

WEST PARK INLAND PORT & SHORT-HAUL RAIL ANALYSIS

FINAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ANALYSES

Submitted to:

Stanislaus County, California

Submitted by:



GLOBAL INSIGHT

March 21, 2008

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. RESPONSE ITEMS 3

 SHIPPER SURVEY 3

 COST ANALYSIS 3

 CONGESTION INFLATOR..... 4

 LOGISTICS AND INVENTORY COSTS 5

 DRAYAGE OPERATIONS 6

 TRUCK DIVERSION ANALYSIS 7

 SEASONAL EXPORTS..... 7

 EMPTY CONTAINERS..... 8

III. CONCLUSION 9

IV. GLOBAL INSIGHT MODIFICATIONS TO WEST PARK COST MODEL..... 11

V. GLOBAL INSIGHT TO WEST PARK: MEMO – FEBRUARY 7, 2008 12

VI. WEST PARK TO GLOBAL INSIGHT: MEMO – FEBRUARY 27, 2008 17

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

I. Introduction

In October 2007, Stanislaus County contracted with Global Insight USA, Inc to provide a critical review of the West Park Inland Port/Short Haul Rail Master Plan, in order to provide constructive feedback to the West Park team (West Park) in the Crows Landing redevelopment.

That initial effort consisted of a review of several documents, including the following:

1. *West Park Inland Port Short Haul Rail and Inland Port Master Plan*, August 14, 2007
2. Attachment B: *Inland Port at Crows Landing and Fresno Vicinity: A report on Truck, Rail and Ramp Cost/Price Levels*
3. Attachment C: *Market Research Executive Summary; Prospective Patronage for a Short Haul Intermodal Rail Shuttle Service Between the Port of Oakland and Crows Landing*
4. Letter from Gerry Kamilos to Ms. Therese McMillan
5. Short Haul Rail/Inland Port: Trade Corridor Bond Program Issues – September 24, 2007
6. Letter from Dick Monteith (Stanislaus County Board of Supervisors) to Chairwoman Mary Nichols (California Air Resources Board)
7. Testimony of Gerry Kamilos; PCCP West Park, LLC at the Goods Movement Emission Reduction Incentive Program, October 10, 2007; Fresno, CA

That review was completed in November 2007, and Global Insight provided a Technical Review (were the basic assumptions and methodologies appropriate for the initial analyses and were they applied in a reasonable fashion?) and a Professional Review (were the conclusions of the preliminary report consistent with the known facts, either those identified in the analysis or those identified externally?)

In that initial document, Global Insight identified a number of suggested modifications to the West Park Analysis covering seven specific areas. These included:

1. Shipper Interest
2. Cost Analysis
3. Operational Analysis
4. Foreign Export Markets
5. Import Market Demand
6. Seasonality of Trade
7. Empty Container Handling

Also part of the initial review Global Insight analyzed West Park's traffic diversion and economic model for the Inland Port/Short Haul Rail Master Plan. This effort provided a number of other suggestions for further exploration by the West Park consulting team. Global Insight made a number of improvements to the West Park cost models and economic performance

evaluations that have been incorporated in subsequent versions. The data and rationale of these corrections were detailed in a follow-up memo supplied to the West Park Team.

The items addressed in that document included:

1. Application of Inflation Adjustments
2. The comparative Cost of Using Truck vs. Short-Haul Rail Intermodal
3. Market Penetration Factors
4. Overall Market Sizing

All during that time, Global Insight participated in several conference calls with representatives of the West Park team, providing clarification for our conclusions, and additional suggestions to improve the quality and coverage of the basic analysis.

In late February 2008, West Park provided a response to the multiple Global Insight reviews, providing clarification on some issues and accepting the suggestions on others. This report, the *West Park Inland Port/Short-Haul Rail Master Plan Response to Global Insight Review* offered responses to several of the issues raised in the previous Global Insight technical memoranda, including:

1. Shipper Survey
2. Cost Analysis
3. Congestion Inflation
4. Logistics and Inventory Costs
5. Railroad Operating Issues
6. Drayage Operations
7. Truck Diversion Analysis
8. Seasonal Exports
9. Empty Containers

West Park's response to the Global Insight analysis suggests that additional early-stage research and planning recommended by Global Insight is premature for the Crows landing development, and that these efforts will proceed – as needed – as the site analysis and development efforts progress. For some aspects of the analysis, this perspective is appropriate. In other areas however, we believe that more detailed preliminary analysis is important to understand the full range of benefits and costs of the West Park Inland Port/Short Haul Rail Project. This final report from Global Insight provides additional guidance for subsequent phases of the analysis effort.

