

Narrative Application Form – Service Development Program Part I



High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program

Applicants interested in applying for funding under the March 2011 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) are required to submit the narrative application forms, parts I and II, and other required documents according to the checklist contained in Section 4.2 of the NOFA and the Application Package Instructions available on FRA’s website. All supporting documentation submitted for this Service Development Program should be listed and described in Section H of this form. Questions about the HSIPR program or this application should be directed to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) at HSIPR@dot.gov.

Applicants must enter the required information in the gray narrative fields, check boxes, or drop-down menus of this form. Submit this completed form and the statement of work, along with all supporting documentation, electronically by uploading it into www.GrantSolutions.gov by 8:00 p.m. EDT on April 4, 2011.

A. Point of Contact and Applicant Information

Applicant must ensure that the information provided in this section matches the information provided on the SF-424 forms.

(1) Name the submitting agency: Vermont Agency of Transportation		Provide the submitting agency Authorized Representative name and title: Joe Flynn, VTrans Rail Director		
Address 1: 1 National Life Drive, 5th Floor	City: Montpelier	State: VT	Zip Code: 5633-5001	Authorized Representative telephone: (802)828-1331 ext.
Address 2:				Authorized Representative email: Joe.Flynn@state.vt.us
Provide the submitting agency Point of Contact (POC) name and title (if different from Authorized Representative): Krista Chadwick, Grants Management Section Chief		Submitting agency POC telephone: (802)828-5750 ext. Submitting agency POC email: Krista.Chadwick@state.vt.us		
(2) List out the name(s) of additional State(s) applying (if applicable): N/A				

B. Eligibility Information

Complete the following section to satisfy requirements for application eligibility.

(1) Select the appropriate box from the list below to identify applicant type. Eligible applicants are listed in Section 3.1 of the NOFA.

- State
- Amtrak
- Group of States
- Amtrak in cooperation with a State or States

If selecting one of the applicant types below, additional documentation is required to establish applicant eligibility. Please select the appropriate box and submit supporting documentation to demonstrate applicant eligibility, as described in Section 3.2 of the NOFA, to GrantSolutions.gov and list the supporting documentation under “Additional Information” in Section H.2 of this application.

- Interstate Compact
- Public Agency established by one or more States

(2) Indicate the status of eligibility documentation including the date of issue and how documentation can be verified by FRA.

Verify any completed Environmental Assessment (EA) or Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) document that demonstrates satisfaction of “Service NEPA” for the proposed Service Development Program by indicating if documents are submitted through GrantSolutions.gov or referenced through an active public URL. Refer to the Service Development Program Application Package Instructions and Section 5.2 of the NOFA for more information. Project-level NEPA documents for component projects within the Service Development Program may also be included.

A NEPA decision document (Finding of No Significant Impact, Record of Decision, or Categorical Exclusion concurrence) is not required at the time of application, but must be issued by FRA prior to award of a construction grant. Applications that are accompanied by a final NEPA determination will be looked upon favorably during the application review and selection process. Any document not available online should be submitted with the application package and listed in Section H.2 of this application. If more rows are required, please provide the same information for additional documentation in a separate supporting document and list it in Section H.2 of this application.

Service Development Planning

Documentation	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link
<input type="checkbox"/> Service Development Plan	8/2010	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Service NEPA Documents

Documentation	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link
<input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exclusion Documentation (worksheet)	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Assessment (EA)	10/2009	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	

FRA Decision Documents for Service Development Programs			
Documentation	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link
<input type="checkbox"/> Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Record of Decision (ROD)	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Project NEPA Documents			
Documentation (select from the list of choices)	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link
Categorical Exclusion Documentation (worksheet)	7/2007	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Categorical Exclusion Documentation (worksheet)	9/2009	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	

(3) Indicate the operational independence of the proposed Service Development Program.¹ Refer to Sections 3.5.2 and 3.4.4 of the NOFA for more information about operational independence and applications related to previously-selected projects.

- This program is operationally independent.
- This program is operationally independent when considered in conjunction with previously selected or awarded HSIPR program project(s) (identify previously selected or awarded projects below).
- This program is not operationally independent.

Briefly clarify the response:

Upon implementation, this project will be operationally independent, with tangible and measurable benefits in the areas of new service implementation, operational reliability improvements, on-time-performance, and travel-time reductions.

¹ A Service Development Program is considered to have operational independence if, upon being implemented, it will have tangible and measurable benefits, either independently of other investments or cumulatively with projects selected to receive awards under previous HSIPR program solicitations. Additionally, a Service Development Program may demonstrate operational independence by resulting in tangible and measurable progress in implementing new or substantially improved high-speed or intercity passenger rail service.



C. Corridor Service Overview

Respond to the following questions to help put this application into the context of the long-term vision and related work for the HSIPR corridor service.

(1) Provide a brief narrative explaining how this Service Development Program relates to the long-term vision of the

SERVICE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Ethan Allen Express Improvements and Extension Service Development Program consists of track and crossing improvements along the existing Ethan Allen Express Amtrak route from the New York-Vermont State Line to Rutland, VT, and an extension of that service from Rutland, VT to Burlington, VT. Improvements will be initiated at MP 84.1 of the Clarendon & Pittsford Railroad (CLP) in Vermont, continuing on the CLP to MP 99.79 (R&W junction), then north along the Vermont Railway at that switch with continued improvements between MP 53.72 to MP 121.91. The extension of the Ethan Allen Express from its current termination point in Rutland will include an additional stop at a temporary station in Middlebury, VT and its termination will be at the Main Street Landing station in Burlington. The Town of Middlebury is currently undertaking a planning process to determine the permanent location of their station.

