	IMARY	
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
2.00 YARDS & SHOPS	Total	5	\$4,086,783	\$23,862,435 \$	:42,837,570 \$	38,750,787
2.01 BUILDING	Each	5	\$4,086,783	\$17,019,418	\$36,002,375	\$31,915,592
2.02 OFFICE FURNITURE & EQUIP.	All	1	\$252,440	\$252,440	\$252,440	\$0
2.03 HEAVY REPAIR		3	\$69,070	\$349,318	\$731,367	\$662,297
2.04 MOTOR SHOPS		2	\$11,512	\$27,032	\$42,553	\$31,042
2.05 WHEEL SHOP		8	\$25,532	\$614,629	\$1,040,170	\$1,014,638
2.06 MACHINE SHOP		8	\$236	\$118,112	\$235,988	\$235,752
2.07 AIR CONDITIONING	(N/X)	1	\$2,419,865	\$2,419,865	\$2,419,865	\$0
2.08 ELECTRONICS	(N//A)	3	\$230,233	\$1,052,600	\$1,645,400	\$1,415,167
2.09 COMMUNICATIONS	(N/A)	2	\$6,907	\$572,302	\$1,137,698	\$1,130,791
2.10 CAR WASH/CAR CLEANING	(N/X)	2	\$144,470	\$508,143	\$871,816	\$727,347
2.11 MAINTENANCE OF WAY SHOPS		4	\$66,700	\$1,633,059	\$5,314,598	\$5,247,898
2.12 MAINTENANCE OF WAY EQUIPMENT		2	\$27,261	\$41,900	\$56,539	\$29,278
2.13 REVENUE CENTER	Each	1	\$1,206,213	\$1,206,213	\$1,206,213	0\$
2.14 CENTRAL CONTROL	(N//A)	1	\$10,159,345	\$10,159,345	\$10,159,345	\$0
Note: Unit Capital Costs Normalized to the 30 City National Avera	ge In 1990 Dollars					



EXHIBIT 3

			UNIT C	OST SU	MMARY	
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
3.00 SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	5	\$179	\$482	\$878	\$693
3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guideway	2	\$54	\$198	\$443	\$388
3.02 ELECTRIFICATION	L.F. Guideway	2	\$92	\$241	\$448	\$356
3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	4	\$196,121	\$7,477,427	\$17,348,680	\$17,152,559
3.04 FARE COLLECTION	Total	4	\$1,080,497	\$3,407,019	\$5,456,404	\$4,375,907

Note: Unit Capital Costs Normalized to the 30 City National Average In 1990 Dollars



necessary to operate the different service levels. The systems with higher service levels were grouped at the higher unit cost range, while the other systems were mainly grouped in the lower unit cost range. The mean of systems unit costs therefore is not as pertinent as the two ends of the unit cost range.

<u>Stations</u> -- This asset category was fairly straight forward with the identification of components and definition of their individual characteristics. Stations were first designated by grade, and then by center and side platform locations. Unique station descriptors were included to identify special asset requirements and related cost impacts. These descriptors included platform length, escalator/elevator availability, disability access mode, and weather coverage. In addition, station access amenities were separately requested to define the cost impacts of such elements as parking areas and pedestrian overpasses.

The station unit cost summary is presented in Exhibit 4, where total station-related costs averaged about \$1.4 million per station overall. Atgrade center platform stations were the least expensive with a minimum cost of \$180,000 for the most basic station design. The more complex of these at-grade stations reach almost \$1.0 million for center platforms, and almost \$2.0 million for side platform stations. Subway stations were as expected the most expensive ranging from almost \$7.0 million to \$25.2 million for the most extensive station. There were only three elevated stations constructed in the five study systems, which cost almost \$2.7 million,. In addition, parking lots averaged about \$1.1 million and a passenger overpass was constructed for \$900,000.

<u>Vehicles</u> -- Revenue and non-revenue vehicles were included in this asset category. Revenue vehicles were identified by separate vehicle orders to differentiate any component and cost impacts. Only one light rail system (Sacramento) had a second vehicle order included in this time period and capital cost data base. Unique vehicle characteristics and/or special componentry were noted to identify unit cost impacts of each vehicle order. These included the make and manufacturer; size and layout

### **EXHIBIT 4**

			UNIT C	INS ISO	<b>WMARY</b>	
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
4.00 STATIONS	Each	2	\$180,861	\$1,431,936	\$3,205,143	\$3,024,282
4.01 AT-GRADE	Each	<del>Q</del>	\$180,861	\$800,732	\$1,961,305	\$1,780,443
4.02 SUBWAY	Each	2	\$6,936,659	\$16,046,881	\$25,157,102	\$18,220,444
4.03 ELEVATED	Each	-	\$2,661,526	\$2,661,526	\$2,661,526	\$0
4.04 PARKING LOTS	Total	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	\$731,214	\$1,137,154	\$1,543,093	\$811,878
4.05 PARKING GARAGES	Total					
4.06 PEDESTRIAN OVERPASSES	Total	1	\$908,360	\$908,360	\$908,360	\$0
			-			

Note: Unit Capital Costs Normalized to the 30 City National Average In 1990 Dollars



dimensions. Special components such as cab signaling, air conditioning, wheelchair lifts, and the particular farebox system were denoted when included in each vehicle order -- otherwise the farebox costs were included in the systems cost category. Non-revenue vehicles were included as a separate category for service trucks, support automobiles and any other necessary non-revenue equipment.

This asset category had the most consistent unit cost experience for all five light rail systems. Exhibit 5 provides the unit cost summary for the vehicle category. Light rail vehicles had unit costs ranging from a low of \$800,000 to a high of \$1,300,000. These vehicles were all articulated with the main differences in the individual vehicle capability and componentry. The lowest unit cost vehicle order represents the most basic design criteria and the more recent order from this same system was at a much greater cost at over \$1.25 million each. Therefore, the higher unit cost range may be more representative than the low or average vehicle cost values.

Non-revenue vehicle costs varied significantly because of the different operational philosophies. Some systems procured all necessary non-revenue vehicles and others only purchased the minimum amount and contracted for the other support services. The unit cost range reflects these two developmental approaches with a minimum unit cost of \$11,000 for mainly automotive support vehicles and a maximum of \$86,000 each for a support fleet that also includes more heavy trucks and other support vehicles.

<u>Special Conditions</u> -- Development of a light rail system involves some mitigating construction requirements that are not directly related to rail service, but necessary to construct each rail line. The capital costs of these items have been included in this special conditions category. The largest cost component is the relocation of existing utility lines from or within the rail corridor under construction. These costs have been separated by replacements in the same or similar condition and replacement with improved or different utility ^onditions that was

### EXHIBIT 5

UNITS OF MEASURE     COUNTS     MINIMUM     MEAN     MAXIMUM     RANGE       Each     5     \$968,562     \$1,159,567     \$1,345,218     \$376,657       Each     5     \$806,202     \$1,119,800     \$1,314,877     \$508,67       Each     1     \$1,255,800				TINU	COST	SUMMARY	
Each     5     \$968,562     \$1,159,567     \$1,345,218     \$376,6:       1     Each     5     \$806,202     \$1,119,800     \$1,314,877     \$508,6       2     Each     1     \$1,255,800     \$1,255,800     \$1,255,800     \$1,255,800     \$51,255,800	7	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
4   Each   5   \$806,202   \$1,119,800   \$1,314,877   \$508,671     3   Each   1   \$1,255,800		Each	5	\$968,562	\$1,159,567	\$1,345,218	\$376,657
B Each 1 \$1,255,800 \$1,255,800 \$1,255,800 \$1,355,800   C Each 2 \$11,267 \$48,750 \$86,232 \$74,96.	РА	Each	5	\$806,202	\$1,119,800	\$1,314,877	\$508,670
Each Each \$11,267 \$48,750 \$86,232 \$74,96.	8	Each	-	\$1,255,800	\$1,255,800	\$1,255,800	\$(
Each 2 \$11,267 \$48,750 \$86,232 \$74,96	<u> </u>	Each					
		Each	2	\$11,267	\$48,750	\$86,232	\$74,96.

Note: Unit Capital Costs Normalized to the 30 City National Average in 1990 Dollars



denoted in the data base as betterments. These replacement costs were listed by utility:

- Gas;
- Telephone;
- Electric;
- Water;
- Pipeline;
- Railroad; and
- Other.

An additional section for utility replacement costs was provided for any unusual or unforeseen circumstances. Three more of these special condition categories were also included for demolitions, roadway changes, and environmental mitigation costs.

These special conditions were measured overall on a linear foot basis to provide a reasonable unit measure for use in planning other light rail systems. Exhibit 6 presents the unit cost summary of special conditions encountered in the development of these light rail systems. The total and unit costs varied significantly for this cost category and should therefore, be carefully considered in cost estimation applications. On a unit cost basis special conditions costs varied from a minimum of \$81 to a maximum of \$1,263 per linear foot, with a mean value of \$337 per linear foot. The total values per system were also provided for each individual cost category. When initial information is available about the extent of special conditions expected for the project, the total costs from the individual cost categories may be most useful, while in the absence of specific special conditions, the overall unit costs may be more appropriate. The lower unit costs may be more appropriate in less dense urban areas and the higher unit costs in more densely developed and/or mature urban areas.

<u>**Right-Of-Way</u>** -- This capital cost category covered all land acquisition and acquisition-related costs. Land acquisition costs were requested for direct purchases and estimated value for any land donations</u>

EXHIBIT 6

			UNIT	COST	SUMMA	RY
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS	Linear feet	5	\$81	\$337	\$1,263	\$1,182
6.01 UTILITY RELOCATION - AS IS	Total	5	\$2,524,684	\$4,719,422	\$6,370,239	\$3,845,555
6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETMTS.	Total	3	\$495,549	\$41,497,095	\$118,409,923	\$117,914,373
6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION - OTHER	Total					
6.04 DEMOLITIONS	Total	5	\$112,628	\$511,718	\$956,912	\$844,284
6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total	N	\$2,220,974	\$7,086,721	\$11,952,468	\$9,731,494
6.06 ENVIRONMENTAL	Total	e	\$356,640	\$6,349,686	\$16,785,885	\$16,429,246

Note: Unit Capital Costs Normalized to the 30 City National Average In 1990 Dollars



or swaps. The related purchase costs for management, appraisal, and relocation expenses were also listed in this capital cost category. The original data was requested on an acreage basis by functional use -- mainline, stations, yards, and parking.

Similar to the special conditions, land costs are presented on a linear foot basis for the overall category costs and on a project total for the individual cost categories -- Exhibit 7. Overall right-of-way costs ranged from \$160 per linear foot to a high of \$600 per linear foot, with a mean of \$346. Land acquisition costs in total cost from \$15.5 million to as high as \$50.4 million. Land acquisition related costs followed a similar cost pattern ranging from \$800,000 to a high of \$4.1 million. Relocation costs were fairly small and only reported by three of the five systems.

**Project Soft Costs** - - This section included all other miscellaneous costs related to development of passenger rail services. The majority of these costs were expended in the planning, engineering, and project management efforts. These services included in-house agency staff and the use of consultants for particular tasks. Project start-up and initiation expenses were also included in this cost category. Project financing cost and an "other" expense line item which includes any reconciliations and unaccountable costs, comprise the full range of any project development capital costs.

Exhibit 8 highlights the unit cost summary of all project soft costs incurred in the development of these light rail systems. This capital cost category represents a fairly large expenditure commitment for light rail system development. The wide cost range is some indication of the relative complexity of each system and the extent of professional services necessary for system development. The cost measurement of in-house agency staff support may not be fully represented and possibly an indication of the cost variance among the individual categories and overall project soft costs. The other expense line item included some reconciliation account costs and some other unidentified expenses.

ຽ
5
20
X
0
F
N
5
F
O
Ш
G
Ž
4
5

- 7	
EXHIBIT	

					Total	7.05 OTHER
\$331,390	\$471,332	\$267,577	\$139,942	c	Total	7.04 RELOCATION
\$3,269,761	\$4,083,215	\$2,296,128	\$813,454	4	Total	7.0 ACQUISITION-RELATED COST
					Total	7.02 LAND ACQUISITION - DONATED
\$34,906,250	\$50,376,726	\$30,823,677	\$15,470,477	S	Total	7.01 LAND ACQUISITION - PURCHASED
\$440	\$600	\$346	\$160	5	Linear Feet	7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY
RANGE	MAXIMUM	MEAN	MINIMUM	COUNTS	UNITS OF MEASURE	
RY	SUMMAI	COST	UNIT			

20


RANGE OF UNIT COSTS

EXHIBIT 8

			UNIT	COST	SUMMA	RY
	UNITS OF MEASURE	COUNTS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
3.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	5	\$359	\$1,491	\$3,068	\$2,708
8.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	3	\$3,718,000	\$14,612,295	\$36,398,671	\$32,680,671
8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total	3	\$16,009,645	\$48,230,137	\$68,801,392	\$52,791,747
8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	2	\$4,788,081	\$35,548,854	\$85,158,669	\$80,370,588
8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	S.	\$2,173,544	\$14,678,448	\$22,938,149	\$20,764,605
8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGH	Total	1	\$4,539,183	\$4,539,183	\$4,539,183	0\$
8.06 PROJECT INITIATION	Total	3	\$1,319,808	\$14,136,884	\$35,235,765	\$35,235,765
8.07 FINANCE CHARGES	Total	1	\$546,621	\$546,621	\$546,621	0\$
8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING	Total	4	\$3,543,743	\$6,480,866	\$9,803,185	\$6,259,441
8.09 OTHER	Total	2	(\$16,589,228)	\$40,319,705	\$97,228,639	\$113,817,867

Note: Unit Capital Costs Formalized to the 30 City National Average In 1990 Dollars

Booz, Alten & Hamilton

## RESULTS

This section presents the capital cost results for each light rail system included in the capital cost data base. Capital cost summaries were prepared to present total project costs of each light rail system for each of the eight asset categories described previously. A pie chart of the proportional costs of each cost category was included to illustrate the overall developmental cost requirements. These project cost summaries are presented within this results section, while the details are included in the data base appendicies. Detailed data were provided for five light rail systems, including:

- Portland;
- Sacramento;
- San Jose;
- Pittsburgh; and
- Los Angeles.

The component costs are presented by specific system to provide a higher level of unit cost information. When project plans begin to focus on a defined developmental design, unit costs from a specific system may be more pertinent to the cost estimation process.

Exhibit 9 provides a summary of system characteristics to aid in understanding the system specific unit cost data (and variances) that follow. The projects vary from 15 to 23 miles in guideway length, averaging approximately 18-1/2 miles. They are substantially all doubletrack operations, with the exception of Sacramento, which is approximately 60% single-track and currently in the process of extending double-tracking to about 60%. Average station spacing varies from slightly over one-half mile to one mile. Exhibit 9 also displays a key characteristic that significantly affects unit costs (especially stations and guideway) --Sacramento and Santa Clara are virtually totally at-grade systems while

Exhibit 9 Summary of Light Rail System Characteristics

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles
Onening Date	1986	1987	1987	1988	1 990
Doute I endth (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	226
At-Grade	6.6	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Elevated	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Subway	0	0	0	5.3	0.6
Open Cut	. 0.2	0	0	5.8	0.1
	5 00	95 G	40.8	*V C9	9.57
Stations	25	26	22	13	22
Parking Lots	<u>ى</u>	80	RN	NR	Ω.
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	NR	NR	1051
Total Bevenue Vehicles	26	26	50	*26	54
Peak Vehicles	22	23	15	70*	26
Midday Vehicles	12	8	15	28*	13
Peak Headway (minutes)	7.5	15	10	NR	10
Midday Headway (minutes)	15	. 30	10	NN	10
Staff					
Administrative	16	15	11	NR	28
Operators	36	32	58	112	73
<ul> <li>Vehicle Maintenance</li> </ul>	28	15	55	NR	47
<ul> <li>Facility Maintenance</li> </ul>	19	16	53	NR	45
Other	=	5	20	RN	68
Total	110	83	197	503	261
Derrent of Bourte Milee					
	CE0/	/0UU	/000	600 000	010/
	% 00	90.00	0/ 66	0/ 00 /02	01/0
<ul> <li>Elevated</li> </ul>	34%	4%	1%	0/2/	16%
Subway	0	0	0	13%	3%
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.

# .

at-grade mileage for Portland and Pittsburgh is only two-thirds of the alignment.

The balance of this section provides an overall summary of unit costs by major category, followed by more detailed comparisons of subsystem costs within each category. Appendices A - E include the full capital cost data base of statistics organized by system. Data are provided in both aggregate and detailed unit costs to be useful at various stages in a project's development from early system planning stages to engineering.

#### Summary Cost Overview

Exhibit 10 presents a summary of the percent of actual (unescalated) as built project costs by major category. Guideway construction is the largest category, averaging 40% of "in-ground" cost. Systems (e.g., signals, electrification, communications, fare collection) comprise the second largest category at almost 18%. Right-of-way averages 14.4% and, if combined with guideway costs, these two items total more than half the "in-ground" costs varying from a low of 36% in Los Angeles to a high of 67% in Portland.

Unit costs by similar categories are displayed in Exhibit 11 (escalated to 1990 dollars). As would be expected, the widest variations occur in the categories most dependent on local characteristics such as "special conditions" where the range is 358% of the average and "stations" which vary from elevated structures to on-street stops. Conversely, the smallest variation is in vehicle unit costs which averaged \$1.272 million with the range being only 37% of the average.

Guideway unit costs average \$5.782 million, with Sacramento and San Jose being at the low end due to virtually 100% at-grade construction. Pittsburgh, with 13% of its alignment in subway, has the highest average guide way unit cost.

Exhibit 10	imary Costs and Percentages of "As Built" Project Costs By Category	(Current \$ millions)
	Summary Costs	

	Port	land	Sacral	mento	San	Jose	Pittsbu	urgh	Los Ai	ngeles	Avera	de
										<b>x</b>		
Guldeway Elements	\$94.6	57.9%	\$46.7	42.5%	\$65.9	35.0%	\$110.5	40.4%	\$148.7	25.4%	\$93.3	40.2
Ya;∹'s & Shops	\$11.6	7.1%	\$4.0	3.6%	\$21.3	11.3%	\$38.2	14.0%	\$44.2	7.5%	\$23.9	ŝ
Systems	\$21.2	13.0%	\$19.4	17.7%	\$33.1	17.6%	\$58.9	21.5%	\$115.3	19.7%	\$49.6	17.9
Stations	\$15.1	9.3%	\$10.3	9.3%	\$4.9	2.6%	\$34.3	12.5%	\$65.9	11.2%	\$26.1	9.6
Special Conditions	\$5.8	3.5%	\$12.2	11.1%	\$8.5	4.5%	\$10.0	3.7%	\$152.3	26.0%	\$37.8	6
Right-of-Way	\$15.1	9.2%	\$17.4	15.8%	\$54.6	29.0%	\$21.5	7.9%	\$60.1	10.2%	\$33.7	14.4
Total "In-Ground" Costs	\$163.4	100.0%	\$110.0	100.0%	\$188.3	100.0%	\$273.4	100.0%	\$586.5	100.0%	\$264.3	100.
Vehicies as Percent of "In-Ground" Costs	\$25.2	15.4%	\$34.6	31.5%	\$55.6	29.5%	\$57.4	21.0%	\$79.9	13.6%	\$50,5	55

9.0%

17.9%

9.7%

14.4%

8.7%

40.2%

22.2%

100.0%

51.8%

\$133.3

\$210.8 35.9%

**\$58.3 35.7% \$36.2 32.9% \$136.4 72.4% \$224.8 82.2%** 

Soft Costs as Percent of "In-Ground" Costs



<b>Unit Costs</b>	in Millions
of System	nal Dollars
Summary	1990 Natior

								Range	
	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Plttsburgh	Los Angeles	Average	Range	of Average	
Cost Per Route Mile <ul> <li>Guideway</li> </ul>	\$7.0	\$2.3	\$3.6	\$8.0	\$6.0	\$5.4	\$5.7	106%	
Systems	1.6	6.0	1.7	4.2	4.6	2.6	3.7	141%	
<ul> <li>Special Conditions</li> </ul>	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.7	6.7	1.8	6.2	351%	
<ul> <li>Pight-of-Way</li> </ul>	1.1	0.8	3.2	1.6	2.4	1.8	2.3	127%	
Yards & Shops Costs Per Shop Capacity	0.1	0.1	0.4	NR	0.7	0.3	0.7	198%	
	į		0		0				
Station Costs Per Station	0.7	0.4	0.2	8. 2.2	E.E.	9. -	9.1 1	202%	
Vehicle Costs Per Vehicle	1.3	1.0	1.0	1 2 1	1.3	1 2	0.4	33%	
Total Project Cost Per Route Mile	18.6	8.9	21.5	40.1	36.6	25.1	31.2	124%	
Project Cost Per Route Mile Less Vehicles and									
Soft Costs	\$7.5	\$5.3	\$10.4	\$19.8	\$24.1	\$13.4	\$18.8	140%	
Percent of System At-Grade	65%	96%	%66	66%	81%				

Total project cost per route mile averaged \$27.5 million with a range from \$9.746 million to \$41.748 million. Reasons for these variations are more evident from the sub-category data presented in the following sections.