For the sake of clarity, Global Insight is responding to each of these issues individually to provide additional direction for future analysis efforts.

II. Response Items

Shipper Survey

With respect to Global Insight comments on additional survey work for the proposed short-haul rail service, West Park advised that:

"Because we are still in the planning stages of this new service, we do not agree that additional marketing studies, focus groups or other such market identification work is worthwhile at this time. When we are closer to implementation and have much more detail decided as to freight train schedules, pricing and overall services to be offered to shippers, we fully intend to study the market further."

We agree that this issue needs further study as project planning progresses. While the Tioga survey did reveal a high level of potential shipper interest, the detailed results provided in February 2008 clearly indicate that the current survey work is not conclusive. In addition, the detailed responses clearly identify an interest in having the short-haul rail service available as an option, that "interest" should not be construed as projecting an actual shipper market behavior, or mode diversion opportunity. In fact, many of the individual shipper comments recorded from the surveys suggested that despite a consistent and reliable short-haul rail service, they would continue to favor truck-based operations. These issues will need clarification in subsequent phases of the analysis.

While the focus group discussions we suggested might not represent a preferred method of data collection for the West Park team, some additional follow-up will be necessary early in the next phase, to more precisely define the divertible market for the short-haul rail service, and to identify specific target shippers for the new operation.

Finally, the Tioga Group's survey results specifically outline that price discounts will be necessary to induce divisions. The Tioga survey's market discount numbers; (1) closely match those suggested by Global Insight in previous communications, (2) were incorporated in Global Insight's cost model edits provided to West Park, and (3) have been accepted, and included in subsequent versions of the analysis. These adjustments had a significant impact on the size and duration of subsidies, and will require further examination in the next phase of the analysis. With the approval of the California infrastructure bond application, we believe it is important on the part of West Park to continue to explore shipper receptivity for the short-haul service.

Cost Analysis

In its response, West Park concurs with GII that the West Park Cost Analysis Model contains several significant assumptions that could alter the economic performance of the short-haul rail operation. They are unable at this point; however, to resolve these assumptions with respect to train operations and trackage rights costs until such time as a more formal agreement is in place with the railroad owners and short-haul rail operations. Global Insight fully understands the preliminary nature of the project discussions, and appreciates the fact that commitments have been difficult to obtain in the absence of certain California infrastructure bond funding.

We would suggest that in the next phase of the analysis that West Park could provide a sensitivity analysis with respect to these uncertain cost elements. Bracketing these costs could provide Stanislaus County with reasonable minimum and maximum subsidy levels that would ease the public-sector anxiety over the long-term commitments inherent to the operation. Global Insight commonly uses ± 10 , 15, and 25% sensitivity factors to reflect the uncertainty surrounding principal, but indeterminate variables. We suggest the West Park Short-Haul rail analysis could apply similar factors in the next phase of research, if these cost elements are still unresolved.

Second, with respect to "stem time"¹ we understand West Park's assumptions with respect to driver domiciles. The issues raised by "stem time" could alter the overall project economics, but not significantly. Thus the risk of uncertainty is low for this issue, and we believe West Park's current response is sufficient.

In the next phase of analysis, the results of the Tioga Survey (which provide some guidance in this area) could be incorporated in the West Park Cost Model. Similarly, local unemployment data – serving as a proxy for driver availability – could provide some surety that the stem time issue is appropriately represented in the analysis.

Congestion Inflator

The West Park analysis utilized a truck congestion inflator to induce diversions to the short-haul rail operation. In principle, we agree with the concept, and acknowledge that mode diversion is impacted by irregular route congestion. Moreover, the West Park cost analysis discounted the congestion inflator by 37% to reflect the uncertainty of its impact in generating demand for short-haul rail service.

