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## PREFACE

This report represents the conclusion of the first year of IURD's study of the potential for a highspeed passenger train service in California. Seven previous studies have each dealt with a specific high-speed train technology; each attempted an evaluation, standardized so far as data permitted, of its technical and economic viability.

The present report first summarizes and synthesizes these seven studies, attempting a systematic point-by-point comparison. Then it goes on to develop a possible high-speed network for California in the light of known facts about the state's physical and economic geography. It develops physical profiles for such a route, and uses available cost data to produce an estimate of total construction cost. It gives simulations of timings between the major urban areas. These data will be used as basic inputs to the second stage of the work, now under way, which will analyze the market prospects for such a system and the ways in which it might be financed.

We gratefully acknowledge the support provided by the United States Department of Transportation and the Callformia Department of Transportation [CALTRANS] through the University of California Transportation Center. Of course, any errors of fact or interpretation should be assigned to us and not to our sponsors.

During our study, after we concluded that we should recommend adoption of steel-wheel-on-steel-rail technology based on the French TGV, we approached M. Andre Huber of GEC-Alsthom for assistance in providing technical data about the performance of the TGV and in simulating its performance in California conditions. We want to acknowledge his help in this part of our study.

Our thanks go to the Caltrans Division of Rail, the San Francisco office of Morrison-Knudsen, Henry Johnson, and many other parties at numerous public agencies who were most helpful in providing information and offering helpful comments and criticism on the draft version of this report. Thanks also go to the University of California Transportation Center for funding this work. Finally, many thanks to the staff at IU.R.D. for their help and support in producing this report.

## INTRODUCTION

The first volume of this report technology contains technology assessments, discussion of route choice, and strategic implications for a California high-speed ground transportation network. The purpose of this second volume is to provide the cost estimate and travel time calculations as well as a more detailed description of the different route alternatives by segments. The cost-estimating methodology and travel time assumptions are treated in Volume I. This volume is arranged by alternative segments with detailed route descriptions, cost estimates, and travel time calculations given for each segment together.

## 1. THE VERY HIGH-SPEED MAINLINE

## los angeles-bay Area

Los Angeles Basin-SP Right-of-Way (32 milles)
Los Angeles Union Station to Burbank Station (pm ${ }^{1}$ 0.00-12.40)
This segment would begin at Union Station in downtown Los Angeles and end at a new station in Burbank, adjacent to the Hollywood-Burbank Airport. The distance between the two stations is 12.4 miles. This entire segment is through urban land, includes portions of Los Angeles, Glendale, and Burbank, and has seven curves within it. However, the only curves that would restrict speeds to below 100 mph are in the vicinity of Union station (pm 0.5 and 0.9 ), where the trains would be travelling at reduced speeds. The first five miles of the SP alignment from Union Station is completely grade-separated. In total, this segment has 17 grade separations, 12 of which are road overcrossings of the rail right-of-way. As a result of the many grade separations, only nine at-grade crossings exist in this segment. To achieve maximum safety at speeds up to 100 mph , road undercrossings or overcrossings will be necessary. Viaduct segments are not feasible as there are not many at-grade crossings, and not practical since there are so many road overcrossings. The existing SP rail crosses over the Los Angeles River, Arroyo Seco, Tujunga Wash, Verdugo Wash, and the Burbank Western Channel (pm 0.85, 2.08, 4.70, 7.42, and 10.57).

## Burbank Station to Soutbern California Mountain Crossing (pm 12.40-32.32)

Beginning at the Burbank station and ending at Saugus, this segment has a length of 19.92 miles. The SP alignment goes through Sun Valley, San Fernando, and Newhall via a tunnel through the San Fernando Pass. The maximum speed for most of the segment would be 100 mph , with the exception of the final two miles, where a maximum of 125 mph would be artained. At pm 24.80 , the SP alignment crosses under the major interchange of $\mathrm{l}-5$ and the Foothill Freeway. These undercrossings designate where the SP alignment leaves the Los Angeles Basin to traverse the San Fernando Pass. The existing tuanel through the pass to Newhall is 1.32 miles long and is single-tracked. For this report, a new bore tunnel was assumed to be necessary since it is questionable whether or not it is feasible to widen the existing tunnel for the additional CST tracks. Included in the cost estimate was a suburban station for the Newhall/Saugus area, most likely to be located in Saugus.

[^0]Although the SP alignment is generally straight through the San Fernando Valley, the pass has several restrictive curves. The last 8.49 miles of the routing has 12 curves, eight of which restrict speeds to between 60 and 65 mph maximum. In addition, two of the remaining curves restrict speed to 80 mph . Of the tight curves, the first four (pm 24.15, 24.95, 25.32, and 25.83) cannot be realigned much. The first is bounded closely by San Fernando Road, and the others are within a narrow corridor between I-5 and San Fernando Road. This results in a two-mile segment that is restricted to a maximum speed of 70 mph . The remaining four tight curves ( pm 28.26, $28.76,29.56$, and 31.31 ) can be realigned to meet the desired maximum speeds of the segment.

There are 23 at-grade crossings through this segment which are relatively evenly distributed through the urban areas. There could be opportunities in this segment for some road closures; however, for the cost estimate, all crossings were assumed to be grade-separated. In contrast to the previous segment, only the freeways have been grade-separated (four grade separations); all are overcrossing the rail right-of-way. The alignment crosses the Angeles Aqueduct at pm 25.35 .

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## L.A. BASIN - SP R/W

LENGTH OF SEGMENT =
AVE. R/W WIDTH = $\qquad$
100 feet

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 387.88 | ACRE | \$400 | 155,152 |
| EXCAVATION | 0 | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 860,800 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,873,600 |
| LANDSCAPEMMULCH | 387.88 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 775,758 |
| FENCING | 64.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 5,184,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 576,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,608,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 32.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 54,400,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 68,996,509 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 17,249,127 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$86,246,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\circ}$ Pier | 0.00 | M | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\prime}$ Pler | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 28 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 238,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 1.32 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 92,400,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 70 | EA | \$3,500 | 246,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 338,646,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 84,661,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$423,308,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 1 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 85,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,250,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$106,250,000 |
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## L.A. Basin - SP r/w

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 64.00 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 48,640,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 32.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 24,320,000 |
| SUETOTAL |  |  |  | 72,960,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,240,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$91,200,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 64.00 | TRK-M | \$900,000 | 57,600,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 32.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 24,320,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 81,920,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 20,480,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$102,400,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1.500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN FAILROAD LAND | 387.88 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 46,545,455 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 387.88 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,357,576 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 47,903,030 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 11,975,758 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$59,879,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$869,283,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$173,856,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,043,100,000 |

## CalSpeed

## LOS ANGELES BASIN: TRAVEL TIMES

| SEGMENT: | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | TIME (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA-BURBANK | 0.00 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 100 | 50.0 | 2.28 |
|  | 1.90 | 12.40 | 10.50 | 100 | 100.0 | 6.30 |
| SUBTOTAL: | 0.00 | 12.40 | 12.40 | 100 | 86.7 | 8.58 |
| BURBANK-GV | 12.40 | 14.30 | 1.90 | 100 | 50.0 | 2.28 |
|  | 14.30 | 23.10 | 8.80 | 100 | 100.0 | 5.28 |
|  | 23.10 | 24.00 | 0.90 | 100 | 85.0 | 0.64 |
|  | 24.00 | 25.10 | 1.10 | 70 | 70.0 | 0.94 |
|  | 25.10 | 26.00 | 0.90 | 100 | 85.0 | 0.64 |
|  | 26.00 | 29.72 | 3.72 | 100 | 112.5 | 1.98 |
|  | 29.72 | 32.32 | 2.60 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.25 |
| SUBTOTAL: | 12.40 | 32.32 | 19.92 | 125 | 91.9 | 13.01 |
| TOTAL: | 0.00 | 32.32 | 32.32 | 125 | 89.8 | 21.59 |

# SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA MOUNTAN CROSSING ALTERNAEHES 

Grapevine Crossing ( 49 miles)

## Newhall to Southern Grade (pm 0.00-8.31)

The alignment prior to the southern climb of the Grapevine is a considerable challenge. In order to achieve high speed throughout the mountain pass, 2 relatively flat segment that adheres to high-speed design criteria is necessary. This allows for momentum to be built up before the steep ascent, and a safety zone for descending trains. Therefore, from the Southern Pacific right-of-way in Newhall at the San Fernando Road/Magic Mountain Parkway intersection to the beginning of the southern grade of the Grapevine, the CST routing follows a new alignment built to high-speed standards. The distance before the grade ( 8.82 or 9.39 miles for 3.5 percent and 5 percent grades respectively) is adequate since the maximum speed of the prior segment through Newhall is 125 mph .

The area between San Fernando Road and $1-5$ to the east has been considerably developed. In fact, the old SP right-of-way which Magic Mountain Parkway closely followed has been lost to a large new commercial shopping complex. New subdivisions are being built both to the north of the Santa Clara River Canyon and to the south of Magic Mountain Parkway. The CST routing will therefore head northwest for about 2.5 miles through the Santa Clara River Canyon, primarily on viaduct, closely following the existing powerline right-of-way. For the next 4.5 miles, the alignment will veer to the north and make use of a corridor created by two sets of power lines (the width of the corridorvaries berween 200 and 1,000 feet). Then the route veers northwest, following the alignment of Castaic Road. After 1.3 miles, the routing crosses under northbound $1-5$ (pm 8.31). USGS topographical maps suggest that at least 30 structures will have to be demolished for this proposed segment.

## Grapevine Crossing (pm 8.31-48.98)

To achieve the Grapevine crossing, an alignment was chosen which closely approximates the existing I-5 alignment, using, however, horizontal curvature standards necessary to maintain high speeds. The alignment generally strays no more than 1,000 feet from the freeway. When creating profiles of the route, two separate maximum-grade options ( 3.5 percent and 5 percent) were calculated.

To begin the climb of the southern grade of the Grapevine, both the 3.5 percent and 5.0 percent grade options would require a viaduct in excess of a mile long (7,000 and 5,500 feet respectively) and reaching a maximum height of 110 feet. For the 3.5 percent grade, the remaining portion of the climb would require a 5.4 -mile tunnel. Using a 5 percent grade would reduce the total tunnelling to 3.07 miles (in four separate tunnel segments), with the remaining distance requiring a cut segment. The 3.5 percent grade begins at an elevation of 1,290 feet and climbs to

2,740 feet over a distance of 7.92 miles. Using 5 percent as the ruling gradient, the grade begins at an elevation of 1,350 feet and climbs to 2,600 feet over a distance of 4.74 miles.

The alignment of the CST route up the southern grade would closely follow the existing powerline just to the east of southbound 1-5. After approximately 4.1 miles (pm 12.4), the alignment passes under southbound I-5, just west of where northbound I- 5 crosses under southbound I5. The alignment stays to the west of $1-5$ (just west of Paradise Ranch) for 2.5 miles until it crosses under $1-5$ at pm 14.9. Then, it follows east of $1-5$ for 1.3 miles until the routing again crosses under $\mathrm{I}-5$ at pm 16.2. For the 3.5 percent option, the southern grade ends shortly thereafter.

The next 15.1 miles of the routing is a generally slight incline (pm 16.2-31.3). The 3.5 percent option rises to a maximum elevation of 3,480 feet, whereas the 5.0 percent one has a maximum of 3,600 feet. Over this distance, the routing crosses $1-5$ three more times ( pm 19.32 , $25.59,30.08$ ); it begins to the west, and ends just east of 1-5. Eleven bridges/viaducts totalling 3.26 miles, and two tunnels totalling 1.76 miles, are necessary.

At this point (pm 31.3), the routing leaves the 1.5 alignment, taking a direct route just over three miles long through the mountains, thereby avoiding the tight curves of the Tejon Pass. The high-speed routing rejoins the I- 5 alignment shortly after Lebec in the Castac Valley, staying east of I. 5 until crossing at pm 37.58. $\mathrm{I}-5$ is completely crossed one more time: southbound lanes at pm 39.81 and northbound lanes at pm 40.00 . At the $\mathrm{I}-5$ interchange, the routing is about 3,000 feer from the northbound lanes (due to the tight curve at Grapevine). It gradually returns to I-5 near Wheeler Ridge and crosses the northbound lanes at pm 48.31. Route 99 is crossed at pm 48.79 and the Grapevine routing ends at pm 48.98 . A 2,800 -foot cut-and-cover tunnel is required at the end of the routing to pass under northbound 1-5 and Route 99.

The 3.5 percent maximum grade alternative begins the descent down the northern grade at pm 31.40 . The total length of this grade is 15.96 miles. The steepest portion of the grade is 12.97 miles long, beginning at an elevation of 3,590 , and ends at 1,350 feet. This alternative requires a 11.27 -mile-long tunnel beginning just before the descent, and a 4,400-foot viaduct ( 65 feet maximum height) at the beginning of the steepest portion of the ascent.

For the 5 percent option, a 2.78 -mile tunnel is required to reach the Castac Valley. This option begins its northern decent at pm 37.20 and shortly thereafter enters a 2.10 -mile tunnel. The total length of the grade is 10.16 miles, with the first 7.42 miles of the descent being the steepest. The final 2.08 miles of the steep portion of the descent requires a viaduct which reaches a maximum height of 200 feet.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
GRAPEVINE: $3.5 \%$ ALTERNATIVE

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | 49.00 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢\% \% \% \% | QTY: | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 772.12 | ACRE | \$400 | 308,848 |
| EXCAVATION | 734,722 | CY | $\$ 3.5$ | 2,571,527 |
| BORROW | 13,311,297 | CY | \$4.5 | 59,900,837 |
| LANDSCAPEMMULCH | 772.12 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,544,242 |
| FENCING | 44.63 | MI | \$81,000 | 3,615,030 |
| SUBBALLAST | 882,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 7,056,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 74,996,484 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,749,121 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$93,746,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ | 1.44 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 20,160,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 2.56 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 64,000,000 |
| VIADCT $100^{\circ}-200^{\circ}$ Pier | 2.10 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 73,500,000 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.95 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 47,500,000 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 10 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 6 | EA | \$50,000 | 300,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.95 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 15,200,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.63 | M | \$35,000,000 | 22,050,000 |
| STD BORE | 18.00 | M | \$70,000,000 | 1,330,000,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 5 | EA | \$83,000 | 415,000 |
| CULVERT | 108 | EA | \$3,500 | 378,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 1,587,503,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 396,875,750 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,984,379,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 35 | EA | \$100,000 | 3,500,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 3,500,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 875,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$4,375,000 |
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Grapevine: 3.5\% Alternative

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 98.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 74,480,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 74,480,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,620,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$93,100,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 98.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 88,200,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 49.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 37,240,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 125,440,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 31,360,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$156,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGELAND | 641.18 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 961.764 |
| PASTUAEICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 130.95 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,273,636 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 772.12 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 2,702,424 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,937,824 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,734,456 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$8,672,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$2,341,072,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$468,214,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$2,809,300,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## GRAPEVINE: $5.0 \%$ ALTERNATIVE

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ | 49.00 |
| :---: | :---: |
| AVE. RWW WIDTH = | 130 |


| \% ${ }_{\text {\% }}$ | QTY. | UoM | UNTT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 772.12 | ACRE | \$400 | 308,848 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,002,315 | CY | \$3.5 | 3,508,103 |
| BORROW | 14,660,555 | CY | \$4.5 | 65,972,498 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 772.12 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,544,242 |
| FENCING | 59.02 | MI | \$81,000 | 4,780,620 |
| SUBBALLAST | 882,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 7,056,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 83,170,311 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 20,792,578 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$103,963,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25 | 1.44 | M | \$14,000,000 | 20,160,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 2.99 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 74,750,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 2.48 | M | \$35,000,000 | 86,800,000 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.95 | M | \$50,000,000 | 47,500,000 |
| SHE. TT SPAN BRIDGE | 5 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 10 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 6 | EA | \$50,000 | 300,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.95 | M | \$16,000,000 | 15,200,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.63 | M | \$35,000,000 | 22,050,000 |
| STD BORE | 10.98 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 768,600,000 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 415,000 |
| CULVERT | 108 |  | \$3,500 | 378,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 1,051,153,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 262,788,250 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,313,941,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 35 | EA | \$100,000 | 3,500,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 3,500,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 875,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$4,375,000 |

PAGE 2
Grapevine: 5.0\% Alternative

| $\cdots$ | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 98.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 74,480,000 |
| FiAll RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 74,480,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,620,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$93,100,000 |
| POWEA/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 98.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 88,200,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 49.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 37,240,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 125,440,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 31,360,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$156,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 641.18 | ACRE | \$1.500 | 961,764 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 130.95 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,273,636 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 772.12 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 2,702,424 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,937,824 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,734,456 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$8,672,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,680,851,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$336,170,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$2,017,000,000 |

## SUMMARY TOTALS:

Design Criteria:
Design Speed $=220 \mathrm{mph}$
Horizontal Curve Radius Minimum $=3.73$ miles ( $6,000 \mathrm{~m}$ )
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$ \& $5 \%$

LENGTH: 48.98 miles
BRIDGES:
Maximum Grade = 3.5\%

| \# Bridges | Length (miles) | Average Length: (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18 | 725 | 2,128 |


|  | al |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Bridges | Length (miles) | Length feet) |
| 19 | 8.11 | 2,253 |

TUNNELS:
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| \# Tunnels | Total Length (miles) | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 19.00 | 20,060 |

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| \# Tunnels | Total Length | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 10.98 | 7.250 |

CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

| \# Tunnels | Total Length (miles) | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.63 | 1,650 |

GRADE SEPARATIONS 16
CUT: (assuming flat section)
Max. Grade $=3.5 \% \quad$ Total (Cubic Yards) $=\quad 14,046,019$

Max. Grade $=5.0 \% \quad$ Total (Cubic Yards) $=\quad 15,662,870$
FILL: (assuming flat section)
Max. Grade $=3.5 \% \quad$ Total (Cubic Yards) $=$
734.722

Max. Grade $=5.0 \% \quad$ Total $($ Cubic Yards $)=$
1,002,315

GRAPEVINE: Summary of Route
BRIDGES: $\quad$ Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Bridge. | Beginning Station | Length (ft). | Height <br> (t) | Average Height (t) | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $2+000$ | 4400 | 60 | 20 | Viaduct |
| 2 | 9+000 | 3200 | 30 | 15 | Viaduct |
| 3 | 18+600 | 1600 | 70 | 40 | Viaduct |
| 4 | $41+200$ | 300 | 20 | 20 |  |
| 5 | $48+000$ | 7,000 | 120 | 70 | Viaduct |
| 6 | $88+200$ | 1,200 | 140 | 90 |  |
| 7 | $90+400$ | 1,700 | 230 | 150 |  |
| 8 | $92+500$ | 2,000 | 270 | 160 |  |
| 9 | 97+600 | 2,100 | 330 | 240 |  |
| 10 | $110+600$ | 3,500 | 320 | 200 |  |
| 11 | $116+500$ | 2,900 | 370 | 190 |  |
| 12 | $124+300$ | 1,700 | 400 | 270 |  |
| 13 | $135+000$ | 300 | 30 | 30 | $1-5 \times 1 \mathrm{NG}$ |
| 14 | $151+700$ | 900 | 100 | 70 |  |
| 15 | 153+600 | 600 | 50 | 35 |  |
| 16 | $158+800$ | 300 | 30 | 20 | I-5 XING |
| 17 | $227+300$ | 4,400 | 65 | 45 | Viaduct |
| 18 | 239+600 | 200 | 20 | 10 | CA AQDT |

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| 1 | $2+000$ | 4400 | 60 | 20 | Viaduct |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 2 | $9+000$ | 3200 | 30 | 15 | Viaduct |
| 3 | $18+600$ | 1600 | 70 | 40 | Viaduct |
| 4 | $41+200$ | 300 | 20 | 20 |  |
| 5 | $50+500$ | 5,500 | 120 | 80 | Viaduct |
| 6 | $76+600$ | 200 | 30 | 20 | $1-5$ XING |
| 7 | $88+200$ | 1,200 | 140 | 90 |  |
| 8 | $90+400$ | 1,700 | 230 | 150 |  |
| 9 | $92+500$ | 2,000 | 270 | 160 |  |
| 10 | $97+600$ | 2,100 | 330 | 240 |  |
| 11 | $110+600$ | 3,500 | 320 | 200 |  |
| 12 | $116+500$ | 2,900 | 370 | 190 |  |
| 13 | $124+300$ | 1,700 | 400 | 270 |  |
| 14 | $135+000$ | 300 | 30 | 30 | $1-5$ XING |
| 15 | $151+700$ | 900 | 100 | 70 |  |
| 16 | $153+600$ | 600 | 50 | 35 |  |
| 17 | $210+200$ | 300 | 30 | 20 | $1-5$ XING |
| 18 | $223+600$ | 10,200 | 200 | 100 | Viaduct |
| 19 | $239+600$ | 200 | 20 | 10 | CA AQDT |
| TOtal $=$ |  |  |  |  | 42,800 |

TUNNELS:

Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$


Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

|  | Beginning Station | Length <br> (ft) | Max Height (t) | Average Height (fi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $61+100$ | 10,000 | 360 | 200 |
| 2 | 79+500 | 5,800 | 290 | 250 |
| 3 | 85+000 | 300 | 60 | 40 |
| 4 | 85+600 | 300 | 60 | 40 |
| 5 | $94+700$ | 2,500 | 280 | 240 |
| 6 | 99+900 | 7,300 | 650 | 250 |
| 7 | 165+800 | 14,700 | 1200 | 700 |
| 8 | $198+300$ | 17,100 | 600 | 250 |
|  | Total $=$ | 58,000 |  |  |

## CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

| Tunnel: | Eeginning Station | Length <br> (ft) | Height <br> (ti) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $44+100$ | 500 | 25 |
| 2 | 254+900 | 2,800 | 25 |

GRAPEVINE: Summary of Route
CUT: Section =
50 ft
Max Slope
$3: 2$
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

|  | Beginning Station | Area $(* 1000)$ | Max. Height | Ave. Height | Volume (cubic yd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $13+300$ | 32 | 50 | 25 | 103,704 |
| 2 | 22+600 | 150 | 160 | 90 | 1,027,778 |
| 3 | $28+400$ | 25 | 90 | 45 | 108,796 |
| 4 | $29+300$ | 245 | 100 | 70 | 1,406,481 |
| 5 | $55+800$ | 128 | 100 | 50 | 592,593 |
| 6 | $86+700$ | 113 | 100 | 70 | 648,704 |
| 7 | 106+200 | 275 | 200 | 110 | 2,189,815 |
| 8 | $114+000$ | 216 | 160 | 100 | 1,600,000 |
| 9 | $119+500$ | 68 | 60 | 30 | 239,259 |
| 10 | 130+300 | 40 | 30 | 15 | 107,407 |
| 11 | 148+500 | 132 | 130 | 80 | 831,111 |
| 12 | $152+800$ | 11 | 40 | 20 | 32,593 |
| 13 | $154+400$ | 166 | 70 | 50 | 768,519 |
| 14 | $158+800$ | 309 | 130 | 60 | 1,602,222 |
| 15 | 223+800 | 350 | 180 | 110 | 2,787,037 |

Total $=$
14,046,019
Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| \#: | Beginning Station | Area $(1000)$ | Max. Héight | Ave. Height | Volume (cubic yd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 13+300 | 32 | 50 | 25 | 103,704 |
| 2 | 22+900 | 150 | 160 | 90 | 1,027,778 |
| 3 | $28+400$ | 25 | 90 | - 45 | 108,796 |
| 4 | 29+300 | 245 | 100 | 70 | 1,406,481 |
| 5 | 57+400 | 165 | 100 | 40 | 672,222 |
| 6 | $72+100$ | 130 | 110 | 60 | 674,074 |
| 7 | $77+000$ | 156 | 110 | 70 | 895,556 |
| 8 | $84+100$ | 173 | 110 | 50 | 800,926 |
| 9 | $106+200$ | 275 | 200 | 110 | 2,189,815 |
| 10 | $114+000$ | 216 | 160 | 100 | 1,600,000 |
| 11 | $119+500$ | 68 | 60 | 30 | 239,259 |
| 12 | $130+300$ | 40 | 30 | 15 | 107.407 |
| 13 | 148+500 | 132 | 130 | 80 | 831,111 |
| 14 | 152+800 | 11 | 40 | 20 | 32,593 |
| 15 | $154+400$ | 166 | 70 | 50 | 768,519 |
| 16 | $158+800$ | 309 | 130 | 60 | 1,602,222 |
| 17 | $180+500$ | 141 | 90 | 30 | 496,111 |
| 18 | $196+400$ | 61 | 50 | 30 | 214,630 |
| 19 | $215+400$ | 230 | 160 | 100 | 1,703,704 |
| 20 | $217+200$ | 70 | 20 | 15 | 187,963 |
| Total $=\quad 15,662,870$ |  |  |  |  |  |

## FILL:

Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

|  | Beginning Station | Area $(1000)$ | Max Height (ft) | Ave. Height <br> (tt) | Volume <br> .. ": (cubic yo) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 17+700 | 13 | 30 | 15 | 34,907 |
| 2 | 20+100 | 16 | 30 | 15 | 42,963 |
| 3 | 21+500 | 30 | 40 | 30 | 105,556 |
| 4 | $46+600$ | 13 | 30 | 15 | 34,907 |
| 5 | $54+800$ | 14 | 30 | 15 | 37,593 |
| 6 | $88+300$ | 2 | 20 | 10 | 4,815 |
| 7 | 97+600 | 7 | 30 | 15 | 18,796 |
| 8 | 116+600 | 5 | 30 | 15 | 13,426 |
| 9 | $133+700$ | 25 | 30 | 15 | 67,130 |
| 10 | $142+300$ | 100 | 30 | 15 | 268,519 |
| 11 | 151+700 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 12 | 153+600 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 13 | 226+700 | 7 | 20 | 10 | 16,852 |
| 14 | 231+600 | 22 | 30 | 20 | 65,185 |
|  |  |  |  | Total $=$ | 734,722 |