# System Cost Summaries

Prior to examining comparative unit costs in detail, it is helpful to review actual systems' cost by category to understand some of the underlying differences in design philosophy and local conditions. Exhibits 12 through 16 display total actual cost for each system in the three types of developmental costs. The "as built" system costs are based on the actual costs expended in the development of each project, and are measured in year-of-expenditure dollars. The city costs represent the inflation of the "as built" costs to a constant 1990 dollar value from each of the individual component procurement years. The national costs then normalize the category costs to account for construction costs of each major metropolitan area. It is evident that costs vary significantly. A few of the reasons for variations include:

**Portland** is a double-track system with approximately one-third of the guideway elevated, resulting in higher guideway and station costs -- Exhibit 12. Portland represented a mid-range design approach that included some passenger amenities and the operational facilities necessary for a consistent service at a peak headway of 7.5 minutes. The at-grade downtown Portland sections helped to maintain guideway costs in the lower range, however the elevated sections introduced some of the higher range unit guideway costs. The "as built" cost proportions were about average except for the higher guideway and station cost categories.



- Sacramento is the lowest cost project of the responding systems -- Exhibit 13. This low cost reflects a philosophy of design simplicity using at-grade construction and single track operation as much as possible. A simplified design approach to stations and yards and shops costs also reflect this design philosophy. The capital costs of the recent and ongoing system upgrades to increase the proportion of double track and the additional turnouts necessary to increase operational consistency were not included in this cost summary of the original project. special conditions were Vehicle costs and the proportionately higher "as built" cost categories while the lower categories were yards and shops and soft costs for Sacramento in comparison to the other systems.
- San Jose, Exhibit 14, is the initial line of a planned larger light rail system which includes some higher unit costs and additional facilities that relate to the expanded system base, such as yards and shops and other systems capacity. These particular component unit costs would be more representative of the unit capital costs and asset requirements encountered by larger systems with an individual line under development. Elsewhere, this line's unit costs were maintained to about average for the five light rail lines in the data base, since almost the entire line length is at-grade. The 99% at-grade alignment held guideway and station costs below the average. This San Jose line was proportionately slightly high for right-ofway and project soft costs, and low on guideway and station cost proportions.









- **Pittsburgh** is a reconstruction and expansion of an existing line with commensurately lower costs for rightof-way and special conditions -- Exhibit 15. These unit costs are representative of the capital costs necessary to rehabilitate an existing light rail line or system. On the other hand, 13% of the line was placed in a new subway alignment, raising overall guideway costs, but also providing a good basis to estimate future subway costs, particularly the highest unit costs for the section through bedrock in downtown Pittsburgh. This subway section also offers cost information for the construction of subway stations through similar grade and high activity construction locations. Proportionately, Pittsburgh was high in soft costs, mainly due to a single line item of \$91 million in other costs.
- Los Angeles, is the first in a series of new lines for the region and the entire systems/support facilities were designed to integrate into the total network. The double-track guideway includes elevated and subway sections with provision for connections into the other portions of the regional rail network. This line also provides subway or tunnel construction costs that averaged about the same as Pittsburgh's overall. Exhibit 16 presents the "as built", city and national costs by category with relatively low guideway costs and high special conditions on a proportionate basis.

These "as built", city, and national costs by component category form the basis for the comparative unit cost analysis using the normalized national unit cost calculations.







### **Comparative Unit Costs**

Exhibits 17 through 23 show detailed comparative unit costs by component system. These exhibits cover each cost category except vehicles, which were displayed previously in Exhibit 11. The cost information is presented in 1990 national dollars which represents the individual component costs normalized to the 30 city nationwide construction index.

Guideway Cost per linear foot (Exhibit 17) varies considerably by system as previously mentioned, and also by grade as would be expected. The data base includes each of the major types of guideway construction. The average unit costs correspond with expected industry costs standards, except where at-grade guideway was slightly higher in cost than the elevated fill. The reason behind this was the rehabilitation of extensive elevated fill in Pittsburgh compared to new at-grade alignment costs elsewhere. For example:

		Average Cost	Average Cost
Type of	f Construction	Per Linear Foot	Per Guideway Mile
At-Grad	e	\$665	\$3.51 M
Elevated	Structure	\$1,768	\$9.34 M
Elevated	Retained Fill	\$994	\$5.25 M
Elevated	Fill	\$658	\$3.47 M
Subway		\$7,001	\$36.97 M
Retained	Cut	\$3,319	\$17.52 M

Within grade categories, there are also variations in track laying methods. For example, the least expensive method for at-grade track is simple

Exhibit 17 Guideway Costs Per Linear Foot 1990 National Dollars

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Plttsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
At-Grade Avg.	\$1,205	\$413	\$603	\$460	\$636	\$665
Direct Fixation	:	:	1	969	:	969
Ballasted	679	350	610	375	442	491
In-Pavement Ballasted	:	526	1	ł	2,588	1,557
Embedded	3,713	:	606	583	906	1,452
Elevated Structure Avg.	3,041	410	ł	636	2,986	1,768
Direct Fixation	ł	410	ł	535	2,756	1,233
Ballasted	2,602	:	1	1,119	4,516	2,746
In-Pavement Ballasted	:	:	:	ł	:	I
Embedded	3,365	:	1	506	•	1,935
Elevated Retained Fill Avg.	ţ	1,077	:	961	943	666
Direct Fixation	1	:	:	1	1	1
Ballasted	1,172	:	1	:	847	1,010
In-Pavement Ballasted	Ι.	;	1	;	:	1
Embedded	:	:	1	1	:	1
Elevated Fill Avg.	1	1	;	669	616	658
Direct Fixation	ł	:	1	:	:	:
Ballasted	I	:	:	:	616	616
In-Pavement Ballasted	1	:	:	:	:	:
Embedded	:	:			1	:
Subway Avg.	;	;	6,887	7,182	6,935	7,001
Direct Fixation	ł	:	1	20,730	6,329	13,529
Ballasted	1	:	1	1	:	1
In-Pavement Ballasted	1	:	ł	4,730	:	4,730
Embedded	1	:	1	506	1	506
Retained Cut	1	4,973	265	4,904	3,133	3,319
Direct Fixation	1	1	1		4,322	4,322
Ballasted	5,410	:	1	329	:	2,870
In-Pavement Ballasted	:	:	:	:	:	:
Embedded	1	;	:	;	:	1
Snoclal Track Work Bar						
Linear Foot of Guideway	\$33	\$15	\$17	NR	\$35	\$25



ballasted guideway and it is clear from the data that this method is used wherever possible -- two-thirds of the 392,000 linear feet of at-grade track in the sample was ballasted. This is also true for elevated track where 64% of the 57,000 linear feet in the sample was ballasted (combining all forms of elevated guideway). Combining the entire sample of 475,847 linear feet yields the following breakdown of construction methods:

Type of Trackwork	<u>Linear Feet</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Ballasted	305,022	64.1%
In-Pavement Ballasted	43,490	9.1%
Direct Fixation	28,912	6.1%
Embedded	<u>98,423</u>	<u>20.7%</u>
Total	475,847	100.0%

Exhibit 17 also presents comparative unit costs for special trackwork such as turnouts and crossovers which average \$25.00 per linear foot of guideway.

Yards and Shops Cost and comparative features are provided in Exhibit 18. Both cost per facility and cost per unit of shop capacity vary by a factor of almost 10. Some of this variation is explained by facility features (e.g., Sacramento does not incorporate heavy repair, motor or car wash/cleaning shops). There is also variation because some yards and shops were designed to accommodate future system expansions (e.g., Los Angeles). Variations also exist for local cost of construction. For example, even when "national average" construction indices were applied to Los Ar. 3 eles an Pittsburgh costs, they were still significantly higher than the other three systems. Further unit cost and component details are provided

	nd Features	
10	shops Costs a	al Dollars
EXUIDIT	y Yards and S	<b>1990 Nationa</b>
	Summary	

	Portiand	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
Yards & Shops Per Facility	\$13.36M	\$4.09M	\$18.86M	\$42.84M	\$40.17M	\$23.86M
Cost per Shop Capacity	\$133,558	\$81,735	\$362,402	\$441,624	\$743,879	\$352,640
Heavy Repair	۶	z	۲	NR	۶	
Motor Shops	z	z	۶	NR	RN	
Wheel Shop	≻	٨	۶	NR	۶	
Machine Shop	≻	٨	¥	NR	RN	
Alr Conditioning	NR	7	٨	NR	RN	
Electronics	≻	۶	۶	NR	۶	
Communications	~	۶	٨	NR	RN	
Car Wash/Cleaning	≻	z	۶	NR	7	
Maintenance-of-Way Shops	~	>	N	>	NR	
Maintenance-of-Way Equipment	>	~	NR	NR	>	
Revenue Center	NR	z	NR	٨	RN	
<b>Control Center</b>	NR	z	NR	NR	٨	



for every system and cost category in the data base sheets in Appendices A - E.

Systems Costs ranges vary by more than 100% of the average for every component category (Exhibit 19). Several of the categories vary because of operating complexities and designs for future expansion (e.g., communications costs in Los Angeles). The method of fare collection varies from on-board fareboxes to self-service impacting fare collection hardware costs. This category is also affected by single-track operation. For example, electrification costs per linear foot of guideway in Sacramento is \$92 compared to an average for the other four systems of \$259 per linear foot of guideway.

Station Cost is shown in Exhibit 20 which highlights the wide variation of designs from fairly simple "on-street" stops to major buildings. Of the 109 stations in the sample, over 90% are at-grade and threequarters of the total are side platforms. At-grade costs range from a low of \$156,000 per station for a center platform to a high of \$1,924,000 for a side platform station. The other station cost categories are limited and provide mainly cost examples.

Special Condition Costs are driven by particular local situations (Exhibit 21). Utility relocations are the largest category and most typically include gas, telephone, electric and water. All systems incurred some "demolitions" costs, but the balance of the costs are very site-specific. On average, these systems cost \$353 per linear foot of guideway, but a consistent grouping was formed by four of the systems with an average of \$125.50 per linear foot.

**Right-of-Way and Related Costs** averaged \$412.76 per linear foot of guideway, with 90% of this category involving land acquisition (Exhibit 22). As would be expected, this group of costs are very locationsensitive, with the range being 70% of the average.


Exhibit 19 Summary Systems Costs 1990 National Dollars

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
Signai System per Linear 7oot of Guideway	\$105	\$76	\$54	\$322	\$310	\$173
Electrification per Linear Foot of Guideway	\$148	\$8 \$	\$142	\$369	\$377	\$225
Total Communications Cost	NR	\$196,121	\$2,348,358	\$10,016,547	\$17,348,680	\$7,477,427
Total Fare Coilection Equipment Cost	\$3,631,126	\$1,080,497	\$3,460,050	NR	\$5,456,404	\$3,407,019
Total Systems Cost per Linear Foot of Guideway	\$297	\$179	\$251	\$804	\$878	\$482



Exhibit 20 Summary Stations Costs and Features 1990 National Dollars in Thousands





Exhibit 21 Summary of Special Conditions Costs	<b>1990 National Dollars in Thousands</b>	All Costs Per Linear Foot of Guideway
---	---	---------------------------------------

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
Utility Relocation Total	\$79.46	\$44.51	\$142.69	\$55.52	\$21.16	
New Installation	\$0.00	\$3.55	\$54.76	\$0.00	\$0.00	
• Gas	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.70	\$7.95	\$3.29	
Telephone	\$0.00	\$0.41	\$0.25	\$3.42	\$1.49	
Electric	\$13.84	\$23.63	\$1.70	\$40.46	\$0.43	
Water	\$65.62	\$0.00	\$3.80	\$3.70	\$1.08	
Pipeline	\$0.00	\$11.29	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$8.34	
Railroad	\$0.00	\$5.24	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	
• Other	\$0.00	\$0.39	\$0.47	\$0.00	\$6.53	
Ctility Betterments Total	00.0\$	\$4.42	\$0.00	\$67.97	\$992.98	
New Installation	\$0.00	\$4.42	\$0.00	\$7.71	\$0.00	
• Gas	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$9.14	\$38.45	
Telephone	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$10.57	\$16.51	
Electric	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$39.32	\$176.70	
• Water	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$51.14	
Pipeline	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$227.02	
Railroad	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$467.62	
• Other	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1.22	\$15.55	
Demolitions	\$1.41	\$3.06	\$5.52	\$10.51	\$8.02	
Roadway Changes	\$0.00	\$59.52	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$100.21	
Environmental	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$23.18	\$4.33	\$140.72	
Total All Special Conditions	\$80.86	\$111.51	\$171.38	\$138.33	\$1,263.10	\$353.04



Exhibit 22 Summary of Right-of-Way and Related Costs 1990 National Dollars

Cost per Linear Foot of Guideway	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
• Land	\$192.95	\$152.46	\$563.41	\$302.48	\$422.34	\$326.73
<ul> <li>Legal &amp; Consulting</li> </ul>	\$33.99	\$4.41	\$10.14	NR	\$16.89	\$16.36
Appraisal	\$33.99	\$2.78	\$10.14	NR	\$0.31	\$11.80
<ul> <li>Property Management</li> </ul>	\$3.67	\$0.08	\$10.14	NR	\$17.13	\$7.76
Relocation	\$2.39	NR	\$5.73	NR	\$1.17	\$3.10
• Total	\$266.98	\$159.73	\$599.57	NR	\$457.83	\$405.71
Land Cost per Acre	\$108.94	RN	\$302.89	μ	N	E



**Project Soft Costs** are shown in Exhibit 23. Approximately half of these costs are in the construction/project management category, with almost 40% in the feasibility/engineering and design studies. Several projects were carried out prior to the requirement for project management oversight and show no cost in this category.

Exhibit 23 Summary of Project Soft Costs 1990 National Dollars All Costs Per Linear Foot of Guideway

Feasibility/Engineering and and Design Studies\$246.04\$199.4and Design Studies\$245.04\$199.4Construction/Project Management\$422.36\$124.3Project Management Oversight\$422.36\$124.3Project Management Oversight\$422.36\$124.3Project Initiation Oversight\$422.36\$124.3Project Initiation Oversight\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation Oversight <th></th> <th>Portland</th> <th>Sacramento</th> <th>San Jose</th> <th>Pittsburgh</th> <th>Los Angeles</th> <th>Average</th>		Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles	Average
Construction/Project\$422.36\$124.3Management\$422.36\$124.3Project Management\$422.36\$124.3Project Management\$422.36\$124.3Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7Training Clarition\$73.02\$11.7Training/Start-Up/Testing\$99.21\$41.2	Isibility/Engineering and I Design Studies	\$246.04	\$199.41	\$442.53	\$728.47	\$576.79	\$438.65
Project Management         Oversight         Oversight         Project Initiation         Finaurce         Maintenance of Traffic         Finance Charges         Training/Start-Up/Testing         \$99.21         \$41.2	nstruction/Project nagement	\$422.36	\$124.39	\$887.26	\$355.65	\$906.23	\$539.18
Project Initiation\$73.02\$11.7• Insurance\$73.02\$11.7• Mobilization\$73.02\$11.7• Maintenance of Traffic\$73.02\$11.7• Maintenance of Traffic\$73.02\$4.8Finance Charges\$4.8\$4.8Training/Start-Up/Testing\$99.21\$41.2	iject Management ersight			\$15.73		\$38.05	
Finance Charges \$4.8 Training/Start-Up/Testing \$99.21 \$41.2	ject Initiation nsurance lobilization laintenance of Traffic	\$73.02	\$11.79	\$75.58 \$5.40		\$295.75	
Training/Start-Up/Testing \$99.21 \$41.2	ance Charges		\$4.89				
	ining/Start-Up/Testing	\$99.21	\$41.29	\$43.16		\$82.19	\$66.46
Total Soft Costs \$840.64 \$381.7	al Soft Costs	\$840.64	\$381.77	\$1,469.58	\$1,084.13	\$1,899.01	\$1,135.02



## APPENDIX: CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

## PORTLAND

S
ы́
S
1
e
$\overline{\mathbf{U}}$
à
ar
Ĩ
C
C
N.
Ĕ
S
6
~
ai
ř
2
<u></u>
_
-
0
>
a
E
I
I
ñ

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles
<b>Opening Date</b>	1986	1987	1987	1988	1990
Route Length (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	22.6
At-Grade	6.6	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Elevated	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Subway	0	0	0	5.3	0.6
Open Cut	0.2	0	0	5.8	0.1
Track Miles	29.3	25.6	40.8	62.4*	43.6
Stations	25	26	22	13	22
Parking Lots	ŝ	80	RN	NR	S
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	NR	NR	1051
Total Revenue Vehicles	26	26	20	*79	54
Peak Vehicies	22	23	15	+02	26
Midday Vehicies	<del>ti</del>	8	15	28*	13
Peak Headway (minutes)	7.5	15	10	NR	10
Midday Headway (minutes)	<del>1</del> 5	30	10	RN	10
Chots					
oldii		ļ	;	(	3
<ul> <li>Administrative</li> </ul>	9	15	=	NR	28
Operators	36	32	58	112	23
Vehicle Maintenance	28	15	55	NR	47
<ul> <li>Facility Maintenance</li> </ul>	19	16	53	NR	45
Other	11	5	20	NR	68
• Totai	110	83	197	503	261
Percent of Route Miles					
At-Grade	65%	%96	%66	66%	81%
Elevated	34%	4%	1%	7%	16%
Subway	0	0	0	13%	3%
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.