For this preliminary analysis, and after reviewing the report of West Park's traffic engineer Chris Kinzel, this would seem to be a reasonable approach. In subsequent phases of research we would suggest further research to enhance this basic approach for two reasons:

(1) *A percentage change in congestion will not generally result in a corresponding and equivalent change in truck cost performance.* The current model's assumption is that competitive truck costs move in lockstep with increases in congestion. This is not always the case, as cost recovery in a competitive business climate is limited, and some time delays occur on unpaid movement legs². Whereas the "discounting" of the congestion inflator could be

¹ "Stem time" is time it takes a drayman to drive from where he lives to where he is scheduled to pick-up a trailer or container. In some circumstances, the cost of this movement (driver time and truck operating costs) is included in price quotations for local drayage operations. The longer the stem time (the further away the driver is from the freight pick-up) the more likely these costs will be included in price quotations, and the more likely they will be substantial.

² These additional delay costs may or may not be reflected in market prices due to the competitiveness of the market for trucking services, and/or the competitiveness of the market for driver labor.

assumed to account for this incongruent relationship, a more empirically based linkage could be developed from available data. Some research has been done in this area that could be useful in developing congestion related cost factor adjustments for the short-haul rail operation.

(2) The Tioga shipper survey results provide some additional information that could be useful in subsequent analysis. From our cost model review, we noted the significant impact of the congestion inflator on the economic performance of the model. Given this sensitivity, we believe it will be prudent in the next phase of the analysis to analyze the survey feedback (or to conduct some new research with the identified shippers) with respect to changing shipper behavior as a result of increased congestion on the principal regional arteries.

Logistics and Inventory Costs

Logistics and inventory costs, as defined in our original review, did not represent a decisive factor in predicting mode diversions. The costs of truck line-haul versus short-haul rail line-haul costs represented a more compelling argument for truck to rail shift. Logistics and inventory costs are however, often a deciding factor in shippers' mode selections. We do not perceive West Park's failure to address these issues in their first analysis to be problematic, based on our calculations of their impact, but we do suggest that subsequent analyses explore the issue in more detail.

In particular, West Park's response indicates that the "...the eventual prime market for short-haul rail services will be to customers that are using Crows Landing as their logistics and distribution activities [sic]." While we agree that the economics of short-haul rail are most favorable for these clients, this assumption will require some clarification in the next phase of the analysis for two reasons: (1) it is somewhat inconsistent with the traffic source data provided in the original cost model (which contemplates significant diversion from shippers in the surrounding communities – particularly for export containers) and (2) it is untested in the survey analysis or other support materials. The next phase of analysis could clarify these findings, perhaps with the benefit of some potential shipper testimonies (such as are reported anonymously in the Tioga survey results) or some comparative examples (from other project applications from similar projects across the nation).

Railroad Operating Issues

Our expressed concern over a lack of definition for the rail operating issues is being resolved through significant efforts by West Park, Stanislaus County, CalTrans, and the railroads themselves. The West Park response reflects an appropriate planning-level understanding of many of the issues that could undermine the success of the short-haul rail operation. We applaud this ongoing effort to resolve the Global Insight identified issues of commuter train interference, track ownership and dispatching, and trainset storage. Further, the early dialogue between the various rail agencies – as reported by Stanislaus County – suggests that a project favorable outcome can eventually be negotiated.

For the next phase of analysis, we are recommending that West Park secure a rail expert from their existing consulting team members to help facilitate continued progress in this area, and to participate in the ongoing multi-party negotiations related to the project.

The number of players involved, the complexity of the issues, and the unique nature of rail operations warrant additional support in the next phase of analysis: much of the overall project benefit is tied to the successful implementation of the short-haul rail operation. This additional scrutiny will likely uncover additional capital investment for the project (although we would not expect such capital investment needs to be extraordinary) that could alter the actual economics of the operation, and perhaps delay self-sufficiency somewhat.

In the interim, we suggest that these capital costs be handled using sensitivity factors such as outlined in the Cost Analysis section, above. This could help set upper and lower bounds for identified capital and rail operating costs. The combination of sensitivity factors – applied here and in different aspects of the analysis – could be defined as scenarios, such as an "optimistic case" and a "pessimistic case". The scenarios could be useful in providing risk assessment for public officials concerned with potential project "downsides".