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$



| long (m) | vit (km/h) | pente(\%) | ltot(m) | altit(m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 29400 | 0.00 |
| 13137 | 322 | 50.8 | 42537 | 667.36 |
| 3292 | 322 | 20.4 | 45829 | 734.52 |
| 5639 | 322 | 4.9 | 51468 | 762.15 |
| 914 | 322 | -10.0 | 52382 | 753.01 |
| 1615 | 322 | -22.6 | 53997 | 716.51 |
| 2256 | 322 | -8.1 | 56253 | 698.23 |
| 1215 | 322 | -43.4 | 57468 | 645.50 |
| 400 | 322 | -43.4 | 57868 | 628.14 |
| 2926 | 322 | -27.1 | 60794 | 548.85 |
| 1920 | 322 | 14.3 | 62714 | 576.31 |
| 2530 | 322 | 0.0 | 65244 | 576.31 |
| 2042 | 322 | -23.9 | 67286 | 527.50 |
| 3444 | 322 | -7.1 | 70730 | 503.05 |
| 3566 | 322 | -3.4 | 74296 | 490.92 |
| 1158 | 322 | 7.9 | 75454 | 500.07 |
| 1433 | 322 | 6.4 | 76887 | 509.24 |
| 774 | 322 | -18.7 | 77661 | 494.77 |
| 2000 | 210 | -18.7 | 79661 | 457.37 |
| 7620 | 210 | -50.8 | 87281 | 70.27 |
| 914 | 322 | -16.7 | 88195 | 55.01 |
| 3444 | 322 | -15.0 | 91639 | 3.35 |
| 1128 | 322 | -5.4 | 92767 | -2.74 |
| 1128 | 322 | 2.7 | 93895 | 0.30 |
| 853 | 322 | 39.3 | 94748 | 33.83 |
| 1158 | 322 | 2.6 | 95906 | 36.84 |
| 1097 | 322 | -36.1 | 97003 | -2.76 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 99563 | -2.76 |
| 1219 | 322 | 7.5 | 100782 | 6.38 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | 6.38 |
| 0 | 200 | MP 31.35 | 102382 | 6.38 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 122382 | 6.38 |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | 6.38 |



| long (m) | vit (km/h) | pente (\%) | $1 \operatorname{tot}(\mathrm{~m})$ | aitit(m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 200 | MP 31.35 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 21600 | 0.00 |
| 1219 | 322 | -7.5 | 22819 | -9.14 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 25379 | -9.14 |
| 1097 | 322 | 36.1 | 26476 | 30.46 |
| 1158 | 322 | -2.6 | 27634 | 27.45 |
| 853 | 322 | -39.3 | 28487 | -6.07 |
| 1128 | 322 | -2.7 | 29615 | -9.12 |
| 1128 | 322 | 5.4 | 30743 | -3.03 |
| 3444 | 322 | 15.0 | 34187 | 48.63 |
| 914 | 322 | 16.7 | 35101 | 63.89 |
| 7620 | 322 | 50.8 | 42721 | 450.99 |
| 2774 | 322 | 18.7 | 45495 | 502.86 |
| 1433 | 322 | -6.4 | 46928 | 493.69 |
| 1158 | 322 | -7.9 | 48086 | 484.55 |
| 3566 | 322 | 3.4 | 51652 | 496.67 |
| 3444 | 322 | 7.1 | 55096 | 521.12 |
| 2042 | 322 | 23.9 | 57138 | 569.93 |
| 2530 | 322 | 0.0 | 59668 | 569.93 |
| 1920 | 322 | -14.3 | 61588 | 542.47 |
| 2926 | 322 | 27.1 | 64514 | 621.76 |
| 400 | 322 | 43.4 | 64914 | 639.12 |
| 1215 | 322 | 43.4 | 66129 | 691.86 |
| 2256 | 322 | 8.1 | 68385 | 710.13 |
| 1615 | 322 | 22.6 | 70000 | 746.63 |
| 914 | 322 | 10.0 | 70914 | 755.77 |
| 5639 | 322 | -4.9 | 76553 | 728.14 |
| 1292 | 322 | -20.4 | 77845 | 701.78 |
| 2000 | 210 | -20.4 | 79845 | 660.98 |
| 13137 | 210 | -50.8 | 92982 | -6.38 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 98585 | -6.38 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 98585 | -6.38 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | -6.38 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 102382 | -6.38 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 122382 | -6.38 |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | -6.38 |



| long (m) | vit(km/h) | pente(\% 0 ) | 1 tot (m) | altit(m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 29400 | 0.00 |
| 3109 | 322 | 24.5 | 32509 | 76.17 |
| 18593 | 322 | 34.9 | 51102 | 725.07 |
| 1128 | 322 | 8.1 | 52230 | 734.20 |
| 1768 | 322 | -8.6 | 53998 | 719.00 |
| 2256 | 322 | -8.1 | 56254 | 700.72 |
| 1615 | 322 | -43.4 | 57869 | 630.63 |
| 2926 | 322 | -27.1 | 60795 | 551.34 |
| 1920 | 322 | 14.3 | 62715 | 578.79 |
| 2529 | 322 | 0.0 | 65244 | 578.79 |
| 2042 | 322 | -23.9 | 67286 | 529.99 |
| 3444 | 322 | -7.1 | 70730 | 505.54 |
| 3566 | 322 | -3.4 | 74296 | 493.41 |
| 1158 | 322 | 7.9 | 75454 | 502.56 |
| 12741 | 322 | -34.7 | 88195 | 60.45 |
| 3444 | 322 | -15.0 | 91639 | 8.79 |
| 1128 | 322 | -5.4 | 92767 | 2.70 |
| 11.28 | 322 | 2.7 | 93895 | 5.74 |
| 853 | 322 | 39.3 | 94748 | 39.27 |
| 1158 | 322 | 2.6 | 95906 | 42.28 |
| 1097 | 322 | -36.1 | 97003 | 2.68 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 99563 | 2.68 |
| 1219 | 322 | 7.5 | 100782 | 11.82 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | 11.82 |
| 0 | 200 | MP 31.35 | 102382 | 11.82 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 122382 | 11.82 |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | 11.82 |



| long (m) | vit (km/h) | pente (\%0) | 1tot (m) | altit(m) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 200 | MP 31.35 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 21600 | 0.00 |
| 1219 | 322 | -7.5 | 22819 | -9.14 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 25379 | -9. 14 |
| 1097 | 322 | 36.1 | 26476 | 30.46 |
| 1158 | 322 | -2.6 | 27634 | 27.45 |
| 853 | 322 | -39.3 | 28487 | -6.07 |
| 1128 | 322 | -2.7 | 29615 | -9.12 |
| 1128 | 322 | 5.4 | 30743 | -3.03 |
| 3444 | 322 | 15.0 | 34187 | 48.63 |
| 12741 | 322 | 34.7 | 46928 | 490.74 |
| 1158 | 322 | -7.9 | 48086 | 481.60 |
| 3566 | 322 | 3.4 | 51652 | 493.72 |
| 3444 | 322 | 7.1 | 55096 | 518.17 |
| 2042 | 322 | 23.9 | 57138 | 566.98 |
| 2529 | 322 | 0.0 | 59667 | 566.98 |
| 1920 | 322 | -14.3 | 61587 | 539.52 |
| 2926 | 322 | 27.1 | 64513 | 618.81 |
| 1615 | 322 | 43.4 | 66128 | 688.91 |
| 2256 | 322 | 8.1 | 68384 | 707.18 |
| 1768 | 322 | 8.6 | 70152 | 722.38 |
| 1128 | 322 | -8.1 | 71280 | 713.25 |
| 18593 | 322 | -34.9 | 89873 | 64.35 |
| 3109 | 322 | -24.5 | 92982 | -11.82 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 98585 | -11.82 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 98585 | -11.82 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | -11.82 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 102382 | -11.82 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 122382 | -11.82 |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | -11.82 |

Sase Tunnel Alternative ( 47 miles)
Newball to Soutbern Grade (pm 0.0-8.3)

The alignment prior to the base tunnel is the same as that for the Grapevine alternative. Since the primary purpose of the base tunnel would be to permit high speeds, it is appropriate that the alignment be designed to the highest possible standards in order to take full advantage of the tremendous investment needed to tunnel through the Grapevine.

The Base Tunnel (pm 8.3-41.3)

A straight tunnel approximately 33 miles long provides the most direct routing to the Central Valley. The tunnel would be located just to the east of 1.5 (the alignment occasionally borders 1-5). There would be no significant grade through this segment.

## Connection to Central Valley (pm 41.3-47.0)

The base tunnel ends about 5.7 miles before the junction of 1.5 and Route 99. At this point, the alignment is about 0.75 miles east of the $1-5$ alignment. From there, it gradually veers to the east until it joins the 1.5 alignment near Wheeler Ridge. The routing crosses the northbound lanes of $1-5$ and then Route 99, at which point this segment ends. A 2,800 -foot cut-and-cover tunnel is required at the end of the routing to pass under northbound 1.5 and Route 99.

## BASE TUNNEL ALTERNATIVE

LENGTH OF SEGMENT＝<br>AVE．RNW WIDTH＝

＊for sections not in tunnel

| ल⿵冂卄一巛 | QTY． | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT： |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 740.61 | ACRE | \＄400 | 296，244 |
| EXCAVATION | 1，211，840 | CY | \＄3．5 | 4，241，440 |
| BORROW | 376，600 | CY | \＄4．5 | 1，694，700 |
| LANDSCAPE／MULCH | 220.61 | ACAE | \＄2，000 | 441，220 |
| FENCING | 28.00 | M1 | \＄81，000 | 2，268，000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 846，000 | SY | \＄8．0 | 6，768，000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M | \＄835，000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALIS | 0.00 | MI | \＄$\$ 1,700,000$ | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 15，709，604 |
| CONTINGENCY（25\％） |  |  |  | 3，927，401 |
| TOTAL： |  |  |  | \＄19，637，000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20＇－25＇ | 1.44 | M1 | \＄14，000，000 | 20，160，000 |
| VIADUCT 25＇－100＇Pier | 0.36 | MI | \＄25，000，000 | 9，000，000 |
| VIADCT 100＇－200 Pier | 0.00 | MI | \＄35，000，000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT＞200＇Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \＄50，000，000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 0 | EA | \＄1，000，000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 12 | EA | \＄1，000，000 | 12，000，000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \＄8，500，000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \＄50，000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.38 | M | \＄16，000，000 | 6，080，000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.53 | MI | \＄35，000，000 | 18，550，000 |
| STD BORE | 33.00 | M1 | \＄70，000，000 | 2，310，000，000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \＄83，000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 31 | EA | \＄3，500 | 108，500 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 2，375，898，500 |
| CONTINGENCY（25\％） |  |  |  | 593，974，625 |
| TOTAL： |  |  |  | \＄2，969，873，000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \＄50，000，000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \＄30，000，000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \＄5，000，000 | 0 |
| INSP．ISERVICE FAC． | 0 | EA | \＄6，000，000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \＄300，000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \＄200，000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 35 | EA | \＄100，000 | 3，500，000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 3，500，000 |
| CONTINGENCY（25\％） |  |  |  | 875，000 |
| TOTAL： |  |  |  | \＄4，375，000 |
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Base Tunnel Alternative

| $\because$ | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 94.00 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 71,440,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 71,440,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 17,860,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$89,300,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 94.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 84,600,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 47.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 35,720,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 120,320,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 30,080,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$150,400,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 89.30 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 133,950 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 130.95 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,273,750 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 220.25 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 770,875 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 4,178,575 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,044,644 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$5,223,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$3,238,808,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$647,761,600 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$3,886,600,000 |



Fichier a: \callgrapod. PAR

| long(m) | vit(km/h) | pente(\%) | ltot(m) | altit(m) |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 23797 | 0.00 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 29400 | 0.00 |
| 57881 | 322 | 1.3 | 87281 | 75.25 |
| 914 | 322 | -16.7 | 88195 | 59.98 |
| 3444 | 322 | -15.0 | 91639 | 8.32 |
| 1128 | 322 | -5.4 | 92767 | 2.23 |
| 1128 | 322 | 2.7 | 93895 | 5.28 |
| 853 | 322 | 39.3 | 94748 | 38.80 |
| 1158 | 322 | 2.6 | 95906 | 41.81 |
| 1097 | 322 | -36.1 | 97003 | 2.21 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 99563 | 2.21 |
| 1219 | 322 | 7.5 | 100782 | 11.35 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | 11.35 |
| 0 | 200 | $M P$ | 31.35 | 102382 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 11.35 |  |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | 11.35 |
|  |  |  | 122382 | 11.35 |



Fichier a: \callgrapou. PAR

| long (m) | vit( $\mathrm{km} / \mathrm{h})$ | pente(\%) | ltot(m) | altit(m) |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | DEPART | 0 | 0.00 |
| 20000 | 200 | 0.0 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 0 | 200 | MP 31.35 | 20000 | 0.00 |
| 1600 | 322 | 0.0 | 21600 | 0.00 |
| 1219 | 322 | -7.5 | 22819 | -9.14 |
| 2560 | 322 | 0.0 | 25379 | -9.14 |
| 1097 | 322 | 36.1 | 30.46 |  |
| 1158 | 322 | -2.6 | 27634 | 27.45 |
| 853 | 322 | -39.3 | 28487 | -6.07 |
| 1128 | 322 | -2.7 | 29615 | -9.12 |
| 1128 | 322 | 5.4 | 30743 | -3.03 |
| 3444 | 322 | 15.0 | 34187 | 48.63 |
| 914 | 322 | 16.7 | 35101 | 63.89 |
| 57881 | 322 | -1.3 | 92982 | -11.35 |
| 5603 | 322 | 0.0 | 98585 | -11.35 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 80.19 | 98585 | -11.35 |
| 3797 | 322 | 0.0 | 102382 | -11.35 |
| 0 | 322 | MP 82.55 | 102382 | -11.35 |
| 20000 | 322 | 0.0 | 122382 | -11.35 |
| 0 | 0 | ARRIVEE | 122382 | -11.35 |

## Palmdale Alternative ( 86 milles)

To achieve the Palmdale crossing, an 86 -mile new alignment was chosen that closely approximates existing transportation/utility corridors, using, however, horizontal curvature standards necessary to maintain high speeds. When creating profies of the route, a maximum grade of 3.5 percent was assumed.

The Palmdale routing begins at the SP right-of-way just north of San Fernando (after the l$210 / 1-5$ crossing). The routing closely follows the Route 14 alignment just to the south, until reaching the Santa Clara River Valley. From Humphreys, the CST would leave the highway alignment to generally follow the SP right-of-way which traverses the river valley. However, the existing rail right-of-way was designed with tight curves. As a result, the CST would cross this existing rail corridor several times through the valley, although it would remain mostly to the north of the $S P$ right-of-way.

The first 25 miles of the Palmdale routing is relatively gentle. A 3.5 percent grade is only required for about 3.5 miles of this portion of the route. We estimate that these first 25 miles would require 15 bridges and two tunnels, totalling 3.3 and 0.75 miles, respectively.

North and west of Acton, the routing would veer north, leaving the Soledad Canyon to tunnel ( 4.5 miles) through the Sierra Pelonas. This tunnel is necessary to bring the alignment north to the Antelope Valley while maintaining high speeds. Once through to the Antelope Valley, an outlying station would be built to serve the Palmdale/Lancaster area.

For about 40 miles, the Palmdale alignment would traverse flatland, primarily in the Antelope Valley. The alignment would closely approximate the alignment of the Califomia Aqueduct northwest through the valley to the Tehachapi mountains.

The Tehachapi mountains would be tunneled taking the shortest path through the range. This would result in an eight-mile tunnel and a 1.1 -mile viaduct. An additional eight miles of atgrade alignment would bring the Palmdale alternative to $1-5$, north of the Grapevine Pass.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## PALMDALE ALTERNATIVE

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ AVE. R/W WIDTH $=$ | $\frac{86.00}{130} \text { miles }$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \% M ¢ C \% | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | $\because$ AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1355.15 | ACRE | \$400 | 542,061 |
| EXCAVATION | 211,111 | CY | \$3.5 | 738,889 |
| 8ORROW | 20,640,463 | CY | \$4.5 | 92,882,084 |
| LANDSCAPEIMULCH | 1355.15 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 2,710,303 |
| FENCING | 135.50 | M1 | \$81,000 | 10,975,500 |
| SUBBALLAST | 1,548,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 12,384,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 120,232,836 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 30,058,209 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$150,291,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 3.05 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 76,250,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 1.50 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 52,500,000 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| FioAd Closure | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.38 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 6,080,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.53 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 18,550,000 |
| STD BORE | 13.22 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 925,400,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 22 | EA | \$83,000 | 1,826,000 |
| CULVERT | 189 | EA | \$3,500 | 662,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 1,105,268,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 276,317,050 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,381,585,000 |
| EUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| RIEGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 1 | EA | \$200,000 | 200,000 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,500,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,375,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,875,000 |
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## Palmdale Alternative

| \% | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 172.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 130,720,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 130,720,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 32,680,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$163,400,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 172.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 154,800,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 86.00 | M | \$760,000 | 65,360,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 220,160,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 55,040,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$275,200,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 1355.15 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 6,775,758 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1355.15 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 4,743,030 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 11,518,788 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 2,879,697 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$14,398,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,991,749,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$398,349,800 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$2,390,100,000 |

## PALMDALE ALTERNATIVE: Summary of Route

Design Criteria:
Design Speed $=220 \mathrm{mph}$
Horizontal Curve Radius Minimum $=3.73$ miles ( $6,000 \mathrm{~m}$ )
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

Route: Route 14 to SP Corridor (Soledad Canyon) to Palmdale, through Antelope Valley, through Tehachapis to Central Valley LENGTH:
86.43 miles

BRIDGES:

| \# Bridges | Total Length (miles) | Average <br> Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 4.55 | 1,412 |

TUNNELS:

| \#Tunnels | Total $\square$ (miles $)$ | Average <br> Length <br> (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 13.22 | 17,450 |

CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

|  | Length $\%$ (miles) | Averäge Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.53 | 2800 |

GRADE SEPARATIONS 12
CUT:
Total (Cubic Yards) $=$
$20,851,574$
FILL:

$$
\text { Total (Cubic Yards) }=
$$

## BRIDGES:

Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Eridge: | Beginning Station | Length <br> (fi) | Height <br> (ti) | Average Height <br> (ft) | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1 | 0+600 | 1,500 | 50 | 30 | viaduct |
| 2 | $3+400$ | 300 | 100 | 80 | CA aqu. xing |
| 3 | 12+300 | 1,800 | 100 | 70 |  |
| 4 | $31+000$ | 500 | 50 | 30 |  |
| 5 | $58+000$ | 5.700 | 140 | 80 | viaduct |
| 6 | $71+100$ | 1.000 | 140 | 130 |  |
| 7 | $74+500$ | 500 | 130 | 80 |  |
| 8 | 77+000 | 900 | 60 | 50 |  |
| 9 | $80+000$ | 300 | 60 | 50 |  |
| 10 | $86+100$ | 2400 | 120 | 90 |  |
| 11 | $99+000$ | 800 | 70 | 50 |  |
| 12 | $105+700$ | 300 | 30 | 30 |  |
| 13 | 106+300 | 300 | 30 | 30 |  |
| 14 | $107+400$ | 600 | 60 | 40 |  |
| 15 | $116+000$ | 700 | 60 | 50 |  |
| 16 | $162+300$ | 400 | 30 | 30 |  |
| 17 | $404+360$ | 6.000 | 200 | 80 |  |

## TUNNELS:

Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Tunnel \# | Beginning Station | Length <br> (ft) | Max. Height (ti) | Average Height (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $5+100$ | 1,900 | 300 | 180 |
| 2 | $64+000$ | 2,000 | 300 | 260 |
| 3 | 129+600 | 23,900 | 1350 | 750 |
| 4 | 398+360 | 42,000 | 1000 | 600 |

Total $=\quad 69,800$

## CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

| Tunnel \# | Eeginning Station | $\underset{\text { (ft) }}{\text { Length }}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Height: } \\ & \therefore(\mathrm{fit)}) \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $452+600$ | 2,800 | 25 |
|  | Total $=$ | 2,800 |  |

CUT: Section $=\quad 50 \mathrm{ft} \quad$ Max Slope $\quad 3: 2$
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| \# | Beginning Station | Area (:1000) | Max. Height. | Ave. Height | Volume (cubic.yd) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1 | $2+200$ | 100 | 120 | 80 | 629,630 |
| 2 | 4+600 | 60 | 100 | 100 | 444,444 |
| 3 | 7+000 | 200 | 100 | 50 | 925,926 |
| 4 | 10+200 | 70 | 100 | 60 | 362,963 |
| 5 | $11+200$ | 100 | 100 | 70 | 574,074 |
| 6 | 21+000 | 250 | 120 | 80 | 1,574,074 |
| 7 | 27+000 | 260 | 110 | 70 | 1,492,593 |
| 8 | $44+800$ | 13 | 30 | 15 | 34,907 |
| 9 | 66+300 | 290 | 60 | 60 | 1,503,704 |
| 10 | $72+200$ | 120 | 60 | 60 | 622,222 |
| 11 | 75+000 | 110 | 60 | 60 | 570,370 |
| 12 | 78+600 | 50 | 60 | 30 | 175,926 |
| 13 | $80+500$ | 600 | 140 | 80 | 3,777,778 |
| 14 | $88+700$ | 100 | 50 | 40 | 407,407 |
| 15 | $96+700$ | 220 | 450 | 80 | 1,385,185 |
| 16 | 101+000 | 100 | 60 | 40 | 407,407 |
| 17 | $108+300$ | 300 | 130 | 80 | 1,888,889 |
| 18 | $112+500$ | 200 | 80 | 60 | 1,037,037 |
| 19 | $117+000$ | 200 | 50 | 30 | 703,704 |
| 20 | $153+400$ | 450 | 120 | 60 | 2,333,333 |
| Total $=\quad 20,851,574$ |  |  |  |  |  |

FILL:
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$


CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
PALMDALE ALTERNATIVE: EXCESS L.A. BASIN SEGMENT

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { LENGTH OF SEGMENT }=\frac{7.50}{} \text { miles } \\
\text { AVE. R/W WIDTH }=\frac{100}{} \text { feet }
\end{array}
$$

| \% $\because \times \square$ | QTY | UOM. | UNIT COST | AMOUNT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 90.91 | ACRE | \$400 | 36,364 |
| EXCAVATION | 0 | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 201,750 | CY | \$4.5 | 907,875 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 90.91 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 181,818 |
| FENCING | 13.72 | MI | \$81,000 | 1,111,320 |
| SUBBALLAST | 135,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 1,080,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | Ml | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 7.50 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 12,750,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 16,067,377 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,016,844 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$20,084,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.00 | M | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 1.32 | Mi | \$70,000,000 | 92,400,000 |
| BOXCULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 17 | EA | \$3,500 | 57,750 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 96,457,750 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 24,114,438 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$120,572,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,250,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,250,000 |
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Palmdale Alternative: Excess L.A. Basin Segment

| : . . . . . | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 15.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 11,400,000 |
| FAIL RELOCATION | 7.50 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 5,700,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 17,100,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,275,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$21,375,000 |
| FOWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 15.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 13,500,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 7.50 | Mi | \$760,000 | 5,700,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 19,200,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,800,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$24,000,000 |
| AIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| FIANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 90.91 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 10,909,091 |
| INDUSTRIALLAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 90.91 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 318,182 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 11,227,273 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,806,818 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$14,034,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$206,315,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  | . |  | \$41,263,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$247,600,000 |

CalSpeed
PALMDALE ALTERNATIVE: TRAVEL TIMES

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH: | TOTAS | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.00 | 10.00 | 10.00 | 200 | 162.5 | 3.69 |
|  | 10.00 | 31.70 | 21.70 | 200 | 200.0 | 6.51 |
| PALMDALE STATION | 31.70 | 66.20 | 34.50 | 200 | 200.0 | 10.35 |
|  | 86.20 | 86.43 | 20.23 | 200 | 180.0 | 6.74 |
|  | 0.00 | 86.43 | 86.43 | 200 | 190.0 | 27.30 |

LA EXCESS SEGMENT: TRAVEL TIMES

|  | START | FINISH | TOTAL, MIEES | MAXIMUM SREED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 24.00 | 25.10 | 1.10 | 70 | 70.0 | 0.94 |
|  | 25.10 | 26.00 | 0.90 | 100 | 85.0 | 0.64 |
|  | 26.00 | 29.72 | 3.72 | 100 | 112.5 | 1.98 |
|  | 29.72 | 32.32 | 2.60 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.25 |
|  | 24.80 | 32.32 | 7.52 | 125 | 93.8 | 4.81 |

## THE CENTRAL VALLEY ALTERNATTVES

## Central Corridor, New Right-of-Way (205 miles)

Main Iine

The entire mainline segment for the Central Corridor would be constructed on new right-of-way. It would be completely constructed on agricultural land, avoiding any developed land. Throughout its entirety, the routing is basically flat.

Route 99 Overcrossing (at I-5) to Bakersfield (pm 0.0-25.0)
The first ten miles of the new right-of-way would closely follow the alignment of $1-5$, about 1,000 feet to the east. Then, near the Ashe Road overcrossing, the new alignment would leave 1.5 and head in a northern direction towards Bakersfield, adjacent and east of Ashe Road. After crossing Panama Lane, the alignment would veer northwest, skirting around (about one mile to the west) the urban limits of western Bakersfield. If Bakersfield were to have an outlying station, it probably would be near pm 25.0. Through this segment, the alignment crosses 29 roads. However, most of these are minor crossings which could be closed. It is assumed for this segment that 12 of the 29 road crossings would have to be grade-separated. The alignment also crosses four canals and one small creek.

## Bakersfield to Delano (pm 25.0-60.0)

From Bakersfield to 2 wayside platform at Delano is 35 miles. In the future, if there were ever adequate demand, the platform could be used in creating a suburban station. The routing is primarily in a northerly direction, closely approximating the alignment of Route 99 , one to two miles to the west. At pm 26.0, 21,000 -foot bridge is necessary to cross the Kern River. At pm 34.0 , the routing crosses over the existing Santa Fe rail corridor. There are 28 additional crossings of roads or rail through the segment, and three creek/canal crossings. It is estimated that 15 of the road/rail crossings would require separation.

## Delano to Visalia (pm 60.0-97.3)

Near the town of Visalia, another wayside platform would be built. Like the one in Delano, this platiorm could be converted to a suburban station some time in the future if necessary. Throughout this segment the routing is about two miles to the west of 1-5, and passes about one mile west of Tulare around pm 86.0. Over this 37.3 -mile segment, the are 29 road crossings and one rail (Santa Fe) crossing. In addition, approximately 18 irrigation canals or small creeks would
also be crossed. Only 14 of the road crossings were considered to need grade separation; the other 15 crossings would be closed.

## Visalia to Fresno (pm97.3-133.0)

Continuing to approximate the routing of Route 99 , the routing remains about two miles to the west of the highway. In the vicinity of Fresno, as in the case of Bakersficld, the alignment stays about one mile from the urban area. If the outlying station option were chosen, the location might be approximately at pm 133. Therefore, the total length of this segment is 35.7 miles. The routing crosses 40 roads and two rail rights-of-way (SP pm 97.2, Santa Fe pm 105.3). It also crosses approximately 31 irrigation canals or small creeks and the Kings River (pm 106.7).

Fresno to Madera (pm 133.0-153.0)

From Fresno to a wayside platform ar Madera would be 20 miles. Like the other platforms, this too could eventually become a suburban station in the future. The alignment is about three miles west of Route 99 , and crosses the San Joaquin River at pm 142.5. There are 24 road crossings, two rail crossings (SP pm 134.0, SP pm 152.0), and 17 irrigation canals crossings. It is estimated that one-half of the roads could be closed, leaving only 12 grade separations necessary.

## Madera to Pacbeco Pass (pm 153.0-205.0)

After Madera, the routing would veer west and cross the Central Valley. Near pm 193, the routing passes Los Banos, two miles south of the town. From this point, the route heads north and ends near the Henry Miller overcrossing of $1-5$, which is due east of the San Luis Reservoir, at pm 205.0. This segment would be 52 miles long, and would cross 24 roads, one rail right-of-way, and 17 irrigation canals. In addition, a 1,000 -foot bridge would be necessary to cross the Eastside Bypass Canal. Near Los Banos the alignment passes through a potentially environmentally sensitive region that has many duck ponds. Of the 24 road crossings, 17 would likely need to be gradeseparated.

Spurs to Bakersfield and Fresno
Bakersfield Spur (12 mack miles)
Downtown Bakersfield could be served by a spur that utilizes the Santa Fe right-of-way just north of the Kern River on the western side of Bakersfield. This existing rail right-of-way would serve both trains from the south and north (see table). Therefore, stops in Bakersfield are estimated
to be ten minutes long, since the driver must move to the opposite end of the train before leaving Bakersfield. Although this type of stop is awkward, in this case it is the simplest, cheapest, and safest way of serving the downtown. In addition, it adds no significant time delay for stops in downtown. Any other route through downtown to allow a loop in Bakersfield would be a very circuitous routing, have many at-grade crossings, and have several tight curves, thus being both expensive and slow. The Santa Fe alignment is short and virtually avoids urban Bakersfield. In addition, it is already nearly completely grade-separated and has no tight speed-restricting curves.

From the south, the spur would be 7.4 miles long, beginning just after the Stockdale Highway overcrossing and ending near the existing downtown Bakersfield Amtrak station. The final four miles would share the Santa Fe right-of-way and serve all trains arriving and departing downtown. The northern portion of the spur requires an additional 5.6 miles of track. For this portion of the spur, the Santa Fe right-of-way is used for three miles, whereas the final 2.6 miles are new right-of-way. The northern portion of the spur ends just north of Green Acres. Only five grade separations would be needed for the entire spur.

## Fresno Loop (26 miles)

The SP right-of-way which runs parallel to Route 99 through Fresno would by utilized for CST trains to directly serve downtown Fresno. New right-of-way would be needed both south and north of the city to connect the CST main line with the existing rail right-of-way. The total distance of this "loop" would be about 26 miles, over half of which would be on the existing SP right-of-way through the western urban area of Fresno. The site of the existing Greyhound Station off Tulare Street appears to be suitable for a new intermodal station site.