	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNTY	<b>METROPOLIT</b> .	AN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	T	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	UNITS OF MEASURE	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT COST	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
-	1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	80,179	\$1,180	\$94,599,637		1984	\$1,342	\$1.329
2	1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	52,212	\$1,070	\$55,869,000		1984	\$1,217	\$1,205
3	DIRECT FIXATION								
4 4	BALLASTED		42,949	\$590		\$25,327,000	1983	\$686	\$679
n v	EMBEDDED EMBEDDED		9.263	29.297		\$30.542.000	1984	\$1.751	P12 E3
2	1.02 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED STRUCTURE	Linear Feet	4,032	\$2,700	\$10,886,000		1984	\$3,072	\$3,041
00	DIRECT FIXATION								
6	BALLASTED		1,713	\$2,310		\$3,957,000	1984	\$2,628	\$2,602
ο.	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		016 6	000 C4		000 000 23	1004	£1 300	376 63
5	1.03 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED.RETAINED FILL	Linear Feet	23,665	\$1.018	\$24,089,000	000,422,000	1984 1983	\$1.184	511.12
3	DIRECT FIXATION				•				
4	BALLASTED		23,665	\$1,018		\$24,089,000	1983	\$1,184	\$1,172
5	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
9	EMBEDDED	1. 1. 1. 10 1000 an - 100 200							
5	1.04 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED FILL	Linear Feet							
x o	DIKECI FIXATION BALLASTED								
^ C	IN-PAVEMENT RALLASTED								
, -	FMREDDED								
5	1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	Linear Feet							
Э	DIRECT FIXATION								
4	BALLASTED								
5	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
0 5	EMBEDDED I DE CIIDEWAY - RETAINED CIT	I Ingar Foot	270	CA BUA	CT 207 000		1004	CE AEE	65 440
- 00	DIRECT FIXATION		>	1.2.2.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1.1			Loot	POT OF	ai tínt
6	BALLASTED		270	\$4,804		\$1,297,000	1984	\$5,465	S5,410
0	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
1	EMBEDDED								
3	1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guideway	80,179	\$2.49	\$200,000		1984	\$2.84	\$2.81
3	1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway							
4	1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guideway	80,179	\$28.17	\$2,258,637		1983	\$32.76	\$32.43
2	TURNOUTS	Each	58	\$21,163	\$1,227,445		1983	\$24,608	\$24,362
9 1	#5		31	\$18,458		\$572,198	1982		
- 0	#4		t				:		
0 0	0#			\$19,237 1931 CC		9134,059	1983	\$22,369	\$22,145
2 0	0#		1/	100'170		105,0026	1983	600,028	\$74,809
5	01#								

TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



	CAPITAL COST DATA B	ASE	TRI-CC	UNTY M	ETROPOL	ITAN TRA	NSPO	RTATION	DISTRICT
	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNT)	METROPOLIT	AN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	5T .	1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
41 7	.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS (continued)								
42	#20		3	\$51,407		\$154,221	1983	\$59,776	\$59,178
43	OTHER - SPECIFY		- 20	\$51,560 \$112 545	\$1,031,192	6117 646	1982	\$63,108	\$62,477
4 <del>1</del>	GIRDER 50 METER		1 6	\$46.804		3112,240	1982		
46	#4, GRDER		10	\$49,741		\$497,410	1982		
47	#8 SINGLE CROSSOVER								
48	#4,DOUBLE CROSSOVER #5 DOURTE CROSSOVER								
20	INTERSECTION								
51	1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	Linear Feet							
52	BRIDGES	Each							
53	OVERPASSES	Each							
7		Fach	ľ	011 000 000	000 000 170		0007	000 000	
55	UN YAHUS & SHUPS	Iotal	1	\$11,602,000	\$11,602,000		1983	\$13,490,698	\$13,355,791
56	2.01 BUILDING	Each	1	\$9,201,000	\$9,201,000		1983	\$10,698,837	\$10,591,849
57	DESCRIPTION	Each		000 7 1 10		\$9,201,000			
20	VAPD CAFACITY * VAPD STORAGE CAPACITY	Revenue Vehicles Revenue Vehicles	100	170'0110			1983	106'HEIS	\$55 55 15
3 99	WORKSTATIONS	Each	12						
61	TRACK LENGTH	Linear Feet	7,728						
62	PARKING	Spaces							
63	2.02 OFFICE FURNITURE & EQUIP.	All							
2 :	2.03 HEAVY REPAIR			\$60,000	\$60,000		1983	\$69,767	\$69,070
3	TRUCK		Y						
20	EOUIPMENT	(N/A)	Y			\$60.000	1983		
68	2.04 MOTOR SHOPS		1	\$10,000	\$10,000		1983	\$11,628	\$11,512
69	VARIABLE TEST LOAD	(N/A)	Z						
70	REWIND	(N/A)							
11	OTHER	(N/A)	and the second	Colles along a grower (Colless	and the second second second second second	\$10,000	1983	(111) (111) (111) (111)	A DIA TOTAL DATA AND A DIA TOTAL AND A DIA TOTAL DATA
72	2.05 WHEEL SHOP		1	\$676,000	\$676,000		1983	\$786,047	\$778,186
13	WHEEL PRESS	Each				\$124,000			
75	D DE MACHINE SHOP	Hach		2015 000	6205 000	000'766\$	1083	CTF 8503	C735 089
76	I ATHF	Fach			000'00-4	855 000	200	- 100000	anolana
11	DRILL PRESS	Each				\$150.000			
78	2.07 AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)							
79	2.08 ELECTRONICS	(N/A)	-	\$200,000	\$200,000		1983	\$232,558	\$230,233



CAPITAL COST DATA	BASE	TRI-COL	JNTY ME	TROPOL	ITAN TRA	NSPO	RTATION	DISTRICT
UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNTY A	<b><i>AETROPOLITA</i></b>	IN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	:Т	1990 CITY	<b>1990 NATIONAL</b>
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	UNITS OF MEASURE	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
80 2.00 YARDS & SHOPS (continued)								
81 2.09 COMMUNICATIONS	(N/X)	8,	\$6,000	\$360,000		1983	\$6,977	\$6,907
82 Z.10 CAH WASH/CAH CLEANING 83 Z.11 MAINTENANCE OF WAY SHOPS	(N/X)		\$137,000	\$137,000		1983	\$159,302	\$157.709
84 SIGNAL	(N/X)				\$137,000			
85 IKACIION POWER 86 COMPONENT REPAIR	(N/A)							
87 TRACK	(N/J)	7	<b><i><u>e</u>En 200</i></b>	#752 000		1001		650 500
	Each	10	\$51.900		\$519.000	1984		sectore
90 CRANE	Each	1	\$54,000		\$54,000	1984		
91 OTHER	Each	4	\$45,000		\$180,000	1984		
93 CASH COUNTING MACHINE								
94 VAULT								
95 OTHER	and a state							
96 ZII CENIRAL CONIAUL 07 MIMIC ROARD								
98 PUBLIC ADDRESS	(N/A)							
99 COMPUTER	(N/A)							
100 FIRE/INTRUSION DETECTOR	(N/J)							
101 MAINLINE CONTROL VAPD CONTROL	(N/X)							
Seismic OR GAS DETECTION	(N/A)							
104 Unit Cost calculated by dividing total cost by shop capacity								
106 3.00 SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	80,179	\$264.00	\$21,167,000		1984	\$300	\$297
107 3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guideway	80,179	\$92.99	\$7,456,000		1984	\$106	\$105
108 TRAIN CONTROL - WAYSIDE		80,179	\$85.52	\$6,857,000		1984	\$97	\$96
109 INSTALLATION		80,179	\$85.52		\$6,857,000	1984		
110 DESIGN								
112 CROSSING PROTECTION	Each	21	\$28,524	\$599,000		1984	\$32,450	\$32,126
113 TRAFFIC SIGNALS	Each	21	\$28,524		\$599,000	1984	\$32,450	\$32,126
114 INSTALLATION								
(1) GATES	Each							
117 3.02 ELECTRIFICATION	L.F. Guldeway	80.179	\$130.79	\$10.487.000		1984	\$149	S147
118 SUBSTATIONS	Each	15	\$236,667	\$3,550,000		1984	\$269,245	\$266,553



L	UNTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNTY	METROPOLIT	AN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	T	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
119	3.00 SYSTEMS (continued)								
120	PURCHASE	Each	15	\$220,000		\$3,300,000	1984		
121	INSTALLATION	Each				\$250,000			
122	CATENARY	L.F. Guideway	80,179	\$86.52	\$6,937,000		1984	\$98	\$97.44
123	INSTALLATION	Each	80,179	\$6.24		\$500,000	1984	200.20	
124	PULES AND CUMPONEN IS WIRE	Facu	1,000	30,000		\$6,000,000	1984	30,820	80/.08
126	TROLLEY		330.000	\$1.32		\$437,000	1984	10.16	64.1¢
127	MESSENGER								
128	FEEDER								
129	RETURN								
130	3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	•		000 000 000		1000		201
151	3.04 TARE COLLECTION	10141		000'+22'CC	\$3,224,UUU		40AL	500'00'00	ezi'iro're
132	FAREBOX		ŝ						
133	VENDING MACHINE		80 8	\$35,632		\$2,423,000	1984		
*	OIHER		80	\$9,102		2801,000	1984		
135	4.00 STATIONS	Each	25	\$604,280	\$15,107,000		1985	\$682,032	\$675,211
136	4.01 AT-GRADE	Each	ধ্য	\$473,400	\$11,835,000		1985	\$534,312	\$528,968
137	CENTER PLATFORM	Each	S	\$440,200	\$2,201,000		1985	\$496,840	\$491,871
138	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet	1,000	\$80,000		\$2,000,000			
139	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(NVA)	6/0						
140	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type	WAYSIDE LIFT	\$40,200		\$201,000	1985		
141	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
142	SIDE PLATFORM	Each	20	\$481,700	\$9,634,000		1985	\$543,679	\$538,243
143	PLAIFORM LENGIH	Linear Feet	8,000	\$1,104		\$8,831,000			
115	HANDRAD ACCESS MODE	(I/I/)		640.150		C003 000	1005		
146	WPATHER COVER AGE	Percent		011010		000'0000	C041		
147	4.02 SUBWAY	Each							
148	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
149	PLATFOR M LENGTH	Linear Feet							
150	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(NV)							
151	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
152	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
153	SIDEPLATFORM	Each							
154	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
155	<b>ESCALATOR/FELVATOR</b>	(N/A)							
156	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type					**		
157	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							

TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



	CAPITAL COST DATA B/	ASE	TRI-CC	OUNTY M	ETROPOI	ITAN TR	NSPO	RTATION	DISTRICT
	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNT	Y METROPOLIT	AN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	CT	1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
-	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
158 4	1.00 STATIONS (continued)								
159	4.03 ELEV :TED	Each							
160	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
161	FLATFORM LENGTH FSCAL ATOR FLATOR	LINEAR PEEL							
163	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
164	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
165	SIDE PLATFORM	Each							
166	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
167	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(NV)							
168	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
169	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent		6654 400	er 177 000		4005	002 0020	100
171	4.04 FAMNING LOIS	10141	0 4	004 4000	000'717'C¢		CORI	10000 AC	\$131,214
1 1			C 1	\$004,400		000 010 00	1001		
173	A DE PARKING CARAGES	Total	0£0,1	000'7\$		\$5,272,000	C861		
174	NITMER OF LOTS								
175	NUMBER OF SPACES								
176	4.06 PEDESTRIAN OVERPASSES	Total							
177 5	1 00 VEHICLES	Each	26	\$969,923	\$25,218,000		1981	\$1.291.509	\$1.278.594
178	5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER A	Each	26	\$965,269	\$25,097,000		1981	\$1,285,312	\$1,272,459
179	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name	BOMBARDIER	\$883,000		\$22,958,000	1981	\$1,175,766	\$1,164,008
180	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type	ARTIC						
181	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet	89						
182	WIDTH	Linear Feet	8.7						
183	NUMBER SEATS	Each	76						
184	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)	Z						
185	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/A)	Z						
186	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type	HYDRAULIC						
187	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type	HIGH						
188	HANDICAPED (LIFT, KAMP)	Type	WAYSIDE LIFT						
189	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/X)	Z						
190	PROCUREMENT COST	Total	26						
191	SPARE PARTS	Total	26	\$34,615		\$900,000	1981	\$46,092	\$45,631
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total	26	\$47,654		\$1,239,000	1981	\$63,454	\$62,819
193	5.02 REVENUE VEHICLES ORDER B	Each							
194	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
195	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
196	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							



					i				
	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		<b>TRI-COUNTY</b>	METROPOLITI	IN TRANSPORT	<b>ATION DISTRIC</b>	1	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF MEASURE	OUANTITY	UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT	VEAR	UNIT COST	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
236	6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)								
237	RAILROAD								
239	01HBR 6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETTERMENTS	Total							
240	NEW INSTALLATION						-		
241	GAS TEI EPHONE								
243	ELECTRIC								
244	WATER								
245	RALINE								
247	OTHER								
248	6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION - OTHER	Total							
249	NEW INSTALLATION								
250	GAS								
251	TELEPHONE								
252	ELECTRIC								
253	WATER								
255	P ATT POAD			-					
256	CTUTTER CTUTTER								
257	6.04 DEMOLITIONS	Total		\$100.000	\$100.000		1984	\$113.766	\$112.628
258	BUILDINGS		9	\$16,667		\$100,000	1984		
259	REMOVALS								
260	6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total							
261	BRIDGES								
262	STREETS								
263	OTHER								and the second
264	6.06 ENVIHONMENIAL	lotal							
265	NOISE								
8	VISUAL								
267	VIBRATION								
269	7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY	Linear Feet	80.179	\$188	\$15.070.000		1984	\$214	\$212
270	7.01 LAND ACQUISITION - PURCHASED	Total	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$13.439.000	\$13.439.000		1983	\$15.626.744	\$15.470.477
271	MAINLINE	Acres	100	\$90,560		\$9,056,000			
272	STATION	Acres	10	\$100,000		\$1,000,000			
273	YARD	Acres	12	\$103,333		\$1,240,000			
274	PARKING	Acres	20	\$107,150		\$2,143,000			

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

03/19/91



CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM         UNIT         TOTAL         COMPONENT         UNIT         TOTAL         COST         COST <thcost< th=""></thcost<>	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		TRI-COUNTY	METROPOLIT	AN TRANSPOR	TATION DISTRIC	T I	1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
I. I.G. H. I.H. J. S. J. S. J. E. M. J. M. J. L. S. J. E. J. M. J. L. S. J.	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF	<b>N_1110</b>	UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT	VEAD	UNIT COST	UNIT COST
57.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)       Total	LIGHI HAIL SYSIEMS	MEASUHE	QUANIIT	COST	CO31	1900	TEAH	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
7.02 AMM ACCONSTION-TOWALD         Total         1         \$1,473,000         \$1,473,000         \$1,473,000         \$1,473,000         \$1,922         \$1,802,938         \$1,802,932         \$1,802,938         \$1,802,93	ns 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)								
MULUNE         STATION         MULUNE           STATION         VAD	7.02 LAND ACUUSIION - DUNAIED	1 OIAI							
TAD         TAD <td>TT MAINLINE STATION</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	TT MAINLINE STATION								
PANKING         PANKING <t< td=""><td>79 YARD</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	79 YARD								
T03 ACOUNSTION-RELATED COST         T0ai         1         \$1,473,000         \$1,473,000         \$1,473,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,803,000         \$1,902         \$1,933,300         \$1,933,30	PARKING						-		
Individual         Individual <thindividua< th="">         Individua         Individua&lt;</thindividua<>	181 7.03 ACOUISITION-RELATED COST	Total	1	\$1,473,000	\$1,473,000		1982	\$1,802,938	\$1,784,900
MORENTAL         TORRENT         Noticital         1         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$192         \$193,300         \$193,300         \$193	182 LEGAL & CONSULTING		1			\$615,000	1982		
R         FROMENTY MAAGMENT         Total         1         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$1982         \$193,390           8         7.05 OTHER         BUNKS         Total         1         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,390           80         SOF         Foral         1         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,390           80         SOF         Total         1         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,390           80         SOF         Total         1         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,390           80         SOF         Total         1         \$73,212,000         \$1982         \$193,301,59         \$17,355,556         \$17,355,556         \$17,350         \$17,500,000         \$1982         \$17,359         \$17,359         \$17,359         \$17,350         \$17,372,555,556         \$17,350         \$17,372,000         \$1982         \$19,340,159         \$17,375,556         \$17,372,000         \$1982         \$19,340,159         \$17,372,000         \$1982         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$17,370         \$19,340,159         \$17,3700         \$1982         \$17,370	APPRAISAL		1			\$615,000	1982		
X 704 RELOCATION         Total         1         \$158,000         \$158,000         \$1982         \$194,390           RENIDEC         RENIDEC         RENIDEC         \$79,000         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,000         \$1982         \$194,390           RENIDEC         RENIDEC         Total         1         \$79,000         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1982         \$193,00         \$1932,255,000         \$1932,255,000         \$1932,255,555,555         \$14,355,555,555         \$14,355,355,555         \$14,355,355,555         \$14,355,355,555         \$14,355,356,317         \$11         \$13,272,000         \$1932,320,000         \$1932,320,000         \$1932,320,000         \$1932,320,000         \$1932,320,000         \$1932,321,320,000         \$1932,321,320         \$14,351,355,356,356         \$14,356,317         \$11         \$13,272,000         \$1932,321,200         \$133,172,000         \$1932,321,320         \$13,172,000         \$1942,31         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,350         \$11,321	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT		1			\$243,000	1982		
Non-contract         Total         1         \$79,000         \$93,000         \$	85 7.04 RELOCATION	Total	-	\$158,000	\$158,000		1982	\$193,390	\$191,451
RESTRINGE         Total         1         \$79,000         1982         \$79,000         1982         \$820         \$823         \$820	BUSINESS		1	000'64\$		000'6/\$	1982		
K.05 OTHER         TODA         TODA         TODA         TODA         S220         \$825555         \$820         \$82755555         \$820         \$827,000         \$817,7339         \$81         \$817,000         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,700         \$817,7000         \$	187 RESIMENCE	100 A	1	000'6/\$		000'6/\$	1982		
B:00 SOFT-COSTS       Linear Feet       B0,179       \$722       \$58,278,000       1985       \$820       \$820         9:0 SOFT-COSTS       B:01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES       Total       1       \$7,535,000       \$7,535,566       \$5,575,566       \$5,575,566       \$5,575,566       \$5,575,556       \$5,575,556       \$5,575,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,755,556       \$5,757,556       \$5,777,556       \$5,777,556       \$5,777,556       \$5,777,556       \$5,774,556       \$5,774,556       \$5,774,520       \$5,747,556       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,747,250       \$5,594,221<	88 7.05 OIHEH	10(3)							
901         B.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES         Total         1         \$2,535,000         \$2,535,000         \$3,755,556         \$5,755,556 <td>89 8.00 SOFT-COSTS</td> <td>Linear Feet</td> <td>80,179</td> <td>\$727</td> <td>\$58,278,000</td> <td></td> <td>1985</td> <td>\$820</td> <td>\$812</td>	89 8.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	80,179	\$727	\$58,278,000		1985	\$820	\$812
91         8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN         Total         1         \$13,212,000         \$13,212,000         \$16,171,359         \$16,	90 B.OT FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	1	\$2,535,000	\$2,535,000		1980	\$3,755,556	\$3,718,000
92         8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT         Total         1         \$17,000,000         \$17,000,000         \$1984         \$19,340,159         \$15         \$15,340,159         \$15         \$15,340,159         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359         \$10,340,359	91 8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total	1	\$13,212,000	\$13,212,000		1982	\$16,171,359	\$16,009,64
93         8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT         Total         1         \$13,172,000         \$13,172,000         \$1985         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,866,817         \$14,827         \$24,900         \$25,240,000         \$5,240,00	92 8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	4	\$17,000,000	\$17,000,000		1984	\$19,340,159	\$19,146,75
99         8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT         Total         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$1           96         R.06 PROJECT INITIATION         Total         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           96         NSURANCE         MOBILIZATION         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           97         MOBILIZATION         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           98         NOBILIZATION         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           98         NOBILIZATION         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           99         MOBILIZATION         1         \$5,240,000         \$5,240,000         \$5,914,221         \$4           99         MANTENANCE OF TRAFFIC         NAMITENANCE OF TRAFFIC         \$5,914,221         \$5,914,221         \$5,914,221           908         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES         NAMITENANCE OF TRAFFIC         \$5,914,221         \$5,914,221         \$5,914,221           909         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES         NAMITENANCE OF TRAFFIC         \$5,914,919         \$5,914,221         \$5,914,221	93 8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	1	\$13,172,000	\$13,172,000		1985	\$14,866,817	\$14,718,14
95         8.06 PROJECT INITIATION         10481         35,240,000         35,240,000         35,240,000         35,314,211         35,314,211         35,314,221         35,314,	94 8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	Total	1				1007		
96         INSURANCE         1         55,240,000         1985         55,914,221           97         MOBILIZATION         MOBILIZATION         1985         55,914,221           98         MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC         MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC         55,914,221         55,914,221           98         MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC         MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC         56,034,989         5,914,221           99         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES         1         \$7,119,000         \$7,119,000         \$7,119,000         \$7,119,000         \$7,034,989         \$5,034,989	95 8.05 PHOJECT INITIATION	I Otal	1	20,240,000	000,040,000		COSI	1776160	10,000,00
9/1         MOBILIZATION           9/2         MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC           9/3         8.07 FINANCE OF TRAFFIC           9/3         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES           9/3         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES           9/3         8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING           0/1         SAFETY CERTIFICATION           0/2         SAFETY CERTIFICATION           0/2         ST,119,000           6.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING           1         \$7,119,000           8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING           001         SAFETY CERTIFICATION           002         OFF-SITE LRV TESTING	96 INSURANCE		1	\$5,240,000		\$5,240,000	1985	\$5,914,221	10,008,08
99         8.07 FINANCE CHARGES         1         \$7,119,000         \$7,000 <td>191 MUBILIZATION MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	191 MUBILIZATION MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC								
00         8.08         TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING         1         \$7,119,000	8.07 FINANCE CHARGES								
001 SAFETY CERTIFICATION 002 OFF-SITE LRV TESTING	00 8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING		1	\$7,119,000	\$7,119,000		1985	\$8,034,989	\$7,954,63
002 OPF-SITE LRV TESTING	001 SAFETY CERTIFICATION								
	02 OFF-SITE LRV TESTING								