Drayage Operations

In its response, West Park indicates that it has made progress developing partnerships with local drayage operators.

"West Park has had a number of informal discussions with several reputable trucking firms as to the feasibility of providing this dedicated level of service. The response has been very favorable. The creation of a long-term, dedicated business relationship with an inland port and short haul rail operator will provide a perfect opportunity to invest in new equipment and operating practices, which will eventually be required of all truckers in the industry."

At this point in the project planning and development, these informal commitments should be sufficient.

The next phase of the analysis however, will probably require that these relationships be formalized with specific service and cost proposal data, and ultimately with a memorandum of

understanding. These efforts might be best coordinated by a terminal operator for the Crows Landing facility – another firm that should be engaged sooner rather than later in the process.

Truck Diversion Analysis

The current truck diversion methodology employed by the West Park team provides a reasonable approach to developing planning level estimates, although more rigorous models are readily available, that include both price and service elasticities. For the current phase of analysis, Global Insight recommends that the results of the Tioga survey be used to inform the development of diversion factors, based on distance from the Crows Landing facility (identified by respondent location) and varying levels of service performance (identified by survey response).

For future phases of analysis, West Park indicates that they:

"...would be most interested if Global Insight is aware of truck traffic modeling or truck diversion to rail analyses accomplished in other travel markets, especially if those projections have the advantage of actual diversion experience, accomplished after the initial projections, to calibrate the models for future use."

While Global Insight and others have developed such analyses for a number of regional projects, we believe that for this very localized analysis, a traditional stated-preference survey should be sufficient for developing reasonable diversion rates. Furthermore, this process could be conducted among the previously surveyed shippers (see Tioga survey results), and would provide strong evidence of local shipper interest. We recommend that such a process be initiated at the start of the environmental impact review.

Seasonal Exports

Global Insight agrees that at this issue is appropriately handled for "this very nascent stage in the development of this new service", and that marketing efforts to local shippers of the ready service will uncover such opportunities. Furthermore, we recognize that these volumes are not necessarily "baseload" for the short-haul rail operation.

We merely sought to raise the profile of the issue as market penetration of seasonal freight impacts facility sizing, staffing, container throughput, service reliability, and hence economic performance. Subsequent phases of the planning effort should address the desirability or undesirability of seasonal traffic volumes, the degree to which they can be accommodated by the facility at different stages of development, and the ways in which the service needs of this traffic varies from regular freight.

Empty Containers

As West Park indicates, empty container positioning is a vexing issue for ports and intermodal terminals alike. The conceptual plan outlined in the West Park rebuttal contemplates a closed-loop system where empties and loads are cycled in and out of the Crows Landing operation. It is unlikely that even a significantly less efficient operation will noticeably diminish the other proposed benefits of the short-haul rail program. Thus, at this point, we agree that a more detailed analysis is not justified.

As the project planning progresses, it will be helpful for West Park to identify locations from which empty containers could be drawn. This should help blunt any criticism that empty repositioning costs will offset the efficiency of environmental gains of the short-haul rail operation.

III. Conclusion

We are encouraged that West Park has continued to refine its analysis in support of the Inland Port/Short Haul Rail Master Plan. We believe that the critical review provided by Stanislaus County and Global Insight represents a positive step towards the successful implementation of the Crows Landing development project and the short-haul rail operation.

We look forward to West Park's continued efforts to clarify and confirm the economic and operational assumptions that underlie their models, and to continue to produce reliable and well documented analysis for this important initiative.

The proposed Crows Landing redevelopment plan is a creative one that has been successful in other venues. The development of the Logistics Park Chicago/Global Trans Park from the former Joliet Arsenal in Illinois as a rail intermodal-centric industrial park represented a milestone in military base conversions. The rapid economic development growth at the site and in the surrounding region has surprised even project advocates, and the job creation in warehousing and distribution has been unusually strong. As communities have sought to replicate the Logistics Park Chicago/Global Trans Park success, the difficulty has been finding a suitable site with strategic rail network access.