From the south, beginning just north of Manning Road, 24.5 -mile new right-of-way spur from the main line would bring the CST alignment to the SP right-of-way near Malaga. Through Fresno, the CST would share the SP right-of-way with other services for 16.5 miles. Just after the San Joaquin River crossing, a new right-of-way northern spur would leave the SP and join the CST main line after five additional miles. Although 14 grade separations would be required to segregate rail traffic from vehicular traffic, only five were considered to be necessary since the trains would be at very slow speeds (stopping in the downtown) near the station.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
CENTRAL CORRIDOR: NEW R/W (MAINLINE)
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Central Corridor: New RNW (Mainline)

| \%\%: | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | $\cdots$ AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWOAK | 410.00 | TRK-M | \$760,000 | 311,600,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 311,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 77,900,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$389,500,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 410.00 | TRK-M | \$900,000 | 369,000,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 205.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 155,800,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 524,800,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 131,200,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$656,000,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 3230.30 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 16,151,515 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 3230.30 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 11,306,061 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 27,457,576 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 6,864,394 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$34,322,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,543,950,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$308,790,000 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,852,700,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
CENTRAL CORRIDOR - BAKERSFIELD SPUR

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RNW WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 12.00 \\ \hline 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | miles feet |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST: | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 145.45 | ACRE | $\$ 400$ | 58,182 |
| EXCAVATION | 432,800 | CY | \$3.5 | 1,514,800 |
| BORROW | 322,800 | CY | \$4.5 | 1,452,600 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 145.45 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 290,909 |
| FENCING | 24.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 1,944,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 216,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 1,728,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 7.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 11,900,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 18,888,491 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 4,722,123 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$23,611,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | Mi | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | - |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 5 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | Mi | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 26 | EA | \$3,500 | 92,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,092,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,273,100 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,366,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| UREAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | 85,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BULLDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |

FAGE 2
Central Corridor - Bakersfield Spur

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 12.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 9,120,000 |
| FAIL RELOCATION | 7.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 5,320,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,440,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,610,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$18,050,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 12.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 10,800,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 12.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 9,120,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 19,920,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,980,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$24,900,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 60.61 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 303,050 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILPOAD LAND | 84.85 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 10,182,000 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 145.45 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 509,091 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 10,994,141 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,748,535 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$13,743,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$86,670,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$17,334,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$104,000,000 |

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## CENTRAL CORRIDOR - FRESNO LOOP

LENGTH OF SEGMENT = $\qquad$

| ¢ \%- $\because$ | QTY: | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 315.15 | ACRE | \$400 | 126,061 |
| EXCAVATION | 822,320 | CY | \$3.5 | 2,878,120 |
| BORROW | 699,400 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,147,300 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 315.15 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 630,303 |
| FENCING | 52.00 | Ml | \$81,000 | 4,212,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 468,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 3,744,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 16.50 | Ml | \$1,700,000 | 28,050,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 42,787,784 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,696,946 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$53,485,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100{ }^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | M | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 0 | ER | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARÁTION URE | 5 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 42,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 57 | EA | \$3,500 | 200,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 42,700,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,675,050 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$53,375,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
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Central Corridor - Fresno Loop

| ¢ | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWOAK | 26.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 19,760,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 16.50 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 12,540,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 32,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 8,075,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$40,375,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 26.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 23,400,000 |
| SIGNAUCONTROL | 26.00 | M1- | \$760,000 | 19,760,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 43,160,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,790,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$53,950,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 115.15 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 575,750 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| UREAN RAILROAD LAND | 200.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 24,000,000 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 315.15 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,103,030 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 25,678,780 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 6,419,695 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$32,098,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$233,283,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  | - |  | \$46,656,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$279,900,000 |

CalSpeed

## CENTRAL CORRIDOR: TRAVEL TIMES

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAXIMUM } \\ & \text { SPEED } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { AVERAGE } \\ & \text { SPEED: } \end{aligned}$ | TIME (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GRAPEVINE-BKRSFD | 0.00 | 25.00 | 25.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 7.50 |
| BAKERSFIELD-DEL | 25.00 | 60.00 | 35.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 10.50 |
| DELANO-VISALIA | 60.00 | 97.00 | 37.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 11.10 |
| VISALIA-FRESNO | 97.00 | 133.00 | 36.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 10.80 |
| FRESNO-MADERA | 133.00 | 153.00 | 20.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 6.00 |
| MADEAA-PACHECO | 153.00 | 205.00 | 52.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 15.60 |
|  | 0.00 | 205.00 | 205.00 | 200 | 200.0 | 61.50 |

### 1.5 Corridor, New Right-of-Way (188 miles)

## Main line

The entire main line segment for the 1-5 Corridor would be constructed on new right-ofway, where there is no development. Primarily on range/pasture land, the purchase of the right-of-way should be relatively simple and cheap. The majority of this routing through the Central Valley is just to the east of 1-5. Although three wayside platforms would need to be built, it is unlikely that there would any need for stations along this portion of the CST routing in the furure.

Route 99 Overcrossing (at I-5) to Pacbeco Pass (pm 0.0-187.5)
The first 80 miles of this corridor would be as close as possible to I-5. The interchanges and the few curves of 1.5 throughout this portion would keep the new CST right-of-way between 1,000 and 2,000 feet from the existing highway. For the next 38 miles, the routing would be further east of 1-5 (up to three miles away), to avoid the town of Kettleman City and several tight curves. The next 22 miles again follow close to $1-5$ between the freeway and existing utilities (pipeline and powerlines). The routing remains between these facilities, staying, however, closer to the utilities (as far as two miles east of I-5), for another 23 miles. This is necessary because of several curves in the alignment of $1-5$. For the final 24.5 miles of the routing, the new right-of-way crosses the utilities and remains about one miles east of $1-5$ in order to avoid the California Aqueduct. The route crosses the aqueduct twice and returns to the $1-5$ alignment just south of the Henry Miller Road overcrossing of 1.5 .

The average right-of-way width for the alignment would be 130 fees. Therefore, approximately 2,947 acres of land are necessary for this alternative. It is estimated that 57 rural grade separations and 45 short span bridges would be required.

## Spurs to Bakersfield and Fresno

## Bakersfield Spur (downtown station, 23 track miles)

A spur to downtown Bakersfield could be very similar to the Central Corridor Bakersfield Spur previously described, with the exception that in order to serve the 1.5 corridor, it must travel further west before joining the main line. This additional distance is estimated to be 11 miles.

From the south, the spur would be about 17 miles long, beginning just after the Station Road overcrossing of $1-5$ and ending near the existing downtown Bakersfield Amtrak station. The
final four miles would share the Santa Fe right-of-way and serve all trains arriving and departing downtown. The northern portion of the spur require an additional five miles of new track. This portion of the spur ends 1.5 miles south of an SP crossing of 1.5 at the McKitrick Highway. A total of 14 grade separations would be needed for this spur.

## Bakersfitel Spur (loop at outlying station, 25 track miles)

A 25 -mile spur would be required to serve an outlying station on the outskirts of western Bakersfield. This spur would be very similar to the spur described previously for a downtown station; the difference is that instead of directly serving the downtown, a loop outside the city limits is utilized to serve an outlying station,

Fresno Spur (downtown loop, 73 miles)
This spur resembles what has been proposed for Bakersfield. A new right-of-way running east-west connects the CST main line with an existing SP rail right-of-way, which would bring trains 4.5 miles to the downtown of Fresno. As with the Central Corridor option, the site off Tulare Street is assumed to be the site for a new intermodal station site. From the station, trains would continue south another 4.5 miles through Fresno on the SP right-of-way. A new right-of-way segment would "loop" trains back around north through rural land to the east-west portion of the spur.

From the south, the spur begins near Russell Road, where the CST main line is about two miles east of I-5. The northern part of the spur ends just before Shields Road. It is estimated that the complete spur will need 33 rural grade separations and four urban grade separations, and that 21 road crossings will need to be closed.

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 1-5 CORRIDOR, CENTRAL VALLEY

LENGTH OF SEGMENT = $\qquad$
AVE. R/W WIDTH = $\qquad$ 130 feet

| \% \% \% \% \% \% : | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 2962.42 | ACRE | \$400 | 1,184,970 |
| EXCAVATION | 16,273,280 | CY | \$3.5 | 56,956,480 |
| BORROW | 5,057,200 | CY | \$4.5 | 22,757,400 |
| -ANDSCAPEMMULCH | 2962.42 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 5,924,848 |
| FENCING | 376.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 30,456,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 3,384,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 27,072,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 144,351,698 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 36,087,925 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$180,440,000 |
| STRUCTUAES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100 ${ }^{\circ}-200^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 45 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 45,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 55 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 55,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| FOAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 94 | EA | \$83,000 | 7,802,000 |
| CULVERT | 414 | EA | \$3,500 | 1,447,600 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 109,249,600 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 27,312,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$136,562,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 4 | EA | \$300,000 | 1,200,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 3 | EA | \$200,000 | 600,000 |
| DEMOLITION | 10 | EA | \$100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 2,800,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 700,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$3,500,000 |

PAGE 2
1-5 Corridor, Central Valley

| $\cdots \cdots$ | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 376.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 285,760,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUETOTAL |  |  |  | 285,760,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 71,440,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$357,200,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 376.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000. | 338,400,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 188.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 142,880,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 481,280,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 120,320,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$601,600,000 |
| AIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 2962.42 | ACAE | \$1,500 | 4,443,636 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACAE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 2962.42 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 10,368,485 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,812,121 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,703,030 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$18,515,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,297,817,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$259,563,400 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,557,400,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 1-5 CORR. - BAKERSFIELD SPUR (Downtown Station)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\frac{23.00}{100} \text { miles }$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | B.UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 278.79 | ACRE | \$400 | 111,515 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,644,640 | CY | \$3.5 | 5,756,240 |
| BOAROW | 618,700 | CY | \$4.5 | 2,784,150 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 278.79 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 557,576 |
| FENCING | 46.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 3,726,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 414,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 3,312,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M 1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 4.00 | M | \$1,700,000 | 6,800,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 23,047,481 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 5,761,870 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$28,809,000 |
| STAUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | - |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 3 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 14 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 3 | EA | \$50,000 | 150,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | Mi | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M11 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 6 | EA | \$83,000 | 498,000 |
| CULVERT | 51 | EA | \$3,500 | 177,100 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 17,825,100 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,456,275 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$22,281,000 |
| EUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 30,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,500,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$37,500,000 |
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| $\cdots$ | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 23.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 17,480,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 4.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 3,040,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 20,520,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 5,130,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$25,650,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 23.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 20,700,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 23.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 17,480,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 38,180,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,545,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$47,725,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 230.30 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 1,151,500 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 48.48 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 5,817,600 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 278.78 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 975,758 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 7,944,858 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,986,214 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$9,931,000 |
| SUETOTAL |  |  |  | \$171,896,000 |
| ADO-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$34,379,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$206,300,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## I-5 CORR. - BAKERSFIELD SPUR (loop at outlying station)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RNW WIDTH = | 25.00 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY* | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 303.03 | ACRE | \$400 | 121,212 |
| EXCAVATION | 2,164,000 | CY | \$3.5 | 7,574,000 |
| BORROW | 672,500 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,026,250 |
| LANDSCAPEIMULCH | 303.03 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 606,061 |
| FENCING | 50.00 | M | \$81,000 | 4,050,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 450,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 3,600,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 18,977,523 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,744,381 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$23,722,000 |
| STRUCTUAES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\circ}$ Pler | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 6 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 16 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 16,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| FOAD CLOSURE | 3 | EA | \$50,000 | 150,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 8 | EA | \$83,000 | 664,000 |
| CULVERT | 55 | EA | \$3,500 | 192,500 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 23,006,500 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 5,751,625 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$28,758,000 |
| EUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BULLDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 30,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,500,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$37,500,000 |
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1-5 Corr. - Bakersfield Spur (loop at outlying station)

| : $\therefore$ ¢ $\%$... | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAll |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 25.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 19,000,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 19,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,750,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$23,750,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 25.00 | TRK-MI. | \$900,000 | 22,500,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 25.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 19,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 41,500,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,375,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$51,875,000 |
| AIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREJCULTIVATED | 303.03 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 1,515,150 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| INDUSTAIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACPE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 303.03 | ACAE | \$3,500 | 1,060,606 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 2,575,756 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 643,939 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$3,220,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$168,825,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  | - |  | \$33,765,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$202,600,000 |

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 1-5 CORR. - FRESNO SPUR (downtown loop)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ AVE. RIW WIDTH = | $\frac{73.00}{100} \text { miles }$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY $\because$ | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 884.85 | ACRE | \$400 | 353,939 |
| EXCAVATION | 5,539,840 | CY | \$3.5 | 19,389,440 |
| BORROW | 1,963,700 | CY | \$4.5 | 8,836,650 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 884.85 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,769,697 |
| FENCING | 146.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 11,826,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 1,314,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 10,512,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 9.00 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 15,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 67,987,726 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 16,996,932 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$84,985,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | Mi | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' ${ }^{\text {Pier }}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 7 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 33 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 33,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 4 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 34,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 21 | EA | \$50,000 | 1,050,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | M | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 32 | EA | \$83,000 | 2,656,000 |
| CULVERT | 161 | EA | \$3,500 | 562,100 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 78,268,100 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 19,567,025 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$97,835,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILOINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 30,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,500,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$37,500,000 |
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## 1-5 Corr. - Fresno Spur (downtown loop)

| ... | QTY | UoM: | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWOAK | 123.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 93,480,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 9.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 6,840,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 100,320,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,080,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$125,400,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 123.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 110,700,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 73.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 55,480,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 166,180,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 41,545,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$207,725,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 775.76 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 3,878,800 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| UREAN RAILROAD LAND | 109.09 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 13,090,800 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 884.85 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 3,096,970 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 20,066,570 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 5,016,642 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$25,083,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$578,528,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$115,705,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$694,200,000 |

Research on the $1-5$ median indicated that there would be several problems involved in its use for high speeds. Though there are few horizontal curves along the 185 miles (Kern County, pm 16.05, continuing north to Merced County, pm 20.81), and by freeway design standards they are very gentle, for the proposed CST standards these curves are unacceptable. There are ten curves which would impose significant restriction on speed, four of which have only an 8,000 -foot radius which would restrict CST speeds to a maximum of 155 mph . A choice would have to be made: either $1-5$ would need extensive re-alignment, or maximum speeds would have to be reduced.

Another problem concerning median use involves the many grade separations. The average roadway vertical clearance of the 55 overcrossings is 17 feet; towards the center of the median the clearance typically is between 18 and 19 feet. The CST requires a minimum vertical clearance of 21 feet. Therefore, excavation work in the median would be necessary for CST use. In addition, each overcrossing is supported by central pier six feet in diameter (junctions are supported by three three-foot-diameter central piers). The piers would lie between the two tracks and require protecrive crash barriers.

Other costly measures would be necessary to utilize the 1.5 median strip. Outside crash walls and sound barriers would be necessary along the entire strip to protect the railway against freeway intrusion and reduce train turbulence from the roadway. Provisions would need to be made for access to the trainway for emergency vehicles. Median crossovers would likely be required at least every two miles to provide adequate State Highway patrol. Finally, since maintenance bases would be required every 50 miles, three such facilities would be required along the median segment. These facilities require at least an additional 140 feet of right-of-way (see figure), and would certainly require freeway reconstruction to be incorporated.

Our conclusion is that use of $1-5$ 's median strip simply is not feasible. Even at reduced speeds, significant additional construction work would be necessary, offsetting the financial gains of median use.

Minor Mainfenance Base


CalSpeed
Summary of Data

Interstate 5 - Freeway Median (to Pacheco Pass)
Kern County - Post Miles 16.046-87.025
Total Miles
70.979

Kings County - Post Miles $0.00-26.724$
Fresno County - Post Miles 0.00-66.159
26.724

Merced County - Post Miles 0.00-20.806
66.159
20.806

Total 184.668

## STRUCTURES:

Overcrossings and Separations
Total Number $=\quad 55$
Average Length $=\quad 281 \mathrm{ft}$
Travel Width Average $=\quad 48 \mathrm{ft}$
Travel Width Total $=\quad 2640 \mathrm{ft}$
Ave. Vertical Clearance $=16.90 \mathrm{ft}$
Bridges
Total Number $=\quad 40$ *
Average Length $=\quad 116 \mathrm{ft}$
Total Length $=\quad 4620$ ft
Average Width $=\quad 39 \mathrm{ft}$
*Represents Number of crossing locations, 2 highway bridges per location
MEDIAN WIDTH:
Totals:

| Width (feet) |  | Percen (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 74 | 0.180 | 0.10 |
| 79 | 0.102 | 0.06 |
| 80 | 0.188 | 0.10 |
| 82 | 0.013 | 0.01 |
| 84 | 175.480 | 95.02 |
| 99 | 8.705 | 4.71 |

Total Miles $=184.668$.
HORIZONTAL CURVES:

Totals:

|  | Radius (feet) | TGV:Std. <br> Max Speed <br> (m.p.h) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 8000 | 155 |
| 3 | 10000 | 173 |
| 1 | 12000 | 189 |
| 2 | 14000 | 204 |

Existing Rail Right-of-Way (217 miles)

## Detail Segment Description

Recent reports on high-speed rail in California Parsons Brinkerhoff Quade and Douglas, June 1990; SCAG, July 1991) recommended that the high-speed alignment should make use of existing rail right-of-way through the Central Valley. For this report, a similar corridor was determined, with the constraint, however, that the alignment serve San Jose. This corridor begins with a section of new right-of-way after the Grapevine crossing, which brings the CST alignment to an existing SP corridor south of Bakersfield. From Bakersfield to Fresno, the Santa Fe rail corridor is then utilized. Once in Fresno, the routing switches to SP right-ofoway. Just after the Fresno downtown station, the alignment veers west until it reaches the Pacheco Pass. For the entire routing, the existing rail right-of-way is assumed to be 100 feet wide and basically flat.

## The Grapevine to Bakersfield Station (pm 0-30.3)

Although there are many possible routings to downtown Bakersfield, the most logical route would be a northerly route that joins a Santa Fe corridor at Di Giorgio Road just west of Route 184. This route would require approximately 17.5 miles of new right-of-way, beginning a mile north of the Wheeler Ridge Road overcrossing of 1-5. This new route would cross eight roads, of which four were estimated to need separation. The routing then uses the Santa Fe right-of-way for 13.26 miles into downtown Bakersfield, where it reaches the existing Bakersfield Downtown station. This segment of Santa Fe right-of-way has an estimated 40 at-grade streer crossings. However, a two-milelong cut-and-cover tunnel would eliminate 27 of these crossings, which are through the last two miles of this segment in Bakersfield.

Summary: 30.3 miles total length, 17.5 miles new rightof-way, two-mile cut-and-cover tunnel, 21 at-grade street crossings ( 16 grade separations needed, five road closures), three creek or canal crossings, two curves, one bend, freight storage facility ( 1.6 miles long begins at pm 30.6), three miles through Bakersfield.

Bakersfield to Fresno (pm30.3-136.1)

For 107.3 miles from Bakersfield to East North Avenue (near the city limits of Fresno), the Santa Fe right-of-way would be used. The remaining portion of this segment would use the SP right-of-way through Fresno. This routing directly goes through the incorporated cities or towns of Bakersfield, Shafter, Wasco, Corcoran, Hanford, and Fresno. In addition, the routing goes through Greenacres, Allensworth, Laton, Monmouth, and Bowles.

Route Characteristics:
Bakersfield-Shafter: 14 miles long, three curves, Kern river-bed crossing (four streams over 0.5 miles), Greenacres, 12 at-grade crossings (eight grade separations needed, four road closures).
Shafter: one mile long, one at-grade crossing.
Shafter-Wasco: six miles long, two curves, five at-grade crossings (three grade separations needed, two road closures).

W/asco: 1.5 miles long, four at-grade crossings, storage facilities, Wasco Station.
Wasco-Corcoran: 37.2 miles long, two curves, 11 creek and canal crossings, 18 at-grade crossings (ten grade separations needed, eight road closures).

Corcoran: 1.3 miles long, five at-grade crossings.
Corcoran-Hanford: 15.75 miles long, two curves, nine creek or canal crossings, ten atgrade crossings (four grade separations needed, six road closures).

Hanford: 1.5 miles long, one curve, nine at-grade crossings (seven in 0.6 mile), Hanford Station.

Hanford-Fresno: 24.25 miles long, six curves, 17 creek or canal crossings, 33 at-grade crossings ( 15 grade separations needed, 18 road closures), Lamont, Monmouth, Bowles.
Fresno (to existing Greyhound Station): 3.3 miles long, eight at-grade crossings, three grade separations.

Summary: 110.6 miles total, 17 curves, 101 at-grade crossings ( 67 grade separations needed, 34 road closures), 0.5 -mile Kern River Bed crossing, 37 creek or canal crossings, 8.6 miles through incorporated city/towns.

## Firesno to Pacbeco Pass (pm 136.1-217.1)

An SP corridor would be used from Fresno for 71.9 miles to the beginning of the Pacheco pass segment near Henry Miller overcrossing of 1-5. The final six miles would leave the SP right-ofway to join the Pacheco Pass segment, west of the SP corridor. This routing directly goes through the incorporated cities or towns of Kerman, Mendota, Firebraugh, South Dos Palos, and Los Banos.

Route Characteristics:
Fresno: 5.5 miles long, one curve, five at-grade crossings, two creek crossings.
Fresno-Kerman: 11 miles long, 15 at-grade crossings (seven grade separations needed, eight road closures), two canal crossings, two curves.

Kerman: one mile long, one at-grade crossing.

Kerman-Mendota: 18.2 miles long, three ar-grade crossings, three canal crossings, one slough crossing ( $500-\mathrm{foot}$ ), two curves.
Mendota: 1.5 miles long, three at-grade crossings.
Mendota-Firebraugh: 6.8 miles long, zero at-grade crossings, two canal crossings, one curve.
Firebraugh: 1.5 miles long, two ar-grade crossings, one curve.
Firebraugh-South Dos Palos: 12.2 miles long, one at-grade crossing, five canal crossings. South Dos Palos: 0.5 miles long, one ar-grade crossing.
South Dos Palos-Los Banos: 11.2 miles, two at-grade crossings.
Los Banos: 2.4 miles long, six at-grade crossings.
Los Banos-Pacheco Pass: 9.2 miles long, two at-grade crossings, seven canal or creek crossings, one curve.

Summary: 71.9 miles total, eight curves, 38 at-grade crossings ( 30 grade separations needed, eight road closures), 500 -foot Slough Crossing, 21 creek or canal crossings, 12.4 miles through incorporated city/towns.

## Cost and Travel TEme Estmation Assumptions

In order to make appropriate cost and travel time estimates for this alternative, some assumptions had to be made. It was assumed that freight service would continue within the corridor and therefore crash walls and rail relocation would be necessary throughout shared corridors. In rural areas, railroad right-of-way was considered to be equivalent in value to the surrounding land ( $\$ 5,000$ per acre). Grade separation was necessary ar all city/town at-grade crossings, whereas in rural areas a majority of crossings were considered to be closed. Speeds for through trains would be restricted by urban/town areas. A maximum speed of 125 mph through these areas would be permitted. As a result of this speed restriction, with the exception of the Bakersfield urban area, the existing curves were not considered to be speed-restricting.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
EXISTING RAIL RNW, CENTRAL VALLEY

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RWW WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 217.00 \\ 100 \\ \text { miles } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\therefore \cdots \cdots$ \% | QTY) | UUOM | UNIT.COST | AMOUNT: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 2630.30 | \|ACRE | \$400 | 1,052,121 |
| EXCAVATION | 2,034,160 | CY | \$3.5 | 7,119,560 |
| BORROW | 5,837,300 | CY | \$4.5 | 26,267,850 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 2630.30 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 5,260,606 |
| FENCING | 434.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 35,154,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 3,906,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 31,248,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | Ml | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 193.60 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 329,120,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 435,222,137 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 108,805,534 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$544,028,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.59 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 8,260,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\circ}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 20 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 20,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 95 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 95,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 18 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 153,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 47 | EA | \$50,000 | 2,350,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.38 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 6,080,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 2.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 70,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| 8OX CULVERT | 10 | EA | \$83,000 | 830,000 |
| CULVERT | 477 | EA | \$3,500 | 1,670,900 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 357,190,900 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 89,297,725 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$446,489,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 2 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 60,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 4 | EA | \$300,000 | 1,200,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 3 | EA | \$200,000 | 600,000 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 61,800,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 15,450,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$77,250,000 |
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## Exsiting Rail RW, Central Valley

| .. | QTY | UOM | UNIT:COST. | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 434.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 329,840,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 193.60 | TRK-M1 | \$780,000 | 147,136,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 476,976,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 119,244,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$596,220,000 |
| POWEA/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 434.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 390,600,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 217.00 | M 1 | \$760,000 | 164,320,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 555,520,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 138,880,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$694,400,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LANO | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 2487.27 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 12,436,364 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 143.03 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 17,163,636 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 2630.30 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 9,206,061 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 38,806,061 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,701,515 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$48,508,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$2,406,895,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  | - |  | \$481,379,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$2,888,300,000 |

CalSpeed
EXISTING AAIL R/W: TRAVEL TIMES

| SEGMENT | START. | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | TIME <br> (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GVINE-BKRFLD U.L | 0.00 | 19.40 | 19.40 | 200 | 200.0 | 5.82 |
|  | 19.40 | 25.00 | 5.60 | 200 | 150.0 | 2.24 |
| BKFLD U.L.-B STA | 25.00 | 30.30 | 5.30 | 100 | 100.0 | 3.18 |
| BKRSFLD-SHAFTER | 30.30 | 33.50 | 3.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 33.50 | 43.10 | 9.60 | 150 | 150.0 | 3.84 |
|  | 43.10 | 44.30 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| SHAFTER | 44.30 | 45.30 | 1.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.48 |
| SHAFTER-WASCO | 45.30 | 51.30 | 6.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.88 |
| WASCO | 51.30 | 52.80 | 1.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.72 |
| WASCO-CORCORAN | 52.80 | 62.30 | 9.50 | 175 | 150.0 | 3.80 |
|  | 62.30 | 85.60 | 23.30 | 175 | 175.0 | 7.99 |
|  | 85.60 | 90.00 | 4.40 | 175 | 150.0 | 1.76 |
| CORCORAN | 90.00 | 91.30 | 1.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.62 |
| CORCORAN-HANFORD | 91.30 | 94.50 | 3.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 94.50 | 105.85 | 11.35 | 150 | 150.0 | 4.54 |
|  | 105.85 | 107.05 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| HANFORD | 107.05 | 108.55 | 1.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.72 |
| HANFORD-FRESNO | 108.55 | 115.05 | 6.50 | 150 | 137.5 | 2.84 |
|  | 115.05 | 130.10 | 15.05 | 150 | 150.0 | 6.02 |
|  | 130.10 | 132.80 | 2.70 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.18 |
| FRESNO UL-FR STA | 132.80 | 136.10 | 3.30 | 125 | 115.0 | 1.72 |
| FRES ST-FRES UL | 136.10 | 141.60 | 5.50 | 100 | 100.0 | 3.30 |
| FRES-KERMAN | 141.60 | 152.60 | 11.00 | 125 | 120.0 | 5.50 |
| KERMAN | 152.60 | 153.60 | 1.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.48 |
| KERMAN-MENDOTA | 153.60 | 156.80 | 3.20 | 150 | 135.0 | 1.42 |
|  | 156.80 | 170.60 | 13.80 | 150 | 150.0 | 5.52 |
|  | 170.60 | 171.80 | 1.20 | 150 | 135.0 | 0.53 |
| MENDOTA | 171.80 | 173.30 | 1.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.72 |
| MNDTA-FIREBRAUGH | 173.30 | 180.10 | 6.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 3.26 |
| FIREERAUGH | 180.10 | 181.60 | 1.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.72 |
| FIR.-S.DOS PALOS | 181.60 | 184.80 | 3.20 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.54 |
|  | 184.80 | 192.60 | 7.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 3.74 |
|  | 192.60 | 193.80 | 1.20 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.58 |
| S. DOS PALOS | 193.80 | 194.30 | 0.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.24 |
| S.D.PAL-LS BANOS | 194.30 | 197.50 | 3.20 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.54 |
|  | 197.50 | 204.30 | 6.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 3.26 |
|  | 204.30 | 205.50 | 1.20 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.58 |
| LOS BANOS | 205.50 | 207.90 | 2.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.15 |
| LOS BANOS-PP | 207.90 | 217.10 | 9.20 | 200 | 162.5 | 3.40 |
|  | 0.00 | 217.10 | 217.10 | 142.0976 | 5242.5 | 91.67 |

## THE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA PASS AETERNATTVES

## Pacheco Pass (34 miles)

Henry Miller Road Overcrossing to US-101 at Route 152 (pm 0.00-32.32)

To traverse the Pacheco Pass, an alignment was chosen that closely approximates the existing Route 152 alignment, using, however, horizontal curvature standards necessary to maintain high speeds. When creating profiles of the route, two separate maximum-grade options ( 3.5 percent and 5 percent) were calculated. The routing begins near the Henry Miller Road overcrossing of I5 and ends at the junction of US-101 and Route 152. This routing assumes that the next CST segment would be utilizing the median of US-101 to San Jose. However, the Pacheco Pass alignment would be basically the same if the SP right-of-way were used as an alternative to the freeway median. Although its precise location is beyond the scope of this report, if there were adequate demand, somewhere near the Henry Miller Road overcrossing could be a suburban station.