The current Amtrak schedule will require some modifications to allow for the additional trip time to Burlington but no other changes are foreseen (please refer to the attached Service Development Plan for additional details). The service will maintain its one daily trip in each direction. Proposed improvements as part of this Service Development Plan are within the railroad right-of-way, with no impacts to private lands anticipated. Public assets utilized include the Rutland Rail Station (municipal) and the Vermont Railway right-of-way, which is owned by the State of Vermont.

Rail freight and seasonal passenger excursions are the only other rail service provided along the corridor. The improvements included as part of this Service Development Program will result in more efficient and dependable rail freight service along the Vermont Railway, particularly as one of the largest freight shippers in Vermont is located on the line, and shipments of petroleum products to Burlington are critical to the economic prosperity of the region.

According to Amtrak's calculations, the service extension to Burlington will result in annual direct cost savings to Vermont of approximately \$490,000 due to the strong ridership potential in Middlebury and Burlington. The new service will therefore provide passenger rail boarding access to two additional communities at a reduced cost to the State, and result in a more efficient use of the current train sets.

PLANNING BACKGROUND

Planning for intercity passenger rail service along this corridor began in the 1990s, where stakeholders identified the lack of passenger rail service as a major impediment to mobility and economic development. In 2001, Amtrak developed a Service Development Plan that identified various options Vermont could consider in an attempt to establish passenger rail service to communities that have not had rail service since 1953. The 2006 Vermont State Rail & Policy Plan identified preservation of existing Amtrak service and new service along the Western Rail Corridor as the highest passenger rail priorities. In addition, the Vermont Rail Advisory Council - established to advise Vermont's Governor on rail policy and projects and composed of both public entity and private railroad members - has recommended numerous projects aimed at improving and establishing passenger rail service along this corridor. At the regional level, the Western Corridor Transportation Plan - developed by communities and regional organizations along the 200-mile corridor - also identified the proposed corridor program as the highest intercity passenger rail priority. At the municipal level, planning and support for intercity passenger rail service has been ongoing. Both the City of Rutland Master Plan (2002) and the Rutland Regional Plan (2008) advocate for and support extended rail service to Burlington. The City of Burlington Municipal Development Plan (2006) was developed with the assumption that intercity passenger rail service along the Western Rail Corridor would be established. Sections of these Plans which reference strategies, recommendations and support are attached.

Since the mid-1990s, the State of Vermont has made significant capital investments along Vermont's Western Rail Corridor that includes the Vermont Railway between Burlington, VT and Hoosick Junction, NY in anticipation of passenger rail service in the corridor. These investments in the past 5 years alone have exceeded \$15 million. In addition, Vermont provides Amtrak an annual operating subsidy of \$4-5 million to support two intercity passenger rail services in the state. The track and crossing improvements

(2) List other HSIPR projects or activities related to this Service Development Program application. This includes any pending, selected, or awarded planning, PE/NEPA, FD/Construction, Service Development Programs or projects, and other FRA funded programs. The purpose of this list is to identify overlapping or complementary applications, projects, or programs. Click on the gray boxes to select from the list of choices for FRA Solicitation and Status. If the Solicitation is not included in the prepopulated list, select “Other” and type the name in the adjacent gray box within that field.

	Project, Activity, or Service Development Program Name ²	FRA Solicitation	Federal Funding Amount ³ (in thousands of dollars)	Status	GrantSolutions Number and/or Award Number	Does the project contain activities or scope also proposed in this application?
1	Livingston Avenue Bridge Replacement	FY10 PE/NEPA	\$ 2,000,000	Obligated	GS # / Award #	No

² If an applicant is submitting an Individual Project application proposing the same or similar scope as a component project contained in this Service Development Program application, the Individual Project application should be listed.

³ Depending on the status of the Project, Activity, or Program record the amount obligated, awarded, or requested.



2	Adirondack Corridor: Ballston Spa Capacity Improvements	ARRA-Track 1a	\$ 3,318,333	Obligated	GS # / Award #	No
3	Empire Corridor South: Albany to Schenectady 2nd Track	ARRA-Track 1a	\$ 9,120,000	Obligated	GS # / Award #	No
4	Empire Corridor South: Grade Crossing Improvements - CSXT Milepost 75 to 143	ARRA-Track 1a	\$ 2,450,000	Obligated	GS # / Award #	No
5	Empire Corridor Planning	FY09-Track 3	\$ 1,000,000	Obligated	GS # / Award #	No
6			\$		GS # / Award #	
7			\$		GS # / Award #	
8			\$		GS # / Award #	
9			\$		GS # / Award #	
10			\$		GS # / Award #	
11			\$		GS # / Award #	
12			\$		GS # / Award #	
13			\$		GS # / Award #	
14			\$		GS # / Award #	
15			\$		GS # / Award #	
16			\$		GS # / Award #	
17			\$		GS # / Award #	
18			\$		GS # / Award #	

D. Executive Summary

Answer the following questions about the proposed program.