## TRI-COUNTY METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



## **SACRAMENTO**



Summary of Light Rail System Characteristics

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles
			1001	0001	
Opening Date	1986	1987	1981	1988	1990
Route Length (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	22.6
At-Grade	9.9	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Elevated	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Subway	0	0	0	5.3	0.6
Open Cut	0.2	o	0	5.8	0.1
Track Miles	29.3	25.6	40.8	62.4*	43.6
Stations	25	26	22	13	53
Parking Lots	5	8	NR	NR	5
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	NR	NR	1051
Total Revenue Vehicles	26	26	50	*79	22
Peak Vehicies	22	23	15	+02	26
Midday Vehicles	12	æ	15	28*	13
Peak Headway (minutes)	7.5	15	10	NR	10
Midday Headway (minutes)	15	30	10	RN	10
Staff					
Administrative	16	15	11	RN	28
Operators	36	32	58	112	73
Vehicie Maintenance	28	15	55	NR	47
<ul> <li>Facility Maintenance</li> </ul>	19	16	53	NR	45
Other	11	ى کا	20	NR	68
• Totai	110	83	197	503	261
Percent of Route Miles					
At-Grade	65%	36%	%66	66%	81%
Elevated	34%	4%	1%	7%	16%
Subway	0	0	0	13%	3%
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.
Ш
S
V
J
F
P
Q
S
0
Ű
_
A
F
A
G

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACR	AMENTO RE	SIONAL TRAN	ISIT DISTRICT	Γ	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
1 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	111,936	\$417	\$46,678,400		1985	\$471	\$428
2 1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	106,920	\$402	\$42,966,000		1985	\$454	\$413
3 DIRECT FIXATION								
4 BALLASTED		68,904	1963		\$23,489,000	1985	\$385	\$350
5 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		38,016	\$512		\$19,477,000	1985	\$578	\$526
	I toor Cont	2012	0063	000000000		1005	CAED	-110
N DIRFCT FIXATION		5.016	0015	****	000 000 CS	1085	10512	2410
9 BALLASTED								
10 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
11 EMBEDDED								
12 I.O. GUIDEWAT - ELEVAIED, AGIANNED FILL								
13 DIRECT FLAATION								
15 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
16 EMBEDDED								
17 1.04 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED FILL	Linear Feet							
18 DIRECT FIXATION				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -		***************************************
19 BALLASTED								
20 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
21 EMBEDDED								
22 1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	Linear Feet							
23 DIRECT FIXATION								
24 BALLASTED								
25 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
26 EMBEDDED								
								*
29 BALLASTED								
30 IN-FAVEMENT BALLASTED								
31 EMBEDDED								
32 1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guidewav							N
33 1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway							
34 1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guideway	111,936	\$15.30	\$1.712,400		1985	\$17.27	\$15.71
35 TURNOUTS	Each	25	\$34,248		\$856,200	1985	\$38,655	\$35,176
36 #5								
37 #44								
38 #6		4	\$25,000		\$100,000	1985	\$28,217	\$25,677
39 #8		œ	\$30,000		\$240,000	1985	\$33,860	\$30,813
40 #10		S	\$33,000		\$165,000	1985	\$37,246	\$33,804



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACI	RAMENTO REC	GIONAL TRAN	SIT DISTRICT		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF	-	LINN	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
41	1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS (continued)								
42	#20		80	\$43,900		\$351,200	1985	\$49,549	\$45,089
43	OTHER - SPECIFY								
45	GIRDER 50 METER								
46	#4, GRDER								
47	#8 SINGLE CROSSOVER								
48	#4,DOUBLE CROSSOVER								
¢ 6	*JOUGDLE CRUSSO VEN								
51	1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	Linear Feet			N.R.				
52	BRIDGES	Each	1						
53	OVERPASSES	Each	2						
X	OTHER	Each							
55	2.00 YARDS & SHOPS	Total	1	\$3,979,000	\$3,979,000		1985	\$4,490,971	\$4,086,783
56	2.01 BUILDING	Each	1	\$3,979,000	\$3,979,000		1985	\$4,490,971	\$4,086,783
57	DESCRIPTION	Each				\$3,979,000			
58	SHOP CAPACITY *	<b>Revenue Vehicles</b>	50	\$79,580			1985	\$89,819	\$81,736
59	YARD STORAGE CAPACITY	Revenue Vehicles	26						
8	WORKSTATIONS	Each	3						
61	TRACK LENGTH	Linear Feet	2,080						
62	PARKING	Spaces	and the second sec						
59	2.02 UFFICE FUMMIUME & EQUIP.	All	ę						
5 5	RODY	(VN)	z						
3	TRUCK	(NVA)	Z						
67	EQUIPMENT	(N/X)	Z						
68	2.04 MOTOR SHOPS								
69	VARIABLF JEST LOAD	(N/X)	Z					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
70	REWIND	(N/N)	Z						
71	OTHFR	(N/N)	Z						
72	2.05 WHELL SHOP		0						
73	WHEEL PRESS	Each	1						
74	WHEEL TRUING	Each	1			and the second			
75	2.06 MACHINE SHOP		10						
76	LATHE	Each	4						
E	DRILL PRESS	Each	\$						
× 2									
5	Z.UB ELEVINUUS	(N/1)	Lawrence and the state						

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



Lu l
3
2
Ш
T
-
2
S
Õ
3
-
Z
F
0
-
X
O

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACH	AMENTO REG	GIONAL TRAN	SIT DISTRICT	ſ	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
80 2.00 YARDS & SHOPS (continued)								
81 2.09 COMMONICATIONS 2.10 CAR WASH/CAR CLEANING		~ 2						
83 2.11 MAINTENANCE OF WAY SHOPS		0						
84 SIGNAL	(N/A)	Y						
85 TRACTION POWER	(N/A)	Y				-		
86 COMPONENT REPAIR	(N/A)	Y						
87 TRACK	(N/A)	Y						
88 2.12 MAINTENANCE OF WAY EQUIPMENT		14						
89 TRUCK	Each	90						
90 CRANE	Each	1						
91 OTHER	Each	5						1
92 2.13 REVENUE CENTER	Each	0						
93 CASH COUNTING MACHINE								
94 VAULT								
95 OTHER								
% 2.14 CENTRAL CONTROL	(N/N)	0						
97 MIMIC BOARD	(N/N)	Z						
98 PUBLIC ADDRESS	(N/A)	Z						
99 COMPUTER	(N/A)	Z						
100 FIRE/INTRUSION DETECTOR	(N/A)	Y						
101 MAINLINE CONTROL	(N/N)	Y						
102 YARD CONTROL	(N/A)	Z						
103 SEISMIC OR GAS DETECTION	(N/A)	Z						
104 OTHER								
105 * Line 58 - Unit Cost calculated by dividing total cost by shop capacity								
106 3.00 SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	111,936	\$174.33	\$19,514,037		1985	\$197	\$179
107 3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guideway	111,936	\$73.58	\$8,236,632		1985	\$83	\$76
108 TRAIN CONTROL - WAYSIDE		111,936	\$61.67		\$6,903,484	1985	\$70	\$63
109 INSTALLATION					\$311,989			
110 HARDWARE								
111 DESIGN					\$6,591,495			
112 CROSSING PROTECTION	Each	90	\$14,813		\$1,333,148	1985	\$16,719	\$15,214
113 TRAFFIC SIGNALS	Each	90	\$14,369		\$1,293,217	1985	\$16,218	\$14,758
114 INSTALLATION					\$39,931	1985		
115 GATES	Each							
		000 111						
117 3.02 ELECINFICATION	L.F. Guideway	066,111	\$89.64	\$10,034,456		1985	2101	\$92
SULLATIONS [118	Fach	14	\$346,886		24,856,409	1985	\$391,520	\$356,283



L	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACH	AMENTO REC	SIONAL TRAN	SIT DISTRICT	Γ	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
119	3.00 SYSTEMS (continued)								
120	PURCHASE	Each				\$3,618,472			
121	INSTALLATION	Each				\$1,237,937			
122	CATENARY DISTALL A TION	L.F. Guideway	111,936	\$46.26		\$5,178,047	1985	\$52.21	\$47.51
124	POLES AND COMPONENTS	Fach	1.000	\$1.520		\$1.520.025	1985	\$1716	
125	WIRE		438,000	\$2.70		\$1,182,145	1985	\$3.05	
126	TROLLEY		194,000						
127	MESSENGER		142,000						
128	FEEDER		102,000						
130	3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	4	\$190.949	\$190.949		1985	\$215,518	101 21013
131	3.04 FARE COLLECTION	Total		\$1,052,000	\$1,052,000		1985	\$1,187,359	\$1,080,497
132	FAREBOX					\$66,000			
133	VENDING MACHINE								
134	OTHER					\$986,000			
135	4.00 STATIONS	Each	28	\$366,786	\$10,270,000		1985	\$413,979	\$376,721
136	4.01 AT-GRADE	Each	28	\$366,786	\$10,270,000		1985	\$413,979	\$376,721
137	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
138	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
139	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)							
140	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
141	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
142	SIDE PLATFORM	Each	28	\$366,786		\$10,270,000	1985	\$413,979	S376,721
143	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet	400						
145	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Tune	Remn						
146	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
147	4.02 SUBWAY	Each							
148	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
149	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
150	ESCALATOR/FELEVATOR	(N/X)							
151	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
152	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
153	SIDE PLATFORM	Each							
154	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
155	ESCALATOR/FLEVATOR	(N/A)							
156	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
101	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91

	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACR	AMENTO RE	GIONAL TRAN	ISIT DISTRICT		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF	VIIII	UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT	VEAD	UNIT COST	UNIT COST
158 4.	.00 STATIONS (continued)			1600	1000	1000	LAN	ESIINA IES	ESTIMATES
159	4.03 ELEVATED	Each							
160	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
161	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
163	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Tvpe							
164	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
165	SIDE PLATFORM	Each							
166	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
167	ESCALATOK/ELEVATOK UANIDICAD ACCESS MODE								
169	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
170	4.04 PARKING LOTS	Total			N.R.				
171	NUMBER OF LOTS		8						
172	NUMBER OF SPACES		3,850						
173	4.05 PARKING GARAGES	Total							
174	NUMBER OF LOTS								
176	NUMBER OF SPACES 4.06 PEDESTRIAN OVERPASSES	Total							
177 5.	00 VEHICLES	Each	36	\$961.111	\$34.600.000		1986	\$1.064.353	\$968.562
178	5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER A	Each	26	\$800.000	\$20.800.000		1986	\$885.936	\$806.202
179	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name	Siemens/Duewag			\$20,800,000			
180	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type	Artic						
181	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet	79.50						
182	WIDTH	Linear Feet	8.75						
183	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
104	AIK CUNULLIUNING	(N/A)	* *						
196	DB AVING SVSTEM (A TO EI EC)	(I/I) T	N Sector						
187	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH I OW)	Type							
188	HANDICAPED (TET RAMP)	Type	Remn						
189	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(NVX)	N						
190	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
191	SPARE PARTS	Total							
192	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
193	5.02 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER B	Each	10	\$1,380,000	\$13,800,000		1990	\$1,380,000	\$1,255,800
194	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
195	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
196	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



L	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACRI	AMENTO RE	GIONAL TRAI	VSIT DISTRICT	Γ	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
197	5.00 VEHICLES (continuea)	1							
198	WIDTH MITMBED SEATS	Linear Feet							
200	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)							
201	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/X)							
202	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC) TYDE OF STEPS (HIGH I OW)	Type							
20 20	HANDICAPED (LIFT, RAMP)	Type							
205	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/X)							
206	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
201	SPARE PARTS	Total							
200	5 03 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER C	Lotal Fach							
210	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
211	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
212	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
213	HTUTH	Linear Feet							
214	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
215	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/X)							
216	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/A)							
117	BRAKING STSTEM (AIK, ELEC)	Ture							
210	HANDICADED (FILORIZOW)	Tune							
220	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/X)							
221	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
222	SPARE PARTS	Total							
223	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
222	5.04 NUN-REVENUE VERICLES	Eacu							
272	SERVICE IRUCAS ALITOMORIL PS								
227	OTHER								
228	6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS	Linear feet	111,936	\$109	\$12,153,425		1985	\$123	\$112
229	6.01 UTILITY RELOCATION - AS IS	Total	1	\$4,850,611	\$4,850,611		1985	\$5,474,730	\$4,982,005
230	NEW INSTALLATION		<b>F</b>	\$386,933		\$386,933			
107	TELEDUD		-	CAA 873		CAA 833			
233	ELECTRIC			\$2.574.580		\$2.574.580			
234	WATER								
235	PIPELINE		-	\$1,230,854		\$1,230,854			

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



UMTA FIXED GUID	DEWAY		SACH	AMENTO REG	IONAL TRAN	SIT DISTRICT		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING	SYSTEM	UNITS OF	VIIANTITV	UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT	VEAD	UNIT COST	UNIT COST
716.00 SPECIAL CONDITION	VS (continued)			1000	1000	1602	ICAN	COLIMATEO	ESTIMATES
237 RAILROAD			1	\$570,767		\$570,767			
238 0THER 239 6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION	N - BETTERMENTS	Total	1	\$42,644 \$482,480	\$482,480	\$42,644	1985	\$544,560	\$495.549
240 NEW INSTALLATION			1	\$482,480		\$482,480			
241 GAS									
742 TELEPHONE									
244 WATER									
245 PIPELINE									
246 RAILROAD									
247 OTHER			-						
248 6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION	N - OTHER	Total							
249 NEW INSTALLATION									
250 GAS									
251 TELEPHONE									
252 ELECTRIC									
253 WATER									
254 PIPELINE									
255 RAILROAD									
256 OTHER									
257 6.04 DEMOLITIONS	1945	Total	2	\$166,568	\$333,136		1985	\$188,000	\$171,080
258 BUILDINGS									
259 REMOVALS			2			\$333,136			
260 6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	0	Total	3	\$2,162,399	\$6,487,198		1985	\$2,440,631	\$2,220,974
261 BKIDGES									
202 SIKEEIS									
263 OIHER		T. 12.1							
		1001							
267 VISUAL									
268 OTHER									
269 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY		Linear Feet	111.936	\$156 5	\$17.408.000		1985	\$176	\$160
270 7.01 LAND ACQUISITION -	PURCHASED	Total	1	\$16.616.000	\$16.616.000		1985	\$18.753,950	\$17.066.095
271 MAINLINE		Acres	1			\$15,983,000			
272 STATION		Acres							
273 YARD		Acres	1	\$633,000		\$633,000			
274 PARKING		Acres							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



#### CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

## SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SACR	AMENTO REC	GIONAL TRAN	SIT DISTRICT		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
ns 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)								
716 7.02 LAND ACQUISITION - DONATED	Total							
277 MAINLINE								
278 SIATION								
281 7.03 ACOUSITION-RELATED COST	Total	7	\$792.000	\$792.000		1985	\$893.905	\$813.454
282 LEGAL & CONSULTING		1	\$481,000		\$481,000			
283 APPRAISAL		1	\$302,000		\$302,000			
284 PROPERTY MANAGEMENT		1	\$9,000		\$9,000			
285 7.04 RELOCATION	Total							
286 BUSNESS								
287 RESIDENCE	Total							
289 8.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	111,936	\$323	\$36,119,000		1982	\$395	\$359
290 B.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	1	\$16,557,000	\$16,557,000		1980	\$24,528,889	\$22,321,289
291 8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total							
292 8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	+	\$9,050,000	\$9,050,000		1983	\$10,523,256	\$9,576,163
293 8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	1	\$4,199,000	\$4,199,000		1984	\$4,777,019	\$4,347,086
294 B.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	Total					1984		
295 8.06 PROJECT INITIATION	Total	1	\$1,285,000	\$1,285,000		1985	\$1,450,339	\$1,319,808
296 INSURANCE		1	\$1,285,000		\$1,285,000	1985	\$1,450,339	\$1,319,808
201 MUBILIZATION								
299 8.07 FINANCE CHARGES		7	\$528,000	\$528.000		1984	\$600.683	\$546.621
300 8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING		1	\$4,500,000	\$4,500,000		1985	\$5,079,007	\$4,621,896
301 SAFETY CERTIFICATION								
302 OFF-SITE LRV TESTING								
303 8.UY UINEM	100000 - 10000 - 10000 - 10000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 100000 - 10000							



#### SAN JOSE



haracteristics
em C
Syst
t Rail
Light
y of
Summai

1

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgn	Los Angeles
Opening Date	1986	1987	1987	1988	1990
Boute Length (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	22.6
At-Grade	9.9	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Floveted	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Cibiuau	0	0	0	. 5.3	0.6
Open Cut	0.2	0	0	5.8	0.1
					`
Track Miles	29.3	25.6	40.8	62.4*	43.6
Stations	25	26	8	13	52
Parking Lots	5	80	NH	NR	5
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	en En	NR	1051
T-4-1 Domains Wahlaloo	90	26	50	97*	54
	2 C	23	\$ <del>;</del>	×0×	26
Peak venicles	7	5	) t	*00	¢,
Midday Vehicles	12	ω	<u>0</u>	87	2
	7 5	¢۲ ک	10	NR	10
Peak neauway (IIIIIIuus)	2		ст т		C T
Midday Headway (minutes)	15	30	2	LN .	2
Staff					
Administrative	16	15	11	NR	28
Oberators	36	32	58	112	73
Vehicle Maintenance	28	15	55	NR	47
Facility Maintenance	19	16	83	NR	45
• Other	11	5	20	NR	68
• Total	110	83	197	503	261
Decent of Darite Milan					
	GE 0/	06%	00%	66%	81%
· At-Grade	0/ 00	0/00	101	70/	16%
Elevated	34%	4%	1.10	0/ 1	2/0L
<ul> <li>Subway</li> </ul>	0	0	0	13%	370
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.

