Benefit-C	Cost Ratios	
	Flyer Extension	· ·
		City-Fort Worth Corridor Passenger Rail Service Development
		15, 116, 121, 123-127, Appendix B
_		ding the system to a no-build scenario"
Benefit-Cost ratio		
0.83	if a 30% contingency	A conservative estimate based on Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) guidelines; uses a 4.0 percent discount rate to get to 2011 dollars
0.87	if a 15% contingency	same as above
		FRA guidelines exclude certain monetizable benefits: - economic development around station; - travel time differences; - land use changes or land value changes; - economic productivity not directly attributed to passengers, effects of construction-related delays, or the value or fares
		Benefits considered are direct benefits to the passengers, such as time savings and improved reliability, vehicle cost savings, savings from fewer vehicle crashes, reduced auto emissions, and productivity benefits.
		Benefits to the general public considered are reductions in automobile emissions and noise pollution, improved safety, and a reduction in the economic costs of imported oil.
,		Why economic development is not included: - it is difficult to predict; - it can constitute double counting of benefits; - it may not be totally attributed to the new transportation mode.
		Costs included: construction, rolling stock, one-time start-up costs, annual operating and maintenance costs, residual value
KC-OKC EN	M Dautima Carvica	
	N Daytime Service	City Fort Worth Couniday Breeze Bell Comite Bell
		City-Fort Worth Corridor Passenger Rail Service Development
	d November 2011, p. 128, Ap	penaix s
0.61	30% contingency	

KC-OKC-FV	V Service (not specifically Daytim	e Service)
		enefit Study," The University of Kansas School of Business
ł .	delivered December 2009	
	Investment	· ·
1.09 over one year		An estimate that used the IMPLAN model, which
2.52 over 5 years		separates direct, indirect, and induced effects on
3.58 over 10 years		counties, states, and regions. The study used the 2000
		Kansas Rail Feasibility Study as baseline for ridership and
		costs. The estimate provided here is base ridership +
		marketing strategies + cost avoidance (for traffic
		fatalities and injuries).
4.6		adds tax impact to the above; "for each \$0.65 of net
7.0		investment, NFA project produces \$2.94 in economic
		benefits"; assumes 10% all taxes impact on value
		produced .
		produced
current He	artland Flyer route	
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	assenger Rail Service Economic Benefit Report," prepared
	Burgess for ODOT, delivered April .	
<u> </u>	income method	
2.02	income method	\$11.4 million in direct spending attributed to the
	·	operation of the Flyer June 1999-December 2004
		yielded \$23.1 million in economic activity (\$6.9 million
		in earnings to Oklahoma residents, the equivalent of 349
		jobs either directly or indirectly, and \$775,825 in state
		and local taxes)
		transportation user benefits method (savings in travel
		time and cost, value of time): savings of \$1.55 million
		·
Kansas Cit	y-Lawrence-Topeka-Newton-Wic	hita corridor
Source: "Ko	ansas Rail Feasibility Study Execut	ive Report," prepared by Transportation Economics &
Manageme	ent Systems, Inc. (TEMS), March 2	000
1.75 - 1.35		The report states subsidies would be expected to
		decline over time, financial results would be better for
		110-mph trains than for 79 mph trains, operating costs
		decline when the service is connected to a rail network,
		and none of the corridors, or corridor segments, could
		justify rail passenger service unless the substantial
		capital costs for the system are funded from state and
		ifederal sources.
	L	

Upcoming Analysis	
Source: memorandum, KDOT to Senate and F Caucus, 9 February 2012	House Transportation Committees and Kansas Rail
department currently uses for the economic	economic analysis using the TREDIS model that the analysis of transportation projects. This analysis will ruction and later during the operation of the service mated to result from the new service."
KDOT will consider whether to use Midwest I criteria to supplement its analysis.	nterstate Passenger Rail Coalition methodology and
Prepared by KLRD, October 2012	