The Pacheco Pass segment begins with a 0.7 -mile cut-and-cover tunnel under $1-5$, Route 33 , and Route 99 just north of Santa Nella Village. The first 5.0 miles of the routing are at a slight grade, heading primarily to the west. At pm $5.15,21.6$-mile tunnel brings the alignment to the northern tip of the San Luis Reservoir, Route 152 being only 1,000 feet to the south. A 2,500-foot bridge is necessary to cross this portion of the reservoir. At the end of the bridge, the routing begins the major grade of the pass.

The primary grade of the Pacheco Pass begins at an elevation of 550 feet and rises to a peak of 1,250 feer over 4.7 miles ( 2.8 percent slope). No tunneling is necessary through this grade; however, since the routing crosses several steep ravines, significant bridge work would be required. Three bridges, totalling 1.95 miles, are needed over the course of this grade. At the elevation of 1,250 feet, a large cut section would make runneling unnecessary. Thus, the routing remains at this elevation for the next 2.1 miles before beginning a long descent. At pm 13.09, the alignment crosses under Route 152 in a short ( 1,100 -foot) tunnel.

At pm 13.66, the major descent of the pass begins. Route 152 is to the north and the alignment is heading in a southwest direction. The descent is 5.70 miles long and ends in the Pacheco Creek Valley at an elevation of 320 feet. The descent could either be accomplished by a 5.0 percent or 3.5 percent grade. Both alternatives would require substantial bridge and tunnel work. For the 3.5 percent alternative, it is estimated that three runnels toralling 2.59 miles and two bridges totalling 0.95 miles are needed. The 5.0 percent alternative allows for 0.79 miles less in the tunnels, but needs 0.35 more miles for the bridges.

From pm 19.36 to pm 23.16 ( 3.2 miles), the routing is level at an elevation of 300 feet, traversing the Pacheco Creek Valley. The creek is crossed seven times through this segment. At pm 23.16, the routing leaves the valley to head west through a southern portion of the San Felipe ridge. The routing must tunnel through this ridge in order to minimize the distance to Gilroy (considering strict horizontal curve requirements, to travel around the range would be too circuitous). The tunnel would be 1.93 miles long, and the CST alignment would cross under Route 152 (in tunnel) at pm 23.26.

The final 8.53 miles of the Pacheco Pass is through the Santa Clara Valley, ending just after the junction of US-101 and Route 152. The routing follows a northwest path through a long gentle horizontal curve. The CST would have to cross over San Felipe Road and the Pajaro River as well as two small canals. Grade separations are needed at Lovers Lane, Fraizer Road, and Bloomfield Avenue. It was estimated that ten structures were likely to be removed through the Pacheco River Valley and Santa Clara Valley as a result of this alignment.

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## PACHECO PASS: 5.0\% ALTERNATIVE

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RW WIDTH = | 34.00 miles 130 feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY\% | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 535.76 | ACRE | \$400 | 214,303 |
| EXCAVATION | 971,667 | CY | \$3.5 | 3,400,835 |
| BORROW | 17,172,407 | CY | \$4.5 | 77,275,832 |
| LANDSCAPEJMULCH | 535.76 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,071,515 |
| FENCING | 47.20 | M | \$81,000 | 3,823,200 |
| SUBBALLAST | 612,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,896,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 90,681,684 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 22,670,421 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$113,352,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.47 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 11,750,000 |
| VIADCT $100^{\circ}-200^{\circ}$ Pier | 1.72 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 60,200,000 |
| VIADUCT > 200 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier | 1.36 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 68,000,000 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 6 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 3 | EA | \$50,000 | 150,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.89 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 31,150,000 |
| STD BORE | 5.57 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 389,900,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 2 | EA | \$83,000 | 166,000 |
| CULVERT | 50 | EA | \$3,500 | 175,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 583,651,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 145,912,750 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$729,564,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 10 | EA | \$100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,500,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,500,000 |
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Pacheco Pass: 5.0\% Alternative

| +....: | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TPACKWORK | 68.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 51,680,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 51,680,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 12,920,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$64,600,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 68.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 61,200,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 34.00 | M | \$760,000 | 25,840,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 87,040,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,760,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$108,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 394.83 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 592,245 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 134.89 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,372,250 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 535.76 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,875,152 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,839,647 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,459,912 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,031,116,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$206,223,200 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,237,300,000 |

CaiSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## PACHECO PASS: 3.5\% ALTERNATIVE

LENGTH OF SEGMENT =
AVE. R/W WIDTH =
34.00 miles 130 feet

| ¢ ¢ | QTY: | UoM | UNIT COST. | AMOUNT: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 535.76 | ACRE | $\$ 400$ | 214,303 |
| EXCAVATION | 875,556 | CY | $\$ 3.5$ | 3,064,446 |
| BORROW | 18,504,444 | CY | \$4.5 | 83,269,998 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 535.76 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,071,515 |
| FENCING | 45.98 | M1 | \$81,000 | 3,724,380 |
| SUBBALLAST | 612,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,896,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 0.00 | M | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 96,240,642 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 24,060,161 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$120,301,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.47 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 11,750,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 2.05 | Mi | \$35,000,000 | 71,750,000 |
| VIADUCT > $200^{\circ}$ Pier | 0.85 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 42,500,000 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 6 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 3 | EA | \$50,000 | 150,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.89 | M | \$35,000,000 | 31,150,000 |
| STD BORE | 6.36 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 445,200,000 |
| BOXCULVERT | 2 | EA | \$83,000 | 166,000 |
| CULVERT | 50 | EA | \$3,500 | 175,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 625,001,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 156,250,250 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$781,251,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 10 | EA | \$100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,500,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,500,000 |
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## Pacheco Pass: 3.5\% Alternative

| $\cdots$ | QTY..... | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 68.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 51,680,000 |
| FAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 51,680,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 12,920,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$64,600,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 68.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 61,200,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 34.00 | M | \$760,000 | 25,840,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 87,040,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,760,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$108,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 394.83 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 592,245 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 134.89 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,372,250 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 535.76 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,875,152 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,839,647 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,459,912 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,089,752,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$217,950,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,307,700,000 |

CalSpeed

## PACHECO PASS: Summary of Route

Design Criteria:
Design Speed $=220 \mathrm{mph}$
Horizontal Curve Radius Minimum $=3.73$ miles ( $6,000 \mathrm{~m}$ )
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \% \& 5 \%$

Route: 1-5 (Merced County, Post Mile 20.806) to SP r/w (at US-101 interchange)
LENGTH: $\quad 33.62$ miles
BRIDGES:

|  | \% Total | Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Bridges | Length (miles) | Length (feet) |
| 12 | 3.54 | 1.558 |

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| Bridges |  | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | 3.73 | 1,642 |

TUNNELS:
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Tunnels | Total Length (miles) | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6 | 6.36 | 5,600 |

CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

| \# Tunnels | Total Length (miles) | Average Length (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.89 | 2,350 |

## GRADE SEPARATIONS <br> 4

CUT:
Max. Grade $=3.5 \%$
Total (Cubic Feet) $=$
19,380,000
Max. Grade $=5.0 \%$
Total $($ Cubic Feet $)=$
18,144,074
FILL:
Max. Grade $=3.5 \% \quad$ Total (Cubic Feet $)=\quad 875,556$
Max. Grade $=5.0 \% \quad$ Total $($ Cubic Feet $)=\quad 971,667$

## BRIDGES:

Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Bridge \# | Beginning Station | Length <br> (fi) | Height <br> (ft) | Average Height <br> (ti) | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $9+200$ | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 2 | 16+400 | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 3 | $36+300$ | 2,500 | 30 | 30 | SAN LUIS RES. |
| 4 | 45+200 | 2,500 | 240 | 120 |  |
| 5 | $51+700$ | 3,600 | 340 | 200 |  |
| 6 | 58+900 | 4,200 | 350 | 220 |  |
| 7 | 85+000 | 1600 | 300 | 200 |  |
| 8 | 89+500 | 3,400 | 200 | 150 |  |
| 9 | $135+200$ | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 10 | 153+100 | 50 | 10 | 10 | OC |
| 11 | 159+100 | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 12 | $161+700$ | 50 | 10 | 10 | 100 |

Total $=\quad 18,700$

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| Bridge 排 | Beginning Station | Length <br> (fi) | Height <br> (ft) | Average Height <br> (tt) | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $9+200$ | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 2 | 16+400 | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 3 | $36+300$ | 2,500 | 30 | 30 | SAN LUIS RES. |
| 4 | $45+200$ | 2,500 | 240 | 120 |  |
| 5 | 51+700 | 3,600 | 340 | 200 |  |
| 6 | 58+900 | 4,200 | 350 | 220 |  |
| 7 | 84+600 | 2,200 | 450 | 300 |  |
| 8 | $89+200$ | 3,800 | 280 | 200 |  |
| 9 | $135+200$ | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 10 | 153+100 | 50 | 10 | 10 | OC |
| 11 | 159+100 | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 12 | 161+700 | 50 | 10 | 10 | OC |

Total $=19,700$

TUNNELS:
Maximum Grade $=3.5 \%$

| Tunnel \# | Beginning Station | Length (ft) | Max. Height <br> (f) | Average Height <br> (ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $27+200$ | 8,600 | 500 | 250 |
| 2 | $67+500$ | 1,100 | 150 | 120 |
| 3 | $76+700$ | 8,200 | 450 | 300 |
| 4 | 86+600 | 2,500 | 320 | 240 |
| 5 | 97+300 | 3,000 | 350 | 220 |
| 6 | 122+300 | 10,200 | 800 | 500 |
|  | Total $=$ | 33,600 |  |  |

Maximum Grade $=5.0 \%$

| Tunnel \# | Beginning Station | Length (t) | Max. Height <br> (ft) | Average Height (t) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 27+200 | 8,600 | 500 | 250 |
| 2 | 67+500 | 1,100 | 150 | 120 |
| 3 | 78+900 | 5,000 | 280 | 200 |
| 4 | $87+400$ | 1.500 | 210 | 180 |
| 5 | $97+300$ | 3,000 | 350 | 220 |
| 6 | $122+300$ | 10,200 | 800 | 500 |

Total $=\quad 29,400$

## CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

| Tunnel \# | Beginning Station | Length <br> (ft) | Height fti) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - 1 | 0-200 | 3,700 | 25 |
| 2 | 176+500 | 1.000 | 25 |
| Total $=\quad 4,700$ |  |  |  |

GRADE SEPARATIONS:

| $\#$ | Station | Street Name |
| ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 1 | $8+700$ | Whitworth Rd. |
| 2 | $137+700$ | Lovers Lane |
| 3 | $157+100$ | Frazier Road |
| 4 | $163+600$ | Bloomfield Ave. |

CalSpeed

## PACHECO PASS ALTERNATIVES: TRAVEL TIMES

PACHECO PASS 5.0\% MAX. GRADE:

| SEGMENT | START: | IFINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | TIME (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.00 | 14.80 | 14.80 | 200 | 200.0 | 4.44 |
|  | 14.80 | 26.00 | 11.20 | 200 | 162.5 | 4.14 |
|  | 26.00 | 30.42 | 4.42 | 200 | 200 | 1.33 |
|  | 30.42 | 33.62 | 3.20 | 200 | 175 | 1.10 |
|  | 0.00 | 33.62 | 33.62 | 200 | 183.4 | 11.00 |

PACHECO PASS 3.5\% MAX. GRADE:

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | TIME (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.00 | 14.80 | 14.80 | 200 | 200.0 | 4.44 |
|  | 14.80 | 26.00 | 11.20 | 200 | 175 | 3.84 |
|  | 26.00 | 30.42 | 4.42 | 200 | 200 | 1.33 |
|  | 30.42 | 33.62 | 3.20 | 200 | 175 | 1.10 |
|  | 0.00 | 33.62 | 33.62 | 200 | 188.5 | 10.70 |

## Panoche Pass Alternatives

To traverse the Panoche Pass, an alignment was chosen that closely approximates a pipeline easement through the pass, using, however, horizontal curvature standards necessary to maintain high speeds. When creating profiles of the route, a 3.5 percent maximum grade was assumed. The routing begins at the Panoche Junction overcrossing of $1-5$. Two alternatives were derermined, both of which end at the junction of US-101 and Route 152. The routings assume that the next CST segment would be utilizing the US-101 median to San Jose. However, the Panoche Pass allignments would be basically the same if the SP right-of-way were used as an alternative to the US-101 median.

The Panoche Pass Alternatives begin at the Panoche Junction overcrossing of 1-5. The alignment follows the pipeline easement to the northwest. Once reaching the Tumey Hills, the alignment continues along the easement west through the hills. Once in the Panoche Valley, both the general alignment of Panoche road and a pipeline easement were utilized. Because of the tight curves of Panoche road, the CST alignment would cross the road several times. The valley becomes the Tres Pinos Creel Valley. The alignment continues along the pipeline easement through the pass until the Hollister Valley.

Once in the Hollister Valley, two alternative were considered. Route A is a completely new right-of-way alternative through agricultural land in the valley, whereas Route $B$ makes use of the SP right-of-way just north of Hollister to the US-101 junction. Route A is 84 miles long, compared to 80.4 miles for Route B . Both routes require about 8.2 miles of bore tunneling, 0.6 miles of cut-and-cover tunneling, and 1.2 miles of bridges.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## PANOCHE PASS: ROUTE A

## LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = <br> $\qquad$



| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.23 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 3,220,000 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}$-100 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier | 1.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 25,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN ERIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.63 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 22,050,000 |
| STD BORE | 8.18 | M | \$70,000,000 | 572,600,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 42 | EA | \$83,000 | 3,486,000 |
| CULVERT | 185 | EA | \$3,500 | 646,800 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 655,162,800 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 163,790,700 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$818,954,000 |


| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | $\$ 50,000,000$ | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | $E A$ | $\$ 30,000,000$ | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | $E A$ | $\$ 5,000,000$ | $5,000,000$ |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | $E A$ | $\$ 6,000,000$ | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | $E A$ | $\$ 300,000$ | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 1 | EA | $\$ 200,000$ | 200,000 |
| DEMOLITION | 10 | $E A$ | $\$ 100,000$ | $1,000,000$ |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  |
| CONTINGENCY $(25 \%)$ |  |  | $6,500,000$ |  |
| TOTAL: |  |  | $1,625,000$ |  |
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Panoche Pass: Route A

| $\because: .$. | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST. | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 168.00 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 127,680,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 0.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 127,680,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 31,920,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$153,600,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 168.00 | TRK-M\| | \$900,000 | 151,200,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 84.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 63,840,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 215,040,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 53,760,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$268,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 1170.47 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 1,755,705 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 157.58 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 3,939,500 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1323.64 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 4,632,727 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 10,327,932 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,581,983 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$12,910,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,387,469,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$277,493,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,665,000,000 |

## PANOCHE PASS: ROUTE B

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r}80.00 \\ \hline \text { * for the new }\end{array}$ | miles feet * r/w por |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square \mathrm{Q} \times \mathrm{\square} \times \mathrm{C}$ | $\because$ QTY $\times$ | UOM. | UNIT:COST: | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1260.61 | ACRE | \$400 | 504,242 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,078,611 | CY | \$3.5 | 3,775,139 |
| BORROW | 14,662,472 | CY | \$4.5 | 65,981,124 |
| LANDSCAPEMULCH | 1225.56 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 2,451,120 |
| FENCING | 139.33 | Ml | \$81,000 | 11,285,730 |
| SUBBALLAST | 1,440,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 11,520,000 |
| SOUNO WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 11.37 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 19,329,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 114,846,355 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 28,711,589 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$143,558,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.17 | Mi | \$14,000,000 | 2,380,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 1.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 25,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200 ${ }^{\text {P }}$ Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.63 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 22,050,000 |
| STD BORE | 8.18 | Mi | \$70,000,000 | 572,600,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 35 | EA | \$83,000 | 2,905,000 |
| CULVERT | 176 | EA | \$3,500 | 616,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 653,711,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 163,427,750 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$817,139,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 1 | EA | \$200,000 | 200,000 |
| DEMOLITION | 10 | EA | \$100,000 | 1,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,500,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,625,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$8,125,000 |
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Panoche Pass: Route B

| $\therefore$ ¢\% $\because$ | QTY | Uom | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 160.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 121,600,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 11.37 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 8,641,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 130,241,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 32,560,300 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$162,802,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 160.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 144,000,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 80.00 | Ml | \$760,000 | 60,800,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 204,800,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 51,200,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$256,000,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 1081.45 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 1,622,169 |
| PASTUFEICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 179.16 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 4,479,000 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1260.61 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 4,412,121 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 10,513,290 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,628,323 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$13,142,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,400,766,000 |
| ADD-ONS ( $20 \%$ ) |  |  |  | \$280,153,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,680,900,000 |

CalSpeed

## PANOCHE PASS: Summary of Routes

Design Criteria:
Design Speed $=220 \mathrm{mph}$
Horizontal Curve Radius Minimum $=3.73$ miles ( $6,000 \mathrm{~m}$ )
Maximum Grade $=5 \%$

Route A: 1-5 (Fresno County, Post Mile 40.660) to 1-101 (Santa Clara Co., Post Mile 6.83)
Route E: I-5 (Fresno County, Post Mile 40.660) to SP r/w (1/4 mile north of Wright RD)
diverges at STA $338+00$ )

## LENGTH: Route $\mathrm{A}=$

Foute $\mathrm{B}=\quad 69.03$ miles *

* New R/W portion only; with SP r/w total $=80.40$ miles

BRIDGES:

| \& | Number | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ave Length } \\ \text { (feet) } \end{gathered}$ | Y\% $\%$ (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route A: | 12 | 542 | 6,500 |
| Route B: | 10 | 620 | 6,200 |

TUNNELS: Route A \& B

| \#Tunnels | Total Length (miles) | Average, qength, \& (teet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 8.18 | 8,640 |

## CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

Route A:

| पY \%, \% | Total Length | Average <br> Length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# Tunnels. | ¢ (miles) | \% (feet) |
| 2 | 0.6 | 1,65 |

Route B:

| \#Tunnels | Q $\%$ Total (miles) | Average, Eength, , (feet) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | 0.44 | 1,150 |

## CUT:

Route A:
Total (Cubic Yards) $=$
15,483,981
Route E:
Total (Cubic Yards) $=$
$15,445,463$

## FILL:

| Route A: | Total (Cubic Yards) $=$ | $1,591,019$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route B: | Total (Cubic Yards) $=$ | $1,078,611$ |

## BRIDGES:

Route A:

| Briage: | Beginning Station | Length (ti) | Height <br> (ft): | Average Height <br> (it) | Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $35+700$ | 350 | 70 | 35 |  |
| 2 | $38+400$ | 700 | 80 | 50 |  |
| 3 | $71+200$ | 300 | 40 | 40 |  |
| 4 | 180+600 | 400 | 60 | 50 |  |
| 5 | 182+000 | 700 | 75 | 55 |  |
| 6 | 194+000 | 2,150 | 80 | 60 |  |
| 7 | 305+000 | 700 | 80 | 60 |  |
| 8 | $346+700$ | 300 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 9 | $371+400$ | 300 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 10 | $374+700$ | 300 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 11 | $413+800$ | 100 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 12 | $416+800$ | 200 | 20 | 20 | OC |

$$
\text { Total }=\quad 6,500
$$

Route B

| Bridge: | Beginning Station | Length,, $(\mathrm{ft}) \mathrm{P}$ | Height <br> (t) | Average Height (ft) | $\square$ <br> Type |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $35+700$ | 350 | 70 | 35 |  |
| 2 | 38+400 | 700 | 80 | 50 |  |
| 3 | 71+200 | 300 | 40 | 40 |  |
| 4 | $180+600$ | 400 | 60 | 50 |  |
| 5 | 182+000 | 700 | 75 | 55 |  |
| 6 | 194+000 | 2.150 | 80 | 60 |  |
| 7 | $305+000$ | 700 | 80 | 60 |  |
| 8 | $338+900$ | 300 | 45 | 45 | OC |
| 9 | $343+300$ | 300 | 20 | 20 | OC |
| 10 | 357+900 | 300 | 20 | 20 | OC |

## TUNNELS:

Route A \& B:

|  | Beginning Station | Length <br> (ti) | Max. Height (ft) | Âverage Height |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1 | $44+000$ | 8.400 | 340 | 150 |
| 2 | $60+800$ | 7.000 | 290 | 200 |
| 3 | 182+800 | 5,700 | 260 | 200 |
| 4 | $196+900$ | 4,700 | 240 | 180 |
| 5 | 208+500 | 17,400 | 580 | 350 |
|  | Total $=$ | 43,200 |  |  |

## CUT AND COVER TUNNELS:

Route A:

| Tunnel | Beginning Siation | Length <br> (ft) | Height <br> (fi) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $0+000$ | 2,300 | 25 |
| 2 |  | 1,000 | 25 |
| Total $=3,300$ |  |  |  |

Route B:

| Tunnel: | Beginning Station | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Height: } \\ (\mathrm{ft}) . \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0+000 | 2,300 | 25 |
| 2 |  | 1,000 | 25 |

## CREEK CROSSINGS:

Route A \& Route B

| $\therefore$ Pration |  |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $11+600$ |
| 2 | $14+200$ |
| 3 | $32+300$ |
| 4 | $33+000$ |
| 5 | $68+700$ |
| 6 | $85+400$ |
| 7 | $123+500$ |
| 8 | $126+400$ |
| 9 | $163+800$ |
| 10 | $164+700$ |
| 11 | $165+200$ |
| 12 | $175+800$ |
| 13 | $177+000$ |
| 14 | $191+200$ |
| 15 | $202+600$ |
| 16 | $204+000$ |
| 17 | $233+600$ |
| 18 | $235+100$ |
| 19 | $236+600$ |
| 20 | $237+100$ |
| 21 | $243+700$ |
| 22 | $244+000$ |
| 23 | $244+400$ |
| 24 | $253+700$ |
| 25 | $259+700$ |
| 26 | $261+700$ |
| 27 | $267+100$ |
| 28 | $268+500$ |
| 29 | $272+800$ |
| 30 | $275+200$ |
| 31 | $278+100$ |
| 32 | $282+700$ |
| 33 | $328+100$ |
| 34 | $333+600$ |
| 35 | $334+900$ |


| CUT: | Section $=$ | 50 | ft | Max Slope | 3:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route $A$ $\cdots \#$ | Beginning Station | Area. ( ${ }^{1} 1000$ ) | Max. Height | Ave. Height | Volume (cubic yd) |
| - 1 | $34+900$ | 2 | 10 | 10 | 4,815 |
| 2 | 36+000 | 26 | 50 | 25 | 84,259 |
| 3 | 37+300 | 16 | 40 | 20 | 47,407 |
| 4 | 42+800 | 70 | 80 | 60 | 362,963 |
| 5 | $52+400$ | 180 | 70 | 70 | 1,033,333 |
| 6 | $55+900$ | 15 | 30 | 25 | 48,511 |
| 7 | 60+400 | 10 | 80 | 40 | 40,741 |
| 8 | $67+800$ | 60 | 80 | 40 | 244,444 |
| 9 | $69+100$ | 25 | 40 | 20 | 74,074 |
| 10 | $79+400$ | 41 | 40 | 15 | 110,093 |
| 11 | $83+000$ | 23 | 40 | 20 | 68,148 |
| 12 | 85+800 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 21,667 |
| 13 | 148+200 | 100 | 120 | 80 | 629,630 |
| 14 | 152+600 | 21 | 40 | 40 | 85,556 |
| 15 | 153+800 | 100 | 60 | 50 | 462,963 |
| 16 | 159+200 | 430 | 120 | 70 | 2,468,519 |
| 17 | $162+400$ | 41 | 70 | 30 | 144,259 |
| 18 | 173+600 | 13 | 40 | 20 | 38,519 |
| 19 | 177+100 | 130 | 100 | 60 | 674,074 |
| 20 | $182+400$ | 8 | 40 | 20 | 23,704 |
| 21 | $188+300$ | 200 | 150 | 100 | 1,481,481 |
| 22 | $192+300$ | 51 | 40 | 30 | 179,444 |
| 23 | $196+400$ | 15 | 50 | 25 | 48,611 |
| 24 | 200+600 | 200 | 80 | 40 | 814,815 |
| 25 | 206+300 | 200 | 140 | 80 | 1,259,259 |
| 26 | $225+700$ | 90 | 70 | 40 | 366,667 |
| 27 | $231+100$ | 180 | 100 | 90 | 1,233,333 |
| 28 | 237+400 | 60 | 80 | 50 | 277,778 |
| 29 | $239+600$ | 8 | 40 | 20 | 23,704 |
| 30 | $244+800$ | 100 | 120 | 80 | 629,630 |
| 31 | 245+900 | 6 | 20 | 15 | 16,111 |
| 32 | $247+200$ | 7 | 40 | 20 | 20,741 |
| 33 | $254+300$ | 34 | 60 | 30 | 119,630 |
| 34 | $257+400$ | 130 | 150 | 100 | 962,963 |
| 35 | 267+000 | 7 | 20 | 10 | 16,852 |
| 36 | $289+400$ | 38 | 30 | 20 | 112,593 |
| 37 | 297+800 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 53,704 |
| 38 | $300+700$ | 180 | 80 | 40 | 733,333 |
| 39 | $303+500$ | 35 | 50 | 30 | 123,148 |
| 40 | $316+600$ | 4 | 10 | 10 | - 9,630 |
| 41 | $321+000$ | 34 | 30 | 20 | 100,741 |
| 42 | $336+200$ | 55 | 45 | 30 | 193,519 |
| 43 | 440+000 | 8 | 20 | 10 | 19,259 |
| 44 | $443+200$ | 8 | 20 | 10 | 19,259 |
| Total $=15015883,981$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Fille:


CUT:

| Foute B | Beginning | Area | Max. Height | Ave. Height | Volume |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# | Station | (*1000) | (ft) | (ft) | (cubic yd) |
| 1 | 34+900 | 2 | 10 | 10 | 4.815 |
| 2 | $36+000$ | 26 | 50 | 25 | 84,259 |
| 3 | $37+300$ | 16 | 40 | 20 | 47,407 |
| 4 | $42+800$ | 70 | 80 | 60 | 362,963 |
| 5 | $52+400$ | 180 | 70 | 70 | 1,033,333 |
| 6 | $55+900$ | 15 | 30 | 25 | 48,611 |
| 7 | $60+400$ | 10 | 80 | 40 | 40,741 |
| 8 | $67+800$ | 60 | 80 | 40 | 244,444 |
| 9 | $69+100$ | 25 | 40 | 20 | 74,074 |
| 10 | $79+400$ | 41 | 40 | 15 | 110,093 |
| 11 | 83+000 | 23 | 40 | 20 | 68,148 |
| 12 | $85+800$ | 9 | 10 | 10 | 21,667 |
| 13 | $148+200$ | 100 | 120 | 80 | 629,630 |
| 14 | 152+600 | 21 | 40 | 40 | 85,556 |
| 15 | 153+800 | 100 | 60 | 50 | 462,963 |
| 16 | 159+200 | 430 | 120 | 70 | 2,468,519 |
| 17 | $162+400$ | 41 | 70 | 30 | 144,259 |
| 18 | $173+600$ | 13 | 40 | 20 | 38,519 |
| 19 | 177+100 | 130 | 100 | 60 | 674,074 |
| 20 | $182+400$ | 8 | 40 | 20 | 23,704 |
| 21 | $188+300$ | 200 | 150 | 100 | 1,481,481 |
| 22 | $192+300$ | 51 | 40 | 30 | 179,444 |
| 23 | $196+400$ | 15 | 50 | 25 | 48,611 |
| 24 | 200+600 | 200 | 80 | 40 | 814,815 |
| 25 | 206+300 | 200 | 140 | 80 | 1,259,259 |
| 26 | $225+700$ | 90 | 70 | 40 | 366,667 |
| 27 | $231+100$ | 180 | 100 | 90 | 1,233,333 |
| 28 | $237+400$ | 60 | 80 | 50 | 277,778 |
| 29 | 239+600 | 8 | 40 | 20 | 23,704 |
| 30 | 244+800 | 100 | 120 | 80 | 629,630 |
| 31 | $245+900$ | 6 | 20 | 15 | 16,111 |
| 32 | $247+200$ | 7 | 40 | 20 | 20,741 |
| 33 | $254+300$ | 34 | 60 | 30 | 119,630 |
| 34 | $257+400$ | 130 | 150 | 100 | 962,963 |
| 35 | $267+000$ | 7 | 20 | 10 | 16,852 |
| 36 | $289+400$ | 38 | 30 | 20 | 112,593 |
| 37 | 297+800 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 53,704 |
| 38 | $300+700$ | 180 | 80 | 40 | 733,333 |
| 39 | $303+500$ | 35 | 50 | 30 | -123,148 |
| 40 | $316+600$ | 4 | 10 | 10 | 9,630 |
| 41 | $321+000$ | 34 | 30 | 20 | 100,741 |
| 42 | $336+200$ | 55 | 45 | 30 | 193,519 |
| Total $=15,445,463$ |  |  |  |  |  |