Ш
S
4
0
-
2
2
-
S
Ó
Ŭ.
<b>.</b>
1
R
Q
V
G

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SANTA	CLARA COUN	ITY TRANSPOR	<b>FATION AGENC</b>		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
1 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	82,252	\$801	\$65,887,000		1987	\$852	\$682
2 1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	82,252	\$715	\$58,816,000		1987	\$761	\$609
3 DIRECT FIXATION		48.050	2112		000 574 453	1087	2163	6611
5 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								1100
6 EMBEDDED 7 A D2 GUIDEWAV, FI EVATED STRUCTURE	l inaar Faat	34,202	\$712		\$24,343,000	1987	\$157	\$606
DIRECT F.ATION								
9 BALLASTED 10 IN-P. VEMENT BALLASTED								
	1 Charles Press							
12 T. DIRECT FIXATION								
BALLASTED								
15 IN-PAVEMENT BALLAS TED RABEDDED								
1.04 GUIDEWAY. ELEVATED FILL	Linear Feet							
18 DIRECT FIXATION								
19 BALLASTED 20 IN-PAVEMENT BALL ASTED								
21 EMBEDDED								
22 1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	Linear Feet							
DIRECT FIXATION								
24 BALLASTED 55 IN-PAVEMENT RALLASTED								
26 EMBEDDED								
27 1.06 GUIDEWAY - RETAINED CUT	Linear Feet							
28 DIRECT FIXATION 20 RALL ASTED								
30 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
31 EMBEDDED								
32 1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guldeway							
33 1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway							
34 1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guldeway	82,252	\$19.51	\$1,605,000		1987	\$20.76	\$17
35 TURNOUTS	Each	36	\$8,611	\$310,000		1987	\$9,161	\$7,329
36 #5		35	\$8,000		\$280,000	1987		
5/ #4 50								
00# 39		-	000 053		000 015	1987	\$11 015	CE5 503
40	_				~~~~~~		V-1274V	and supp

03/19/91



UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SANT	A CLARA COUN	<b>UTY TRANSPOR</b>	TATION AGENC	٢	1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	I UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
41 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS (continu	(pan							
42 #20								
43 OTHER - SPECIFY		20	\$64,750	\$1,295,000		1987	\$68,883	\$55,106
GIRDER, 25 METER								
45 GIRDER,50 METER		,	66 000		000	1001		
40 PH		7	000,04		000'01¢	1001		
4/ #8 SHULE CKUSSUVER		3 14	000,000		000 0023	1987		
49 #5,DOUBLE CROSSOVER		5	00010010					
50 INTERCACTION		1	\$250,000		\$250,000	1987		
51 1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	S Linear Feet	1060	\$5,157	\$5,466,000		1987	\$5,486	\$4,389
52 BRI -JES	Each	1	\$4,822,000		\$4,822,000			
53 OVERPASSES	Each	2	\$322,000		\$644,000			
54 OTHER	Each							
55 2.00 YARDS & SHOPS	Total	1	\$21,291,136	\$21,291,136		1986	\$23,578,224	\$18,862,579
56 2.01 BUILDING	Each		\$13,500,000	\$13,500,000		1987	\$14,361,702	\$11,489,362
57 DESCRIPTION	Each	1	\$13,500,000		\$13,500,000	1987		
58 SHOP CAPACITY *	Revenue Vehicles	50	\$425,823			1987	\$453,003	\$362,402
59 YARD STORAGE CAPACITY	Revenue Vehicles	50						
50 WORKSTATIONS	Each	13						
51 TRACK LENGTH	Linear Feet	10,000						
22 PARKING	Spaces	. And the second second second					40.47 220	at a same
2.02 UFFICE FURNITURE & EQUIP.	All	- *	110,6174	110,2124		2001	000,0154	1044/2024
	UNV)	AEC.	sos'enot	eos'anot		COAL	507'41 F¢	1001010
56 TRUCK		YES						
67 BOUIPMENT	(N/X)	YES			\$809.989			
58 2.04 MOTOR SHOPS		F. C.	\$50,000	\$50,000		1987	\$53,191	\$42,553
69 VARIABLE TEST LOAD	(N/A)	YES						
70 REWIND	(N/A)	YES						
01 OTHER	(NVA)	YES			\$50,000			
72 2.05 WHEEL SHOP		1	\$30,000	\$30,000		1987	\$31,915	\$25,532
73 WHEEL PRESS	Each	1			\$30,000			
74 WHEEL TRUING	Each							
75 2.06 MACHINE SHOP		6	\$262	\$1,570		1985	\$295	\$236
76 LATHE	Each	0						
77 DRILL PRESS	Each	. 6			\$1,570			
78 2.07 AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)	1	\$2,680,000	\$2,680,000		1985	\$3,024,831	\$2,419,865
79 2.08 ELECTHONICS	(A/N)	Later and the second second	\$1.420,000	\$1,420,000		19851	S1.602.709	51 282 10/1

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



MU	ITA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SANT	I CLARA COUN	<b>TY TRANSPOR</b>	TATION AGENC	SY	1990 CITY	<b>1990 NATIONAL</b>
CAL	PITAL COSTING SYSTEM IGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	UNITS OF MEASURE	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
80 2.00	YARDS & SHOPS (continued)			1 260 000	e1 260 000		1005		001 101 10
81 82	2.10 CAR WASHCAR LOWS	(N/A)		\$160,000	\$160,000	•	1985	\$180,587	\$144,470 \$144,470
83 84	2.11 MAIN LENANCE OF WAY SHOPS SIGNAL	(NVX)		\$1,100,000	000'001'14		CBEL	\$1,241,535	\$993,228
85	TRACTION POWER	(NVX)							
86	COMPONENT KEPAIK TRACK								
88 88	2.12 MAINTENANCE OF WAY EQUIPMENT								
68 00	TRUCK	Each Fach							
10	OTHER	Fach							
92	2.13 REVENUE CENTER	Each							
93	CASH COUNTING MACHINE								
8	VAULT								
95	OTHER								
8	2.14 CENTRAL CONTROL	(N/A)							
60	MIMIC BOARD	(N/X)							
8 8	PUBLIC AUDKESS	(N/X)							
100	FIRE/INTRUSION DETECTOR	(N/L)							
101	MAINLINE CONTROL	(N/N)							
102	YARD CONTROL	(N/A)							
103	SEISMIC OR GAS DETECTION	(N/X)							
104 * 1 ine 58	. I Init Cost calculated by dividing total cost by shon canacity								
106 3.00	SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	105.600	\$313.68	\$33.124.742		1990	\$314	\$250.95
107	3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guideway	105,600	\$67.89	\$7,169,292		1990	\$68	\$54.31
108	TRAIN CONTROL - WAYSIDE		105,600	\$66.28	\$6,999,292		1990	\$66	\$53.02
109	INSTALLATION					\$3,182,635			
110	HARDWARE					\$3,513,954			
111	DESIGN		Ň			\$302,703			
113	CKUSSING PRUTECTION TRAFFIC SIGNALS	Fach	Ø	\$28,333.33	\$1/0,000		1990	\$28,333	\$22,667
114	INSTALLATION								
115	GATES	Each	4			\$110,000			
116	OTHER		2		second	\$60,000			
117	3.02 ELECTRIFICATION	L.F. Guldeway	105,600	\$177.04	\$18,694,939		1990	2125	\$141.63
118	SUBSIATIONS	Hach	30	\$256,589.30	\$1,697,679		1990	\$256,589	\$205,271

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SANTA	CLARA COUN	TY TRANSPOR	ATION AGENC		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
119	3.00 SYSTEMS (continued)								
120	PURCHASE	Each	15			\$5,527,894			
121	INSTALLATION	Each	15			\$2,169,785			
122	CATENARY	L.F. Guideway	105,600	\$104.14	\$10,997,260		1990	\$104	\$83.31
123	INSTALLATION BOI ES AND COMPONENTS	Each				\$4,132,000 \$6 \$65 760			
125	VILES AND COMPONENTS					007'00'00			
126	TROLLEY								
127	MESSENGER								
128	FEEDER								
129	RETURN				and a state of the second				
130	3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	-	\$2,935,448	\$2,935,448		1990	\$2,935,448	\$2,348,358
131	3.04 FARE COLLECTION	Total	-	\$4,325,063	\$4,325,063		1990	\$4,325,063	\$3,460,050
132	FAREBOX								
133	VENDING MACHINE		93	\$43,394		\$4,035,602	1990		
134	OTHER		54	\$5,360		\$289,461	1990		
135	4.00 STATIONS	Each	22	\$223,364	\$4,914,000		1989	\$226,077	\$180,861
136	4.01 AT-GRADE	Each	ສ	\$223,364	\$4,914,000		1989	\$226,077	\$180,861
137	CENTER F. ATFORM	Each	3	\$192,333		\$577,000	1989	\$194,669	\$155,735
138	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet	334						
139	I SCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)	Z						
140	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
141	WEATHER CUVERAGE SIDE DI ATEODM	Fercent	100	170 763		000 2337 000	1000	1010	010 010
143	PI ATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet	312	10101		000' 100'LA	6061	000'1070	070'-010
144	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)	Y						
145	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
146	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent	100						
147	4.02 SUBWAY	Each							
148	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
149	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
151	ESCALATOK/ELEVATOK	(V/V)							
152	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
153	SIDE PLATFORM	Each							
154	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
155	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/N)							
156	11ANDICAP ACCTSS MODE	Type							
157	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE





\*

ų.
S
4
m
4
F
er -
2
9
in .
ĸ
2
<b>O</b>
A.
0
>
X

L	IIMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		L SANT	CI ARA COUN	TY TRANSPOR	TATION AGENC		1000 CITV	1000 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
15	8 4.00 STATIONS (continued)								
15	9 4.03 ELEVATED	Each							
16	0 CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
16	1 PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
16	2 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/N)							
16	3 HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
16	4 WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
16	SIDE PLATFORM	Each							
16	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
16	1 ESCALATOR/FILEVATOR	(N/A)							
16	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
16	WFATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
11	4.04 PARKING LOTS	Total							
117	NUMBER OF LOTS								
11	NIIMBER OF SPACES								
1	4.05 PARKING GARAGES	Total							
17	NI IMRED OF LOTS								
1									
11	A DE DEDESTRIAN OVERDASSES	Total							
1	5.00 VEHICLES	Fach	20	\$1 112 220	\$55 611 000		1983	\$1 293 279	S1 034 623
11	5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER A	Each	202	\$1.112.220	\$55,611,000		1983	\$1 293 279	S1 034 623
17	MAKFMANTIFACTITRER	Name				\$50,000,000			and in a state of the state of
18	RODY TYPE (RIGID. ARTIC)	Tvne	ARTIC						
18	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet	89.50						
18	WIDTH	Linear Feet	8.75						
18	NUMBER SEATS	Each	75						
18	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)	YES						
18.	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/A)							
18	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type	AIR						
18	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH,LOW)	Type							
18	HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type	ON						
18	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/A)	ON						
19	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
19	SPARE PARTS	Total				\$1,405,000	1983		
19.	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total				\$4,206,000	1983		
19.	5.02 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER B	Each							
19	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
19.	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
19	1 ILENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							



SANTA CLARA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AGENCY	
CAPITAL COST DATA BASE	

L			TTA A						
	UMIA FIAED GUIDEWAT		SANIA	I CLARA CUUN	IT IHANSPOH	IA ITON AGENC		1880 CILL	1990 NA HONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
197	5.00 VEHICLES (continued)								
198	WIDTH	Linear Feet							
199	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
200	AIR CONDITIONING CAP SIGNAT POLIPAGNT								
202	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR ELEC)	Tvne							
203	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH,LOW)	Type							
204	HANDICAPED (LIFT, RAMP)	Type							
205	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/X)							
206	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
207	SPARE PARTS	Total							
208	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
209	5.03 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER C	Each							
210	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
211	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
212	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
213	WIDTH	Linear Feet							
214	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
215	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/N)							
216	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/N)							
217	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type							
218	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type							
219	HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type							
220	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/N)							
221	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
222	SPARE PARTS	Total							
223	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
224	5.04 NON-REVE VUE VEHICLES	Each	13		N.R.				
3	SEKVICE I KUCKS		4						
977	AUTIMUBILES		4 4						
177		l incar foot	82 752	\$102	000 207 03		1005	6444	503
077	6 of UTH ITY RELOCATION - AS IS	Total	7	\$5 822 000	\$5,720,000		1086	CK 447 308	\$5 157 018
230	NEW INSTALLATION			2001-0100		\$\$ 086 000	2021	andierian	
231	GAS					\$158,000			
232	TELEPHONE					\$23,000			
233	ELECTRIC					\$158,000			
234	WATER					\$353,000			
235	PIPELINE								

Booz, Allen & Hamiltor

03/19/91



		SANT	I CLARA COUN	<b>TY TRANSPOR</b>	TATION AGENC	Ϋ́	1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
236 6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued	()							
237 RAILROAD								
238 0 OTHER 730 6 02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETTERMENT	S Total				\$44,000			
240 NEW INSTALLATION								
241 GAS								
242 TELEPHONE								
243 ELECTRIC								
244 WATER								
245 PIPELINE								
246 RAILROAD								
247 OTHER	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1							
248 0.03 UIILIT RELUCATION - UINEM	10181							
249 NEW INSTALLATION								
250 GAS								
251 TELEPHONE								
252 ELECTRIC								
253 WATER								
254 PIPELINE								
255 RAILROAD								
256 OTHER								
257 6.04 DEMOLITIONS	Total	1	\$513,000	\$513,000		1986	\$568,106	\$454,485
258 BUILDINGS			-					
259 REMOVALS		1			\$513,000			
260 6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total							
261 BRIDGES								
262 STREETS								
263 OTHER								
264 6.06 ENVIRONMENTAL	Total	1	\$2,152,000	\$2,152,000		1986	\$2,383,167	\$1,906,53
265 NOISE								
790 TVISIA					\$1,324,000			
267 VIBRATION								
268 OTHER			_		\$828,000			
269 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY	Linear Feet	82.252	\$664	\$54,617,000		1985	\$749	\$600
270 7.01 LAND ACC JISITION - PURCHASED	Total	1	\$51.323.000	\$51.323.000		1985	\$57.926.637	\$46.341.30
271 MAINLINE	Acres	73	\$342,394		\$25,029,000			
272 STATION	Acres	23	\$312,743		\$7,068,000			
273 YARD	Acres	37	\$313,333		\$11,468,000			
274 PARKING	Acres	20	\$389,849		\$7,758,000			

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



Lu l
3
d'
m
Z
2
-
F
S
2
0
-
Z
1
D
V
S

	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		SANT	A CLARA COUN	ITY TRANSPOR	TATION AGENC		1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
275	7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)	Total							
017	MAININE MAININE MAININE MAININE	ma							
278	STATION								
279	YARD								
280		<b>T</b>	•	000 044 00	en 770 nnn		1005	022 042 63	50 CM3 C3
281	1.03 ACGUISTITON-HELATED COST	10191		000121154	000'Z / 1'7¢	000 F CD3	C021	000'071'00	000 1700'7¢
207	AppR A ISAI					\$924,000			
284	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT					\$924,000			
285	7.04 RELOCATION	Total	1	\$522,000	\$522,000		1985	\$589,165	\$471,332
286	BUSINESS		15			\$476,000			
287	RESIDENCE		98			\$46,000			
288	7.05 OTHER	I Otal							
289	8.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	82,252	\$1,659	\$136,417,000		1986	\$1,837	\$1,469
290	8.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	1	\$41,085,000	\$41,085,000		1986	\$45,498,339	\$36,398,671
291	8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total							
292	8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	1	\$63,260,000	\$63,260,000		1986	\$70,055,371	\$56,044,297
293	8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	7	\$19,115,000	\$19,115,000		1986	\$21,168,328	\$16,934,662
294	8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	Total	1		\$1,457,000				
295	8.06 PROJECT INITIATION	Total	1	\$7,500,000	\$7,500,000				
296	INSURANCE								
297	MOBILIZATION					\$7,000,000			
298	MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC		1			000'000			
299	8.07 FINANCE CHARGES		,						
300	8.08 IMAININGSIAHI-UP/IESIING		1	100°000'04	34,000,000		0861	24'4ZA'0/A	\$3,243,143
301	SAFETY CERTIFICATION								
302	OFF-SITE LRV TESTING								
303	8.09 OTHER								


#### PITTSBURGH

Summary of Light Rail System Characteristics

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles
<b>Opening Date</b>	1986	1987	1987	1988	1990
Route Length (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	22.6
At-Grade	9.6	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Elevated	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Subway	0	0	0	5.3	0.6
Open Cut	0.2	0	0	5.8	0.1
Track Miles	29.3	25.6	40.8	62.4*	43.6
Stations	25	26	22	13	53
Parking Lots	5	8	NR	NR	5
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	NR	NN	1051
Total Bevenue Vehicles	26	26	50	*26	54
Peak Vehicies	22	53	15	70*	26
Midday Vehicies	12	8	15	28*	13
Peak Headway (minutes)	7.5	15	10	AN	10
Midday Headway (minutes)	15	30	10	RN	10
Chatt					
Stall		1	3		ç
<ul> <li>Administrative</li> </ul>	16	15	11	HN	28
Operators	36	32	58	112	73
<ul> <li>Vehicie Maintenance</li> </ul>	28	15	55	NR	47
<ul> <li>Facility Maintenance</li> </ul>	19	16	53	NR	45
• Other	=	5	20	NR	68
Total	110	83	197	503	261
Percent of Route Miles					
At-Grade	65%	%96	%66	66%	81%
Elevated	34%	4%	1%	20%	16%
Subway	0	0	0	13%	3%
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.

.

ш
S
4
0
-
R.
d.
6
5
ĸ
X
C
-
Z
L
D
A
CS.

L			TUCU			001101		1000 001	1211017 614 0005
	UMIA FIXED GUIDEWAT		IHOA	AUTHUNIT OF	ALLEGHENT	COUNTY		ISAU CIT	1990 NA I IONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
-	0.00 SYSTEM DESCRIPTION								
2	0.01 SERVICE								
3	ROUTE MILES	Route Miles	* 41.1						
4	TRACK MILES	Track Miles	62.4						
5	STATIONS	Each	13						
9	VEHICLES IN SERVICE	Revenue Vehicles	16						
1	PEAK	<b>Revenue Vehicles</b>	70						
80	MIDDAY	<b>Revenue Vehicles</b>	28						
6	HEADWAY								
10	PEAK	Minutes							
11	MIDDAY	Minutes							
12	0.02 STAFFING - TOTAL	Total	502.7						
13	ADMINISTRATIVE	FTE's							
14	OPERATORS	FTE's	112.2						
15	MAINTENANCE								
16	VEHICLE	FTE's							
17	FACILITY	FTE's							
18	OTHER (eg Fare Inspection)	FTE's	390.5	* Total System Mileage	not Project Mileage				



L
5
2
2
-
2
ব
5
2
Q
S
_
Y
0
$\geq$
2
U

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT .	AUTHORITY OF	- ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
11.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	82,198	\$1,344	\$110,472,428		1985	\$1.517	\$1.508
2 1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	54,627	\$410	\$22,416,945		1985	\$463	\$460
3 DIRECT FIXATION		5,131	\$620		\$3,183,075	1985	\$700	\$696
4 BALLASTED		34,933	\$334		\$11,666,125	1985	175\$	\$375
5 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
6 EMBEDDED		14,563	\$520		\$7,567,746	1985	\$587	\$583
7 1.02 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED STRUCTURE	Linear Feet	5,012	\$567	\$2,841,209		1985	\$640	\$636
8 DIRECT FIXATION		2,141	S477		\$1,020,441	1985	\$538	\$535
9 BALLASTED		963	L66\$		\$960,077	1985	\$1,126	\$1,119
10 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
11 EMBEDDED		1,908	\$451		\$860,691	1985	\$509	\$506
12 1.03 GUIDEWAY + ELEVAIEU, HEIAINEU FILI	L LINear Feet				-			
13 DIRECT FLATION								
14 IN PAVEMENT BALL ASTED								
10 I DA CHINEWAY. ELEVATED EN I	I Ineer East							
10 DALL ASTED								
20 DAVEMENT DAILASTED								
			HEN HE					
		10,121	170-14	381,1/U,84/		C861	28,003	12,24
23 DIRECT FIXATION		3,462	\$18,478		\$63,976,786	1985	\$20,855	\$20,730
24 BALLASTED								
25 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		3,856	\$4,216		\$16,259,569	1985	\$4,759	\$4,730
26 EMBEDDED		3,402	\$451		\$1,534,493	1985	\$509	\$506
27 1.06 GUIDEWAY - RETAINED CUT	Linear Feet	11,838	\$291	\$3,443,427		1984	\$331	\$329
28 DIRECT FIXATION								
29 BALLASTED		11,838	\$291		\$3,443,427	1984	16ES	\$329
30 IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
31 EMBEDDED								
32 1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guldeway							
33 1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway							
34 1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guldeway							
35 TURNOUTS	Each							
36 #5								
37 #4								
38 #6								
39 #8								
40 #10								

Booz, Allen & Hamiltor

03/19/91



#### CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

# PORT AUTHORITY OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY

INTA FIVED GUIDEWAV		Tana		ALLECHENV	COLINITY	ſ	1000 CITV	1000 NA TIONAL
				ALLEGUENT	INDOD	1	1330 0111	1330 NA ILONAL
CAPITAL POSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
41 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS (continued)								
42 #20								
43 OIHER - SPECIFY								
45 GIRDER 50 METER								
46 #4, GIRDER								
47 #8 SINGLE CROSSOVER								
48 #4,DOUBLE CROSSOVER								
49 #3,DOUBLE CROSSOVER 50 INTERSECTION								
1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	Linear Feet							
52 BRIDGES	Each							
53 OVERPASSES	Each							
	Each	ľ				1007		
	IOIAI		\$38,183,180	\$38,183,180		CORL	\$43,090,141	\$42,837,570
56 2.01 BUILDING	Each	1	\$32,090,648	\$32,090,648		1985	\$36,219,693	\$36,002,375
57 DESCRIPTION	Each	1	\$32,090,648		\$32,090,648	1985		
58 SHOP CAPACITY *	Revenue Vehicles	6	\$393,641			1985	\$444,290	\$441,624
759 YARD STORAGE CAPACITY	Revenue Vehicles							
60 WOKKSTATIONS 61 TB ACT I ENGTH	Fach I inner Foot							
titoritititititititititititititititititi	Chical Feet							
63 2.02 OFFICE FURNITURE & EQUIP.	All							
64 2.03 HEAVY REPAIR								
65 BODY 44 millor	(N/X)							
67 FOLIPMENT								
68 2.04 MOTOR SHOPS								
69 VARIABLE TEST LOAD	(VV)							
70 REWIND	(N/A)							
71 OTHER	(N/X)							
72 2.05 WHEEL SHOP								
73 WHEEL PRESS	Each							
74 WHEEL TRUING	Each	and the second						
75 2.06 MACHINE SHOP								
76 LATHE	Each							
17 DKILL PRESS	Each		of a first second s					
78 2.07 AIH CONDITIONING 79 2.08 ELECTRONICS	(N/X)							



LI
10
U)
V
m
-
~
5
2
S
Ó
X
O
_
-
T
0
V
(S)