It is possible that the Crows Landing site – connected by rail to the Port of Oakland – could become just such an engine of economic development for the region. As port volumes and local road congestion both continue to increase, the demand for inland port capacity is likely to accelerate. With a number of strategic options available to Stanislaus County for the Crows Landing redevelopment, the West Park Inland Port/Short Haul Rail Master Plan is certainly worth a careful look.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

IV. Global Insight Modifications to West Park Cost Model

Year	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030
Years of Inflation	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Daily Container Quantities from Daily-Boxes-Trains sheet																				
Inbound (from Oakland to West park)																				
Import Containers	40	60	100	150	300	425	550	560	570	580	650	660	670	680	690	690	690	690	690	690
Empty Containers	14	21	15	150	300	425	550	560	570	580	650	660	670	680	690	690	690	690	690	690
Total Inbound Containers	54	81	115	150	300	425	550	560	570	580	650	660	670	680	690	690	690	690	690	690
Outbound (from West Park to Oakland)																				
Export Containers	34	83	115	150	165	186	195	175	149	120	124	128	132	136	140	144	149	153	158	162
Empty Containers	20	27	40	53	193	304	445	500	471	500	567	572	582	591	591	591	591	591	591	591
Total Outbound Containers	54	81	115	150	300	425	550	560	570	580	650	660	670	680	690	690	690	690	690	690
Total Daily Containers Handled	108	162	150	300	600	850	1,100	1,120	1,140	1,160	1,300	1,320	1,340	1,360	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380	1,380
Trains Required (each way)																				
At 115 containers nominal per train	0.47	0.70	1.00	1.30	2.1	3.70	4.78	4.87	4.96	5.04	5.65	5.74	5.83	5.91	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00	6.00
Trains required (rounded) - roundtrips	1	1	1	1	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Train Cost (assume 70% of costs fixed, 30% variable with length of train)	\$ 12,926	\$ 14,225	\$ 15,876	\$ 17,661	\$ 46,264	\$ 63,289	\$ 80,638	\$ 81,748	\$ 82,879	\$ 84,031	\$ 99,031	\$ 100,290	\$ 101,571	\$ 102,873	\$ 104,196	\$ 104,933	\$ 105,670	\$ 106,407	\$ 107,144	\$ 107,881
Total Cost For Importer/Exporter to Use Rail																				
Inbound (from Oakland to West park)																				
Unit Cost	1.15	1.18	1.19	1.22	1.26	1.28	1.31	1.33	1.36	1.39	1.42	1.44	1.47	1.50	1.53	1.55	1.58	1.61	1.63	1.66
Dray Ocean Term to Intermodal Term (loads)	\$ 70	\$ 3,540	\$ 5,403	\$ 9,174	\$ 14,047	\$ 28,704	\$ 41,428	\$ 54,646	\$ 56,693	\$ 58,777	\$ 60,898	\$ 62,470	\$ 64,127	\$ 65,864	\$ 67,681	\$ 69,588	\$ 71,495	\$ 73,402	\$ 75,309	\$ 77,216