(1) Provide a clear, concise, and descriptive project name. The Service Development Program name must consist of the following elements, each separated by a hyphen: (1) the State abbreviation; (2) the route or corridor name; and (3) a Service Development Program descriptor that will concisely identify the program’s focus (e.g., HI-Fast Corridor-Main Stem). Please limit the response to 100 characters.

VT-Ethan Allen Express Amtrak Route-Improvements & Extension

(2) If an application containing the proposed scope was previously submitted for consideration and was not selected, indicate the solicitation under which that application was submitted. Check all that apply.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ARRA – Track 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> FY 2010 Service Development Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ARRA – Track 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> FY 2010 Individual Project – PE/NEPA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FY 2009 – Track 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> FY 2010 Individual Project – FD/Construction |
| <input type="checkbox"/> FY 2009 Residual | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |

(3) Indicate the anticipated duration, in months, for the proposed Service Development Program. Consider that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding must be obligated by September 30, 2017, while FY 2010 funding does not have a deadline.

Number of Months: 36

(4) Specify the anticipated HSIPR funding information for the proposed Service Development Program. This information must match the SF-424 documents, and dollar figures must be rounded to the nearest whole dollar. All applicants are encouraged to contribute non-Federal matching funds. FRA will consider matching funds in evaluating the merit of the application. See Section 3.3 of the NOFA for further information regarding cost sharing.

HSIPR Federal Funding Request	Non-Federal Match Amount	Total Program Cost	Non-Federal Match Percentage of Total
\$65,332,951	\$15,000,000	\$80,332,951	19 %



(5) Indicate the source, amount, and percentage of non-Federal match for the proposed Service Development Program (if applicable). The sum of figures below should equal the amount provided in Section D.4. Click on the gray boxes to select the appropriate response from the lists provided in type of source, status of funding, and type of funds. Dollar figures must be rounded to the nearest whole dollar. Also, list the percentage of the total program cost represented by each non-Federal funding source. Provide supporting documentation that will allow FRA to verify each funding source. Any required verification documentation not available online should be submitted with the application package and listed in Section H.2 of this application.

Non-Federal Match Funding Sources	Type of Source	Status of Funding ⁴	Type of Funds	Dollar Amount	% of Total Program Cost	Describe Any Supporting Documentation to Help FRA Verify Funding Source
State of Vermont Funds	New	Budgeted	Cash	\$ 15,000,000	19 %	See attached Legislative ACT 123
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
Sum of Non-Federal Funding Sources				\$ 15,000,000	19 %	N/A

(6) Indicate the name of the corridor where the proposed Service Development Program is located and identify the start and end points as well as major integral cities along the route.

The Service Development Program for the Ethan Allen Express Improvements and Extension begins along the New York-Vermont State Line to Burlington Vermont. Major integral cities along the route where the proposed improvements will occur include Rutland, VT, Middlebury, VT and Burlington, VT. Major integral cities along the entire Ethan Allen Express Route include New York, NY, Albany, NY and Saratoga Springs, NY.

(7) Describe the project location, using municipal names, mileposts, control points, or other identifiable features such as longitude and latitude coordinates. If available, please provide a project GIS shapefile (.shp) as supporting documentation. This document must be listed in Section H.2 of this application.

The project originates at the New York-Vermont State Line (MP 84.1 of the CLP) then proceeds to Rutland (MP 99.79 of the CLP) where it will interchange with the Vermont Railway (VTR) at MP 53.72 and then north to Burlington (MP 121.9 of the VTR). Both a project location map and regional service map are attached to this application and are included in Section H2 as 'Corridor Program Location Maps'.

(8) Provide an abstract outlining the proposed Service Development Program. Briefly summarize the narrative provided in the Statement of Work in 4-6 sentences. Capture the major milestones, outcomes, and anticipated benefits that will result from

⁴ The following categories and definitions are applied to funding sources:

Committed: Committed sources are programmed capital funds that have all the necessary approvals (e.g., statutory authority) to be used to fund the proposed project without any additional action. These capital funds have been formally programmed in the State Rail Plan and/or any related local, regional, or state capital investment program or appropriation guidance. Examples include dedicated or approved tax revenues, state capital grants that have been approved by all required legislative bodies, cash reserves that have been dedicated to the proposed project, and additional debt capacity that requires no further approvals and has been dedicated by the sponsoring agency to the proposed project.

Budgeted: This category is for funds that have been budgeted and/or programmed for use on the proposed project but remain uncommitted (i.e., the funds have not yet received statutory approval). Examples include debt financing in an agency-adopted capital investment program that has yet to be committed in the near future. Funds will be classified as budgeted when available funding cannot be committed until the grant is executed or due to the local practices outside of the project sponsors' control (e.g., the project development schedule extends beyond the State Rail Program period).

Planned: This category is for funds that are identified and have a reasonable chance of being committed, but are neither committed nor budgeted. Examples include proposed sources that require a scheduled referendum, requests for state/local capital grants, and proposed debt financing that has not yet been adopted in the agency's capital investment program.

implementing the Service Development Program. For any acronyms, spell out the first frequency with the acronym in parentheses. If this application is divided into phases or groupings of component projects⁵, provide a brief abstract of 4-6 sentences for each phase or group of component projects.