L	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT	AUTHORITY OF	ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
00 00	<sup>o</sup> 2.00 YARDS & SHOPS (continued) 2.09 COMMUNICATIONS	(N/A)							
00 00	2 2.10 CAN WASH CAN CLEANING 2.11 MAINTENANCE OF WAY SHOPS	(1//1)	1	\$5,025,877	\$5,025,877	٩	1987	\$5,346,678	\$5.314.598
à	4 SIGNAL	(N/N)						na ana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang a	
àc à	5 TRACTION POWER	(N/N)							
5 60	TRACK	(N/L)							
õõ	8 2.12 MAINTENANCE OF WAY EQUIPMENT								
80	9 TRUCK	Each							
8	CRANE	Each							
9,9	1 OTHER	Each	•	et nee eet	64 DEC 664		1001	101 CHC 14	C+C 3VC +4
6	3 CASH COUNTING MACHINE				• • • • • • • • • • • •		-	10101410	~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
x	4 VAULT								
6	5 OTHER								
x	6 2.14 CENTRAL CONTROL	(N/N)							
2	MIMIC BOARD	(N/A)							
8	8 PUBLIC ADDRESS	(N/A)	-						
5, 5	COMPUTER	(N/A)							
10	D FIRE/INTRUSION DEFECTOR								
				-					
01	2 I TAKU CUN IKUL	(N/A)							
0 0	1 OTHER	(N/1)							1
102	5 * Line 58 - Unit Cost calculated by dividing total cost by shop capacity								
Ĩ	s 3.00 SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	82,198	\$716.38	\$58,885,157		1985	\$809	\$804
107	1 3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guldeway	58,083	\$394.49	\$22,913,020		1985	\$445	\$443
105	TRAIN CONTROL - WAYSIDE		58,083	\$394.49	\$22,913,020		1985	\$445	5443
10	6 INSTALLATION								
Ĩ	0 HARDWARE								
Ē	DESIGN								
11	CROSSING PROTECTION	Each							
11	INCTAL SUUND	Each							
Ĩ	STREET	Each							
116	OTHER	TARI							
E	7 3.02 ELECTRIFICATION	L.F. Guideway	68,219	\$396.43	\$27.043.907		1984	\$451	S448
11	8 SUBSTATIONS	Each	4	\$3,007,949	\$12,031,797		1984	\$3,422,013	\$3,401,481



Ш
S
V
0
A
F
A
Q
F
S
Ö
0
1
Z
Q
Y
C

L							ſ		
_	UMIA FIXED GUIDEWAT		THOM	AUTHOHITY OF	- ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
_	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
11	9 3.00 SYSTEMS (continued)								
12(	0 PURCHASE	Each							
12.	I INSTALLATION	Each							
12.	2 CATENARY	L.F. Guideway	68,219	\$220	\$15,012,110		1984	\$250	\$249
12	3 INSTALLATION	Each	1	\$181,509	\$181,509		1984		
124	POLES . ND COMPONENTS	Each	1	\$1,113,906	\$1,113,906		1984	\$1,267,242	\$1,259,639
12:	S WIRE		1	\$1,066,033	\$1,066,033		1984	\$1,212,779	\$1,205,503
126	7. OLLEY								
127	MESSENGER								
128	8 FEEDER								
125	9 RETURN								
130	0 3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	1	\$8,928,230	\$8,928,230		1985	\$10.077.009	\$10.016.547
131	1 3:04 FARE COLLECTION	Total							
132	2 FAREBOX								
133	3 VENDING MACHINE								
134	4 OTHER			-					
135	4.00 STATIONS	Fach	121	\$2 856 898	\$34 282 779		1985	62 224 490	C3 205 143
	A DY AT CDADE	Each							
130	4.01 AI-GUAUE	Eacil	R	cu2,047,14	\$10,/33,840		COSL	\$1,9/3,143	\$1,961,305
137	CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
138	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
135	9 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)							
140	1 HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
141	1 WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
142	2 SIDE PLATFORM	Each	6	\$1,748,205	\$15,733,846		1985	\$1,973,143	\$1,961,305
143	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
14	4 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(NVA)							
145	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
146	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
147	7 4.02 SUBWAY	Each	<del>o</del>	\$6,182,978	\$18,548,933		1985	\$6,978,530	\$6,936,659
148	8 CENTER PLATFORM	Each							
149	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
150	5 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)							
151	I HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
152	2 WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
153	3 SIDE PLATFORM	Each	3	\$6,182,978	\$18,548,933		1985	\$6,978,530	\$6,936,659
154	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
155	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/X)							
156	IIANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
157	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							



CAPITAL COST DATA	BASE	F	ORT AU	THORITY	OF ALLI	EGHEI	IN COUNT	-Y
UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT	Αυτηοριτγ ο	F ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF MEASURE	OUANTITY	UNIT	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
158 4.00 STATIONS (continued)								
159 4.03 ELEVATED	Each							
160 CENTER PLATFORM 161 PLATFORM LENGTH	Each Linear Feet							
162 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)							
163 HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
164 WEATHER COVERAUE	Each							
166 PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
167 F°CALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)							
168 HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
169 WEATHER COVERAGE 170 A DA PARKING I OTS	Percent Total							
171 NUMBER OF LOTS								
172 NUMBER OF SPACES								
173 4.05 PARKING GARAGES	Total							
174 NUMBER OF LOTS								
1/5 4.06 PEDESTRIAN OVERPASSES	Total							
177 5.00 VEHICLES	Each	55	\$1,043,626	\$57,399,440		1985	\$1,177,908	\$1,170,840
178 5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER A	Each	55	\$1,043,626	\$57,399,440	-	1985	\$1,177,908	\$1,170,840
179 MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
180 BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
181 LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
18.2 WILLIN 18.3 NIIMBER SPATS	Linear Feet							
184 AIR CONDITIONING	(N/X)							
185 CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(X/N)							
186 BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type							
187 TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type							
188 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type							
189 ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/N)							
190 PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
191 SPARE PARTS	Total							
192 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
122 VOL 111 VELICE VELI	Name							
195 BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
196 LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							



L	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT	AUTHORITY OF	ALLEGHENY	COUNTY	Γ	1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
197	5.00 VEHICLES (continued)								
198	WIDTH MILITOR STATE	Linear Feet							
200	AIR CONDITIONING	(VV)							
201	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(NVA)							
202	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type							
203	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type							
205	HANDICAFED (LIFT, KAME) ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(Y/N)							
206	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
207	SPARE PARTS	Total							
208	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
209	5.03 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER C	Eacn							
210	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name							
211	BODY TYP? (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
212	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
213		Linear Feet							
214	NULLIBER SEATS	Each							
C17									
210	CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT DD AVNIC SVSTEM (ATD ET EC)	(1/N) T-m0							
218	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH I OW)	Type							
219	HANDICAPED (LIFT.RAMP)	Type							
220	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/A)							
221	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
222	SPARE PARTS	Total							
223	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
225	SUM NOT TEVENOE VENICES	Each							
226	AUTOMOBILES								
227	OTHER								
228	6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS	Linear feet	82,198	\$122	\$10,038,972		1984	\$139	\$138
230	New INSTALLATION	1010		Cott'stoo'sto	not tonite		LOCI	inniencito	41,000,000
231	GAS		2		\$578,064				
232	HISTER				\$248,253				
233	ELECTRIC		4 •		\$2,939,444				
235	WATEK DIDET INE		-		\$268,674				

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT	Αυτηοριτγ ορ	ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	UNITS OF MEASURE	QUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT COST	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
236	6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)								
238	OTHER 07HER 6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETTERMENTS	Total	1	\$4.939.567	<b>\$4</b> ,939,567		1984	\$5.619.530	\$5.585.813
240	NEW INSTALLATION		1		\$560,596				
241	GAS		1 1		\$664,702 \$767.687				
243	ELECTRIC		1		\$2,857,500				
244	WATER								
245	PIPELINE RAILROAD								
247	OTHER		1		\$89,082				
248	6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION - OTHER	Total							
249	NEW INSTALLATION								
250	GAS								
251	TELEPHONE								
227	ELECTRIC								
254	PIPELNE								
255	RAT ROAD								
256	OTHER								
257	BUT DINGS	1 OTAI	-	\$/4/,060	\$/4/,080		1962	\$408° 038	\$803,485
259	REMOVALS								
260	6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total							
261	BRIDGES								
202	SI KEELS ATTITED								
264	6.06 ENVIRONMENTAL	Total	1	\$317,890	\$317,890		1985	\$358,792	\$356,640
265	NOISE							-	
266	NISUAL		1		\$317,890		1985		
267	VIBRATION								
268							T		
269	V.UU HIGHI-OF-WAY	Linear Feet	82,198	\$262	\$21,511,920		1983	\$304	\$302
271		Acres		076'110'17¢	175,110,124		COSI	000'010'07\$	\$44,000,111
272	STATION	Acres							
273	YARD	Acres							
274	PARKING	Acres							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

## PORT AUTHORITY OF ALLEGHENY COUNTY

L	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		PORT	AUTHORITY OI	= ALLEGHENY	COUNTY		1990 CITY	1990 NA TIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
275	5. 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)								
276	7.02 LAND ACQUISITION - DONATED	Total							
278	MAINLINE STATION								
279	YARD	_							
280	PARKING	a shirt of a base as the bound of the second							
281	T.03 ACQUISITION-RELATED COST	Total							
283	APPRAISAL								
284	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT								
285	T.04 RELOCATION	Total							
286	BUSINESS								
287	RESIDENCE	1							
288	7.05 OTHER	Total							
289	8.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	82,198	\$2,734	\$224,751,180		1985	\$3,086	\$3,068
290	8.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total							
291	8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total	1	\$106,746,730	\$106,746,730		1985	\$120,481,637	\$119,758,747
292	8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	7	\$11,236,750	\$11,236,750		1985	\$12,682,562	\$12,606,467
293	8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	1	\$14,821,100	\$14,821,100		1985	\$16,728,104	\$16,627,735
294	8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	Total							
295	ROUT A SUCE PROJECT INITIATION	Total							
296	INSURANCE								
297	MOBILIZATION								
298	MAINTEN , NCE OF TRAFFIC								
299	8.07 FINANCE CHARGES								
300	8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING								
301	SAFETY CERTIFICATION								
302	OFF-SITE LRV TESTING								
303	8.09 OTHER			\$91 946 600	\$91 946 600		1087	\$97 815 532	\$97 228 639



#### LOS ANGELES



Summary of Light Rail System Characteristics

	Portland	Sacramento	San Jose	Pittsburgh	Los Angeles
Opening Date	1986	1987	1987	1988	1990
Route Length (miles)	15.2	18.3	19.9	41.1	22.6
At-Grade	9.9	17.6	19.7	27.1	18.3
Elevated	5.2	0.7	0.2	2.9	3.6
Subway	0	0	0	5.3	0.6
Open Cut	0.2	0	0	5.8	0.1
Track Mlies	29.3	25.6	40.8	62.4*	43.6
Stations	25	26	22	13	23
Parking Lots	5	80	NR	NR	<u>נו</u>
Parking Spaces	1636	3850	NR	NR	1051
Total Revenue Vehicles	26	26	50	*26	54
Peak Vehicies	22	23	15	+02	26
Midday Vehicles	12	8	15	28*	13
Peak Headway (minutes)	7.5	15	10	NR	10
Midday Headway (minutes)	15	30	10	NN	10
Staff					
Administrative	16	15	1	NR	28
Operators	36	32	58	112	73
<ul> <li>Vehicle Maintenance</li> </ul>	28	15	55	NR	47
Facility Maintenance	19	16	53	NR	45
Other	Ħ	5	20	NR	68
Total	110	83	197	503	261
Parcant of Route Miles					
• At-Grade	65%	96%	%66	66%	81%
Elevated	34%	4%	1%	7%	16%
<ul> <li>Subway</li> </ul>	0	0	0	13%	3%
Open Cut	1%	0	0	14%	<1%

\* Total system statistics; not project-specific.

	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		LOS ANGEL	ES COUNTY 1	RANSPORTATIC	N COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
-	.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	119,283	\$1,247	\$148,719,104		1988	\$1,293	\$1,133
	1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	96,253	\$700	\$67,408,808		1988	\$726	\$636
	DIRECT FIXATION								
-	BALLASTED		61,869	\$487		\$30,145,147	1988	\$505	SAA3
	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		1,618	\$2,848		\$4,608,103	1988	\$2,954	\$2,588
-	EMBEDDED		32,766	2665		\$32,655,558	1988	\$1,034	\$906
	1.02 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED STRUCTURE	Linear Feet	10,785	\$3,286	\$35,437,638		1988	23,409	\$2,986
	DIRECT FIXATION		9,376	\$3,033		\$28,435,174	1988	\$3,146	\$2,756
_	BALLAS LEU N.PAVFMFNT BALL ASTFD		1,409	のんち		\$1,002,464	1988	cc1,c&	01C,4%
	EMBEDDED								
-	1.03 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED, RETAINED FILL	Linear Feet	6,407	\$932	\$5,973,099		1988	\$965	\$847
-	DIRECT FIXATION						:		
_	BALLASTED		6,407	\$932		\$5,973,099	1988	\$961	\$847
_	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
-	EMBEDDED								
_	1.04 GUIDEWAY - ELEVAIEU FILL	Linear reet	790,2	8/04	\$1,390,912		1988	\$103	\$010
	DIRECT FIXATION								
-	BALLASTED		2,052	\$678		\$1,390,912	1988	\$703	\$616
-	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
_	EMBEDDED	1							
	1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	Linear Feet	3,296	\$6,965	\$22,955,679		1988	\$7,225	\$6,329
	DIRECT FIXATION		3,296	\$6,965		\$22,955,679	1988	\$7,225	\$6,329
_									
	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
-	1 DE CHINEWAV , DETAINED CIT	I Incor Fact	400	CA 7EG	C2 220 510		1000	64 034	CC 8 277
_	DIRECT FIXATION		490	84.756	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~	\$2,330,510	1988	LADILA	
_	BALLASTED								
_	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED								
	EMBEDDED								
_	1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guideway	119,283	\$71.99	\$8,586,709		1988	\$74.67	\$65.41
	1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway	119,283						
_	1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guideway	119,283	\$38.86	\$4,635,749		1988	\$40.31	\$35.32
_	TURNOUTS	Each	57	\$38,938		\$2,219,465	1988	\$40,392	\$35,383
-	#2								
_	54								
_	#								
_	8#								
-	#10								

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		LOS ANGE	LES COUNTY TI	<b>PANSPORTATIC</b>	ON COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF	VIIIIVII	TINU	TOTAL	COMPONENT	VEAD	UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGNI RAIL STOLEWS	MEAJUHE	GUANTIT	CO31	CO31	c031	TEAH	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
41 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENIS (CONTINUE	ed)							
42 #20 43 OTHER - SPECIFY								
44 GIRDER, 25 METER								
45 GIRDER,50 METER 46 GIRDER 44 GIRDER								
40 #4, UNDEN #8 SINGLE CROSSOVER		12	203 340		\$1,120,080	1988	\$96.826	\$84 810
48 #4,DOUBLE CROSSOVER		1	\$205,473		\$205,473	1988	\$213,146	\$186,716
49 #5,DOUBLE CROSSOVER		2	\$329,791		\$659,582	1988	\$342,107	\$299,686
50 INTERSECTION 51 1 10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	Linear Feat	4	\$107,787		\$431,149	1988	\$111,813	\$97,948
52 BRIDGES	Each							
53 OVERPASSES	Each							
	Totol	Ŧ	047 DA7 740	644 DA4 740		1000	CAE REE 520	CAN 150 152
	Fach Fach	•	041,204,744 825 220 B64	475 770 REA		1000	440,000,009	\$77 075 T77
27 DESCRIPTION	Fach			Loole Trioth	\$13.724.388	1988		444-14 PULL
58 SHOP CAPACITY *	Revenue Vehicles	\$4	\$818,606			1988	\$849,177	\$743,879
59 YARD STORAGE CAPACITY	Revenue Vehicles	54			\$11,505,476	1988		
60 WORKSTATIONS	Each							
61 TRACK LENGTH	Linear Feet							
62 PARKING	Spaces					Variation of the second		
2.02 UFFICE FURNIUME & EUUIP.	ł	11	5272 383	S7 996 208		1088	\$282 555	\$247 518
65 BODY	(N/A)	2			\$1.858.720			
66 TRUCK	(N/A)	2			\$347,413			
67 EQUIPMENT	(NV)	7			\$790,075			
00 ZOLA MOLOH SHOLE COL								
70 REWIND								
71 OTHER	(NVA)							
72 2.05 WHEEL SHOP		1	\$1,144,662	\$1,144,662		1988	\$1,187,409	\$1,040,170
73 WHEEL PRESS	Each			-			<	
74 WHEEL TRUING	Each				\$1,144,662			
75 2.06 MACHINE SHOP								
76 LATHE	Each							
77 DRILL PRESS	Each				<ul> <li>A set of state at state at selection at the state of state of</li></ul>			
2.07 AIH CONDITIONING			24 010 E01			0001	010010	AL CIF 100
1) Z.UO ELEVINUNUU	(N/)	1	11201010110	1,010,051		1980	\$1,8/8,310	nn+'c+0'1¢

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



CAPITAL COST DATA	A BASE	1 507	ANGELE	S COUNTY	TRANSP	ORTA	TION COM	NOISSIM
UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		LOS ANGEL	ES COUNTY T	RANSPORTATIO	N COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF MEASURE	OUANTITY	UNIT COST	TOTAL COST	COMPONENT	YEAR	UNIT COST ESTIMATES	UNIT COST ESTIMATES
							07141107	
	IVWI							
2 10 COMMUNICATIONS		F	\$959.396	\$959.396		1988	\$995.224	\$871 816
2.11 MAINTENANCE OF WAY SHOPS		10	\$73,400	\$734,000		1988	\$76,141	\$66,700
84 SIGNAL	(NV)							
85 TRACTION POWER	(NVX)							
86 COMPONENT REPAIR	(NV)							
TRACK	(VV)	4	000 000	000 0274		4000	001 1 00	
2112 MAINIENANCE OF WAT EQUIPMENT	r -	0	minet	moncie		0021	121'100	341,401
89 IKUCK 60 CPANE	Each Fach							
	Hach							
9) 2.13. REVENUE CENTER	Each							
93 CASH COUNTING MACHINE								
94 VAULT								
95 OTHER								
% 2.14 CENTRAL CONTROL	(N/A)	1	\$11,179,919	\$11,179,919	\$6,106,054	1988	\$11,597,426	\$10,159,345
97 MIMIC BOARD	(N/A)	1	\$4,432,019		\$4,432,019	1988	\$4,597,530	\$4,027,436
98 PUBLIC ADDRESS	(N/N)							
99 COMPUTER	(N/N)	1	\$641,846		\$641,846	1988	\$665,815	\$583,254
100 FIRE/INTRUSION DETECTOR	(N/N)							
101 MAINLINE CONTROL	(N/N)							
102 YARD CONTROL	(N/N)							
103 SEISMIC OR GAS DETECTION	(N/X)							
105 * Line 58 - Unit Cost calculated by dividing total cost by shop capacity								
106 3.00 SYSTEMS	Linear Feet	119.282	\$966.39	\$115.273.245		1988	\$1.002	\$878
101 3.01 SIGNAL SYSTEM	L.F. Guideway	119,282	\$341.59	\$40.745.221		1988	\$354	\$310
108 TRAIN CONTROL - WAYSIDE		119,282	\$232.35	\$27,715,247		1988	\$241	\$211
109 INSTALLATION					\$116,349			
110 HIARDWARE					\$1,034,481			
111 DESIGN		119,282	\$222.70		\$26,564,417	1988	1628	\$202.37
112 CROSSING PROTECTION	Each	28	\$465,356	\$13,029,974		1988	\$482,735	\$422,876
113 TRAFFIC SIGNALS	Each	28	\$433,001		\$12,124,025	1988	S449,171	\$393,474
114 INSTALLATION					\$552,641			
GATES GATES	Each				\$353,308			
		000 077	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	010 001 010		0007		
111 JUNE ELECTRIFICATION	L.F. GUIDEWAY	119,202	414.41	\$45,432,018	000 020 000	1999	33	1154
CNINI VICANCE 011	Lach	6	1995,301,16		99C'6CN'17@	1988	761'641'16	e17.100.16

03/19/91



4 Y
MEAS
Each
I.F. Guid
Eac
Ea
Tota
Tots
Ea
Ea
Ea
(Y/)
Typ
Ea
Linear
NY F
Percei
Eac
Each
Linear Fe
(NX)
Type
Each
Linear
VA)
Ty
Perce