Dray Ocean Term to Intermodal Term (empties)	\$ 70	\$ 1,239	\$ 1,891	\$ 1,376	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Ramp access fee by YPRR to ACTS	\$ 25	\$ 1,550	\$ 2,380	\$ 3,435	\$ 4,575	\$ 9,433	\$ 13,602	\$ 17,977	\$ 18,686	\$ 19,409	\$ 20,145	\$ 21,020	\$ 22,224	\$ 23,224	\$ 24,631	\$ 25,721	\$ 27,322	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,732	\$ 30,674
Ramp OAK Intermodal Term Lift-off Charge (loads+miles)	\$ 35	\$ 2,170	\$ 3,332	\$ 4,808	\$ 6,405	\$ 13,206	\$ 19,042	\$ 25,168	\$ 26,161	\$ 27,172	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,228	\$ 30,354	\$ 31,480	\$ 32,606	\$ 33,732	\$ 34,858	\$ 35,984	\$ 37,110	\$ 38,236
Rail Train from Oakland to West Park (112 of row 22)	\$ 6,463	\$ 7,112	\$ 7,938	\$ 8,861	\$ 23,132	\$ 31,645	\$ 40,319	\$ 49,274	\$ 41,440	\$ 42,016	\$ 45,516	\$ 50,145	\$ 50,785	\$ 51,436	\$ 52,088	\$ 52,740	\$ 53,392	\$ 54,044	\$ 54,696	\$ 55,348
Ramp Inland Port Lift-off Charge (loads+miles)	\$ 35	\$ 2,170	\$ 3,332	\$ 4,808	\$ 6,405	\$ 13,206	\$ 19,042	\$ 25,168	\$ 26,161	\$ 27,172	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,228	\$ 30,354	\$ 31,480	\$ 32,606	\$ 33,732	\$ 34,858	\$ 35,984	\$ 37,110	\$ 38,236
Ramp Inland Port Gate Charge	\$ 35	\$ 1,607	\$ 2,468	\$ 4,181	\$ 6,405	\$ 13,206	\$ 19,042	\$ 25,168	\$ 26,161	\$ 27,172	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,228	\$ 30,354	\$ 31,480	\$ 32,606	\$ 33,732	\$ 34,858	\$ 35,984	\$ 37,110	\$ 38,236
West Park to Oakland																				
Ramp Inland Port Gate Charge	\$ 35.00	\$ 1,366	\$ 3,414	\$ 4,808	\$ 6,405	\$ 7,256	\$ 8,844	\$ 8,171	\$ 7,080	\$ 6,162	\$ 6,162	\$ 6,481	\$ 6,800	\$ 7,118	\$ 7,489	\$ 7,804	\$ 8,227	\$ 8,593	\$ 9,015	\$ 9,434
Ramp Inland Port Lift-off Charge (loads+miles)	\$ 35.00	\$ 2,170	\$ 3,332	\$ 4,808	\$ 6,405	\$ 13,206	\$ 19,042	\$ 25,168	\$ 26,161	\$ 27,172	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,228	\$ 30,354	\$ 31,480	\$ 32,606	\$ 33,732	\$ 34,858	\$ 35,984	\$ 37,110	\$ 38,236
Train from West Park to Oakland (112 of row 22)	\$ 6,463	\$ 7,112	\$ 7,938	\$ 8,861	\$ 23,132	\$ 31,645	\$ 40,319	\$ 49,274	\$ 41,440	\$ 42,016	\$ 45,516	\$ 50,145	\$ 50,785	\$ 51,436	\$ 52,088	\$ 52,740	\$ 53,392	\$ 54,044	\$ 54,696	\$ 55,348
Ramp Ramp access fee by YPRR to ACTS	\$ 25	\$ 1,550	\$ 2,380	\$ 3,435	\$ 4,575	\$ 9,433	\$ 13,602	\$ 17,977	\$ 18,686	\$ 19,409	\$ 20,145	\$ 21,020	\$ 22,224	\$ 23,224	\$ 24,631	\$ 25,721	\$ 27,322	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,732	\$ 30,674
Dray OAK Intermodal Term Lift-off Charge (loads+miles)	\$ 35	\$ 2,170	\$ 3,332	\$ 4,808	\$ 6,405	\$ 13,206	\$ 19,042	\$ 25,168	\$ 26,161	\$ 27,172	\$ 28,203	\$ 29,228	\$ 30,354	\$ 31,480	\$ 32,606	\$ 33,732	\$ 34,858	\$ 35,984	\$ 37,110	\$ 38,236