This Service Development Program will result in necessary track and crossing improvements to the existing Ethan Allen Express Amtrak Route from the New York-Vermont State Line to Rutland, VT and similar track/crossing improvements along the state-owned Vermont Railway line to extend the service from its current end point of Rutland, VT to Burlington VT. The project is anticipated to be completed in 3 years. Outcomes include higher operating speeds, improved on-time-performance, and a service extension to Vermont's only metropolitan area. Benefits include intercity passenger rail service to currently underserved and unserved communities, improved system performance, mode integration, economic competitiveness, livability, and environmental benefits (energy and emissions) as documented in subsequent sections of this application narrative and attached supporting documentation.

⁵ An application's competitiveness may be improved by demonstrating how a proposed project could be divided into discrete phases, each with operational independence, based on geographic section, type of activity, discrete benefits and costs, or other appropriate criteria.

(9) Indicate the type of expected capital investments included in the proposed Service Development Program. Check all that apply.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Additional main-line tracks | <input type="checkbox"/> Rolling stock acquisition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Communication, signaling, and control | <input type="checkbox"/> Rolling stock refurbishments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Electric traction | <input type="checkbox"/> Station(s) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade crossing improvements | <input type="checkbox"/> Structures (bridges, tunnels, etc.) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Major interlockings | <input type="checkbox"/> Support facilities (yards, shops, administrative buildings) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> New rail lines | <input type="checkbox"/> Track rehabilitation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positive Train Control | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): |

(10) Indicate the anticipated service outcomes for the proposed Service Development Program. Check all that apply.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Additional service frequencies | <input type="checkbox"/> New service on existing IPR route |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increased average speeds/shorter trip times | <input type="checkbox"/> New service on new route |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increases in operational reliability | <input type="checkbox"/> Reroute existing service |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increases in ridership | <input type="checkbox"/> Service quality improvements |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Improved on-time performance of passenger trains | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe): Enhancement and extension of existing IPR service |

Briefly clarify the response(s) if needed:

Other: Service extension along an existing Ethan Allen Express Amtrak Route to Burlington, VT.

(11) Describe the rolling stock type (if applicable). Describe the fleet of locomotives, cars, self-powered cars, and/or train sets that are intended to provide service upon completion of the Service Development Program. Note if the equipment is already owned or needs to be acquired.

The current service and extended service will utilize current Amtrak/Amfleet equipment. There is currently no dedicated rolling stock, and Amtrak equipment cycles through Penn Station.

(12) Provide information about job creation through the life of the proposed Service Development Program. Please consider construction, maintenance, and operations jobs.

Anticipated number of onsite and other direct jobs created (on a 2080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis).	FD/ Construction Period	First full year of operation	Fifth full year of operation	Tenth full year of operation
	175	4	25	49
Indicate the anticipated fiscal year.	N/A	2015	2020	2025

(13) Divide the Service Development Program into discrete phases (groups of component projects) and identify each phase on a separate row of the table, if possible.⁶ Detail the service benefits to be realized after completion of each phase on the corresponding row. At the bottom of the table, provide the anticipated service benefits upon completion of the entire Service Development Program. Use as many rows as necessary; if the Service Development Program cannot be subdivided, summarize the information for the entire Service Development Program in the first row. Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the NOFA for additional information about phasing Service Development Programs.

⁶ An application's competitiveness may be improved by demonstrating how a proposed project could be divided into discrete phases, each with operational independence, based on geographic section, type of activity, discrete benefits and costs, or other appropriate criteria.

Phase	Title ⁷	Frequencies ⁸		Scheduled Trip Time (in minutes)		Average Speed (mph)		Top Speed (mph)		Reliability – Provide Either On-Time Performance Percentage or Delay Minutes	
		Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future	Current	Future
	Track & Crossing Improvements	1	1	68	30	15	51	59	59	62.04	90
II.											
III.											
IV.											
VI.											
VII.											
VIII.											
Provide the Cumulative Service Outcome <i>(Aggregate Benefits of all Phases)</i>		1	1	68	30	15	51	59	59	62.04	90

(14) Provide information on the component projects within each phase of the proposed Service Development Program identified in Section D.14 above. For each phase, please list all component projects in the sequence they will be completed. If this application is not phased, include all component projects within the Phase I table. The sum of Phase Total Costs should equal the Total Program Cost indicated in Section D.4. This section is unlocked – the applicant can add rows and adjust column widths as needed for additional projects and phases.

PHASE I.			<i>[Insert Title from Section D.13]</i>
Component Project Name	Short Project Description		Project Cost
1	Track and Crossing Improvements	Replace cross ties, ballast, track surfacing and alignment, replace jointed rail with continuously welded rail; provide passing sidings; grade crossing surface improvements, new and upgraded flashing lights.	\$ 80,332,951
2			\$
3			\$
4			\$
5			\$
Phase I. Total Cost			\$ 80,332,951

PHASE II.			<i>[Insert Title from Section D.13]</i>
1			\$
2			\$
3			\$

⁷ Title should be a brief descriptive name for the phase.

⁸ Frequency is measured in daily round-trip train operations. One daily round-trip operation should be counted as one frequency.