FILL:
Route B

|  | Beginning Station | Area $(1000)$ | Max. Height (ti). | Ave. Height (fi) | Volume (cubic:ft) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -1 | 39+600 | 35 | 30 | 15 | 93,981 |
| 3 | $71+700$ | 5 | 10 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 4 | 72+900 | 9 | 30 | 15 | 24,167 |
| 5 | 76+600 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 8 | 84+500 | 11 | 20 | 10 | 26,481 |
| 9 | $150+100$ | 6 | 20 | 10 | 14,444 |
| 10 | 153+300 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 11 | 204+900 | 30 | 50 | 30 | 105,556 |
| 12 | 206+800 | 37 | 40 | 30 | 130,185 |
| 13 | 225+700 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 12,037 |
| 14 | 227+600 | 13 | 20 | 10 | 31,296 |
| 15 | $233+100$ | 6 | 10 | 10 | 14,444 |
| 16 | 234+400 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 14,444 |
| 17 | $251+400$ | 22 | 15 | 10 | 52,963 |
| 18 | 259+000 | 14 | 20 | 10 | 33,704 |
| 19 | 268+500 | 10 | 20 | 10 | 24,074 |
| 20 | 275+100 | 7 | 40 | 20 | 20,741 |
| 21 | $277+800$ | 12 | 40 | 30 | 42,222 |
| 22 | $288+300$ | 11 | 25 | 15 | 29,537 |
| 23 | $313+400$ | 23 | 10 | 10 | 55,370 |
| 24 | $333+000$ | 40 | 30 | 20 | 118,519 |
| 25 | $341+60$ | 21 | 20 | 15 | 56,389 |
| 26 | $343+50$ | 17 | 20 | 15 | 45,648 |
| 27 | 355+00 | 40 | 20 | 10 | 96,296 |

Total $=$
$1,078,611$

## PANOCHE PASS ROUTES: TRAVEL TIMES

PANOCHE PASS A (3.5\%)

| , | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1-5$ | 0.00 | 5.68 | 5.68 | 200 | 200.0 | 1.70 |
|  | 5.68 | 13.82 | 8.14 | 200 | 185 | 2.64 |
|  | 13.82 | 28.03 | 14.21 | 200 | 200 | 4.26 |
|  | 28.03 | 32.95 | 4.92 | 200 | 185 | 1.60 |
|  | 32.95 | 35.04 | 2.09 | 200 | 200 | 0.63 |
|  | 35.04 | 44.70 | 9.66 | 200 | 185 | 3.13 |
|  | 44.70 | 81.08 | 36.38 | 200 | 200 | 10.91 |
| 1-101 | 81.08 | 84.28 | 3.20 | 200 | 175 | 1.10 |
| TOTALS: | 0.00 | 84.28 | 84.28 | 200 | 194.7 | 25.97 |

PANOCHE PASS B (3.5\%)

|  | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-5 | 0.00 | 5.68 | 5.68 | 200 | 200.0 | 1.70 |
|  | 5.68 | 13.82 | 8.14 | 200 | 185 | 2.64 |
|  | 13.82 | 28.03 | 14.21 | 200 | 200 | 4.26 |
|  | 28.03 | 32.95 | 4.92 | 200 | 185 | 1.60 |
|  | 32.95 | 35.04 | 2.09 | 200 | 200 | 0.63 |
|  | 35.04 | 44.70 | 9.66 | 200 | 185 | 3.13 |
|  | 44.70 | 72.91 | 28.21 | 200 | 200 | 8.46 |
|  | 72.91 | 77.20 | 4.29 | 200 | 200 | 1.29 |
| 1-101 | 77.20 | 80.40 | . 3.20 | 200 | 175 | 1.10 |
| TOTALS: | 0.00 | 80.40 | 80.40 | 200 | 194.4 | 24.81 |

PACHECO PASS 3.5\%

| RY | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.00 | 33.62 | 33.62 | 200 | 188.5 | 10.70 |
| Additional Dist. | 33.62 | 79.19 | 45.57 | 200 | 200.0 | 13.67 |
| Totals: | 0.00 | 79.19 | 79.19 | 200 | 195.0 | 24.37 |

PACHECO PASS 5.0\%

|  | START. | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.00 | 33.62 | 33.62 | 200 | 183.4 | 11.00 |
| Additional Dist. | 33.62 | 79.19 | 45.57 | 200 | 200.0 | 13.67 |
| Totals: | 0.00 | 79.19 | 79.19 | 200 | 192.6 | 24.67 |

## Santa Clara Valley Alternatives

The alternatives for the Santa Clara Valley were adequately described in Volume I of this report. Refer to the section "Route Alignment Alternatives" in Chapter Four.

## Additional Cost Estimation Metbodology

For this report, the portion of US-101 between Gilroy and San Jose was the oniy freeway median segment considered for CST use. As a result, additional costs needed to be added to the Capital Cost Estimates for the two US-101 alternatives.

Concrete Barrier/Footing:: Jersey barriers would be required on both sides of the median to prevent vehicle entry. Costs were assumed to be the same as the BART extension estimates for the Dublin/Pleasanton extension.

Retained Fill: For 4.2 miles, beginning 0.9 miles after the Burnett Avenue overcrossing, the northbound and southbound lanes are at different elevations. The median through this segment will remain at nearly 100 feet upon completion of the ultimate eight-lane freeway configuration. The average elevation difference between the north and southbound lanes is 15 feet. The cost of $\$ 5.3$ million per mile represents the Dublin/Pleasanton BART extension cost for an eight-foothigh retained-fill section (tracks elevated to eight-foot height by retaining walls on both sides). It was assumed that this cost would be very similar to a section with eight-foot wralls on both sides, one wall beginning at track level and the other (like the retained fill section) ending at track level.

Structural Excavation: For the 70 -foor median-width scenario, at overcrossings, the vertical clearance would not be adequate for the CST. Therefore, at each overcrossing, some excavation work would be necessary. It was estimated that $\$ 100,000$ would cover the total costs of reworking an overcrossing so that the vertical clearance would be sufficient.

Grade Separation Urban: Assuming a 46-foot median, the central piers of each overcrossing would have to be removed. It was assumed that the cost of retrofitting each overcrossing would equal that of a new urban grade separation.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
SANTA CLARA VALLEY - SP R/W
LENGTH OF SEGMENT :=
AVE. R/W WIDTH = $\qquad$

| \%\%\% | QTY: | : UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 218.18 | ACRE | \$400 | 87,273 |
| EXCAVATION | 0 | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| EORROW | 126,430 | CY | \$4.5 | 568,935 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 218.18 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 436,364 |
| FENCING | 9.40 | MI | \$81,000 | 761,400 |
| SUBBALLAST | 540,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,320,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 4.70 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 7,990,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,163,971 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,540,993 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$17,705,000 |

STRUCTURES

| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 25.00 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 350,000,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | Mi | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 2 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD Closure | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 10 | EA | \$3,500 | 35,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 352,035,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 88,008,750 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$440,044,000 |


| EUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| OEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |

PAGE 2
Santa Clara Valley - SP RN

| \%. | QTY: | UOM | UNIT COST. | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 60.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 45,600,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 4.70 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 3,572,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 49,172,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 12,293,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$61,465,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 60.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 54,000,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 30.00 | M | \$760,000 | 22,800,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 76,800,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 19,200,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$96,000,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 218.18 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 26,181,818 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACAE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 218.18 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 763,636 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 26,945,455 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 6,736,364 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$33,682,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$648,896,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$129,779,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$778,700,000 |

## SANTA CLARA VALLEY: US-101 MEDIAN (70')

LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH =
29.00 miles

70 feet

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| grading | 246.06 | ACRE | \$400 | 98,424 |
| EXCAVATION | 2,508,500 | CY | \$3.5 | 8,779,750 |
| BORROW | 672,500 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,026,250 |
| LANSCAPEJMULCH | 246.06 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 492,121 |
| FENCING | 50.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 4,050,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 522,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,176,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 4.50 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 7,650,000 |
| RETAINED SECTION $16^{*}$ | 4.00 | M1 | \$5,300,000 | 21,200,000 |
| CONCRETE WALLIFTG* | 41.00 | M1 | \$1,300,000 | 53,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 102,772,545 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,693,136 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$128,466,000 |


| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 4.00 | M | \$25,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 5 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 0 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| STRUCTURE EXCAVATION* | 11 | EA | \$100,000 | 1,100,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 64 | EA | \$3,500 | 223,300 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 106,323,300 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 26,580,825 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$132,904,000 |

EUILDINGS

| CBD STATION (EXPRESS) | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CBD STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
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|  | Q QTY: | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT...: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 58.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 44,080,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 8.50 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 6,460,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 50,540,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 12,635,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | 63,175,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 58.00 | M1 | \$900,000 | 52,200,000 |
| SUBSTATIONS | 29.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 22,040,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 74,240,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,560,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$92,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 72.12 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 8,654,545 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 72.12 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 252,424 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 8,906,970 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,226,742 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$11,134,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$428,479,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$85,695,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$514,175,000 |

[^1]
## SANTA CLARA VALLEY: US-101 MEDIAN (46')

LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ AVE. R/W WIDTH = $\qquad$

|  | QTY: | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| grading | 175.76 | ACRE | \$400 | 70,303 |
| EXCAVATION | 2,508,500 | CY | \$3.5 | 8,779,750 |
| BORROW | 672,500 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,026,250 |
| LANSCAPE/MULCH | 175.76 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 351,515 |
| FENCING | 50.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 4,050,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 522,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,176,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 4.50 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 7,650,000 |
| RETAINED SECTION $16{ }^{\prime *}$ | 4.00 | M1 | \$5,300,000 | 21,200,000 |
| CONCRETE WALL/FTG* | 41.00 | MI | \$1,300,000 | 53,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 102,603,818 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,650,955 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$128,255,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\circ}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.00 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 4.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 5 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 0 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEP. URBAN * | 11 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 93,500,000 |
| STRUCTURE EXCAVATION* | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 64 | EA | \$3,500 | 223,300 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 198,723,300 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 49,680,825 |
| TOTAL: | - |  |  | \$248,404,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| CBD STATION (EXPRESS) | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| CBD STATION | 0 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 0 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 0 | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
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| \%\%\% \%:...: | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST. | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 58.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 44,080,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 8.50 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 6,460,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 50,540,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 12,635,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | 63,175,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 58.00 | M1 | \$900,000 | 52,200,000 |
| SUBSTATIONS | 29.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 22,040,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 74,240,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,560,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$92,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 0.00 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 51.52 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 6,181,818 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACFE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 51.52 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 180,303 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 6,362,121 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,590,530 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,953,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$540,587,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$108,117,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$648,704,000 |

[^2]
## SANTA CLARA VALLEY ALTERNATIVES: TRAVEL TIMES

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| SEGMENT |  | TOTAL | MAXIMUM | AVERAGE | TIME |  |
| SPRN | 0.00 | 27.60 | 27.60 | 125 | 125.0 | 13.25 |
|  | 27.60 | 29.70 | 2.10 | 125 | 92.5 | 1.36 |


| SEGMENT | START | FINISH: | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | TIME (MINUTES) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-101 | 0.00 | 6.25 | 6.25 | 150 | 150.0 | 2.50 |
|  | 6.25 | 7.00 | 0.75 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.33 |
|  | 7.00 | 26.80 | 19.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 9.50 |
|  | 26.80 | 28.90 | 2.10 | 125 | 92.5 | 1.36 |
|  | 0.00 | 28.90 | 28.90 | 150 | 126.6 | 13.69 |

## THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA AUTERNATIVES

## San Jose to San Francisco

From the Tamien site in San Jose to San Francisco, CST would share the SP right-of-way with Caltrain commuter services. Presently, Caltrain operates a basic 60 -minute-frequency allstops service scheduled to take 90 minutes berween San Jose and San Francisco, with additional peak-hour express services. It is intended to introduce a half-hour frequency on extension of the line to Gilroy, with a quarter-hour frequency in prospect later. The fastest train takes 63 minutes, with only five intermediate stops instead of the usual 25.

In order to run both commuter and CST trains at high frequencies, a four-track configuration is desirable. The SP right-of-way consists of a mixture of two-, three-, and four-track right-ofway; generally stations have four-track capacity (except where rebuilding has occurred, as at Menlo Park, Hillsdale, and San Mateo), but some intermediate stretches have only two-track capacity, as between Califormia Avenue and Palo Alto, Menlo Park and Atherton, San Carlos and Belmont, Hillsdale and Bay Meadows, and San Mateo and Burlingame.

In northern San Jose, some overpasses might need to be reconstructed to accommodate four tracks. Frequent grade crossings represent a problem, particularly where they occur in or near city centers with busy traffic, notably at Mountain View, San Mateo, and Broadway. The line appears to have ample four-track capacity from Broadway to San Francisco, but two of the three tunnels berween Bayshore and San Francisco would require duplication. In addition, the overhead structure of the I-280 freeway may represent a considerable problem in duplicating the track, especially at Evans Avenue, at the 22 nd Street station, and immediately north of the tunnel portal near 16th Street; the feasibility and cost of the operation could be determined only after detailed engineering examination.

Between Lawrence and Redwood City, and in places north of Redwood City, the line passes almost exclusively through high-quality residential areas. Despite the fact that this is an existing rail-noise corridor, environmental considerations will restrict speeds to a maximum of 100 mph . Higher speeds might be obtained between Milbrae and San Francisco, but on this section many trains would make an intermediate stop at San Francisco International Airport.

At the San Francisco end, the existing terminal station at \&th and Townsend is poorly located to serve the San Francisco central business district. Caltrain proposes to extend their services in tunnel to a new terminal in downtown San Francisco. Using one of the alternatives presented in the San Francisco Downtown Station Relocation Study Draft EIS, the CST would
probably enter a tunnel four miles north of the Bayshore Yard, following the alignments of Townsend Street, the Embarcadero, and Main Street to a new station immediately south of the Transbay Terminal. The new terminal project is in the Peninsula Joint Powers Board Capital Improvement Plan. A $\$ 400$ million contribution to the project was included in the cost estimate. The $\$ 30$ million urban station covers a Tamien station upgrade in San Jose, and the $\$ 5$ million suburban station represents the CST contribution to a San Francisco Airport station.

## CalSpeed Capital Cost Estimates

## SAN JOSE - SAN FRANCISCO

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RNW WIDTH = | 49.00 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 593.94 | ACRE | \$400 | 237.576 |
| EXCAVATION |  | CY | \$3.50 | 0 |
| BORROW | 1,318,100 | CY | \$4.5 | 5,931,450 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 593.94 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,187,879 |
| FENCING | 93.64 | MI | \$81,000 | 7,584,840 |
| SUBBALLAST | 882,000 | SY | $\$ 8.0$ | 7,056,000 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | M | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 46.82 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 79,594,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 101,591,745 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,397,936 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$126,990,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\circ}-25^{\prime}$ |  | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier |  | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 55 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 467,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 103 | EA | \$3.500 | 360,514 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 467,860,514 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 116,965,129 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$584,826,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| NEW TERMINAL PROJECT | 1 | LS | \$400,000,000 | 400,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFOFMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 441,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 110,325,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$551,625,000 |
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San Jose - San Francisco

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 98.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 74,480,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 93.64 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 71,166,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 145,646,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 36,411,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$182,058,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 98.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 88,200,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 49.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 37,240,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 125,440,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 31,360,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$156,800,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY (see 2.) |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND |  | ACRE | \$120,000 | 0 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND |  | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS |  | ACRE | \$3.500 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,602,299,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$320,459,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,922,800,000 |

## Notes:

1. Station costs include contributions to the new downtown San Francisco terminal ( $\$ 400$ the Tamien station in San Jose (urban), and the San Francisco airport (suburban). 2. The right-of-way is owned by the Joint Powers Board.

CalSpeed Travel Times
San Jose-San Francisco

| From | Distance (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg (mph) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { (minutes) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tamien | 1.9 | 60 | 40 | 2.8 |
| San Jose Cahill | 2.3 | 60 | 60 | 2.3 |
| Santa Clara | 3.7 | 100 | 80 | 2.8 |
| Sunnyvale | 4.8 | 100 | 100 | 2.9 |
| Mountain View | 5.9 | 100 | 100 | 3.5 |
| Palo Alto Sta. | 4.5 | 100 | 100 | 2.7 |
| Redwood City Sta. | 7.5 | 100 | 100 | 4.5 |
| San Mateo | 5.2 | 100 | 90 | 3.5 |
| SFO | 1.4 | 100 | 50 | 1.7 |
| SJ-SFO | 37.2 |  |  | 26.7 |
|  |  | stop |  | 5.0 |
| San Bruno | 2.4 | 100 | 60 | 2.4 |
| Butier Rd. | 3.8 | 80 | 80 | 2.8 |
| Bayshore Yard | 3.5 | 80 | 70 | 3.0 |
| Existing Term. | 2.2 | 35 | 25 | 5.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| SJ-Transbay Term. | 49.1 |  | 65.2 | 45.1 |

## San Jose-West Oakland

The western branch of the Southern Pacific between San Jose and Oakland appears to be the most desirable for CST express service, as it runs through fewer residential areas and is straighter than the eastern branch. The western branch, which is currently occupied by Amtrak's Capitol service berween San Jose and Sacramento, with five trains daily in each direction, has a mixture of four-track, two-track, and single-track formation.

From the junction with the Peninsula line north of San Carlos, she single-track formation has a number of busy at-grade crossings in San Jose. It crosses the wetlands at the southern end of the San Francisco Bay on a single-track embankment and bridge. It is unclear whether additional rights-of-way exist, but in any event double-tracking might well be open to major environmental objections. Later, the line traverses extensive new residential areas in western Newark.

Northward through Fremont there is extensive warehousing and manufacturing on both sides of the line (here, single-track on a two-track right-of-way), accompanied by some freight sidings, but with some islands of residential development. In addition, there are many at-grade crossings. The line traverses open land between Union Ciry and Hayward, followed by further industrial development in Hayward and San Leandro. There is a severe speed restriction at the junction with the SP eastern branch near 98 th Street in Oakland, followed by a stretch of fast running over four-track formation to the I-880 freeway overpass.

From here trains are slowed to $5-10 \mathrm{mph}$ for street-running through the Jack London Square area of Oakland, and onward round the very sharp bend under the BART structure, immediately west of the Post Office building at West Oakland, to the existing Amtrak station at 16th and Wood Streets, Oakland. (The sharp curve will be eased somewhat with the realignment of track that will take place in conjunction with construction of a new Cypress/l-880 Freeway replacement structure.)

Amtrak plans to reroute their Capitol service via the eastern branch of the SP, with intermediate stops at Milpitas, Fremont, and Hayward, leaving the western branch for freight service. If constructing separate freight and CST tracks within the western SP branch right-of-way proves infeasible, CST services might share the eastern tracks with a future, probably electrified manifestation of the Capitol Corridor service. With the construction of passing loops, a 100 mph non-stop service between San Jose and Oakland could be achieved. Higher speeds would not be desirable because the line runs through extensive residential areas.

Amtrak proposes to relocate their main Oakland station from 16th and Wood Streets, where the historic structure suffered severe damage in the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake and is now closed
to the public, to a new station at Jack London Square. This appears logical for Amtrak operations, but high-speed operations would need to by-pass this section, probably by a new grade-separated strucrure closer to I-880. The main CST station, which would have a connection both to Amtrak and BART, would be at Kirkham Street close to the West Oakland BART station, where a large area of redundant Southern Pacific land is available. A connecting structure (probably including retail and other services) could be built on derelict industrial land, in such a way as not to impinge on the West Oakland residential community, with direct access to the BARTWest Oakland stationat its eastern end.

If a truly competitive level of service is to be provided, a bypass will have to be found in order to avoid in-street running in Oakland. High-frequency CST service simply would not be compatible with automobile, pedestrian, and freight train traffic within Oakland street rights-ofway. Initially, a cut-and-cover tunnel was considered to avoid this problem. However, the great uncertainty of construction cost due to unknown utility relocations and the difficulty in continuing freight operations made a viaduct seem more atractive. A viaduct constructed above the freight tracks along the Jack London waterfront would have a very detrimental effect on development in this area and would probably not be allowed. The best solution would integrate the viaduct with the $1-880$ freeway structure. Conveniently, the new Cypress/1-880 structure will touch down near the proposed new CST station site in West Oakland.

Ultimately, resolution of the approach to Oakland and the exact configuration of the new West Oakland station will require detailed engineering appraisals, outside the scope of the present study. For rough comparative purposes, three alternatives were priced and three time calculations made. One assumes construction of a viaduct; the second, construction of a tunnel; and the third, continued in-street running. The first alternative was judged superior and was used in the overall figures in Volume 1.

## CalSpeed

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES: San Jose - West Oakland

| (Viaduct Alternative) LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 43.00 \\ \hline 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | miles feet |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cdots$ | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 521.21 | ACRE | \$400 | 208,485 |
| WIDEN ENBANKMENT | 1 | LS | \$933,000 | 933,000 |
| BORROW | 1,156,700 | CY | \$4.5 | 5,205,150 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 521.21 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,042,424 |
| FENCING | 86.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 6,966,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 774,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 6,192,000 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CAASH WALLS | 40.90 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 69,530,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 90,077,059 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 22,519,265 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$112,596,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 2.10 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 29,400,000 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier |  | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | M | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 54 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 459,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | M | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 90 | EA | \$3,500 | 314,930 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 500,714,930 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 125,178,733 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$625,894,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| AEGIONAL STATION | 1 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBUREAN STATION |  | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 86,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,575,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$107,875,000 |
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|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 86.00 | TRK-M | \$760,000 | 65,360,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 40.90 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 31,084,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 96,444,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 24,111,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$120,555,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 86.00 | TRK-M | \$900,000 | 77,400,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 43.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 32,680,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 110,080,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 27,520,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$137,600,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTURE/CULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | Acre | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 495.76 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 59,490,909 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND |  | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 495.76 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,735,152 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 61,226,061 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 15,306,515 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$76,533,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,181,053,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$236,210,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,417,300,000 |

Note: Tamien Station included

CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES: San Jose - West Oakland
(Tunnel Alternative)
LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=\frac{42.80}{}$ miles

AVE. R/W WIOTH $=\quad 100$ feet

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 518.79 | ACRE | $\$ 400$ | 207,515 |
| WIDEN ENBANKMENT | 1 | LS | \$933,000 | 933,000 |
| BORROW | 1,151,320 | CY | \$4.5 | 5,180,940 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 495.76 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 991,515 |
| FENCING | 81.80 | MI | \$81,000 | 6,625,800 |
| SUBBALLAST | 770,400 | SY | \$8.0 | 6,163,200 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 40.90 | M | \$1,700,000 | 69,530,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 89,631,970 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 22,407,993 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$112,040,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ |  | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100$ 'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100 ${ }^{\circ}-200^{\circ}$ Pier |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | M | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 54 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 459,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.25 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 1.90 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 66,500,000 |
| STD BORE |  | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 90 | EA | \$3,500 | 314,930 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 541,814,930 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 135,453,733 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$677,269,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | , | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION |  | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 86,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,575,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$107,875,000 |

pAGE 2
San Jose - W. Oakland

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 85.60 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 65,056,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 40.90 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 31,084,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 96,140,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 24,035,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$120,175,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 85.60 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 77,040,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 42.80 | M1 | \$760,000 | 32,528,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 109,568,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 27,392,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$136,960,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 495.76 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 59,490,909 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND |  | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 495.76 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,735,152 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 61,226,061 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 15,306,515 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$76,533,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,230,852,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$246,170,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,477,000,000 |

Note: Includes Tamien station

## CAPITAL COST ESTIMATES: San Jose - West Oakland

| ( n -Street Alternative) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | 42.80 miles |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWOAKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 518.79 | ACRE | \$400 | 207.515 |
| WIDEN ENBANKMENT | 1 | LS | \$933,000 | 933,000 |
| BORROW | 1,151,320 | CY | \$4.5 | 5,180,940 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 495.76 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 991.515 |
| FENCING | 81.80 | MI | \$81,000 | 6,625,800 |
| SUBBALLAST | 770,400 | SY | \$8.0 | 6,163,200 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 42.80 | M | \$1,700,000 | 72,760,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 92,861,970 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 23,215,493 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$116,077,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' |  | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 12 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 12,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 54 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 459,000,000 |
| POAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CIUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | M 1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 90 | EA | \$3,500 | 314,930 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 471,314,930 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 117,828,733 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$589,144,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 1 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION |  | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 86,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,575,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$107,875,000 |
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|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 85.60 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 65,056,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 42.80 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 32,528,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 97,584,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 24,396,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$121,980,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 85.60 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 77,040,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 42.80 | M1 | \$760,000 | 32,528,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 109,568,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 27,392,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$136,960,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED OEVELOP. |  | ACAE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 495.76 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 59,490,909 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND |  | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 495.76 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,735,152 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 61,226,061 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 15,306,515 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$76,533,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,148,569,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$229,713,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,378,300,000 |

Note: Tamien station included

Calspeed: Travel times
San Jose-West Oakland
With viaduct in Oakland

| From <br> : | Distance <br> (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | Tmime <br> (minutes) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| San Jose (Tamien) | 1.9 | 60 | 40 | 2.8 |
| San Jose (Cahill) | 2.3 | 60 | 60 | 2.3 |
| Santa Clara Caltrain | 0.4 | 60 | 60 | 0.4 |
| Jnct. Peninsula | 3.7 | 100 | 90 | 2.5 |
| Great America (rd.) | 1.8 | 100 | 100 | 1.1 |
| Alviso (urban limit) | 6.4 | 100 | 100 | 3.9 |
| Newark (Mowry Ave.) | 18.8 | 100 | 90 | 12.5 |
| Jnct. Niles | 5.7 | 80 | 80 | 4.3 |
| $1-880$ | 2.1 | 80 | 45 | 2.8 |
| SJ-W.Oakland $\because$ | 43.0 |  | 79.5 | 32.4 |

With tunnel in Oakland

| From | Distance (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg (mph) | Time (minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jose (Tamien) | 1.9 | 60 | 40 | 2.8 |
| San Jose (Cahill) | 2.3 | 60 | 60 | 2.3 |
| Santa Clara Caltrain | 0.4 | 60 | 60 | 0.4 |
| Jnct. Peninsula | 3.7 | 100 | 90 | 2.5 |
| Great America (rd.) | 1.8 | 100 | 100 | 1.1 |
| Alviso (urban limit) | 6.4 | 200 | 100 | 3.9 |
| Newark (Mowry Ave.) | 18.8 | 100 | 90 | 12.5 |
| Jnct. Niles | 5.7 | 80 | 80 | 4.3 |
| 1-880 | 1.9 | 80 | 50 | 2.3 |
| S.l-W.Oakland | 42.8 | $\because$ | 80.4 | 31.9 |

In Street Running

| From | Distance (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg (mph) | Time (minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| San Jose (Tamien) | 1.9 | 60 | 40 | 2.8 |
| San Jose (Cahill) | 2.3 | 60 | 60 | 2.3 |
| Santa Clara Caltrain | 0.4 | 60 | 60 | 0.4 |
| Jnct. Peninsula | 3.7 | 100 | 90 | 2.5 |
| Great America (rd.) | 1.8 | 100 | 100 | 1.1 |
| Alviso (urban limit) | 6.4 | 200 | 100 | 3.9 |
| Newark (Mowry Ave.) | 18.8 | 100 | 90 | 12.5 |
| $J$ Jnct. Niles | 5.7 | 80 | 70 | 4.9 |
| 1-880 | 1.9 | 10 | 9 | 12.6 |
| SJ-W.Oakland | 42.8 |  | 59.9 | 42.9 |

Note: assumes no delay due to street congestion

## LOS ANGELES-SACRAMENTO ALTERNATIVES

## 1. Madera to Sacramento, Existing SP Right-of-Way (161 milles)

This aligmment would be a continuation of the "Central Corridor, New Right-of-way" alternative. Just after the Madera outlying station, the alignment would veer east until joining the existing SP right-of-way about four miles north of Madera. From this point to Sacramento, the altemative would be completely constructed on existing $S P$ right-of-way. This report assumes that there would be stations in Merced, Modesto, Stockton, and a major station in Sacramento. If there was demand, additional towns could be directly served.