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		LOS ANGEI	LES COUNTY TI	RANSPORTATIC	ON COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
158	4.00 STATIONS (continued)								
159	4.03 ELEVATED	Each	3	\$2,928,894	\$8,786,682		1988	\$3,038,272	\$2,661,526
8	CENTER PLATFORM	Each	3	\$2,928,894		\$8,786,682	1988	\$3,038,272	\$2,661,526
161	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
162	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/X)							
63	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
8 3	WEATHEK COVERAGE CIDE DI ATEORM	Fercent					_		
6 8	PI ATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet							
67	ESCALATOR/FILEVATOR	(N/N)							
68	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type							
69	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent							
10	4.04 PARKING LOTS	Total	ð	\$1,698,107	\$8,490,533		1988	\$1,761,521	\$1,543,093
12	NUMBER OF LOTS		S						
72	NUMBER OF SPACES		1,051	\$8,079			1988	\$8,380	\$7,341
73	4.05 PARKING GARAGES	Total							
74	NUMBER OF LOTS								
75	NUMBER OF SPACES	Total	c	C000 611	CCC 000 13		1088	\$1 175 041	Cons 250
1	5.00 VEHICLES	Each	54	\$1,480.354	\$79,939,129		1988	\$1,535,637	\$1.345.218
78	5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES - ORDER A	Each	5	\$1,446,965	\$78,136,129		1988	\$1,501.001	\$1.314.877
61	MAKE/MANUFACTURER	Name		or a large statement of the second statement of the se					
80	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
81	LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
82	HLCIM	Linear Feet							
83	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
5 6	AIR CONDITIONING CAP SIGNAT FOLITIMAT								
86	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR ELEC)	Type							
87	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH,LOW)	Type							
88	HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type							
89	ON-BOARD FAREBOX	(N/A)							
8	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
16	SPARE PARTS	Total							
92	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
2 2	MAKEMANI RACTI PEP	Name							
95	BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type							
20	I FNGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91


	CAPITAL COST DATA B.	ASE	'SOT	ANGELES	COUNTY	TRANSP	ORTA	TION COM	NOISSIM
	2								
	UMTA FILED GUIDEWAY		LOSANGEI	ES COUNTY TH	RANSPORTATIO	N COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
_	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
19.	75.00 VEHICLES (continued)								
198	8 WIDTH	Linear Feet							
19	NUMBER SEATS	Each							
20, 20	CAR SIGNAL FOLIPMENT								
202	() BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type							
203	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type							
20	4 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP) ON.BOAPD FAPEROY	Type					-		
ŝ	PROCUREMENT COST	Total							
207	PARE PARTS	Total							
202	special EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
502	D.UJ HEVENUE VERICLES - URDER C	Lacn							
211	RODY TYPE (RICIT) ARTIC	Tune							
212	TENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet							
213	HICIM	Linear Feet							
214	1 NUMBER SEATS	Each							
215	AIR CONDITIONING	(N/A)							
216	S CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/A)							
21.	BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type							
218	TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type							
17		Type							
221	PROCLIREMENT COST	Total							
222	SPARE PARTS	Total							
223	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total							
224	1 5.04 NON-REVENUE VEHICLES	Each	19	\$94,895	\$1,803,000		1988	\$98,439	\$86,232
225	SERVICE TRUCKS		5		\$136,000	\$680,000			
226	AUTOMOBILES		12		\$28,333	\$340,000			
77			200 077	110 10	1000 01 0 0	WU, 25/ &	1001		000 10
228	6.00 SPECIAL CUNULLIUNS	Linear teet	119,282	\$7,211	\$152,349,392		1985	\$1,442 \$7,442	\$1,263 \$7 524 684
230	NEW INSTALLATION								
231	GAS					S397,776			
232	TELEPHONE					\$179,117			
.62	ILLECTRIC WATTER					C/1/2CS			
235	PIPELANE					\$130,065			
							1		

03/19/91

Booz, Allen & Hamiltor



HHTA CIVES CHIDEWAV			T VTMIIO	OTTATOOOSMA	NOISSIMNOJIN			1000 MATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF	LUS ANGEL		TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
26.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued)								
B37 RALKOAD					- 6799 140			
239 6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETTERMENTS	S Total	1	\$119,761,634	\$119,761,634	\$/00'140	1985	\$135,171,144	\$118,409,923
40 NEW INSTALLATION							-	
di GAS					\$4,636,851 \$1 001 741			
A2 ELEPHONE FILECTRIC					\$21.311.426			
WATER WATER					\$6,168,122			
PIPELINE PIPELINE					\$27,379,768			
A6 RAILROAD					\$56,398,574	1988		
6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION - OTHER	Total				761,078,16			
049 NEW INSTALLATION								
GAS GAS								
TELEPHONE TELEPHONE								
52 ELECTRIC								
MATER WATER								
CULTER OTHER								
51 6.04 DEMOLITIONS	Total	1	\$967,836	\$967,836		1985	\$1,092,366	\$956,912
BUILDINGS					\$384,438			
REMOVALS					\$583,398			
60 6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total	1	\$12,088,912	\$12,088,912		1985	\$13,644,370	\$11,952,468
61 BRIDGES								
202 SIKEEIS					000'000 011 CEE 012			
6.06 ENVIRONMENTAL	Total	7	\$16.977.505	\$16.977.505	712'000'116	1985	\$19.161.970	\$16.785.885
65 NOISE								
7VISIA 999					\$10,124,905			
VIBRATION								
0010 OUDER					90,852,600	1		
69 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY	Linear Feet	119,282	\$504	\$60,084,803		1988	\$523	\$458
70 7.01 LAND ACCUISITION - PUHCHASED	lotal		\$55,437,402	204,154,002	LOF 253	1988	8/0'/nc'/c¢	071'015'nG¢
	Acres	I	704,104,000		204,104,000			
VARD	Acres							
PARKING	Acres							

03/19/91

Booz, Allen & Hamiltor



SE
3A
AE
AT
TD
SO
C
TA
4 PI
6

# LOS ANGELES COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY		LOS ANGEL	ES COUNTY TH	RANSPORTATIO	N COMMISSION		1990 CITY	1990 NATIONAL
CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT	TOTAL	COMPONENT		UNIT COST	UNIT COST
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	QUANTITY	COST	COST	COST	YEAR	ESTIMATES	ESTIMATES
zs 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)								
276 7.02 LAND ACQUISITION - DONATED	Total							
277 MAINLINE								
278 STATION								
280 PARLING								-
281 7.03 ACOUISITION-RELATED COST	Total	1	\$4,493,401	\$4,493,401		1988	\$4,661,204	\$4,083,215
282 LEGAL & CONSULTING					\$2,211,075			
283 APPRAISAL					\$40,500			
284 PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	and a second sec				\$2,241,826			
285 7.04 RELOCATION	Total	1	\$154,000	\$154,000		1988	\$159,751	\$139,942
286 BUSINESS		1			000'11\$			
287 RESIDENCE	Total	1			\$77,000			
200 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	119.282	\$1.767	\$210.805.963		1985	\$1,995	\$1.747
290 B.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	<u>,</u>						
291 8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total	1	\$69,586,796	\$69,586,796		1985	\$78,540,402	\$68,801,392
292 8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	4	\$86,130,800	\$86,130,800		1985	\$97,213,093	\$85,158,669
293 8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	1	\$23,200,000	\$23,200,000		1985	\$26,185,102	\$22,938,149
294 8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	T Total	1	\$4,591,000	\$4,591,000		1985	\$5,181,716	\$4,539,183
295 8.06 PROJECT INITIATION	Total	1	\$35,638,000	\$35,638,000		1985	\$40,223,476	\$35,235,765
296 INSURANCE					\$35,638,000			
291 MOBILIZATION 298 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC								
299 8.07 FINANCE CHARGES								
300 8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING		1	\$9,915,093	\$9,915,093		1985	\$11,190,850	\$9,803,185
301 SAFETY CERTIFICATION								
302 OFF-SITE LRV TESTING				and the second		al 1 a a la la la	가 있는 것 같은 것 같은 것 같이 없다.	아이아 소 바로 가지 않는다. 아이가 않는 것이 ??
303 8.09 OTHER		1	(\$18,255,726)	(\$18,255,726)		1988	(\$18,937,475)	(\$16,589,228)



-----

Ш
S
J.
m
7
V
0
1
S
0
Ŭ.
<b>.</b>
Z
0
5
<u>र</u>
()

	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY			UNIT	COST SU	MMARY	
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF					
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	OBSERVATIONS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
-	0.00 SYSTEM DESCRIPTION						
2	0.01 SERVICE						
ъ	ROUTE MILES	Route Miles	5	0	÷ 18	30	30
4	TRACK MILES	Track Miles	5	26	40	62	37
S	STATIONS	Eách	5	13	22	28	15
6	VEHICLES IN SER VICE	Revenue Vehicles	5	26	51	6	11
2	PEAK	Revenue Vehicles	5	15	31	10	55
90	MIDDAY	Revenue Vehicles	5	8	15	28	20
6	HEADWAY						0
10	PEAK	Minutes	4	0	6	15	15
11	MIDDAY	Minutes	4	0	13	30	30
12	0.02 STAFFING - TOTAL	Total	5	83	231	503	420
13	ADMINISTRATIVE	FTE's	4	0	14	28	28
14	OPERATORS	FTE's	5	32	62	112	80
15	MAINTENANCE						0
16	VEHICLE	FTE's	4	0	29	55	55
17	FACILITY	FIE's	4	0	12	53	53
18	OTHER (eg Fare Inspection)	FTE's	5	5	66	391	386



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY			UNIT C	US LSO	MMARY	
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF					
	LIGHI HAIL SYSTEMS	MEASUHE	<b>OBSERVATIONS</b>	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
-	1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS	Linear Feet	5	\$428	\$1,016	\$1,508	\$1,079
2	1.01 GUIDEWAY AT-GRADE	Linear Feet	3	\$413	\$665	\$1,205	\$792
3	DIRECT FIXATION		1	\$696	\$696	\$696	\$0
4	BALLASTED		5	\$350	\$491	\$679	\$329
S	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		2	\$526	\$1,557	\$2,588	\$2,062
9	EMBEDDED		4	\$583	\$1,452	\$3,714	161'6\$
1	1.02 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED STRUCTURE	Linear Feet	4	\$410	\$1,768	\$3,041	\$2,631
80	DIRECT FIXATION		3	\$410	\$1,233	\$2,756	\$2,346
6	BALLASTED		3	611'1\$	\$2,746	\$4,516	23,397
10	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						
11	EMBEDDED	00000-000-000-000000	2	\$506	\$1,936	\$3,365	\$2,859
12	1.03 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED, RETAINED FILL	Linear Feet	~	\$847	\$1,009	\$1,172	\$325
13	DIRECTFIXATION						
14	BALLASTED		2	\$847	\$1,009	\$1,172	\$325
15	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						
16	ENBEDDED	and the second second second second					
17	1.04 GUIDEWAY - ELEVATED FILL	Linear Feet	1	\$616	\$616	\$616	\$0
18	DIRECT FIXATION						
19	BALLASTED		I	\$616	\$616	\$616	\$0
20	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						
21	EMBEDDED						
22	1.05 GUIDEWAY - SUBWAY	Linear Feet	~	\$6,329	\$7,443	\$8,557	\$2,228
23	DIRECT FIXATION		2	\$6,329	\$13,530	\$20,730	
24	BALLASTED						
25	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED		I	\$4,730	\$4,730	\$4,730	(0\$)
26	EMBEDDED		I	\$506	\$506	\$506	\$0
27	1.06 GUIDEWAY - RETAINED CUT	Linear Feet	3	\$329	\$3,354	\$5,410	\$5,081
28	DIRECT FIXATION						
29	BALLASTED		2	\$329	\$2,870	\$5,410	\$5,081
30	IN-PAVEMENT BALLASTED						
31	EMBEDDED						
32	1.07 POCKET TRACK	L.F. Guideway	8	\$2.81	\$34.11	\$65.41	\$62.61
33	1.08 STORAGE TRACK	L.F. Guideway					
33	1.09 SPECIAL TRACKWORK	L.F. Guideway	4	\$15.71	\$25.02	\$35.32	\$19.60
35	TURNOUTS	Each					
36	#5						
37	#4						
38	9#						
39	8#						
40	#10						



			RANGE						\$0			\$38,750,787	400 00 0 0 0 0 0 0				\$0	\$662,297			7to lice		** 544 COO	00001410114	6075 YEA	70,50070		\$1,415,167
ARY		I H H I	MAXIMUM						\$4,389			\$42,837,570 \$36 002 375	~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~				\$252.440	\$731,367		645 EF3	0001740		64 010 4 TO	0115040514	-275 000	005'077¢	•	\$2,419,865 \$1,645,400
T SUMM			MEAN						\$4,389			\$23,862,435	A11:5101114				\$252.440	\$349,318		100 Lus	200,126		6644 COD	4014,043		711/0114		\$2,419,865 \$1,052,600
INIT COS			MINIMUM						\$4,389			\$4,086,783 \$4,086,783					\$252.440	\$69,070		611 E12	710110		675 570	940,004	2009	00720		\$2,419,865 \$230,233
7			OBSERVATIONS					-	1			א טו	<del>)</del>				1	3		c	4		¢	<u>,</u>		v		3
ASE		UNITS OF	MEASURE						Linear Feet	Each	Each	Total	Each	Revenue Vehicles	Kevenue Vehicles Each	Linear Feet	Spaces			(NVX)	(V/V)	(N/A)	(NVA)	Each	Each	Each	Each	(N/A)
CAPITAL COST DATA B	UNTA LIVED CUIDEWAV	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	41 1.00 GUIDEWAY ELEMENTS (continued)	42 #20 43 OTHER - SPECIFY 43 CIDINED 24 METTER	44 GRDER,50 METER 45 GRDER,50 METER 46 GRDFR	47 #8 SINGLE CROSSOVER 48 #4,DOUBLE CROSSOVER	49 #5,DOUBLE CROSSOVER	31 1.10 GUIDEWAY-SPECIAL STRUCTURES	52 BRIDGES 53 OVERPASSES	54 OTHER	55 2.00 YARDS & SHOPS	57 DESCRIPTION	S8 SHOP CAPACITY *	59 YAKD STOKAGE CAPACITY 60 WORKSTATIONS	61 TRACK LENGTH	62 PAP ING 63 2.02 OFFICE FUBNITURE & EQUIP	64 2.03 HEAVY REPAIR	66 BODY 66 TRUCK	C EQUEMENT	69 VARIABLE TEST LOAD	70 REWIND	11 OTHER	73 WHEEL PRESS	74 WIEEL TRUNG		77 DRILL PRESS	78 2.07 AIR CONDITIONING 2.08 ELECTRONICS

Booz, Allen & Hamilton



MINIMUM \$6,5
w
51
\$10
100



	CAPITAL COST DATA B	ISE		UNIT CO	ST SUM	MARY	
	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT C	OST SUI	MMARY	
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	OBSERVATIONS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
119	3.00 SYSTEMS (continued)						
120	PURCHASE	Each					
121	LINSI ALLATION CATENARY	Lacn I F Guideway					
123	NSTALLON	Each					
124	POLES AND COMPONENTS	Each				-	
125	WIRE						
126	TROLLEY						
127	MESSENGER						
170	NATTAN						
130	3.03 COMMUNICATIONS	Total	4	\$196.121	\$7.477.427	\$17.348.680	\$17,152,559
131	3.04 FARE COLLECTION	Total	4	\$1,080,497	\$3,407,019	\$5,456,404	\$4,375,907
132	FAREBOX						
133	VENDING MACHINE						
134	OTHER						
135	4.00 STATIONS	Each	5	\$180,861	\$1,431,936	\$3,205,143	\$3,024,282
136	4.01 AT-GRADE	Each	5	\$180,861	\$800,732	\$1,961,305	\$1,780,443
137	CENTER PLATFORM	Each	3	\$155,735	\$542,827	\$980,874	\$825,139
138	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet					
139	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)					
140	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type					
141	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent					
142	SIDE PLATFORM	Each	5	\$184,828	\$778,309	\$1,924,381	\$1,739,553
143	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet					
144	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)					
145	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	1 ype					
146	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent	c	66.005 EED	10 210 213	605 454 400	A10 000 414
141	Marcelle in definity	Each	1	envioreine	100-010-010	4441111111	****'077'016
140	DI ATHORM I FNGTH	I inear Feet					
150							
151	HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Tvne					
152	WFATHER COVERAGE	Percent					
153	SIDE PLATFORM	Each	2	\$6,936,659	\$16,046,881	\$25,157,102	\$18,220,443
154	PLATFORM LENGTH	Linear Feet					
155	ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	(N/A)					
156	IIANDICAP ACCESS MODE	Type					
157	WEATHER COVERAGE	Percent					



	RANGE	80										\$811,878					\$0	\$376.657	\$508,676															20			
AMARY	MAXIMUM	\$2.661.526			-							\$1,543,093					\$908.360	\$1.345.218	\$1,314,877															\$1,255,800			
INS ISO	MEAN	\$2.661.526										\$1,137,154					\$908.360	\$1.159.567	\$1,119,800															\$1,255,800			
UNIT C	MINIMUM	\$2.661.526										\$731,214					\$908.360	\$968.562	\$806,202															\$1,255,800			
	OBSERVATIONS											8					1	5	5															1			
UNITS OF	MEASURE	Each	Each	Linear Feet	Tvpe	Percent	Each	Linear Feet	(N/X)	Type	Percent	Total			10181		Total	Each	Each	Name	Type	Linear Feet	Linear Feet	Each	(NV)	(N/X)	Type	Type	Type	(N/A)	Total	Total	Total	Each	Name	Type	Linear Feet
UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	58 4.00 STATIONS (continued) 50 4 03 FI FVATED	60 CENTER PLATFORM	PLATFORM LENGTH	62 ESCALATORELE VATOR HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	WEATHER COVERAGE	55 SIDE PLATFORM	PLATFORM LENGTH	57 ESCALATOR/ELEVATOR	58 HANDICAP ACCESS MODE	69 WEATHER COVERAGE	70 4.04 PARKING LOTS	71 NUMBER OF LOTS	72 NUMBER OF SPACES	13 4.05 PAHKING GAHAGES	NUMBER OF LOIS	75 A DE DEDESTRIAN OVERPASSES	n 5.00 VEHICLES	78 5.01 REVENUE VEHICLES ORDER A	79 MAKE/MANUFACTURER	80 BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	81 LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	82 WIDTH	83 NUMBER SEATS	AIR CONDITIONING	85 CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	86 BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	87 TYPE OF STEPS (HIGH,LOW)	88 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	89 ON-BOARD FAREBOX	90 PROCUREMENT COST	91 SP.ARE PARTS	92 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	33 5.02 IEVENUE VEHICLES OHDEH B	94 MAKE/MANUFACTURER	94 BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	96 LENGTH OVER COUPLERS