4			\$
5			\$
Phase II. Total Cost			\$

PHASE III.			<i>[Insert Title from Section D.13]</i>
1			\$
2			\$
3			\$
4			\$
5			\$
Phase III. Total Cost			\$

PHASE IV.			<i>[Insert Title from Section D.13]</i>
1			\$
2			\$
3			\$
4			\$
5			\$
Phase IV. Total Cost			\$

E. Infrastructure Owner(s) and Operator(s)

Address the sections below with information regarding railroad infrastructure owners and operators of the proposed Service Development Program. Applicants that own and/or control the infrastructure to be improved by the project or have a service outcomes agreement in place with the infrastructure owning railroad for the proposed project, or an executed agreement that could be amended with the infrastructure owning railroad for a project(s) located on the same corridor as the proposed project, will be looked upon favorably during the application review and selection process.

(1) Provide information regarding Right-of-Way Owner(s). Where railroads currently share ownership, identify the primary owner. Click on the gray boxes to select the appropriate response from the lists of railroad type, right-of-way owner, and status of agreement. If the Right-of-Way Owner is not included in the prepopulated list, select “Other” and type the name in the adjacent text box within that field. Should this application have more than five owners, please provide the same information for additional owners in a separate supporting document and list it in Section H.2 of this application.

Type of Railroad	Railroad Right-of-Way Owner	Route-Miles	Track-Miles	Status of Agreements to Implement Projects
Other/Special Situations	Other: State of Vermont	66	66	Preliminary Executed Agreement/MOU
Regional or Short Line Freight	Other: Clarendon-Pittsford Railroad	17	17	Preliminary Executed Agreement/MOU

(2) Name the Intercity Passenger Rail Operator and provide the status of the agreement. If applicable, provide the status of agreement with the entity that will operate the planned passenger rail service (e.g., Amtrak). Click on the gray box to select the appropriate response from the list of choices for Status of Agreement. Should the proposed service have more than three operators, please provide the same information for additional operators in a separate supporting document and list it in Section H.2 of this application.

Name of Operating Partner	Status of Agreement
Amtrak	Preliminary executed agreement/MOU

(3) Provide information about the existing rail services within the proposed Service Development Program area (i.e., freight, commuter, and intercity passenger). Click on the gray box to select the appropriate response from the list of type of service and name of operator. If the Name of Operator is not included in the prepopulated list, select “Other” and type the name in the adjacent text box within that field.

Type of Service	Name of Operator	Top Speed Within Project Boundaries (mph)		Number of Route-Miles Within Project Boundaries (miles)	Average Number of Daily One-Way Train Operations ⁹
		Passenger	Freight		
Intercity Passenger	Amtrak	59		52	2
Freight	Other: Vermont Railway, Inc		40	67	8
Freight	Other: Clarendon and Pittsford Railroad Co.		40	17	4

⁹ One daily round-trip operation should be counted as two daily one-way train operations.

(4) Estimate the share of benefits that will be realized by non-intercity rail services and select the approximate cost share provided by the beneficiary.¹⁰ Click on the gray boxes to select the appropriate response from the lists of type of beneficiary, expected share of benefits and approximate cost share. If more than three types of non-intercity passenger rail are beneficiaries, please provide additional information in a separate supporting document, and list it in Section H.2 of this application.

Type of Non-Intercity Passenger Rail	Expected Share of Benefits	Approximate Cost Share
Freight	Less than 50%	1-25%

¹⁰ Benefits include service improvements such as increased speed or on-time performance, improved reliability, and other service quality improvements.



F. Response to Evaluation Criteria

Respond to each of the following evaluation criteria in the gray text boxes provided to demonstrate how the proposed Service Development Program will achieve each criterion.

(1) Project Readiness

Describe the feasibility of the proposed Service Development Program to proceed promptly to award, including addressing:

- The applicant's progress, at the time of application, in reaching compliance with NEPA for the proposed project. Although a NEPA decision document (Record of Decision, Finding of No Significant Impact, Categorical Exclusion determination) is not required at the time of application, applications for Service Development Programs that are accompanied by a final NEPA determination will be looked upon favorably during the application review and selection process;
- The applicant's progress, at the time of application, in reaching final service outcomes agreements (where necessary) with key project partners. Applicants that own and/or control the infrastructure to be improved by the project or have a service outcomes agreement in place with the infrastructure owning railroad for the proposed project, or an executed agreement that could be amended with the infrastructure owning railroad for a project(s) located on the same corridor as the proposed project, will be looked upon favorably during the application review and selection process; and
- The quality and completeness of the project's Statement of Work, including whether the Statement of Work provides a sufficient level of detail regarding scope, schedule, and budget to immediately advance the project to award.

NEPA DOCUMENTS

This Service Development Program is ready to be implemented immediately upon obtaining HSIPR funding. A Service Environmental Assessment has been completed and submitted as part of the application. In addition, FRA-approved Project-level Categorical Exclusions have been obtained for track and crossing work along both the VTR and CLP railroads.

SERVICE OUTCOME AGREEMENTS

The State of Vermont, Amtrak and Vermont Rail Systems have signed an Agreement in Principle (AIP). The AIP contains the necessary provisions with key project partners that will be included in the final Service Outcome Agreement.

STATEMENT OF WORK

A Statement of Work (SOW) has been included with the SDP Narrative Application Form Part II. The SOW includes comprehensive scope, cost and schedule information that has been developed by VTrans' Rail Engineering section, in consultation with retainer rail engineering consultants, and Amtrak.

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

Vermont has put in place the statutory authority to expend up to \$15 million in state matching funds towards the cost of this project.