## Madera to Stockton (pm 0.0.100.05)

Using SP right-of-way from north of Madera to the SP depot in Stockton (where a new station would be built, the distance is approximately 102 miles. For most of this routing, Route 99 follows and abuts the rail right-of-way. As a result, this corridor makes use of many grade separations built for the highway. Like most rall corridors in the state, the average width of the corridor is about 100 feet. This routing directly goes through the incorporated cities or towns of: Madera, Chowchilla, Merced, Atwater, Livingston, Turlock, Ceres, Modesto, Ripon, Manteca, and Srockton.

## Route Characteristics:

Madera Outlying Station-SP Right-of-Way: 7.0 miles long, two curves, four ar-grade crossings, one creek crossing.
SP Right-of-Way-Chowchilla: 7.3 miles long, Nortarb, Benrenda, Fairmead, two at-grade crossings (seven exissing grade separations), five creek or canal crossings.

Chowchilla: 0.7 miles long, two at-grade crossings.
Chowchilla-Merced: 16 miles long, Minturn, Sierra Vista, Labranza, Athlone, Lingard, three at-grade crossings (three existing grade separations), 12 creek or canal crossings.
Merced: 3.5 miles long, one curve, seven at-grade crossings (five crossings within 0.7 mile strip) (three grade separations), one creek crossing.
Merced-Arwater: 5 miles long, Fergus (four existing grade separations), two creek or canal crossings.

Atwater: 2.5 miles long, one at-grade crossing (one existing grade separation).
Arwater-Livingston: 5.5 miles long, Arena (five existing grade separations), two creek or canal crossings.
Livingston: 0.8 miles long, three at-grade crossings (one existing grade separation).

Livingston-Turlock: 9 miles long, two curves, Delhi, two at-grade crossings (four existing grade separations), four creek or canal crossings.

Turlock: 2.1 miles long, seven at-grade crossings (one existing grade separation).
Turlock-Ceres: 7.2 miles long, Keyes ( 1.5 miles long), six at-grade crossings (four existing grade separations), two creek or canal crossings.

Modesto: 9 miles long, two curves, 13 at-grade crossings (use $1 / 2$-mile viaduct to eliminate five crossings; there are four existing grade separations), four creek or canal crossings.

Modesto-Manteca: 10 miles long, Salida ( 0.7 miles long), Ripon ( 0.4 miles long), Calla, one curve, three at-grade crossings (seven existing grade separations), four creek or canal crossings.

Manteca: 3.8 miles long, seven at-grade crossings, one canal crossing.
Manteca-Stockton: 7.25 miles long, Lathop, French Camp, Ortega, two curves ( 80 mph speed restriction for curve at Lathop), seven at-grade crossings, two creek or canal crossings.
Stockton: 3.4 miles long, one curve, ten at-grade crossings (use $3 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel to eliminate ten crossings; there is one existing grade separation), one canal crossing.

Summary: 108.05 total miles, 0.75 -miles cut-and-cover tunnel, 0.5 -miles viaduct, 10 curves, 78 at-grade crossings ( 15 "urban" and 48 "rural" grade separations needed), 51 existing grade separations, 41 creek or canal crossings, 28.3 miles through incorporated ciry/towns.

## Stockiton to Sacramento Dountown Station (100.05-148.25)

From Stockton to Sacramento's Downtown Station, the SP route follows the general alignment of Route 99. This alignment bisects Lodi, Galt, and Elk Grove and is 48.2 miles long.

Route Characteristics:
Stockton: 6 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings ( $1 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel eliminates four crossings), one river crossing, one canal crossing.
Stockton-Lodi: 4 miles in length. Three at-grade crossings, four creek or canal crossings.
Lodi: 3.4 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings (one-mile viaduct eliminates six crossings).

Lodi-Sacramento: 22.2 miles in length. One curve, Galt, Elk Grove, 22 at-grade crossings, one existing grade separation, 23 creek or canal crossings.
Sacramento: 12.6 miles in length. Seven curves (final 0.6 mile restricted to 40 mph and prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves), nine at-grade crossings, two existing grade separations, four creek or canal crossings.

Summary: 48.2 miles in length. 0.25 -mile cut-and-cover sunnel, 0.5 -mile viaduct, eight curves, 54 at-grade crossings ( 19 "urban" and 25 "rural" grade separations needed), three existing grade separations, 33 creek or canal crossings, one river crossing, 22.0 miles of urban area.

## Bay Area Turnout Segment (13 miles)

An additional 13 miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northern Central Valley to the Bay Arez. This short segment would be just north of Madera. The segment would need 17 grade separations and five canal crossings.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 1. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, EXISTING SP R/W

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 161.00 \\ \hline 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢\%\%\% $\times$ | QTY: | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT: :- |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| Gfiding | 1951.52 | ACRE | \$400 | 780,606 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,730,000 | CY | \$3.5 | 6,055,000 |
| BORROW | 4,330,900 | CY | \$4.5 | 19,489,050 |
| LANDSCAPEJMULCH | 1951.52 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 3,903,030 |
| FENCING | 320.50 | MI | \$81,000 | 25,960,500 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,898,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 23,184,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 141.25 | Mi | \$1,700,000 | 240,125,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 319,497,186 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 79,874,297 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$399,371,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 1.00 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 26 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 26,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 73 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 73,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 34 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 289,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 1.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 354 | EA | \$3,500 | 1,239,700 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 450,399,700 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 112,599,925 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$563,000,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| UPBBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 3 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 2 | EA | \$300,000 | 600,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 45,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 11,400,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$57,000,000 |
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1. Madera to Sacramento, Existing SP RNW

| ...: | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 322.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 244,720,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 141.25 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 107,350,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 352,070,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 88,017,500 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$440,088,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 322.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 289,800,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 161.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 122,360,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 412,160,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 103,040,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$515,200,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACAE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 1696.97 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 8,484,848 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 254.55 | ACAE | \$120,000 | 30,545,455 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1951.52 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 6,830,303 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 45,860,606 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 11,465,152 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$57,326,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$2,031,985,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$406,397,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$2,438,400,000 |

CalSpeed

1. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, EXISTING SP R/W

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT. | START, | FINISH: | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MADERA | 0.00 | 6.30 | 6.30 | 140 | 140.0 | 2.70 |
|  | 6.30 | 7.00 | 0.70 | 150 | 145.0 | 0.29 |
| SP ANW-CHOWCHILLA | 7.00 | 13.10 | 6.10 | 150 | 150.0 | 2.44 |
|  | 13.10 | 14.30 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| CHOWCILLA | 14.30 | 15.00 | 0.70 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.34 |
| CHOWCHILLA-MERCED | 15.00 | 18.20 | 3.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 18.20 | 29.80 | 11.60 | 150 | 150.0 | 4.64 |
|  | 29.80 | 31.00 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| MERCED | 31.00 | 34.50 | 3.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.68 |
| MERCED-ATWATER | 34.50 | 39.50 | 5.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.40 |
| ATWATER | 39.50 | 42.00 | 2.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.20 |
| ATWATER-LIVING. | 42.00 | 47.50 | 5.50 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.64 |
| LIVINGSTON | 47.50 | 48.30 | 0.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.38 |
| LIVING.-TURLOCK | 48.30 | 51.50 | 3.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 51.50 | 56.10 | 4.60 | 150 | 150.0 | 1.84 |
|  | 56.10 | 57.30 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| TURLOCK | 57.30 | 59.40 | 2.10 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.01 |
| TURLOCK-CERES | 59.40 | 66.60 | 7.20 | 125 | 125.0 | 3.46 |
| MODESTO | 66.60 | 75.60 | 9.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 4.32 |
| MODESTO-MANTECA | 75.60 | 78.81 | 3.21 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 78.81 | 84.40 | 5.59 | 150 | 150.0 | 2.24 |
|  | 84.40 | 85.60 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| MANTECA | 85.60 | 89.40 | 3.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.82 |
| MANTECA-STOCKTON | 89.40 | 90.80 | 1.40 | 125 | 102.5 | 0.82 |
|  | 90.80 | 91.36 | 0.56 | 80 | 80.0 | 0.42 |
|  | 91.36 | 95.26 | 3.90 | 125 | 102.5 | 2.28 |
|  | 95.26 | 96.65 | 1.39 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.67 |
| STOCKTON | 96.65 | 100.05 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
|  | 100.05 | 106.05 | 6.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.88 |
| STOCKTON-LODI | 106.05 | 110.05 | 4.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.92 |
| LODI | 110.05 | 113.45. | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
| LODI-SACRAMENTO | 113.45 | 120.55 | 7.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 2.84 |
|  | 120.55 | 132.55 | 12.00 | 175 | 125.0 | 5.76 |
|  | 132.55 | 135.65 | 3.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 1.24 |
| SACRAMENTO | 135.65 | 140.95 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 140.95 | 142.65 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 142.65 | 146.75 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 146.75 | 147.65 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 147.65 | 147.95 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 147.95 | 148.25 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 148.25 | 148.25 | 175 | 125.9 | 70.64 |

## 2. Pacheco Pass to Sacramento, Existing SP Right-of-Way (126.0 miles)

This alignment would be a continuation of either the "Central Corridor" or "I-5 Corridor" alternatives through the Central Valley. It begins just north of the San Luis Reservoir where the Pacheco Pass segment begins. This alignment is constructed predominately on existing SP right-of-way, with two exceptions: where curves must be realigned, and the "turnout segment." This report only assumes stations in Stockton and Sacramento for this alternative, although additional stations could be added if there was adequate demand.

## Pacbeco Pass to Stockton (pm 0.0.70.8)

Using SP right-ofoway from the beginning of the Pacheco Pass (where a new right-of-way would veer west leaving the SP right-of-way for trains destined for the Bay Area) to the SP depot in Stockton (where a new station would be built), is approximately 70.8 miles. For most of this routing, the SP right-of-way has an alignment similar to $1-5$, but several miles to the east. Just before Tracy, the alignment veers east and then north to reach Stockton. Since there are two very tight curves in this segment, approximately 6.5 miles of new right-of-way would be necessary to create a smoother alignment. In addition, another seven miles of new right-of-way would be necessary for a short spur to allow for service between the northerm Central Valley and the Santa Clara Valley. The SP routing to Stockton is presently sparsely populated; however, since it bisects several small towns (Gustine, Newman, Crows Landing, and Patterson), speeds would be restricted to 125 mph for 18 miles of the routing (pm 12.0-30.0).

Route Characteristics:
Pacheco Pass-Stockton: 67.4 miles long, three curves, three bends, 77 at-grade crossings, San Joaquin River crossing, 28 creek/canal crossings, 13.5 miles of new right-of-way (includes seven-mile spur).
Stockton: 3.4 miles long, one curve, ten at-grade crossings (use $3 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel to eliminate ten crossings; there is one existing grade separation), one canal crossing.

Summary: 70.8 total miles, 0.75 -miles cut-and-cover tunnel, three curves (three bends), 87 at-grade crossings ( 77 "rural" grade separations needed), one existing grade separation, San Joaquin River Crossing, 29 creek or canal crossings, 3.4 miles through incorporated ciry/towns.

From Stockton to Sacramento's Downtown Station, the SP route follows the general alignment of Route 99. This alignment bisects Lodi, Galt, and Elk Grove, and is 48.2 miles long.

Route Characteristics:
Stockton: 6 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings ( $1 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel eliminates four crossings), one river crossing, one canal crossing.

Srockton-Lodi: 4 miles in length. Three at-grade crossings, four creek or canal crossings.
Lodi: 3.4 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings (one-mile viaduct eliminates six crossings).

Lodi-Sacramento: 22.2 miles in length. One curve, Galt, Elk Grove, 22 at-grade crossings, one existing grade separation, 23 creek or canal crossings.

Sacramento: 12.6 miles in length. Seven curves (final 0.6 mile restricted to 40 mph and prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves), nine at-grade crossings, two existing grade separation, four creek or canal crossings.

Summary: 48.2 miles in length, 0.25 -miles cut-and-cover tunnel, 0.5 -miles viaduct, eight curves, 54 at-grade crossings ( 19 "urban" and 25 "rural" grade separations needed), three existing grade separations, 33 creek or canal crossings, one river crossing, 22 miles of urban area.

## Bay Area Tumout Segment

An additional seven miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northem Central Valley to the Bay Area. This short segment would be just north of the San luis Reservoir, and would need three additional grade separations.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 2. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, EX. SP RNW

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = <br> AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 126.00 \\ \hline 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | UOR | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1527.27 | ACRE | \$400 | 610,909 |
| EXCAVATION | 605,920 | CY | \$3.5 | 2,120,720 |
| BORROW | 3,389,400 | CY | \$4.5 | 15,252,300 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 1527.27 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 3,054,545 |
| FENCING | 250.50 | MI | \$81,000 | 20,290,500 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,268,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 18,144,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 119.00 | M | \$1,700,000 | 202,300,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 261,772,975 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 65,443,244 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$327,216,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.50 | M | \$14,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' ${ }^{\text {Pier }}$ | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 23 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 23,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUA | 105 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 105,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 19 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 161,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.76 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 12,160,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 1.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 277 | EA | \$3,500 | 970,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 344,630,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 86,157,550 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$430,788,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| UREAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILOINGS | 2 | EA | \$300,000 | 600,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 35,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 8,900,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$44,500,000 |
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## 2. Pacheco Pass to Sacramento, EX. SP R/W

| \%\% $\because$ | QTY: | UoM: | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 252.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 191,520,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 119.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 90,440,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 281,960,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 70,490,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$352,450,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 252.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 226,800,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 126.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 95,760,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 322,560,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 80,640,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$403,200,000 |
| AIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTURE/CULTIVATED | 1272.73 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 6,363,636 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RALLROAD LAND | 254.55 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 30,545,455 |
| INDUSTRIAL LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEEAL COSTS | 1527.27 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 5,345,455 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 42,254,545 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,563,636 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$52,818,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,610,972,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  | - |  | \$322,194,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,933,200,000 |

Calspeed
2. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, EXISTING SP RN express service travel times: 200 mph maximum speed

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH女 | TOTAL MILES | MAXIRUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCHECO PASS-STOCK | 0.00 | 10.80 | 10.80 | 150 | 150.0 | 4.32 |
|  | 10.80 | 12.00 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
|  | 12.00 | 30.00 | 18.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 8.64 |
|  | 30.00 | 33.20 | 3.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 33.20 | 48.80 | 15.60 | 150 | 150.0 | 6.24 |
|  | 48.80 | 50.00 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
|  | 50.00 | 67.40 | 17.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 8.35 |
| STOCKTON | 67.40 | 70.80 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
|  | 70.80 | 76.80 | 6.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.88 |
| STOCKTON-LODI | 76.80 | 80.80 | 4.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.92 |
| LODI | 80.80 | 84.20 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
| LODI-SACRAMENTO | 84.20 | 91.30 | 7.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 2.84 |
|  | 91.30 | 103.30 | 12.00 | 175 | 125.0 | 5.76 |
|  | 103.30 | 106.40 | 3.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 1.24 |
| SACRAMENTO | 106.40 | 111.70 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 111.70 | 113.40 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 113.40 | 117.50 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 117.50 | 118.40 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 118.40 | 118.70 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 118.70 | 119.00 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 119.00 | 119 | 175 | 125.8 | 56.76 |

3. Madera to Sacramento, New Right-of-Way (158 miles)

This alignment would be a continuation of the "Central Corridor, New Right-of-Way" alternative through the Central Valley. It begins at Madera (where the Los Angeles to Oakland/San Francisco routing veers west across the Central Valley) and ends at the location of the existing Downtown Sacramento Amtrak station. Until reaching the Sacramento urban area, this alignment would be completely constructed on new right-of-way through agricultural land. This report assumes outlying stations near Merced, Modesto, and Stockton; if there were demand, additional outlying stations could be built.

## Madera to Stockton (0.0-97.6)

The new right-of-way is generally about three miles to the west of Route 99 for the first 45 miles of this segment. At this point, the routing veers north, crossing Route 99 just south of Manteca. A little over two miles east of Route 99, this segment ends at a station on the outskirts of Stockton at Route 26. Outlying stations would also be built in the vicinity of Merced and Modesto along this alignment. The total distance of this segment is 97.6 miles. It is estimated there would need to be 88 grade separations and 20 road closures. There are 42 creek/canal crossings through this segment.

Stockton to Sacramento Urban Area (97.6-132.4)

Until joining the existing SP right-of-way at the urban fringe of Sacramento, the routing is between one and three miles east of Route 99 . This segment is 34.8 miles long. There would need to be an estimated 34 grade separations, and there are 14 creek/canal crossings.

## Sacramento Urban Area (132.4-145.0)

The Sacramento urban area extends 12.6 miles along the SP right-of-way before reaching Sacramento's downtown station. The rail right-of-way has seven curves which would be difficult to realign (final 0.6 mile restricted to 40 mph and prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves). There are nine at-grade crossings which would need to be grade-separated and four creek/canal crossings. It appears that there are only two existing grade separations.

## Bay Area Turnout Segment (13 miles)

An additional 13 miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northem Central Valley to the Bay Area. This short segment would be just north of Madera. The segment would need 17 grade separations and five canal crossings.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 3. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

LENGTH OF SEGMENT = $\qquad$
AVE. RNW WIDTH =

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 2489.70 | ACRE | \$400 | 995,879 |
| EXCAVATION | 12,585,824 | CY | \$3.5 | 44,050,384 |
| BORROW | 4,250,200 | CY | \$4.5 | 19,125,900 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 2489.70 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 4,979,394 |
| FENCING | 316.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 25,596,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,844,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 22,752,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 12.60 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 21,420,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 138,919,557 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 34,729,889 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$173,649,000 |


| STAUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 14,000,000$ | 0 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 25,000,000$ | 0 |
| VIADCT $100^{\prime}-200^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 35,000,000$ | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 50,000,000$ | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 22 | EA | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $22,000,000$ |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 139 | EA | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $139,000,000$ |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 9 | EA | $\$ 8,500,000$ | $76,500,000$ |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | $\$ 50,000$ | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 16,000,000$ | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 35,000,000$ | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | MI | $\$ 70,000,000$ | 0 |
| BOXCULVERT | 73 | EA | $\$ 83,000$ | $6,059,000$ |
| CULVERT | 348 | EA | $\$ 3,500$ | $1,216,600$ |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  |  |
| CONTINGENCY $(25 \%)$ |  |  | $244,775,600$ |  |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | $61,193,900$ |


| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| UFIBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 3 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 2 | EA | \$300,000 | 600,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 45,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 11,400,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$57,000,000 |
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## 3. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RNW

| : | QTY. | UOM | UNTT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 316.00 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 240,160,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 12.60 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 9,576,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 249,736,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 62,434,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$312,170,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 316.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 284,400,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 158.00 | M | \$760,000 | 120,080,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 404,480,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 101,120,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$505,600,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 2291.15 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 11,455,750 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 152.73 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 18,327,600 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 2489.70 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 8,713,939 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 38,497,289 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,624,322 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$48,122,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,402,511,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$280,502,200 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,683,000,000 |

CalSpeed
3. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT | START. | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MADERA-STOCKTON | 0.00 | 7.70 | 7.70 | 200 | 170.0 | 2.72 |
|  | 7.70 | 97.60 | 89.90 | 200 | 200.0 | 26.97 |
| STOCKTON-SAC URB. | 97.60 | 127.90 | 30.30 | 200 | 200.0 | 9.09 |
|  | 127.90 | 132.40 | 4.50 | 200 | 162.5 | 1.66 |
| SACRAMENTO | 132.40 | 137.70 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 137.70 | 139.40 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 139.40 | 143.50 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 143.50 | 144.40 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 144.40 | 144.70 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 144.70 | 145.00 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 145.00 | 145.00 | 200 | 176.5 | 49.30 |

## CalSpeed

3. SJ - MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH | TOTAL MIES | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAXMMUM } \\ & \text { SPEED } \end{aligned}$ | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCV-SPRN | 0 | 5.2 | 5.20 | 125 | 62.5 | 4.99 |
|  | 5.2 | 29.7 | 24.50 | 125 | 125 | 11.76 |
| PACEHCO PASS | 29.7 | 63.32 | 33.62 | 200 | 180 | 11.21 |
| CENTRAL CORRIDOR | 63.32 | 94.52 | 31.20 | 200 | 200 | 9.36 |
|  | 94.52 | 98.32 | 3.80 | 200 | 170 | 1.34 |
|  | 98.32 | 111.32 | 13.00 | 140 | 140 | 5.57 |
| MADERA-STOCKTON | 111.32 | 119.02 | 7.70 | 200 | 170 | 2.72 |
|  | 119.02 | 189.92 | 70.90 | 200 | 200.0 | 21.27 |
| STOCKTON-SAC URB. | 189.92 | 220.22 | 30.30 | 200 | 200.0 | 9.09 |
|  | 220.22 | 224.72 | 4.50 | 200 | 162.5 | 1.66 |
| SACRAMENTO | 224.72 | 230.02 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 230.02 | 231.72 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 231.72 | 235.82 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 235.82 | 236.72 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 236.72 | 237.02 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 237.02 | 237.32 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0.00 | 237.32 | 237.32 | 200 | 162.1 | 87.83 |

## 4. Pacheco Pass to Sacramento, New Right-of-Way (117 miles)

This alignment could either be a continuation of the "Central Corridor, New Right-of-Way" alternative or the " $\mathrm{I}-5$ Corridor" alternative through the Central Valley. It begins near the Henry Miller Road overcrossing of $1-5$ at the Pacheco Pass where the Los Angeles-to-Oakland/San Francisco routing heads west across the Pacheco Pass. Until reaching the Sacramento urban area, this alignment would be completely constructed on new right-of-way through agricultural land. This report assumes an outlying station at Srockton and in the vicinity of Modesto; if there were demand, additional outlying stations could be built.

## Pacheco Pass to Stockton (0.0-63.1)

The new right-of-way closely approximates I-5 for the first 20 miles of this segment. At this point, the routing veers north, and after another 28 miles crosses Route 99 just south of Manteca. A little over two miles east of Route 99, this segment ends at a station on the outskirts of Stockton at Route 26. This segment is 63.1 miles long. It is estimated there would need to be 36 grade separations and six road closures. There are 33 creek/canal crossings through this segment. An outlying station would be built somewhere between Manteca and Modesto.

Stockton to Sacramento Urban Area (63.1-97.6)

Until joining the existing SP right-of-way at the urban fringe of Sacramento, the routing is berween one and three miles east of Route 99 . This segment is 34.8 miles long. There would need to be an estimated 34 grade separations, and there are 14 creek/canal crossings.

Sacramento Urban Area (97.6-110.5)

The Sacramento urban area extends 12.6 miles along the SP right-of-way before reaching Sacramento's downtown station. The rail right-of-way has seven curves which would be difficult to realign (the final 0.6 mile would be restricted to 40 mph and the prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves). There are nine at-grade crossings that would need to be grade separated and four creel/canal crossings. It appears that there are only two existing grade separations.

## Bay Area Tumout Segment (six miles)

An additional six miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northern Central Valley to the Bay Area. This short segment would be just north of the San Luis Reservoir, beginning near Cortonwood Road. The segment would need only two grade separations.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 4. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ AVE. F/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 117.00 \\ \hline 130 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | miles feet |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \%) | QTY | UoM : | UNIT COST | AMOUNT : ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1843.64 | ACRE | \$400 | 737,455 |
| EXCAVATION | 8,993,584 | CY | \$3.5 | 31,477,544 |
| BORROW | 3,147,300 | CY | \$4.5 | 14,162,850 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 1843.64 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 3,687,273 |
| FENCING | 234.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 18,954,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,106,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 16,848,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 12.60 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 21,420,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 107,287,121 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 26,821,780 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$134,109,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.00 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 17 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 17,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUA | 72 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 72,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 9 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 76,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 6 | EA | \$50,000 | 300,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 52 | EA | \$83,000 | 4,316,000 |
| CULVERT | 257 | EA | \$3,500 | 900,900 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 171,016,900 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 42,754,225 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$213,771,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 2 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| OEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 40,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,075,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$50,375,000 |
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## 4. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

| . | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | $\therefore$ AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 234.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 177,840,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 12.60 | TRK-Mi | \$760,000 | 9,576,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 187,416,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 46,854,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$234,270,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUESTATIONS | 234.00 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 210,600,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 117.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 88,920,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 299,520,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 74,880,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$374,400,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 1690.91 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 8,454,532 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 152.73 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 18,327,600 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1843.64 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 6,452,727 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 33,234,859 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 8,308,715 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$41,544,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,048,469,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$209,693,800 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,258,200,000 |

CalSpeed
4. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCHECO PASS-STOCK | 0.00 | 7.70 | 7.70 | 200 | 170.0 | 2.72 |
|  | 7.70 | 63.10 | 55.40 | 200 | 200.0 | 16.62 |
| STOCKTON-SAC URB. | 63.10 | 93.40 | 30.30 | 200 | 200.0 | 9.09 |
|  | 93.40 | 97.90 | 4.50 | 200 | 162.5 | 1.66 |
| SACRAMENTO | 97.90 | 103.20 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 103.20 | 104.90 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 104.90 | 109.00 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 109.00 | 109.90 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 109.90 | 110.20 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 110.20 | 110.50 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 110.50 | 110.50 | 200 | 170.2 | 38.95 |

CalSpeed
4. SJ - PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RW

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGRENT | START | FINISH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { MILES } \end{aligned}$ | MAXIMUM SPEED: | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SCV-SP RN | 0 | 5.2 | 5.20 | 125 | 62.5 | 4.99 |
|  | 5.2 | 29.7 | 24.50 | 125 | 125 | 11.76 |
| PACEHCOPASS | 29.7 | 52.52 | 22.82 | 200 | 180 | 7.61 |
|  | 52.52 | 56.32 | 3.80 | 200 | 170 | 1.34 |
|  | 56.32 | 63.7 | 7.38 | 140 | 140 | 3.16 |
| PCHECO PASS-STOCK | 63.7 | 71.4 | 7.70 | 200 | 170 | 2.72 |
|  | 71.40 | 119.10 | 47.70 | 200 | 200.0 | 14.31 |
| STOCKTON-SAC URB. | 119.10 | 149.40 | 30.30 | 200 | 200.0 | 9.09 |
|  | 149.40 | 153.90 | 4.50 | 200 | 162.5 | 1.66 |
| SACRAMENTO | 153.90 | 159.20 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 159.20 | 160.90 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 160.90 | 165.00 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 165.00 | 165.90 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 165.90 | 166.20 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 166.20 | 166.50 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0.00 | 166.50 | 166.50 | 200 | 152.5 | 65.51 |

## 5. Madera to Sacramento, New Right-of-Way and SP Right-of-Way ( 158 miles)

This alignment would be a continuation of the "Central Corridor, New Right-of-Way" alternative through the Central Valley. It begins at Madera where the Los Angeles-to-Oakland/San Francisco routing veers west across the Central Valley. Before Modesto, this alignment would be completely constructed on a new right-of-way through agricultural land, after which the alignment would use the existing SP right-of-way to Sacramento's downtown station. This report also assumes an outlying station near Merced, and stations in downtown Modesto and Stockton.