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE



UMTA     FIXED     GUIDEWAY     UNIT     COST     SUMMARY       CAPITAL     COSTING SYSTEM     UNIT     COST     SUMMARY       LIGHT     BAIL     SYSTEMS     MENON     MENON     MENON       10     NUMER     UNIT     COST     SUMMARY     MENON       11     WILL     COST     MENON     MENON     MENON       11     WILL     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       11     WILL     COST     MENON     MENON     MENON       12     WILL     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       13     WILL     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       14     WILL     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       15     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       16     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       17     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON     MENON       16 <th>CAPITAL COST DATA</th> <th>BASE</th> <th></th> <th>UNIT CO</th> <th>ST SUM</th> <th>MARY</th> <th></th>	CAPITAL COST DATA	BASE		UNIT CO	ST SUM	MARY	
CADITAL COSTING STATE     UNTS OF LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM     UNTS OF MEASURE     ONTI COST SOMMART       CADITAL COSTING STATE     MASS OF LIGHT RAIL SYSTEM     MASS OF MEASURE     MASS OF							
LIGHT BALL SYSTEMS         MASTINE         Description         MASTINE         MASTINE<	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF			US ISO:	MMARY	
Instruction     Lameted     Lameted </th <th>LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS</th> <th>MEASURE</th> <th>OBSERVATIONS</th> <th>MINIMUM</th> <th>MEAN</th> <th>MAXIMUM</th> <th>RANGE</th>	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	OBSERVATIONS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
18     WDM       18     <	197 5.00 VEHICLES (continued)						
000     AR CONDUNING     (10)       010     CAR STATURE AND	HDUW 198	Linear Feet					
mill     c.ds Stork all Comparent     (m)     (	200 AIR CONDITIONING	(Y/N)					
InterOversion     The origination of the ori	201 CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT 200 BD AVING SYSTEM (A ID ET EC)	(VV)					
000     0.0.300.0480 (MERLOADE)     (Tris)	203 TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type					
10     FIGURDATION     Total	204 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type		-			
main     state harts     Total	205 DIAD FAREBUA 206 PROCUREMENT COST	Total					
2008     5.03 REVENUEMENT COST     Toul     Toul       210     MAERAAUTACTURER     Name       211     MAERAAUTACTURER     Name       212     MAERAAUTACTURER     Name       213     MAERAAUTACTURER     Name       214     MAERAAUTACTURER     Name       215     HANDHOUR CONTLER     Name       216     Lanof Tree Contract     Name       217     MAERAAUTACTURER     Lanof Feet       218     NUMERI     Lanof Feet       219     NUMERI     Contracturer       210     Cals Sond Lapuration     Then Feet       211     RACONDITIONIC     Then Feet       212     AR CONDITIONIC     Then Feet       213     RACANED LITTIAND     Then Feet       214     NUMERI EALT     Then Feet       215     RACANED LITTIAND     Then Feet       216     Cals Sond LITTIAND     Then Feet       217     Sond NOMARETON     Then Feet       218     Sond NOMARETON     Then Feet       219     Sond NOMARETON     Sond NOMARETON       219     Sond NOMARETON     Then Feet       2101     Sond NOMARETON     Sond NOMARETON       2101     Sond NOMARETON     Sond NOMARETON       2101     Sond	207 SPARE PARTS	Total					
0.00     MAREMANE FAILURATION     MAREMANE FAILURATION     MAREMANE FAILURATION       211     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       213     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       214     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       215     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       216     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       218     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       219     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       219     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       210     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)       211     EDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     The IDENTIFIC REGLARTIC)     Statistics       212     STATISTICS     STATISTICS     STATISTICS       213     STATISTICS     STATISTICS     STATISTICS       213     STATISTICS     STATISTICS     STATISTICS       213     STATISTICS     STATISTICS     STATISTICS       213     STATISTICS     STATISTICS	208 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total	and the statement of the statement				
211     Instruction     Type     Type <td>209 D. D. D. MAKEMANUFACTURER</td> <td>Laci</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	209 D. D. D. MAKEMANUFACTURER	Laci					
213     UBOTH OVER COUPLERS     Linear Flet     Linear Flet       213     WITH     Linear Flet     Linear Flet       214     WUNBER SATS     Linear Flet     Linear Flet       215     WUNBER SATS     Linear Flet     Flet       216     REANL EDUTHANING     (YN)     Type       218     NUMBER SATS     Flat     (YN)       219     REANLED     Type       219     HANDOLADEID LINAMID     Type       210     REANL EDUTHANING     (YN)       211     REANL STERN (ARALEC)     Type       212     REANL FOUNDERD     Total       213     RARDOLADEID LINAMID     Total       214     HANDOLADEID LINAMID     Total       215     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       216     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       217     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       218     SARE PATS     Total       219     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       210     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       211     SARE PATS     SARE PATS       <	211 BODY TYPE (RIGID, ARTIC)	Type					
213     WUDH     Linear Red     Linear Red     Linear Red     Linear Red       216     AR CONDITIONING     (YN)     (YN)       216     AR CONDITIONING     (YN)       216     AR CONDITIONING     (YN)       216     RAARCONTIONING     (YN)       217     RAARCONTIONING     (YN)       218     RAARCONTIONING     (YN)       219     TYPE OF SYERS (HIGHLON)     TyPE       210     NANDICAPED (LITRAND)     TyPE       211     SARETARTS     Total       212     SARETARTS     Total       213     SARETARTS     Total       214     SARETARTS     SARETARTS       215     SARETARTS     Total       225     SARETARTS     SARETARTS       225     SARETARTS     SA	212 LENGTH OVER COUPLERS	Linear Feet					
216     AN CONDITIONICO     Teal       217     AN CONDITIONICO     Teal       218     AN CONDITIONICO     TYPE       219     TYPE OF SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TYPE       210     RAKING SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TYPE       210     RAKING SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TYPE       210     TYPE OF SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TyPE       210     TYPE OF SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TyPE       211     RAKING SYSTAW (AR, AL, Ed.)     TyPE       212     SPAKE PARTS     Total       213     SPAKE PARTS     Total       214     SPAKE PARTS     Total       215     SAKE PARTS     Total       216     MORPECAL EQUIPMENT COST     Total       217     STAKE PARTS     Total       218     ANTORONDELES     Each       219     STAKE PARTS     Total       210     MORPECAL EQUIPMENT COST     Total       211     STAKE PARTS     Total       212     STAKE PARTS     Total       213     STAKE PARTS     Total       214     STAKE PARTS     STAKE PARTS       215     MORPECAL EQUIPARTS     STAKE PARTS       216     STAKE PARTS     Total       217     STAKE PARTS     STAKE PARTS	213 WDTH	Linear Feet					
11     Cab SIGNAL EQUIPMENT     (*/i)     (*/i)     (*/i)     (*/i)     (*/i)       21     The OFSTSTEM (MELLEC)     Type     (*/i)     (*/i)       22     ON-BOARD FARENCY     (*/i)     (*/i)     (*/i)       23     SCA MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Toul     Toul       24     SCA MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Each     2     \$11,267     \$46,750     \$66,232     \$74,965       25     SCA MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Toul     Toul     Toul     S46,750     \$66,232     \$74,965       25     SO MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Toul     Toul     S46,750     \$66,370,239     \$74,965       25     MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Each     5     \$11,267     \$46,750     \$66,370,239     \$74,965       25     MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Toul     5     \$51,764     \$47,796     \$74,965       26     MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Fach     5     \$54,545     \$74,965       20     MON-REVENUE VEHICLES     Indeat feet	214 NUMBER SEATS	(VN)					
211     BRAKING SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       212     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       213     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       214     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       215     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       216     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       217     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Type       218     HANDIC SYSTEM (AR.B.LEC)     Total       219     PROCUREMENT COST     Total       211     SAM (TONDELLES)     Each       212     SAM NOT NOBILES     SAM (TONDELLES)       213     SAM NOT NOBILES     SAM (TONDELLES)       214     MUTANDELLES     SAM (TONDELLES)       215     GOD SPECIAL CONDITIONS     Linear feet       216     GOD SPECIAL CONDITIONS     Linear feet       217     GAN NSTALLATION     SAM (TO ASS)       218     MUTANDELLES     SAM (TO ASS)       219     GAN NSTALLATION     SAM (TO ASS)       210     BAN (TO ASS)     SAM (TO ASS)       211     GAN NSTALLATION     SAM (TO ASS)       212     MUTANDANCH     SAM (TO ASS)       213     GAN (TO ASS)     SAM (TO ASS)       214     GAN (TO ASS)     SAM (TO ASS)       214     SAM (TO ASS) <td>216 CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT</td> <td>(N/A)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	216 CAB SIGNAL EQUIPMENT	(N/A)					
118TYPE OF STEPS (HICHLOW)Type219HANDICAEB (LIFTRAME)Type210NONCORED (LIFTRAME)Type211NONCORED (LIFTRAME)Type212NONCORED (LIFTRAME)Type213PROCUREMENT COSTTotal214SPARE PARTSTotal215STARE PARTSTotal216STARE PARTSTotal217STARE PARTSTotal218STARE PARTSTotal219STARE PARTSTotal219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSTotal219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS210STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS211STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS212STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS213STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS214STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS215STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS216STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS217STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS218STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS219STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS210STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS211STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS211STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS211STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS211STARE PARTSSTARE PARTS </td <td>217 BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)</td> <td>Type</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	217 BRAKING SYSTEM (AIR, ELEC)	Type					
210HANDICAED (LITTAMP)Type220ON-BOARD FAREBOXType221FROCINEMENT COSTTotal222SPARE PARTSTotal223SPARE PARTSTotal224SPARE PARTSTotal225SPARE PARTSTotal226SPARE PARTSTotal227SPARE PARTSTotal228SPARE PARTSTotal229SPARE PARTSTotal229SPARE PARTSTotal229SOURMENT COSTTotal229SOURMENT COSTTotal229SOURMENT CONDITIONSLinear feet230SOURMENT CONDITIONSLinear feet231SOURT RELOCATION - AS ISTotal232SOURT RELOCATION - AS ISTotal233TOTALSAG, 233245, 555Total5233Total5233SOURT RELOCATION - AS ISTotal233TOTALSAG, 233246, 555SG, 370, 239246, 56, 370, 239SG, 370, 239	218 TYPE OF STEPS (HIGHLOW)	Type					
223FOCUREMENT COSTTotal(11)223SPARE PARTSTotal100223SPARE PARTSTotal224SPARE PARTSTotal225SPARE PARTSTotal225SPARE PARTSTotal226SPARE PARTSTotal227SPARE PARTSTotal228SCOA NON-REVENCE VEHICLESEach229SCOA NON-REVENCE VEHICLESEach229G.OT SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COSTEach231G.OT SPECIAL CONDITIONSLinear feet232G.OT UTILITY RELOCATION - AS ISTotal233G.OT UTILITY RELOCATION - AS ISS11,267244SARALIATIONS119,422253GASTotal254S2,524,684\$4,719,422254,555GAS254MATER254WATER254WATER254WATER254WATER255WATER </td <td>219 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)</td> <td>Type</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	219 HANDICAPED (LIFT,RAMP)	Type					
22SPARE PARTSToal23SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COSTToal24SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COSTToal25S.04 NON-REVENUE VEHICLESFach25SERVICE TRUCKSFach25SERVICE TRUCKS26NUTOMOBILES27OTHER28OTHER29OTHER29OTHER29SARTA PART20OTHER21OTHER22OTHER23OTHER24OTHER25GO SPECIAL CONDITIONS26Linear feet27VIII-ITY RELOCATION - AS IS28TELEPHIONE29GAS29SARTA ANDI29TELEPHIONE29WATER29WATER29WATER20WATER<	221 PROCUREMENT COST	Total					
223SPECIAL BOURMENT COSTToalToalToalSH1,267\$48,750\$86,232\$74,965224SERVICE TRUCKSEach2\$11,267\$48,750\$86,232\$74,965225NUTOMOBILESOTHEREach2\$11,267\$48,750\$86,232\$74,965226OU SPECIAL CONDITIONSLinear feet5\$47,79\$65,70,239\$51,1822296.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONSLinear feet5\$2,524,684\$4,719,422\$6,370,239\$3,845,5552300.05Tellaritone5\$2,524,684\$4,719,422\$6,370,239\$3,845,555231TELARIONETellaritone5\$2,524,684\$4,719,422\$6,370,239\$3,845,555232TELARIONEMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA\$6,370,239\$3,845,555234WATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA\$4,719,422\$6,370,239\$3,845,555234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234MATHAMATHAMATHAMATHAMATHA234 </td <td>222 SPARE PARTS</td> <td>Total</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	222 SPARE PARTS	Total					
124         5.04 MON-HE VENUE VETILLES         Each         2         311,201         349,750         360,232         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,950         371,150	223 SPECIAL EQUIPMENT COST	Total	¢				
121DEFINITION228AUTOMOBILES229AUTOMOBILES229OTHER2296.01 UTLITY RELOCATION - AS IS2306.01 UTLITY RELOCATION - AS IS2315.3372326.01 UTLITY RELOCATION - AS IS2335.370,2392345,5552345.4,719,4222355.370,2392365.3845,5552375.3845,5552385.3845,5552395.3845,5552315.3845,555232TellePIONE233TellePIONE234TellePIONE235TellePIONE236FILE237TellePIONE238TellePIONE239TellePIONE <td< td=""><td>224 D.04 NON-HEVENUE VENICLES</td><td>Eacn</td><td>N</td><td>107/114</td><td>1001,884</td><td>\$80,232</td><td>\$/4,905</td></td<>	224 D.04 NON-HEVENUE VENICLES	Eacn	N	107/114	1001,884	\$80,232	\$/4,905
213         OTHER         5         \$\$81         \$\$337         \$\$1,263         \$\$1,182           228         6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS         Linear feet         5         \$\$81         \$\$337         \$\$1,263         \$\$1,182           220         6.01 UTLITY RELOCATION - AS IS         Total         5         \$\$2,524,684         \$\$4,719,422         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           220         0.05         TELEPHONE         5         \$\$2,524,684         \$\$4,719,422         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           221         0.05         TELEPHONE         5         \$\$2,524,684         \$\$4,719,422         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           223         TELEPHONE         5         \$\$2,524,684         \$\$4,719,422         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           223         TELEPHONE         5         \$\$2,524,684         \$\$4,719,422         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           223         0.00         UTLITY RELOCATION         5         \$\$45,556         \$\$5,370,239         \$\$3,845,555           224         WATER         UTLITY RELOCATION         5         \$\$6,370,239         \$\$10,239         \$\$2,845,555           224         WATER         UTLITY RELOCATION         1         \$\$10,432 <td< td=""><td>222 SEKVICE INUCKS</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	222 SEKVICE INUCKS						
228       6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS       Linear feet       5       \$81       \$337       \$1,263       \$1,182         229       6.01 UTILITY RELOCATION - AS IS       Total       5       \$2,524,684       \$3,79,239       \$3,845,555         230       New INSTALLATION       5       \$2,524,684       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$3,845,555         231       GAS       TELEPHIONE       5       \$2,524,684       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$3,845,555         232       TELEPHIONE       ELECTRIC       WATER       WATER       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$3,845,555         233       TELEPHIONE       ELECTRIC       WATER       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$3,845,555         233       PIDELANE       ELECTRIC       \$4,719,422       \$5,70,239       \$5,345,555         234       TELEPHIONE       ELECTRIC       WATER       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$5,845,555         235       TELEPHIONE       ELECTRIC       WATER       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$5,845,555         235       TELEPHIONE       ELECTRIC       WATER       \$4,719,422       \$6,370,239       \$5,845,555         234       WATER       WATER       TELEPHIONE       TELEPHIONE	227 OTHER						
220         6.01 UTILTY RELOCATION - AS IS         Total         5         \$2,524,684         \$4,719,422         \$6,370,239         \$3,845,555           230         NEW INSTALLATION         5         \$2,524,684         \$4,719,422         \$6,370,239         \$3,845,555           231         GAS         Total         5         \$2,524,684         \$4,719,422         \$6,370,239         \$3,845,555           231         GAS         TELEPHONE         5         \$4,719,422         \$6,370,239         \$3,845,555           231         GAS         TELEPHONE         5         \$4,719,422         \$6,370,239         \$3,845,555           232         TELEPHONE         MATER         1	228 6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS	Linear feet	5	\$81	\$337	\$1,263	\$1,182
<ul> <li>230 NEW INSTALIATION</li> <li>231 GAS</li> <li>232 TELEPIONE</li> <li>233 ELECTRIC</li> <li>234 WATER</li> <li>235 PIPELINE</li> </ul>	229 6.01 UTILITY RELOCATION - AS IS	Total	5	\$2,524,684	\$4,719,422	\$6,370,239	\$3,845,555
231         GAS           232         TELEPIONE           233         ELECTRIC           234         WATER           235         PIPELINE	230 NEW INSTALLATION						
232 HELEPHONE 233 ELECTRIC 234 WATTER 235 PIPELINE	231 GAS						
234 WATER 235 PIPELINE	232 TELEPHONE						
235 PIPEJNE	233 WATER						
	235 PIPELINE						



UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF		UNIT C	OST SU	MMARY	
LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	OBSERVATIONS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
236 6.00 SPECIAL CONDITIONS (continued						
237 RAILROAD						
239 6.02 UTILITY RELOCATION - BETTERMENT	S Total	3	\$495,549	\$41,497,095	\$118,409,923	\$117,914,373
240 NEW INSTALLATION						
241 GAS						
242 TELEPHONE						
243 ELECIRIC 244 WATED						
245 PIPELINE						
246 RAILROAD						
247 OTHER					ļ	
248 6.03 UTILITY RELOCATION - OTHER	Total					
249 NEW INSTALLATION						
250 GAS						
251 TELEPHONE						
252 ELECTRIC						
253 WATER						
254 PPELNE						
255 RAILROAD						
256 OTHER		1		074 T 1 1 1 1		
25 0.04 DEMOLITIONS	IRIOI	0	\$115,020	01/1100	ZIR'OCR¢	\$07 <sup>4</sup> 880¢
260 6.05 ROADWAY CHANGES	Total	8	\$2.220.974	\$7,086,721	\$11,952,468	\$9.731,494
261 BRIDGES						
262 STREETS						
263 OTHER		\$	6420 C 40	ac 242 Cac		
		0	040'0000	000'8+0'00	000'00/'01¢	\$10,423,440
260 VIRRATION						
268 OTHER						
269 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY	Linear Feet	5	\$160	\$346	\$600	S440
270 7.01 LAND ACQUISITION - PURCHASED	Total	5	\$15.470.477	\$30.823.677	\$50.376.726	\$34.906.250
271 MAINLINE	Acres					
272 STATION	Acres					
273 YARD	Acres					
274 PARKING	Acres					

CAPITAL COST DATA BASE

03/19/91

Booz, Allen & Hamilton



	UMTA FIXED GUIDEWAY			UNIT C	OST SUN	AMARY	
	CAPITAL COSTING SYSTEM	UNITS OF					
	LIGHT RAIL SYSTEMS	MEASURE	OBSERVATIONS	MINIMUM	MEAN	MAXIMUM	RANGE
27:	5 7.00 RIGHT-OF-WAY (continued)						
27	6 7.02 LAND ACQUISITION - DONATED	Total					
27	MAINLINE						
27	8 STATION				4		
27	YARD						
58	PARKING				000 000 000		
28	1.03 ACCUISITION-HELATED CUST	IBIOI	*	\$013,434	32,230,120	CIT'CON'SA	101'507'54
28.	LEGAL & CONSULTING						
207	APPKAISAL						
28	PROPERTY MANAGEMENT						000 1000
28	S 7.04 HELOCATION	10131	<u>s</u>	\$139,942	116'1074	\$411,332	9551555
28	BUSINESS						
28	RESIDENCE	and the second	The store the state of the	A NAME OF A DAMAGE OF A DAMAGE OF A	<ul> <li>A state of a state o</li></ul>		
28	8 7.05 OTHER	Total		and the second			
28	8.00 SOFT-COSTS	Linear Feet	5	\$359	\$1,491	\$3,068	\$2,708
29	8.01 FEASIBILITY STUDIES	Total	3	\$3,718,000	\$20,812,653	\$36,398,671	\$32,680,671
29	8.02 ENGINEERING & DESIGN	Total	3	\$16.009.645	\$68,189,928	S119,758,747	\$103,749,102
29	8.03 CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT	Total	5	\$9.576.163	\$36,506,471	\$85,158,669	\$75,582,506
29	8.04 PROJECT MANAGEMENT	Total	5	\$4,347,088	\$15,113,157	\$22,938,149	\$18,591,061
29	1 8.05 PROJECT MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT	Total	1	\$4,539,183	\$4,539,183	\$4,539,183	\$0
29	8.06 PROJECT INITIATION	Total	3	\$1,319,808	\$14,136,884	\$35,235,765	\$33,915,957
29	5 INSURANCE						
29	MOBILIZATION						
29	8 MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC						
29	9 8.07 FINANCE CHARGES		1	\$546,621	\$546,621	\$546,621	80
30	D 8.08 TRAINING/START-UP/TESTING		4	\$3,543,743	\$6,480,866	\$9,803,185	\$6,259,441
30	SAFETY CERTIFICATION						
30.	2 OFF-SITE LRV TESTING						
30	1 8.09 OTHER		2	(\$16.589.228)	\$40.319.705	\$97,228,639	\$113.817.867



•

### FTA Capital Cost Database South Sacramento Corridor Project as of December 31, 2002

FTA Cost Category 1.00 Guideway Elements 2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Special Conditions 6.00 Special Conditions
1.00 Guideway Elements 2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 5.00 Vehicles 6.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 6.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles snoitions 6.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 5.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 8.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 5.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 8.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles snoitions e.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 8.00 Special Conditions
2.00 Yards & Shops 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles 8.00 Special Conditions
3.00 Systems 3.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles e.00 Special Conditions
4.00 Systems 4.00 Stations 6.00 Special Conditions
4.00 Stations 5.00 Vehicles enoitiono 2.00 Special Conditions
6.00 Special Conditions 8.00 Special Conditions
enoitibnoJ Isibage 00.6
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
_
VeW to track 00 X
8.00 Soft Costs
4
4
_