(2a) Transportation Benefits

Describe the transportation benefits that will result from the proposed Service Development Program and how they will be achieved in a cost efficient manner, including addressing:

- Generating improvements to existing high-speed and intercity passenger rail service, as reflected by estimated increases in ridership, increases in operational reliability, reductions in trip times, additional service frequencies to meet anticipated or existing demand, and other related factors;
- Generating cross-modal benefits, including anticipated favorable impacts on air or highway traffic congestion, capacity, or safety, and cost avoidance or deferral of planned investments in aviation and highway systems;
- Creating an integrated high-speed and intercity passenger rail network;
- Encouragement of intermodal connectivity and integration, including a focus on convenient connection to local transit and street networks, as well as coordination with local land use and station area development;
- Ensuring a state of good repair of key intercity passenger rail assets;
- Promoting standardized rolling stock, signaling, communications, and power equipment;
- Improved freight or commuter rail operations, in relation to proportional cost-sharing (including donated property) by those

other benefiting rail users;

- Equitable financial participation from benefiting entities in the project's financing;
- Encouragement of the implementation of positive train control (PTC) technologies (with the understanding that 49 U.S.C. 20147 requires all Class I railroads and entities that provide regularly scheduled intercity or commuter rail passenger services to fully institute interoperable PTC systems by December 31, 2015); and
- Incorporating private investment in the financing of capital projects or service operations.

IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL

The Service Development Program is expected to result in substantial improvements to intercity passenger rail along the current and extended Ethan Allen route. By adding Middlebury and Burlington to the list of station stops, the market for intercity passenger rail will be greatly expanded. Track and signal improvements will also result in achieving an average operating speed of over 50 MPH, effectively doubling the speed of the current route. These track operating speed improvements will be augmented even further with the work New York State is currently undertaking along the Empire Corridor. In addition, estimated ridership is projected to increase from 9,040,000 passenger miles (base year) to 12,427,000 by 2015 (first year of service) and to 14,854,000 by 2030. Operational reliability is also projected to increase from a current on-time-performance of 62.04% to 90%.

The Ethan Allen Express extension is anticipated to cover the additional operating costs, and produce improved performance metrics, including seat utilization and operating subsidy required per passenger mile. In 2015, implementation of the service will result in an increase in ticket revenues from \$2,335 to \$3,305 million, a net increase of \$970,000. At the same time, operating costs would increase by \$480,000, producing a net reduction in financial support of approximately \$490,000. In 2015, passenger volumes are projected to increase by 17,000 passengers to 66,000, an increase of approximately 37% over current levels. These additional passengers would be attracted primarily through the Burlington service, and secondarily from improved reliability and travel time resulting from improvements to the CLP segment.

VTrans commissioned an economic impact/benefit-cost study to quantify measurable impacts of the Service Development Program. A summary of those benefits is included below. Please consult the attached Economic Impact Report for more detailed information.

□ Safety. Safety benefits will accrue primarily from travelers who would switch from driving their automobile to using the train. In 2015, the startup year, approximately 8,000 auto trips would be diverted. Compounding this decline in personal vehicle highway travel will be a decrease in truck traffic resulting from shorter travel times as a result of improvements in the track. Combined, the benefits from reduced traffic accidents will amount to \$69,000 in 2015, and increasing to \$117,000 in 2030.

□ The train will operate through a relatively uncongested corridor, and thus investments in alternative modes will not be avoided or delayed. However, implementation at this time ensures the availability of an option that will be increasingly valuable as the region continues to grow at a higher rate than is prevalent in New England. In the initial service year of 2015, approximately 2,500 passengers who travel by air between Burlington and the New York area are expected to take the train.

(1) Time Savings

* Existing passengers on the CLP line decrease their travel time by half.

* Additional passengers reduce their travel time by 10 minutes through a modal switch from car to rail between Rutland and Burlington.

(2) Operational costs savings

* Additional passengers on the VTR Rutland to Burlington segment save \$99 by replacing the \$114 cost per trip (car operating cost; \$.58/mile for 67 miles plus other operating costs) with a \$15 estimated rail fare, solely for the segment of the trip between Whitehall, NY and Rutland/Burlington.

(3) Safety Benefits

* Total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) reduction on U.S 7 is 2.6 million by 2030 which leads to a reduction in accidents.

* No-Build crash rates for fatalities, injuries and property damage accident rates are .04, 12, and 198 respectively.

* Costs per accident type are \$3.6 million for fatal accidents, \$211,000 for injuries, and \$2,800 for property damage.

(4) Improvements in Reliability

* Increasing On-Time Performance reduces buffer time delay (additional time factored into trip for unanticipated delay).

* Average value per hour of buffer time is \$21.20

CROSS-MODAL BENEFITS

The Service Development Program will result in shifting some automobile and aviation trips to passenger rail. At a time when the region's roadways and airports have reached unprecedented congestion levels, shifting to rail trips will provide positive operational benefits to these other modes. By the first full year of operation in 2015, approximately 1,416,000 passenger miles

will be diverted from aviation to rail, increasing to 1,691,000 by 2025. Automobile passenger-miles will similarly shift to rail, 8,295,000 in 2015 and 9,739,000 by 2025. Combined, these shifts from automobile/aviation trips will account for 4% of roadway/airport passenger-miles.