Intermodal Term to Ocean Term (loads) (*)	\$ 65	\$ 6,940	\$ 9,786	\$ 13,043	\$ 14,844	\$ 18,822	\$ 24,736	\$ 24,814	\$ 17,759	\$ 9,337	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Intermodal Term to Ocean Term (empties) (*)	\$ 65	\$ 1,643	\$ 2,258	\$ 3,407	\$ 4,609	\$ 17,183	\$ 27,532	\$ 38,006	\$ 41,736	\$ 45,145	\$ 48,712	\$ 52,524	\$ 56,610	\$ 61,004	\$ 65,840	\$ 71,124	\$ 76,956	\$ 83,344	\$ 90,388	\$ 98,104
(*) Assumes 50% will be part of round-trip																				
Total cost to move containers to/from West Park by rail	\$ 36,893	\$ 54,685	\$ 74,722	\$ 96,943	\$ 198,947	\$ 279,804	\$ 362,962	\$ 373,025	\$ 382,782	\$ 392,506	\$ 450,420	\$ 463,984	\$ 477,663	\$ 491,556	\$ 505,822	\$ 518,689	\$ 521,987	\$ 530,008	\$ 538,126	\$ 546,373
Cost per Loaded Container (to be charged to Importer/Exporter)	\$ 499	\$ 382	\$ 348	\$ 323	\$ 428	\$ 458	\$ 487	\$ 508	\$ 532	\$ 561	\$ 582	\$ 599	\$ 622	\$ 643	\$ 666	\$ 689	\$ 712	\$ 735	\$ 758	\$ 781
Local Dray Costs (incurred by Importer/Exporter)																				
Unit Cost	1.26	1.29	1.31	1.34	1.37	1.39	1.42	1.45	1.47	1.50	1.53	1.55	1.58	1.61	1.63	1.66	1.69	1.71	1.74	1.77
Dray Intra-West Park Truck Cost	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ 1,737	\$ 5,925	\$ 10,404	\$ 25,770	\$ 39,055	\$ 53,057	\$ 55,095	\$ 56,935	\$ 59,055	\$ 60,899	\$ 62,100	\$ 63,224	\$ 64,372	\$ 65,544	\$ 66,739	\$ 67,966	\$ 69,225	\$ 70,516
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Stockton	\$ 200	\$ 2,528	\$ 2,701	\$ 2,893	\$ 3,097	\$ 3,322	\$ 3,555	\$ 3,804	\$ 4,070	\$ 4,353	\$ 4,654	\$ 4,974	\$ 5,315	\$ 5,677	\$ 6,062	\$ 6,471	\$ 6,907	\$ 7,369	\$ 7,861	\$ 8,383
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Modesto	\$ 135	\$ 2,560	\$ 2,735	\$ 2,926	\$ 3,136	\$ 3,364	\$ 3,599	\$ 3,852	\$ 4,121	\$ 4,407	\$ 4,712	\$ 5,038	\$ 5,381	\$ 5,748	\$ 6,138	\$ 6,552	\$ 6,991	\$ 7,456	\$ 7,959	\$ 8,498
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Merced	\$ 180	\$ 2,048	\$ 2,188	\$ 2,341	\$ 2,509	\$ 2,692	\$ 2,879	\$ 3,081	\$ 3,297	\$ 3,526	\$ 3,770	\$ 4,029	\$ 4,305	\$ 4,598	\$ 4,910	\$ 5,242	\$ 5,594	\$ 5,969	\$ 6,367	\$ 6,790
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Fresno	\$ 315	\$ 2,389	\$ 2,553	\$ 2,731	\$ 2,927	\$ 3,140	\$ 3,359	\$ 3,593	\$ 3,842	\$ 4,107	\$ 4,389	\$ 4,687	\$ 5,001	\$ 5,331	\$ 5,678	\$ 6,043	\$ 6,426	\$ 6,828	\$ 7,249	\$ 7,689
Export Containers																				
Dray Intra-West Park Truck Cost	\$ 75	\$ 75	\$ -	\$ 565	\$ 715	\$ 1,778	\$ 1,765	\$ 2,447	\$ 2,558	\$ 2,845	\$ 3,004	\$ 3,116	\$ 3,272	\$ 3,426	\$ 3,578	\$ 3,776	\$ 3,915	\$ 4,105	\$ 4,306	\$ 4,493