## Madera to Modesto (0.0-65.0)

The new right-of-way is generally about three miles to the west of Route 99 for the first 45 miles of this segmenat. At this point, the routing veers north, crossing Route 99 just south of Manteca. At a location about 56 miles from Madera, the routing would again veer further north to join the SP right-of-way just south of Modesto. An outlying station would also be built in the vicinity of Merced along this alignment. The total distance of this segment is 65 miles. It is estimated there would need to be 45 grade separations and 20 road closures. There are 27 creek/canal crossings through this segment.

Modesto to Stockton, SP Rigbt-of.Way (65.0-98.5)

For most of this routing, Route 99 follows and abuts the rail right-of-way. As a result, this corridor makes use of several grade separations built for the highway. Like most rail corridors in the state, the average width of the corridor is about 100 feet. This routing directly goes through the incorporated cities or towns of Modesto, Ripon, Manteca, and Stockton.

## Route Characteristics:

Modesto: 9 miles long, two curves, 13 at-grade crossings (uses $1 / 2$-mile viaduct to eliminate five crossings; there are four existing grade separations), four creek or canal crossings.

Modesto-Manteca: 10 miles long, Salida ( 0.7 miles long), Ripon ( 0.4 miles long), Calla, one curve, three at-grade crossings (seven existing grade separations), four creek or canal crossings.

Manteca: 3.8 miles long, seven at-grade crossings, one canal crossing.
Manteca-Stockton: 7.25 miles long, Lathop, French Camp, Ortega, two curves ( 80 mph speed restriction for curve at Lathop), seven at-grade crossings, two creek or canal crossings.

Stockron: 3.4 miles long, one curve, ten at-grade crossings (uses $3 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel to eliminate ten crossings; there is one existing grade separation), one canal crossing.

Summary: 33.45 total miles, 0.75 -miles cut-and-cover tunnel, 0.5 -miles viaduct, four curves, 40 at-grade crossings (eight "urban" and 17 "rural" grade separations needed), 12 existing grade separations, 12 creek or canal crossings, 16.2 miles through incorporated city/towns.

Stockton to Sacramento Downtown Station SP Rigbt-of-Way (98.5-146.7)

From Stockton to Sacramento's Downtown Station, the SP route follows the general alignment of Route 99. This alignment bisects Lodi, Galt, and Elk Grove and is 48.2 miles long.

Route Characteristics:
Stockton: 6 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings ( $1 / 4 \cdot \mathrm{mile}$ cut-and-cover runnel eliminates four crossings), one river crossing, one canal crossing.

Stockton-Lodi: 4 miles in length. Three at-grade crossings, four creek or canal crossings.
Lodi: 3.4 miles in length. Ten ar-grade crossings (one-mile viaduct eliminates six crossings).

Lodi-Sacramento: 22.2 miles in length. One curve, Galr, Elk Grove, 22 at-grade crossings, one existing grade separation, 23 creek or canal crossings.
Sacramento: 12.6 miles in length. Seven curves (final 0.6 mile restricted to 40 mph and prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves), nine at-grade crossings, two existing grade separation, four creek or canal crossings.

Summary: 48.2 miles in length. 0.25 -miles cut-and-cover runnel, 0.5 -miles viaduct, eight curves, 54 at-grade crossings ( 19 "urban" and 25 "rural" grade separations needed), three existing grade separations, 33 creek or canal crossings, one river crossing, 22 miles of urban area.

## Bay Area Turnout Segment

An additional 13 miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northern Central Valley to the Bay Area. This short segment would be just north of Madera. The segment would need 17 grade separations and five canal crossings.

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 5. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W \& SP RNW

LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=\frac{158.00}{}$ miles
AVE. RWW WIDTH $=\frac{115}{}$ feet

| \# \% \% < \% \% | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 2202.42 | ACRE | $\$ 400$ | 880,970 |
| EXCAVATION | 6,604,528 | CY | \$3.5 | 23,115,848 |
| BORROW | 4,250,200 | CY | \$4.5 | 19,125,900 |
| LANDSCAPEIMULCH | 2202.42 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 4,404,848 |
| FENCING | 316.00 | MI | \$81,000 | 25,596,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,844,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 22,752,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 81.70 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 138,880,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 234,765,566 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 58,691,392 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$293,457,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.50 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}-100^{\prime}$ Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 27 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 27,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 104 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 104,000,000 |
| GRIADE SEPARATION URB | 27 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 229,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 20 | EA | \$50,000 | 1,000,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.40 | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 6,400,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 1.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| 80X CULVERT | 38 | EA | \$83,000 | 3,154,000 |
| CULVERT | 348 | EA | \$3,500 | 1,216,600 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 414,270,600 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 103,567,650 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$517,838,000 |
| EUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 3 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 15,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 2 | EA | \$300,000 | 600,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 45,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 11,400,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$57,000,000 |
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## 5. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW R/W \& SP R/W

| - .. | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT : |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 316.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 240,160,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 81.70 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 62,092,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 302,252,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 75,563,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$377,815,000 |
| POWERSSIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 316.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 284,400,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 158.00 | MI | \$760,000 | 120,080,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 404,480,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 101,120,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$505,600,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTURE/CULTIVATED | 2049.69 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 10,248,471 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 152.73 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 18,327,600 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 2202.42 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 7,708,485 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 36,284,556 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,071,139 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$45,356,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,797,066,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$359,413,200 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$2,156,500,000 |

CalSpeed
5. MADERA TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RNW \& SP RIW

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT | START: | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IMADERA-STOCKTON | 0.00 | 7.70 | 7.70 | 200 | 170.0 | 2.72 |
|  | 7.70 | 58.90 | 51.20 | 200 | 200.0 | 15.36 |
|  | 58.90 | 65.00 | 6.10 | 200 | 162.5 | 2.25 |
| MODESTO | 65.00 | 74.00 | 9.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 4.32 |
| MODESTO-MANTECA | 74.00 | 77.21 | 3.21 | 150 | 137.5 | 1.40 |
|  | 77.21 | 82.80 | 5.59 | 150 | 150.0 | 2.24 |
|  | 82.80 | 84.00 | 1.20 | 150 | 137.5 | 0.52 |
| MANTECA | 84.00 | 87.80 | 3.80 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.82 |
| MANTECA-STOCKTON | 87.80 | 89.20 | 1.40 | 125 | 102.5 | 0.82 |
|  | 89.20 | 89.76 | 0.56 | 80 | 80.0 | 0.42 |
|  | 89.76 | 93.66 | 3.90 | 125 | 102.5 | 2.28 |
|  | 93.66 | 95.05 | 1.39 | 125 | 125.0 | 0.67 |
| STOCKTON | 95.05 | 98.45 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
|  | 98.45 | 104.45 | 6.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.88 |
| STOCKTON-LOOI | 104.45 | 108.45 | 4.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.92 |
| LODI | 108.45 | 111.85 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
| LODI-SACRAMENTO | 111.85 | 118.95 | 7.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 2.84 |
|  | 118.95 | 130.95 | 12.00 | 175 | 125.0 | 5.76 |
|  | 130.95 | 134.05 | 3.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 1.24 |
| SACRAMENTO | 134.05 | 139.35 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 139.35 | 141.05 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 141.05 | 145.15 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 145.15 | 146.05 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 146.05 | 146.35 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 146.35 | 146.65 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 146.65 | 146.65 | 200 | 142.9 | 61.59 |

## 6. Pacheco Pass to Sacramento, New Right-of-Way and SP Right-of-Way ( 118 miles)

This alignment could be either a continuation of the "Central Corridor, New Rightof.Way" alternative or the "I-5 Corridor" alternative through the Central Valley. It begins near the Henry Miller Road overcrossing of $1-5$ at the Pacheco Pass, where the Los Angeles-to-Oakland/San Francisco routing heads west across the Pacheco Pass. Until approaching the Stockton urban area, the alignment would be completely constructed on new right-of-way through agricultural land. Through Stockton to the Sacramento Downtown Station, the alignment utilizes existing SP right. of-way. This report only assumes a downtown station at Stockton; if there were demand, additional stations could be built.

## Pacbeco Pass to Stockton Station (0.0-63.4)

The new right-of-way closely approximates $1-5$ for the first 20 miles of this segment. At this point, the routing veers north for another 34 miles until it joins the SP right-of-way at Lathrop. From there, another six miles brings the alignment to the urban fringe of Stockton. A new station at the SP depot would be built in the downtown area of Stockton, 3.4 miles into town. The total length of this segment is 63.4 miles long, 54 miles to be constructed on new right-of-way. A 0.75 -mile cut-and-cover tunnel just before the downtown station would eliminated the need for ten grade separations through Stockton. It is estimated there would need to be 36 grade separations and six road closures. There are 17 creek/canal crossings and one river crossing through this segment.

## Stockton to Sacramento Dountoun Station (63.4-111.6)

From Stockton to Sacramento's Downtown Station, the SP rouse follows the general alignment of Route 99. This alignment bisects Lodi, Galt, and Elk Grove, and is 48.2 miles long.

Route Characteristics:
Stockton: 6 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings ( $1 / 4$-mile cut-and-cover tunnel eliminates four crossings), one river crossing, one canal crossing.

Stockton-Lodi: 4 miles in length. Three at-grade crossings, four creek or canal crossings.
Lodi: 3.4 miles in length. Ten at-grade crossings (one-mile viaduct eliminates eight crossings).

Lodi-Sacramento: 22.2 miles in length. One curve, Galk, Elk Grove, 22 at-grade crossings, one existing grade separation, 23 creek or canal crossings.

Sacramento: 12.6 miles in length. Seven curves (final 0.6 mile restricted to 40 mph and prior five miles to 80 mph as a result of curves), nine at-grade crossings, two existing grade separation, four creek or canal crossings.

Summary: 48.2 miles in length. 0.25 -miles cut-and-cover tunnel, 0.5 -miles viaduct, eight curves, 54 at-grade crossings ( 19 "urban" and 25 "rural" grade separations needed), three existing grade separations, 33 creek or canal crossings, one river crossing, 22.0 miles of urban area.

## Bay Area Turnout Segment (six miles)

An additional six miles of track would be necessary to allow for service from the Northern Central Valley to the Bay Area. This short segment would be just north of the San Luis Reservoir, beginning near Cottonwood Road. The segment would need only two grade separations.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## 6. PACHECO TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RNW \& SP RNW

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RIN WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 118.00 \\ \hline 115 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \%) | QTY | UOM | UNIT. COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1644.85 | ACRE | $\$ 400$ | 657,939 |
| EXCAVATION | 5,193,600 | CY | \$3.5 | 18,177,600 |
| BORROW | 3,174,200 | CY | \$4.5 | 14,283,900 |
| LANDSCAPEJMULCH | 1644.85 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 3,289,697 |
| FENCING | 236.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 19,116,000 |
| SUBEALLAST | 2,124,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 16,992,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.00 | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 57.60 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 97,920,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 170,437,136 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 42,609,284 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$213,046,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 0.50 | M | \$14,000,000 | 7,000,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pler | 0.00 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' ${ }^{\text {Pier }}$ | 0.00 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 19 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 19,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 63 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 63,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 19 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 161,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 6 | EA | \$50,000 | 300,000 |
| DEPAESSED SECTION | 0.40 | MI | \$16,000,000 | 6,400,000 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 1.00 | M | \$35,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 0.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 30 | EA | \$83,000 | 2,490,000 |
| CULVERT | 260 | EA | \$3,500 | 908,600 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 295,598,600 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 73,899,650 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$369,498,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.JSERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 2 | EA | \$300,000 | 600,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 35,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 8,900,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$44,500,000 |

PAGE 2

## 6. PACHECO TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RIW \& SP R/W

| . | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 236.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 179,360,000 |
| BAIL RELOCATION | 57.60 | TAK-MI | \$760,000 | 43,776,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 223,136,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 55,784,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$278,920,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 236.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 212,400,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 118.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 89,680,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 302,080,000 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 75,520,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$377,600,000 |
| AIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED | 1492.12 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 7,460,592 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 152.73 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 18,327,600 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1644.85 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 5,756,970 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 31,545,162 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,886,291 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$39,431,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$1,322,995,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$264,599,000 |
| TOTAL: |  | - |  | \$1,587,600,000 |

CalSpeed
6. PACHECO PASS TO SACRAMENTO, NEW RNW \& SP RNW

EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 200 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT $\because$ | START | FINISH | TOTAL MILES | MAXINUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PCHECOPASS-STOCK | 0.00 | 7.70 | 7.70 | 200 | 170.0 | 2.72 |
|  | 7.70 | 53.90 | 46.20 | 200 | 200.0 | 13.86 |
|  | 53.90 | 60.00 | 6.10 | 200 | 162.5 | 2.25 |
| STOCKTON | 60.00 | 63.40 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
|  | 63.40 | 69.40 | 6.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.88 |
| STOCKTON-LODI | 69.40 | 73.40 | 4.00 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.92 |
| LODI | 73.40 | 76.80 | 3.40 | 125 | 125.0 | 1.63 |
| LODI-SACRAMENTO | 76.80 | 83.90 | 7.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 2.84 |
|  | 83.90 | 95.90 | 12.00 | 175 | 125.0 | 5.76 |
|  | 95.90 | 98.00 | 3.10 | 175 | 150.0 | 1.24 |
| SACRAMENTO | 99.00 | 104.30 | 5.30 | 125 | 125.0 | 2.54 |
|  | 104.30 | 106.00 | 1.70 | 125 | 102.5 | 1.00 |
|  | 106.00 | 110.10 | 4.10 | 80 | 80.0 | 3.08 |
|  | 110.10 | 111.00 | 0.90 | 80 | 60.0 | 0.90 |
|  | 111.00 | 111.30 | 0.30 | 40 | 40.0 | 0.45 |
|  | 111.30 | 111.60 | 0.30 | 40 | 20.0 | 0.90 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 111.60 | 111.6 | 200 | 146.8 | 45.60 |

## 2. SUPPIEMENTARY HIGH-SPEED SERVICES

## SAN PRANCISCO BAY AREA-SACRAMENTO

Since the existing Southern Pacific alignment between Oakland and Sacramento precludes VHST service, study of this potential high-speed branch mainly focused on the possibilities for new alignments. An analysis of alternate alignments, including travel time and cost estimates, was prepared in sections corresponding to the diagram on the following page. From West Oakland to Richmond, the SP is common to all alternatives. Just north of Richmond, the first opportunity to divert from the SP was seen by cutting over to the Santa Fe (ATSF) line and using this right-of-way for approximately ten miles to near Hercules.

At this point, two major alternatives to crossing the strait were examined. Both involved a new crossing of the Carquinez strait. The first alternative (later referred to as Option II) involved crossing the strait with a tube and connecting with the Vallejo branch of the $S P$, which would later connect with the main line at Fairfield. The second involved bridging the strait at a point between Vallejo and Benicia and continuing northeast on new right-of-way for approximately 12 miles before connecting with the main SP line. Both alternates save approximately ten minutes travel time between Richmond and Fairfield over the SP but are quite costly.

Because Fairfield is surrounded by mountains and hills to the northwest and extensive development, including an air force base, to the southeast, all alternate alignment options would pass through Fairfield on the SP. From Fairfield to Sacramento, a new right-of-way option was considered which would run southeast of and parallel to the SP, bypassing the towns of Elmira, Dixon, and Davis. This particular segment would save about three minutes over the SP between Fairfield and Sacramento but represents a significant cost savings and avoids possible noise problems associated with running through towns.

Although some fieldwork was done to ascertain whether or not certain portions of new alignments were feasible, other alignments were chosen on the basis of USGS topographical maps. In particular, deveiopment to the north and south of the Carquinez Strait has almost certainly encroached past the limits shown on the maps, making new routes in the vicinity of the strait highly uncertain. Environmental concerns are also an issue. A new crossing of the Strait is always problematic, and Option II involves skirting a state recreation area. There are also extensive wetlands south of Fairfield (which the SP already crosses) where new construction might not be permitted.

The new alignment between Fairfeld and Sacramento, however, is less uncertain as this land is more likely to remain undeveloped. The Fairfield-Sacramento new right-of-way also would not require any major new structures or tunnels and for these reasons is characterized as more feasible.

Table 5.1 summarizes five alternates for integrating the Bay Area-Sacramento corridor into the CST network. Detailed time and cost estimates corresponding to each segment denoted in the left-hand column follow. Starting with Option I, which is the reconstruction of the SP right-ofway currently in use, the options are arrayed by increasing levels of new right-of-way construction. Option la uses the SP berween Oakland and Fairfield and new alignment between Fairfield and Sacramento. Option Ib adds a new alignment between Richmond and the Benicia Bridge to the Option Ia route. Option II involves the crossing of the strait berween Benicia and Vallejo with the same new alignment between Fairfield and Sacramento as found in Options Ia and Ib. Likewise, Option III is the new crossing to the Vallejo branch of the SP with the new alignment past Fairfield. As discussed earlier, questions of right-of-way acquisition and feasibility have prompted the classification of alternatives into "more feasible" and "less feasible."

Option III can be discarded straightaway as it is, by far, the most expensive yet does not offer the fastest time. Although Option II would cost $\$ 58$ million more than the least expensive option, Option la, it offers a time saving of 11 minures. However, this option involves more acquisition of right-of-way through a corridor which has seen a great deal of new development in recent years. While market research has yer to be conducted to investigate the ridership effect of 11 minutes, the time savings are certainly not dramatic.

Option Ia, which involves new right-of-way only between Fairield and Sacramento, seems most promising. This alternative is both less expensive and faster than using the SP. Since local service is thought to be an important component of the Bay Area.Sacramento market, it might seem imprudent to concentrate on providing the fastest possible express service at the expense of serving local stops directly. However, Davis, the largest town between Fairfield and Sacramento, could be easily served with an outlying station.

In sum, the costs involved in using a new right-of-way do not seem to be balanced by the benefits gained. The most cost-effective improvements in service in this corridor can be gained by reconstructing on the $S P$ right-of-way except, perhaps, between fairfeld and Sacramento. Here, if separation of high-speed passenger traffic from freight proves a major problem, or as an eventual expansion of capacity, a new right-of-way might be constructed.



Table 5.1
OAKLAND - SACRAMENTO: OPTIONS

| Segment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cost } \\ & \left(000^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right) \end{aligned}$ $1$ | Time (min.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { (000's) } \end{gathered}$ <br> la) | Time (min.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { (000's) } \end{gathered}$ <br> lb) | Time (min.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \left(000^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right) \\ \text { II } \end{gathered}$ | Time (min.) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Cost } \\ \text { (000's) } \\ \text { III } \end{gathered}$ | Time (min.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W. Oakland-Richmond | 464.800 | 9:37 | 464,800 | 9.37 | 464,800 | 9.37 | 464,800 | 9.37 | 464,800 | 9.37 |
| Richmond-Benicia Br. | 279,400 | 20.05 | 279,400 | 20:05 | - | - | -- | - | -- | - - |
| Richmond-Hercules | - | \% | -- | $\cdots$ | 121,300 | 6.85 | 121,300 | 6.85 | 121,300 | 6.85 |
| Hercules-Faiffield (via Vallejo SP) | --m |  | -m- | ¢ | -- | $\cdots$ | - | - | 983,100 | 12.22 |
| Hercules-Fairfield (via Sky Valley) | - -m. |  | --- |  | --- | $4$ | 622,500 | 10.82 | --- | -- |
| Hercules-Benicia Br. | --m | $\xrightarrow{4}$ | --m | - | 216,100 | 7,98 | -- | - | --- | -- |
| Benicia Br.-Fairfield | 161,300 | 8.64 | 161,300 | 8.64 | 161,300 | 8.64 | -m- | -mo | --- | --- |
| Fairfield--Sacramento (SP ROW) | 718,700 | $19.85$ | - | $\cdots$ | --- | - | - | $\because$ | ---- | ---- |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fairfield-Sacramento } \\ & \text { (new ROW) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | --- |  | 565,200 | 16.78 | 565,200 | 16.78 | 565,200 | 16.78 | 565,200 | 16.78 |
| Total: Oakland <br> to Sacramento $\$ 1,624,200$ 58 $\$ 1,470,700$ 55 $\$ 1,528,700$ 50 $\$ 1,773,800$ 44 $\$ 2$, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---less new r/w more new r/w-m-m |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Option I: Use of Southern Pacific ROW (Capitol Corridor route).

Option la): Option I plus new alignment between Fairfield and Sacramento. Option lb): Option la) plus new alignment between Richmond and the Benicia-Martinez RR Bridge. Option II: New alignment from Richmond to Sacramento, new crossing of Carquinez Strait at Dillon Point. Option III: New alignment between Fichmond and Sacramento, new crossing of Carquinez Strait to Vallejo.

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
OAKLAND-RICHMOND (SP r/w)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. R/W WIDTH = | 14.6 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT. |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| gRADING | 176.73 | ACRE | \$400 | 70,691 |
| EXCAVATION |  | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 392,202 | CY | \$4.5 | 1,764,909 |
| LANDSCAPEMULCH | 176.73 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 353,455 |
| FENCING | 29.16 | M | \$81,000 | 2,361,960 |
| SUBBALLAST | 262,440 | SY | \$8.0 | 2,099,520 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.47 | MI | \$835,000 | 392,450 |
| CRASH WALLS | 14.58 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 24,786,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 31,828,984 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,957,246 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$39,786,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' |  | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 2 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 21 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 178,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVEAT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 32 | EA | \$3,500 | 112,266 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 180,612,266 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 45,153,067 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$225,765,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | . | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| OEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,250,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,250,000 |

PAGE 2
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|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 29.16 | TRK-MI | \$750,000 | 22,161,600 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 14.58 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 11,080,800 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 33,242,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 8,310,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$41,553,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 29.16 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 26,244,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 14.58 | M1 | \$760,000 | 11,080,800 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 37,324,800 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,331,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$46,656,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 176.73 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 21,207,273 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 176.73 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 618,545 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 21,825,818 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 5,456,455 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$27,282,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$387,292,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$77,458,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$464,800,000 |

## CalSpeed Travel Times

## Oakland-Richmond

| From | Distance <br> (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | Time <br> (minutes) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| W. Oakland | 1.80 | 100 | 75 | 1.44 |
| Grand Avenue | 6.72 | 100 | 100 | 4.03 |
| Emeryville(Ashby) | 2.94 | 100 | 100 | 1.76 |
| Richmond(13th) | 3.13 | 100 | 88 | 2.13 |
| Oakland-Richmond : | 14.58 |  | 93.4 | 9.37 |

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

RICHMOND-FAIRFIELD (SP r/w)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RNW WIDTH $=$ | 32.7 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | QTY. | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 396.00 | \|ACRE | \$400 | 158,400 |
| EXCAVATION |  | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 878,823 | CY | \$4.5 | 3,954,704 |
| LANDSCAPEIMULCH | 396.00 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 792,000 |
| FENCING | 65.34 | M | \$81,000 | 5,292,540 |
| SUBBALLAST | 588,060 | SY | \$8.0 | 4,704,480 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.36 | MI | \$835,000 | 300,600 |
| CRASH WALLS | 32.67 | M | \$1,700,000 | 55,539,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 70,741,724 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 17,685,431 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$88,427,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' |  | Mi | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\circ}$ Pier |  | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 2 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 1 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 8,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 72 | EA | \$3,500 | 252,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 10,752,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,688,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$13,440,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,325,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,625,000 |
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## RICHMOND-FAIRFIELD (SP r/w)



## Calspeed Travel Times

Richmond-Fairfield

| From | $\begin{gathered} \text { Distance } \\ \text { (miles) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & V \max \\ & (\mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vavg } \\ & (\mathrm{mph}) \end{aligned}$ | Time (minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Richmond (Pinole) | 2.3 | 50 | 50 | 2.7 |
|  | 1.2 | 50 | 50 | 1.5 |
|  | 2.3 | 60 | 58 | 2.4 |
|  | 2.5 | 50 | 50 | 3.0 |
|  | 8.0 | 60 | 58 | 8.3 |
|  | 1.0 | 60 | 58 | 1.1 |
| Bridge (south) | 0.9 | 50 | 50 | 1.8 |
| Richmond-Benicia: | $\cdots 18.3$ | Mと: | , 54.7 | 20.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Bridge (north) | 14.4 | 200 | 100 | 8.6 |
| Benicia-Fairfield: | 32.7 |  | 68,3 | 28.7 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## FAIRFIELD-SACRAMENTO (SP r/w)

LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$
AVE. R/W WIDTH =
39.9 miles 100 feet

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 483.27 | ACRE | \$400 | 193,309 |
| EXCAVATION |  | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 1,072,503 | CY | \$4.5 | 4,826,264 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 483.27 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 966,545 |
| FENCING | 79.74 | MI | \$81,000 | 6,458,940 |
| SUBBALLAST | 717.660 | SY | \$8.0 | 5,741,280 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.38 | M1 | \$835,000 | 317,300 |
| CRASH WALLS | 39.87 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 67,779,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 86,282,638 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 21,570,660 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$107,853,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ |  | MI | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' ${ }^{\text {Pier }}$ |  | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 14 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 14,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 7 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 59,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 2 | EA | \$50,000 | 100,000 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 88 | EA | \$3,500 | 306,999 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 73,906,999 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,476,750 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$92,384,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 1 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 2 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 66,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 16,575,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$82,875,000 |
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|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 79.74 | TRK-MAI | \$760,000 | 60,602,400 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 39.87 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 30,301,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 90,903,600 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 22,725,900 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$113,630,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 79.74 | TAK-MI | \$900,000 | 71,766,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 38.87 | MI | \$760,000 | 30,301,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 102,067,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,516,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$127,584,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTTVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| UREAN RAILROAD LAND | 483.27 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 57,992,727 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 483.27 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,691,455 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 59,684,182 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 14,921,045 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$74,605,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$598,931,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$119,786,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$718,700,000 |

## CalSpeed Time Estimates

## Fairfield-Sacramento (SP alignment)

| From | Distance (miles) | Vmax (mph) | Vavg (mph) | Time (minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fairfield (station) | 3.1 | 125 | 112 | 1.7 |
| Fairfield (urban limit) | 6.8 | 200 | 140 | 2.9 |
| Elmira | 0.9 | 125 | 125 | 0.5 |
| Eimira (urbanlimit) | 6.3 | 200 | 140 | 2.7 |
| Dixon | 2.6 | 125 | 125 | 1.2 |
| Dixon (urban limit) | 5.9 | 200 | 135 | 2.6 |
| Davis (1-80) | 2.5 | 100 | 100 | 1.5 |
| Davis (urban limit) | 8.8 | 200 | 140 | 3.8 |
| Sacramento (1-880) | 3.0 | 100 | 60 | 3.0 |
| FF-Sacramento | \% 39.9 | \% | 120.5 | 19.8 |

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

RICHMOND-HERCULES (modified ATSF)

LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$
AVE. RNWIDTH $=$ $\qquad$ -$-$
-
10.3 miles 100 feet

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 124.48 | ACRE | \$400 | 49,794 |
| EXCAVATION | 888,971 | CY | \$3.5 | 3,111,399 |
| BORROW | 276,263 | CY | \$4.5 | 1,243,184 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 124.48 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 248,970 |
| FENCING | 20.54 | M | \$81,000 | 1,663,740 |
| SUBBALLAST | 184,860 | SY | \$8.0 | 1,478,880 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.47 | MI | \$835,000 | 392,450 |
| CRASH WALLS |  | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 8,188,416 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 2,047,104 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$10,236,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.19 | M | \$14,000,000 | 2,660,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' ${ }^{\text {Pier }}$ |  | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 2 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 17,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | Mi | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | M11 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 22 | EA | \$3,500 | 77,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 19,737,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 4,934,250 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$24,671,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION |  | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS |  | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
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|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 20.54 | TRK-M | \$760,000 | 15,610,400 |
| RAIL RELOCATION |  | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 15,610,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,902,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$19,513,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 20.54 | TAK-MI | \$900,000 | 18,486,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 10.27 |  | \$760,000 | 7,805,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 26,291,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 6,572,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$32,864,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| FANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTURE/CULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 45.91 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 1,147,750 |
| URBAN FAILROAD LAND | 78.57 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 9,428,400 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 124.48 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 435,697 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 11,011,847 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,752,962 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$13,765,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$101,049,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$20,209,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$121,300,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
HERCULES-BENICIA BRIDGE

