

January 11-12, 2012 ■ Portland, Oregon



U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Transit Administration

TRI MET

PORTLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION



# Streetcar Operations Planning, Start-Up & Implementation

## Seattle Streetcar Perspectives

Ethan Melone

Rail Transit Manager

Seattle Department of Transportation





## Options for General Government Cities Operating Streetcar Systems

- A. Contract with Regional Rail Agency
- B. Contract with Local/Regional Bus Agency
- C. Contract with Private Provider
- D. Self-Perform
- E. Hybrid of A-D



## Seattle Model

- Operations Agreement with County (Bus) Transit Agency (King County Metro)
- Regional Rail Agency Also Contracts with Metro for Rail Operations
- Seattle Retains A Small Self-Performed Scope (Eg, Train Signals; Platforms, Shelters & Landscape; Signage; Web Presence)



## Advantages of Seattle Model

- Builds on Established Infrastructure/Procedures for Fare Policy, Communications, Training, Operations Procedures, Safety Programs, Maintenance Tracking, Compliance with Federal Requirements
- KC Metro Power & Facilities Division has long experience with Power Systems (Trolley Bus)



## Disadvantages of Seattle Model

- Agency Overhead is high proportion of total streetcar operating cost
- Some “scope gaps” became unanticipated City costs (eg, real-time arrival & automated passenger counting systems)



## Considerations for New Streetcar Cities

- Local Expertise with Track Maintenance, Rail Vehicle Maintenance, Traction Power Systems
- Early Integration of Operator v. Maintaining Design Control
- Comprehensive Understanding of Operations & Maintenance Scope?