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Stockton	\$ 200	\$ 826	\$ 1,304	\$ 1,829	\$ 2,407	\$ 3,042	\$ 3,727	\$ 4,316	\$ 4,909	\$ 5,148	\$ 5,397	\$ 5,657	\$ 5,928	\$ 6,209	\$ 6,502	\$ 6,807	\$ 7,125	\$ 7,456	\$ 7,799	\$ 8,157
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Modesto	\$ 135	\$ 743	\$ 1,268	\$ 1,833	\$ 2,033	\$ 2,573	\$ 3,200	\$ 4,767	\$ 5,120	\$ 5,608	\$ 6,120	\$ 6,658	\$ 7,224	\$ 7,820	\$ 8,446	\$ 9,104	\$ 9,795	\$ 10,520	\$ 11,281	\$ 12,076
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Merced	\$ 180	\$ 1,485	\$ 2,536	\$ 3,655	\$ 4,065	\$ 5,146	\$ 4,286	\$ 4,237	\$ 3,915	\$ 4,092	\$ 4,314	\$ 4,566	\$ 4,740	\$ 4,923	\$ 5,114	\$ 5,314	\$ 5,531	\$ 5,766	\$ 6,019	\$ 6,291
Dray Truck Cost West Park from Fresno	\$ 315	\$ 7,507	\$ 12,430	\$ 17,391	\$ 22,856	\$ 29,052	\$ 34,736	\$ 40,814	\$ 47,299	\$ 54,184	\$ 61,479	\$ 69,184	\$ 77,300	\$ 85,827	\$ 94,766	\$ 104,116	\$ 113,977	\$ 124,350	\$ 135,235	\$ 146,644
Total cost of "local" dray trips per loaded container	\$ 277	\$ 206	\$ 191	\$ 180	\$ 157	\$ 148	\$ 142	\$ 138	\$ 135	\$ 128	\$ 129	\$ 131	\$ 134	\$ 136	\$ 139	\$ 142	\$ 145	\$ 148	\$ 151	\$ 154
Average cost of local dray trips per loaded container	\$ 277	\$ 206	\$ 191	\$ 180	\$ 157	\$ 148	\$ 142	\$ 138	\$ 135	\$ 128	\$ 129	\$ 131	\$ 134	\$ 136	\$ 139	\$ 142	\$ 145	\$ 148	\$ 151	\$ 154
Total Daily Cost For Importer/Exporter to Use Rail and "Local" Truck	\$ 57,379	\$ 84,138	\$ 115,821	\$ 150,942	\$ 271,804	\$ 369,957	\$ 469,152	\$ 474,774	\$ 479,560	\$ 482,320	\$ 549,964	\$ 567,327	\$ 584,887	\$ 602,828	\$ 621,222	\$ 632,251	\$ 643,555	\$ 654,830	\$ 666,317	\$ 677,852
Average Cost per Loaded Container to Importer/Exporter	\$ 775	\$ 588	\$ 539	\$ 503	\$ 585	\$ 606	\$ 629	\$ 646	\$ 667	\$ 689	\$ 710	\$ 720	\$ 729	\$ 739	\$ 748	\$ 758	\$ 767	\$ 777	\$ 786	\$ 795
Total Daily Cost For Importer/Exporter to Use Truck Exclusively																				
Cost Increase Due to Road Congestion Productivity Loss																				
Unit Cost	3.0%																			
Truck Cost from POO to West Park	\$ 300	\$ -	\$ 8,053	\$ 26,243	\$ 51,182	\$ 130,579	\$ 203,833	\$ 285,219	\$ 305,058	\$ 324,705	\$ 346,883	\$ 411,970	\$ 437,044	\$ 463,333	\$ 490,879	\$ 519,724	\$ 541,171	\$ 563,186	\$ 585,760	\$ 608,880
Truck Cost from POO to Stockton	\$ 300	\$ 4,998	\$ 6,986	\$ 9,786	\$ 13,574	\$ 18,344	\$ 25,097	\$ 33,849	\$ 35,651	\$ 37,503	\$ 39,405	\$ 41,357	\$ 43,359	\$ 45,411	\$ 47,513	\$ 49,665	\$ 51,867	\$ 54,119	\$ 56,421	\$ 58,773
Truck Cost from POO to Modesto	\$ 400	\$ 8,537	\$ 9,995	\$ 11,453	\$ 12,911	\$ 14,369	\$ 15,827	\$ 17,285	\$ 18,743	\$ 20,201	\$ 21,659	\$ 23,117	\$ 24,575	\$ 26,033	\$ 27,491	\$ 28,949	\$ 30,407	\$ 31,865	\$ 33,323	\$ 34,781
Truck Cost from POO to Merced	\$ 515	\$ 5,122	\$ 5,637	\$ 6,152	\$ 6,6															