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT |
| ---: |
| AVE. R/W WIDTH |$=\quad 9.8$ miles


|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 118.18 | ACRE | \$400 | 47,273 |
| EXCAVATION | 349,746 | CY | \$3.5 | 1,224,111 |
| BORROW | 2,395,319 | CY | $\$ 4.5$ | 10,778,936 |
| LANDSCAPEIMULCH | 118.18 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 236,360 |
| FENCING | 15.66 | M | \$81,000 | 1,268,460 |
| SUBBALLAST | 175,500 | SY | \$8.0 | 1,404,000 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | M | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS |  | M | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,959,139 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,739,785 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$18,699,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' | 0.96 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 13,440,000 |
| VIADUCT $25^{\prime}$-100 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200 ${ }^{\circ}$ Pier |  | Mi | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1.000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB |  | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 0.96 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 67,200,000 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 17 | EA | \$3,500 | 59,500 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 80,699,500 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 20,174,875 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$100,874,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION |  | EA | \$5,000,000 | 0 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS |  | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 0 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 0 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$0 |
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|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RIAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 19.50 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 14,820,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION |  | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,820,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,705,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$18,525,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 19.50 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 17,550,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 9.75 | M1 | \$760,000 | 7,410,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 24,960,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 6,240,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$31,200,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 63.15 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 1,578,750 |
| URBAN FAILROAD LAND | 55.03 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 6,603,600 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 118.18 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 413,636 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 8,595,986 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,148,997 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$10,745,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$180,043,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$36,008,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$216,100,000 |

CalSpeed Travel Times
Richmond-Hercules

| From <br> $\vdots$ | $\therefore$ | Distance <br> (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | Time <br> (minutes) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Richmond | 0.00 | 10.27 | 10.27 | 100 | 90 | 6.85 |

## Hercules-Benicia Bridge

| From | 8 | To | Distance (miles) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vmax } \\ & \text { (mph) } \end{aligned}$ | Vavg (mph) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { (minutes) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 90 |  |  |
| Hercules | 0.00 | 5.21 | 5.21 | 140 | 100 | 3.13 |
| Rejoin SP | 5.21 | 8.81 | 3.60 | 60 | 58 | 3.72 |
| Bridge (s.) | 8.81 | 9.75 | 0.95 | 50 | 50 | 1.14 |
| Bridge (n) | ¢\% | $\because \because$ | 9.75 | \% | + $\quad .73 .3$ | 7.98 |

## CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## BENICIA BRIDGE-FAIRFIELD (SP)

LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$
AVE. R/W WIDTH $=$ $\qquad$ 14.4 miles 100 feet

| : | QTY | U0M | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 174.42 | ACRE | \$400 | 69,770 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,245,598 | CY | \$3.5 | 4,359,594 |
| BORROW | 387,091 | CY | \$4.5 | 1,741,910 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 174.42 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 348,848 |
| FENCING | 28.78 | M1 | \$81,000 | 2,331,180 |
| SUBBALLAST | 259,020 | SY | \$8.0 | 2,072,160 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | M1 | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS |  | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 10,923,462 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 2,730,866 |
| Total: |  |  |  | \$13,654,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25' |  | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\circ}$ Pier |  | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB |  | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | M1 | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 32 | EA | \$3,500 | 110,803 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 110,803 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 27,701 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$139,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,325,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,625,000 |
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BENICIA BRIDGE-FAIRFIELD (SP)

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 28.78 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 21,872,800 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 14.39 | TRK-M! | \$760,000 | 10,936,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 32,809,200 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 8,202,300 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$41,012,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 28.78 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 25,902,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 14.39 | M | \$760,000 | 10,936,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 36,838,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,209,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$46,048,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILAOAD LAND | 174.42 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 20,930,909 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 174.42 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 610,485 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 21,541,394 |
| CONTINGENCY(25\%) |  |  |  | 5,385,348 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$26,927,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$134,405,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$26,881,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$161,300,000 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
HERCULES-FAIRFIELD (via Sky Valley)
LENGTH OF SEGMENT = $\qquad$
AVE. RW WIDTH $=$ 130 feet

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 341.78 | ACRE | \$400 | 136,713 |
| EXCAVATION | 123,759 | CY | \$3.5 | 433,157 |
| BORROW | 7,460,130 | CY | \$4.5 | 33,570,585 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 341.78 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 683,564 |
| FENCING | 32.05 | MI | \$81,000 | 2,596,050 |
| SUBBALLAST | 390,420 | SY | \$8.0 | 3,123,360 |
| SOUND WALLS | 1.52 | MI | \$835,000 | 1,269,200 |
| CRASH WALLS |  | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 41,812,628 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 10,453,157 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$52,266,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT 20'-25 | 0.49 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 6,860,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 2.12 | MI | \$25,000,000 | 53,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.72 | MI | \$50,000,000 | 36,000,000 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 3 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 3,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB |  | EA | \$8,500,000 | 0 |
| ROAD CLOSURE |  | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION |  | MI | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 2.33 | MI | \$70,000,000 | 163,100,000 |
| BOXCULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 35 | EA | \$3,500 | 122,500 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 262,082,500 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 65,520,625 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$327,603,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| UABAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS |  | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,000,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,250,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$6,250,000 |
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HERCULES-FAIRFIELD (via Sky Valley)

|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 43.38 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 32,968,800 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 4.26 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 3,237,600 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 36,206,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 9,051,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$45,258,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 43.38 | TRK-MI | \$900,000 | 39,042,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 21.69 | Ml | \$760,000 | 16,484,400 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 55,526,400 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 13,881,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$69,408,000 |
| FIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 136.93 | ACRE | \$1.500 | 205,395 |
| PASTUREJCULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 70.12 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 1,753,000 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 93.59 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 11,230,800 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 344.78 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,196,236 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 14,385,431 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 3,596,358 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$17,982,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$518,767,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$103,753,400 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$622,500,000 |

Hercules-Fairfield (via Sky Valley)
Summary of Quantities

| From | To | Distance | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(1000^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Avg. Ht. | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 5000 | 5000 |  |  | at grade |
| 5000 | 5100 | 100 | 5 | 10 | fill |
| 5100 | 9300 | 4200 |  |  | viaduct ( $100^{\prime}$ ) |
| 9300 | 9800 | 500 | 8 | 15 | fill |
| 9800 | 10800 | 1000 | 94 | 100 | cut |
| 10800 | 13300 | 2500 | 295 | 140 | cut |
| 13300 | 14100 | 800 | 9 | 5 | fill |
| 14800 | 16700 | 1900 | 215 | 100 | cut |
| 16700 | 16900 | 200 | 4 | 10 | fill |
| 17900 | 18100 | 200 | 3 | 15 | fill |
| 18100 | 21900 | 3800 |  |  | tunnel |
| 21900 | 23700 | 1800 |  |  | viaduct (50') |
| 23700 | 24100 | 400 | 5 | 8 | fill |
| 24100 | 27900 | 3800 |  |  | carginez bridge |
| 27900 | 33300 | 5400 |  |  | at grade |
| 33300 | 36600 | 3300 |  |  | viaduct (1-780) 100 |
| 36600 | 37900 | 1300 | 13 | 7 | fill |
| 37900 | 42500 | 4600 |  |  | tunnel |
| 42500 | 42800 | 300 |  |  | bridge (short span) |
| 42800 | 43900 | 1100 | 69 | 50 | cut |
| 43900 | 44800 | 900 |  |  | viaduct (50) |
| 44800 | 54300 | 9500 |  |  | at grade |
| 54300 | 55700 | 1400 | 61 | 60 | cut |
| 55700 | 58100 | 2400 | 231 | 100 | cut |
| 58100 | 58800 | 700 |  |  | ss bridge |
| 58800 | 59800 | 1000 | 12 | 5 | cut |
| 59800 | 63700 | 3900 |  |  | tunnel |
| 63700 | 65800 | 2100 |  |  | at grade |
| 65800 | 67200 | 1400 | 34 | 10 | cut |
| 67200 | 67700 | 500 | 6 | 5 | fill |
| 67700 | 71700 | 4000 |  |  | at grade |
| 71700 | 74300 | 2600 |  |  | viaduct (1-680) ('25) |
| 74300 | 91000 | 16700 |  |  | at grade to SP |

Hercules-Fairfield (via Sky Valley)
Summary of Quantities (page 2)
FILL

| From | To | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ (1000 \text { 's }) \end{gathered}$ | Avg. <br> Ht . | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fill } \\ & \text { ICn } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3000 | 3100 | 5 | 10 | 12037 |
| 7300 | 7800 | 8 | 15 | 21481 |
| 11300 | 12100 | 9 | 5 | 18167 |
| 14700 | 14900 | 4 | 10 | 9630 |
| 15900 | 16100 | 3 | 15 | 8056 |
| 21700 | 22100 | 5 | 8 | 11481 |
| 34600 | 35900 | 13 | 7 | 29130 |
| 65200 | 65700 | 6 | 5 | 12778 |
|  |  |  |  | 123759 |

CUT

| From: | T0 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(1000^{\prime}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Avg. } \\ \mathrm{Ht} . \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fill } \\ & \text { (CY } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7800 | 8800 | 94 | 100 | 696296 |
| 8800 | 11300 | 295 | 140 | 2840741 |
| 12800 | 14700 | 215 | 100 | 1592593 |
| 40800 | 41900 | 69 | 50 | 319444 |
| 52300 | 53700 | 61 | 60 | 316296 |
| 53700 | 56100 | 231 | 100 | 1711111 |
| 56800 | 57800 | 12 | 5 | 25556 |
| 63800 | 65200 | 34 | 10 | 81852 |

## STRUCTURE

| From | To | VIADUCT: C : C |  |  |  | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (25) | (50) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | (100') ${ }^{\circ}$ | YSS | TUNNEL |
| 3100 | 7300 |  |  | 4200 |  |  |
| 12100 | 12800 |  |  |  | 700 |  |
| 14900 | 15900 |  |  | 1000 |  |  |
| 16100 | 19900 |  |  |  |  | 3800 |
| 19900 | 21700 |  | 1800 |  |  |  |
| 22100 | 25900 | 3800' Carq | quinez Bridg |  |  |  |
| 31300 | 34600 |  |  | 3300 |  |  |
| 35900 | 40500 |  |  |  |  | 4600 |
| 40500 | 40800 |  |  |  | 300 |  |
| 41900 | 42800 |  | 900 |  |  |  |
| 56100 | 56800 |  |  |  | 700 |  |
| 57800 | 61700 |  |  |  |  | 3900 |
| 69700 | 72300 | 2600 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 2600 | 2700 | 8500 | 1700 | 12300 |

CalSpeed Travel Times
Hercules to Fairfield (via Sky Valley)

| From | Distance <br> (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | Time <br> (minutes) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Hercules | 4.5 | 200 | 110 | 2.4 |
| Strait | 0.6 | 200 | 110 | 0.3 |
| Dillon Pq. | 1.6 | 200 | 110 | 0.9 |
| $1-780$ | 2.6 | 110 | 110 | 1.4 |
| Sky Valley | 1.7 | 200 | 115 | 0.9 |
| End Sky Valley | 3.1 | 180 | 120 | 1.6 |
| $1-680$ | 3.4 | 200 | 140 | 1.5 |
| loin SP | 4.3 | 200 | 135 | 1.9 |
| Fairfield Sta. | 21.7 | 100 | 120.3 | 10.8 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
HERCULES-FAIRFIELD (via Vallejo SP)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RNW WIDTH = | 25.4 miles 100 feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 307.64 | ACRE | \$400 | 123,055 |
| EXCAVATION | 1,784,328 | CY | \$3.5 | 6,245,149 |
| BORROW | 2,457,320 | CY | \$4.5 | 11,057,940 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 307.64 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 615,273 |
| FENCING | 47.92 | M1 | \$81,000 | 3,881,520 |
| SUBBALLAST | 456,840 | SY | \$8.0 | 3,654,720 |
| SOUND WALLS |  | MI | \$835,000 | 0 |
| CRASH WALLS | 16.99 | Mi | \$1,700,000 | 28,883,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 54,460,656 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 13,615,184 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$68,076,000 |
| STRUCTUAES | - |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\circ}$ | 0.23 | M1 | \$14,000,000 | 3,220,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 0.17 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 4,250,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200 ${ }^{\prime}$ Pier |  | M | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT $>200^{\prime}$ Pier |  | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE |  | EA | \$1,000,000 | 0 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 8 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 8,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 11 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 93,500,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.11 | M | \$16,000,000 | 1,760,000 |
| TUBE | 1.65 | M | \$160,000,000 | 264,000,000 |
| STD BORE | 1.02 | M | \$70,000,000 | 71,400,000 |
| BOX CULVERT |  | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 49 | EA | \$3,500 | 171.500 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 446,301,500 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 111,575,375 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$557,877,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION |  | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 5,000,000 |
| INSP./SERVICE FAC. |  | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW SUILDINGS |  | EA | \$300,000 | 0 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 6 | EA | \$100,000 | 600,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 5,600,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 1,400,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$7,000,000 |
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HERCULES-FAIRFIELD (via Vallejo SP)

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 50.76 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 38,577,600 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 20.12 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 15,291,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 53,868,800 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 13,467,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$67,336,000 |
| POWER/SIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 50.76 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 45,684,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 25.38 | M1 | \$760,000 | 19,288,800 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 64,972,800 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 16,243,200 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$81,216,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUREICULTIVATED |  | ACRE | \$5,000 | 0 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 82.10 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 2,052,500 |
| UPBAN RAILROAD LAND | 225.54 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 27,064,800 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 307.64 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 1,076,727 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 30,194,027 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 7,548,507 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$37,743,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$819,248,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$163,849,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$983,100,000 |

Hercules-Fairfield (via Vallejo SP)
Summary of Quantities for New Alignment Section

| From | To | Distance <br> (f) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(1000^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Avg. Ht. | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 3700 | 3700 |  |  | at grade |
| 3700 | 4200 | 500 | 7 | 10 | fill |
| 4200 | 4900 | 700 |  |  | bridge |
| 4900 | 5300 | 400 | 4 | 5 | fill |
| 5300 | 5700 | 400 | 2 | 5 | cut |
| 5700 | 6000 | 300 | 2 | 5 | fill |
| 6000 | 6700 | 700 | 14 | 10 | cut |
| 6700 | 8600 | 1900 | 125 | 120 | cut |
| 8600 | 8800 | 200 | 3 | 5 | 6 in |
| 8800 | 9300 | 500 |  |  | bridge |
| 9300 | 9600 | 300 | 3 | 7 | fill |
| 9600 | 11800 | 2200 | 135 | 80 | cut |
| 11800 | 12700 | 900 |  |  | bridge (80') |
| 12700 | 13200 | 500 | 3 | 3 | cut |
| 13200 | 18600 | 5400 |  |  | tunnel |
| 18600 | 27300 | 8700 |  |  | tube (Carquinez) |
| 27300 | 27900 | 600 |  |  | depressed section |
| $27900$ |  |  |  |  |  |

FILL

| From | TO | $\begin{gathered} \text { Area } \\ \left(1000^{\prime} \mathrm{s}\right) \end{gathered}$ | Avg. Hi | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fill } \\ & \text { (CY } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3700 | 4200 | 7 | 10 | 16852 |
| 4900 | 5300 | 4 | 5 | 8519 |
| 5700 | 6000 | 2 | 5 | 4259 |
| 8600 | 8800 | 3 | 5 | 6389 |
| 9300 | 9600 | 3 | 7 | 6722 |
|  |  |  | total | 42741 |

## CUT
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Hercules-Fairfield (via Vallejo SP)
Summary of Quantities
Excavation (CY):
42,741 new alignment
0 rail r/w 42,741 total

Borrow (CY):
1958833
-42741 new alignment.
20.12*2690 rail r/w
$2,457,320$ total

CalSpeed Travel Times
Hercules to Fairfield (via Vallejo SP)

| From | Distance (miles) | Vmax (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Time } \\ \text { (minutes) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hercules | 3.5 | 200 | 100 | 2.1 |
| Strait | 1.7 | 100 | 100 | 1.0 |
| Vallejo | 1.3 | 100 | 100 | 0.8 |
| Georgia St. | 4.5 | 100 | 100 | 2.7 |
| American Canyon | 5.7 | 150 | 125 | 2.7 |
| Jameson Canyon | 8.7 | 200 | 180 | 2.8 |
| Fairfield Sta. | 25.4 | \% | 124.6 | 12.2 |

CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates

## FAIRFIELD-SACRAMENTO (new alignment)

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT = AVE. RW WIDTH = | 39.9 miles$\qquad$ feet |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 628.25 | ACRE | \$400 | 251,302 |
| EXCAVATION | 3,451,147 | CY | \$3.5 | 12,079,015 |
| BORROW | 1,072,503 | CY | \$4.5 | 4,826,264 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 628.25 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 1,256,509 |
| FENCING | 76.33 | MI | \$81,000 | 6,182,730 |
| SUBBALLAST | 717.660 | SY | \$8.0 | 5,741,280 |
| SOUND WALLS | 0.38 | MI | \$835,000 | 317,300 |
| CRASH WALLS | 8.90 | M1 | \$1,700,000 | 15,130,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 45,784,399 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 11,446,100 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$57,230,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 1.70 | MI | \$14,000,000 | 23,800,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier |  | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier |  | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier |  | MI | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 4 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 4,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 11 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 11,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URB | 4 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 34,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 12 | EA | \$50,000 | 600,000 |
| OEPRESSED SECTION |  | Mi | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL |  | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE |  | MI | \$70,000,000 | 0 |
| BOX CULVERT | 2 | EA | \$83,000 | 166,000 |
| CULVERT | 80 | EA | \$3,500 | 280,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 73,846,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 18,461,500 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$92,308,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 1 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 50,000,000 |
| URBAN STATION |  | EA | \$30,000,000 | 0 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 2 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 1 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 6,000,000 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS |  | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION |  | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 66,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 16,575,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$82,875,000 |
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FAIRFIELD-SACRAMENTO (new alignment)

|  | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 79.74 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 60,602,400 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 8.90 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 6,764,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 67,366,400 |
| CONTINGENCY ( $25 \%$ ) |  |  |  | 16,841,600 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$84,208,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARYISUBSTATIONS | 79.74 | TAK-M1 | \$900,000 | 71,766,000 |
| SIGNALICONTROL | 39.87 | M | \$760,000 | 30,301,200 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 102,067,200 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 25,516,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$127,584,000 |
| RIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND |  | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| PASTUAEJCULTIVATED | 488.01 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 2,440,050 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. |  | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 140.24 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 16,828,800 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 628.25 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 2,198,891 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 21,467,741 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 5,366,935 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$26,835,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$471,040,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$94,208,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$565,200,000 |

CalSpeed Travel Times
Fairfield-Sacramento (New Right-of-Way)

| From <br> (name of map) | Distance <br> (miles) | Vmax <br> (mph) | Vavg <br> (mph) | Time <br> (minutes) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Fairfield Stat. | 0.7 | 125 | 125 | 0.3 |
| (Fairfield N.) | 2.0 | 125 | 125 | 1.0 |
| Fairfield edge | 0.4 | 125 | 125 | 0.2 |
| (Elmira) | 9.5 | 200 | 157 | 3.6 |
| (Dixon) | 12.7 | 200 | 175 | 4.4 |
| (Davis) | 7.6 | 200 | 175 | 2.6 |
| Sacramento W.) | 0.9 | 200 | 175 | 0.3 |
| Rejoin SP ROW | 3.2 | 200 | 135 | 1.4 |
| Urban Lirnit | 3.0 | 100 | 60 | 3.0 |
| Fairfield-Sacramento | 39.9 | 0 | 142.5 | 16.8 |

## CalSpeed Travel Times

## Fairfield-Sacramento (New Right-of-Way)

| (name of map) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Distance } \\ \because \text { (miles) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $V \max$ $(\operatorname{mph})$ | Vavg (mph $:$ | Time (minutes) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fairfield Stat. | 0.7 | 125 | 125 | 0.3 |
| (Fairfield N.) | 2.0 | 125 | 125 | 1.0 |
| Fairfield edge | 0.4 | 125 | 125 | 0.2 |
| (Elmira) | 9.5 | 200 | 157 | 3.6 |
| (Dixon) | 12.7 | 200 | 175 | 4.4 |
| (Davis) | 7.6 | 200 | 175 | 2.6 |
| (Sacramento W.) | 0.9 | 200 | 175 | 0.3 |
| Rejoin SP ROW | 3.2 | 200 | 135 | 1.4 |
| Urban Limit | 3.0 | 100 | 60 | 3.0 |
| Sacramento Sta. | 39.9 | 0 |  | 16.8 |

Avg. Speed
155.0

## LOS ANGELES-SAN DIEGO

The coastal Santa Fe rail corridor from Union Station in Los Angeles to downtown San Diego (LOSSAN) is about 128 miles. The ultimate HST alignment along this corridor would be shortened to about 123 miles, primarily as a result of the construction of a three-mile bore tunnel just north of San Diego which would avoid the circuitous Soledad and Rose Canyons. The additional decreases in mileage would be a result of the realigning of several speed-restricting curves throughout the routing.

From Downtown Los Angeles to Fullerton, the Santa Fe is a "heavily used freight line which contains major freight marshalling yards, industry sidings, and spur tracks." ${ }^{\text {. }}$ To avoid conflicts with freight operations, a 26 -mile viaduct section is assumed to be necessary. An additional two miles of viaduct would be needed between Orange and Santa Ana (beginning just south of Highway 22), since there exists a single-track segment which fronts Lincoln Boulevard where there is no available right-of-way for additional tracks.

To maintain HST speeds throughout the LOSSAN corridor, the entire route would have to be grade-separated. There are 82 signalized at-grade public crossings along the rail line. ${ }^{3}$ As a result of the viaduct segments, only 66 at-grade crossings would remain. It is estimated that 56 of these crossings would be in urban areas. Where HST tracks would share Santa Fe right-of-way atgrade with additional freight and commuter rail tracks, a protective barrier is assumed necessary. In addition, for these segments, rail relocation costs for the freight line is included.

All the stations along the LOSSAN corridor would require rehabilitation and retrofiting for the improved service.

[^3]CalSpeed: Capital Cost Estimates
LOS ANGELES - SAN DIEGO: ULTIMATE HST ALIGNMENT

| LENGTH OF SEGMENT $=$ AVE. R/W WIDTH = | $\begin{array}{r} 123.00 \\ \hline 100 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢¢ Q ¢ | QTY. | UOM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| EARTHWORKS |  |  |  |  |
| GRADING | 1490.91 | ACRE | \$400 | 596,364 |
| EXCAVATION | , | CY | \$3.5 | 0 |
| BORROW | 3,308,700 | CY | \$4.5 | 14,889,150 |
| LANDSCAPE/MULCH | 1490.91 | ACRE | \$2,000 | 2,981,818 |
| FENCING | 184.00 | M1 | \$81,000 | 14,904,000 |
| SUBBALLAST | 2,214,000 | SY | \$8.0 | 17,712,000 |
| SOUND WALLS | 10.00 | M | \$835,000 | 8,350,000 |
| CRASH WALLS | 93.00 | MI | \$1,700,000 | 158,100,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 217,533,332 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 54,383,333 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$271,917,000 |
| STRUCTURES |  |  |  |  |
| STD VIADUCT $20^{\prime}-25^{\prime}$ | 24.00 | Mi | \$14,000,000 | 336,000,000 |
| VIADUCT 25'-100'Pier | 4.00 | M1 | \$25,000,000 | 100,000,000 |
| VIADCT 100'-200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| VIADUCT > 200' Pier | 0.00 | M1 | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| SHORT SPAN BRIDGE | 30 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION RUR | 10 | EA | \$1,000,000 | 10,000,000 |
| GRADE SEPARATION URE | 56 | EA | \$8,500,000 | 476,000,000 |
| ROAD CLOSURE | 0 | EA | \$50,000 | 0 |
| DEPRESSED SECTION | 0.00 | M! | \$16,000,000 | 0 |
| CUT AND COVER TUNNEL | 0.00 | MI | \$35,000,000 | 0 |
| STD BORE | 3.00 | M1 | \$70,000,000 | 210,000,000 |
| BOX CULVERT | 0 | EA | \$83,000 | 0 |
| CULVERT | 246 | EA | \$3,500 | 861,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 1,162,861,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 290,715,250 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$1,453,576,000 |
| BUILDINGS |  |  |  |  |
| REGIONAL STATION | 0 | EA | \$50,000,000 | 0 |
| URBAN STATION | 1 | EA | \$30,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| SUBURBAN STATION | 7 | EA | \$5,000,000 | 35,000,000 |
| INSP.ISERVICE FAC. | 0 | EA | \$6,000,000 | 0 |
| MOW BUILDINGS | 1 | EA | \$300,000 | 300,000 |
| WAYSIDE PLATFORMS | 0 | EA | \$200,000 | 0 |
| DEMOLITION | 0 | EA | \$100,000 | 0 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 65,300,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 16,325,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$81,625,000 |
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Los Angeles - San Diego: Ultimate HST Alignment

| \% | QTY | UoM | UNIT COST | AMOUNT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIAIL |  |  |  |  |
| TRACKWORK | 246.00 | TRK-M1 | \$760,000 | 186,960,000 |
| RAIL RELOCATION | 92.00 | TRK-MI | \$760,000 | 69,920,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 256,880,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 64,220,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$321,100,000 |
| POWERISIGNALS |  |  |  |  |
| CATENARY/SUBSTATIONS | 246.00 | TRK-M1 | \$900,000 | 221,400,000 |
| SIGNALCONTROL | 123.00 | M1 | \$760,000 | 93,480,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 314,880,000 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 78,720,000 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$393,600,000 |
| FIGHT-OF-WAY |  |  |  |  |
| RANGE LAND | 0.00 | ACRE | \$1,500 | 0 |
| FASTURE/CULTIVATED | 363.64 | ACRE | \$5,000 | 1;818,182 |
| SCATTERED DEVELOP. | 0.00 | ACRE | \$25,000 | 0 |
| URBAN RAILROAD LAND | 1127.27 | ACRE | \$120,000 | 135,272,727 |
| Industilial Land | 0.00 | ACRE | \$250,000 | 0 |
| LEGAL COSTS | 1490.91 | ACRE | \$3,500 | 5,218,182 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | 142,309,091 |
| CONTINGENCY (25\%) |  |  |  | 35,577,273 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$177,886,000 |
| SUBTOTAL |  |  |  | \$2,699,704,000 |
| ADD-ONS (20\%) |  |  |  | \$539,940,800 |
| TOTAL: |  |  |  | \$3,239,600,000 |

CalSpeed
LA - SD
EXPRESS SERVICE TRAVEL TIMES: 125 MPH MAXIMUM SPEED

| SEGMENT | START | FINISH: | TOTAL MLEES | MAXIMUM SPEED | AVERAGE SPEED | MINUTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LA UNION STATION | 0.00 | 1.90 | 1.90 | 100 | 50.0 | 2.28 |
| LA - FULLERTON | 1.90 | 26.00 | 24.10 | 100 | 90.0 | 16.07 |
| FULLERTON- | 26.00 | 28.00 | 2.00 | 125 | 112.5 | 1.07 |
|  | 28.00 | 111.00 | 83.00 | 125 | 120.0 | 41.50 |
| SAN DIEGO | 111.00 | 112.00 | 1.00 | 125 | 112.5 | 0.53 |
|  | 112.00 | 121.00 | 9.00 | 100 | 90.0 | 6.00 |
| DOWNTOWN SD | 121.00 | 123.00 | 2.00 | 100 | 50.0 | 2.40 |
| TOTAL SEGMENT | 0 | 123.00 | 123.00 | 200 | 105.7 | 69.85 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Postmile.

[^1]:    * Concrete Barrier/Ftg: Jersey Barrier protection from freeway Structure Excavation: Around US-101 OC central piers Retained Fill: 8 ' retaining walls both sides of tracks

[^2]:    * Concrete Barrier/ftg: Jersey Barrier protection from freeway Grade Separation Urb.: Reconstruction of US101 Overcrossings
    Retained Fill: $8^{\prime}$ retaining walls both sides of tracks

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Wrubur Smith Associates. June 1987.
    ${ }^{3}$ Wribur Smith Associates. June 1987.