CREATING AN INTEGRATED PASSENGER RAIL NETWORK

Creating an integrated passenger rail network is at the core of Vermont's participation in regional passenger rail organizations, with the goal of developing seamless integration within existing high speed and intercity passenger rail networks. The proposed Service Development program will provide Vermont and New York State residents cost and time-competitive access to Albany, NY and New York City, NY, two epicenters of intercity passenger rail in the northeast, and further integrate passenger rail systems that have been twined since 1995.

INTERMODAL CONNECTIVITY AND INTEGRATION

There are currently no intercity transportation options that link Burlington to Albany or New York City. Three local transit providers in the Service Development Program area strongly support this project (Addison County Transit Resources, Chittenden County Transportation Authority, and Marble Valley Regional Transit District, please see attached letters of support). These local transit providers view intercity passenger rail as complementing the transit services they provide and an opportunity to provide feeder service to the route, as well as allowing seamless connections to regions from de-boarding passengers.

Transit providers provide 38 local transit routes to a regional population of 420,135. Over 2,988,138 trips are made on these routes, most of which link to the downtowns of Rutland, Middlebury and Burlington - where train stations are located.

Through connections with adjacent local transit providers, a full 549,393 residents (88% of Vermont's population) will have access to the expanded Ethan Allen Express route.

STATE OF GOOD REPAIR

The U.S. Department of Transportation defines 'state of good repair' as "a condition in which the existing physical assets, both individually and as a system, (a) are functioning within their 'useful lives', and (b) are sustained through regular maintenance and replacement programs." State of good repair represents just one element of a comprehensive capital investment program that also addresses system capacity and performance.

This Service Development Program includes a set of interrelated projects resulting in a service that will function as designed, and its performance level will meet or exceed that called for in its as-built or modified design specification. In addition, assets will be maintained and replaced on a regular schedule designed to mitigate cyclical imbalances in renewal needs. This will also ensure that there will be no backlog of deferred maintenance so that the system can be continually maintained in a state of good repair.

The set of projects included in this Service Development Program is part of a comprehensive capital investment program which examined the long-term capacity and performance requirements driven by the service plans for both passenger rail and freight users. The included improvements will ensure that current physical assets are sufficient to meet projected service requirements. The capital investment program will be updated on a regular basis for changes in user needs, market demand, asset condition and other considerations.

PROMOTING STANDARDIZED ROLLING STOCK, SIGNALING, AND EQUIPMENT

The Service Development Program includes standard track and crossing infrastructure that is consistent with both existing and connecting railroads. This will result in more efficient operations of the corridor itself as well as adjacent railroads.

IMPROVED FREIGHT OPERATIONS

Freight rail service will benefit from shorter travel times and increased service reliability along the entire route between Whitehall, Rutland and Burlington. Travel time savings over the 67.7 mile route between Rutland and Burlington and savings over the 15.7 State Line-Rutland segment are expected to amount to 30-45 minutes. The impact is expected to amount to an increase of 4.44 million ton-miles on a basis of 226.27 million in 2015. By 2030, this gain is forecasted to be 6.13 million ton-miles.

Increasing freight speeds from 15MPH to 30 MPH will also decrease overall inventory carrying costs (capital lock up). This is net of the decreased speed when compared to truck freight for diverted volumes.

EQUITABLE FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION

Vermont recognizes the importance of cost-sharing and will contribute \$15,000,000 of state funding towards the cost of the Service Development Program.

COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES

During the FRA debriefing in 2010, VTrans was asked to examine options for lighted territory on the premise that additional signaling would improve the operational reliability of the service. At the request of FRA, VTrans staff conducted a benefit-cost analysis to determine the viability of implementing such as system.

VTrans reviewed options for trackside signaling, including positive train control, on the Amtrak Ethan Allen Express extension along the Western Corridor from Rutland to Burlington, and has concluded that the cost-benefit of the added operational reliability and safety factors are not justified by the added estimated expense of \$7.8 million to this proposal. The primary reasons for this include:

* The current track geometry, with horizontal and vertical alignment issues and no simple options for the introduction of proper super-elevation, results in train speeds that will be limited to less than 60 MPH. Track infrastructure improvements in the proposed scope of the application will improve operational reliability and safety, but cannot improve poor alignment issues.

VTrans has determined that the goal of an average speed of 50 MPH on the 66-mile route will render passenger rail cost-competitive with other transportation modes.

* Amtrak's Empire District Assistant Superintendent of Operations has concluded that installing signaling would not yield sufficient operational reliability and safety factors to justify the cost. The anticipated widely-spaced passenger train schedules would allow for adequate temporal separation of freight and passenger service in the corridor.

* Passenger service has historically operated in this corridor without the use of automatic signaling, relying first on a simple timetable and train order scenario. Presently, there exists a very robust radio-dispatch/warrant network at Vermont Rail Systems, covering both the Vermont Railway (VTR), and the Clarendon Pittsford RR (CLP).

* The Northeast Operating Rules Advisory Committee Rulebook, as used by Amtrak and other major railroads, prescribes proper behavior for railroad employees operating in non-signaled area, as well as in fully signaled areas. Human error(s), rather than lack of proper equipment and signaling, are the cause the majority of incidents on railroads. Automatic block signaling (ABS) cannot remedy human error.

* Although there is evidence to suggest that trackside signaling, leading to future improved positive train control technology would improve safety, the added safety benefit on this line would be considerably less than on a route with more volume and higher freight and passenger speeds. The most significant safety benefits to the public are realized from the first steps in the Service Development Program proposal – improvements in track infrastructure and grade crossing safety. Another notable safety measure is simply transferring travel trips from automobile to train. Presently there are 1.5 deaths per 100 million miles of auto travel and only 0.03 deaths per 100 million miles on conventional rail lines without positive train control (PTC).

As this corridor is developed in the future and increased speeds become possible, the cost-benefit ratio of trackside signaling, (Automatic Block Signaling (ABS), Centralized Traffic Control (CTC), and someday, PTC), will likely become more favorable, and the option of adding signaled territory can be reconsidered. At this stage, however, the corridor will realize large public safety benefits without the added cost of trackside signaling, ABS, CTC, or PTC.

(2b) Other Public Benefits

Describe the other public benefits that will result from the proposed Service Development Program and how they will be achieved in a cost-effective manner, including addressing:

- The extent to which the project is expected to create and preserve jobs and stimulate increases in economic activity;
- Promoting environmental quality, energy efficiency, and reduction in dependence on oil, including the use of renewable energy sources, energy savings from traffic diversions from other modes, employment of green building and manufacturing methods, reductions in key emissions types, and the purchase and use of environmentally sensitive, fuel-efficient, and cost-effective passenger rail equipment; and
- Promoting coordination between the planning and investment in transportation, housing, economic development, and other infrastructure decisions along the corridor, as identified in the six livability principles developed by DOT with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, which are listed fully at <http://www.dot.gov/affairs/2009/dot8009.htm>.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

The following economic benefits are summarized from the Economic Impact Analysis report (see attached report for more detailed information).

Construction costs are estimated to create a total \$99.33M in economic activity and 402 jobs: 175 jobs in the construction sector (direct), 120 jobs due to construction expenditures on purchases of materials and supplies (indirect), and 107 jobs due to





(3) Project Delivery Approach

Describe the risk associated with delivery of the proposed Service Development Program within budget, on time, and as designed, including addressing:

- The timeliness of project completion and the realization of the project's benefits;
- The applicant's financial, legal, and technical capacity to implement the project;
- The applicant's experience in administering similar grants and projects;
- The soundness and thoroughness of the cost methodologies, assumptions, and estimates;
- The thoroughness and quality of the Project Management Plan;
- The timing and amount of the project's future noncommitted investments;
- The adequacy of any completed engineering work to assess and manage/mitigate the proposed project's engineering and constructability risks; and
 - The sufficiency of system safety and security planning.

This section presents a summary of the project delivery approach included in the detailed attached Project Management Plan. Please refer to the attachment for more detailed information.

TIMELINESS OF PROJECT COMPLETION AND REALIZATION OF BENEFITS

The Service Development Program is anticipated to take 36 months to implement, with the first year spent on completing preliminary engineering and the remaining two on final design and construction. The realizations of benefits will occur both during construction (job creation and economic impact) and the first year of operation in 2015 (transportation benefits).

FINANCIAL, LEGAL AND TECHNICAL CAPACITY, AND PROJECT EXPERIENCE

Financial Capacity

VTrans' average annual budget exceeded \$400 million dollars over the five-year period 2005-2009. For FY2010, including currently available Recovery Act (ARRA) funding, the budget is \$558 million. The Agency has sufficient flexibility to shift funding between projects to accommodate unforeseen cost overruns, and can also shift funding between programs if necessary. Adding to this capability is active budget monitoring process whereby finance and budget staff meet regularly with program





(4) Sustainability of Benefits

Identify the likelihood of realizing the proposed Service Development Program's benefits, including addressing:

- The applicant's financial contribution to the project;
- The quality of a Financial Plan that analyzes the financial viability of the proposed rail service;
- The quality and reasonableness of revenue, operating, and maintenance cost forecasts;
- The availability of any required operating financial support, preferably from dedicated funding sources;
- The quality and adequacy of project identification and planning;
- The reasonableness of estimates for user and non-user benefits for the project; and
- The reasonableness of the operating service plan.

FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TO PROJECT

Vermont will contribute up to \$15,000,000 in state funds towards the cost of the Service Development Program, which represents a 19% contribution towards overall costs.

FINANCIAL PLAN

A financial plan, which details both the capital and operating requirements to implement the Service Development Program, has been developed in accordance with the requirement contained in the HSIPR Notice of Funding Availability (please see attached financial plan).

REVENUE, OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE COST FORECAST

Revenue, operating and maintenance cost forecasts were developed using Amtrak's Performance Tracking System methodology.

AVAILABILITY OF REQUIRED OPERATING FINANCIAL SUPPORT

VTrans prepares an annual budget that is presented to the Vermont Legislature for approval each January. The Agency budget is developed by staff in each division. The Amtrak operation service line item is included in the Rail Section of the Policy, Planning & Intermodal Development Budget. The dedicated State Transportation Funds are the source of funds for the Amtrak Contract and other expenses related to the operation of the State supported services (The Vermonter and The Ethan Allen Express). Funding for the Amtrak line has a tremendous amount of support in the Legislature and has been fully funded annually since the inception of the Vermonter service in 1995. Since that time the Legislature has included funding for the state's passenger rail services (over \$40 million) as well as capital improvement projects related to the expansion of those services. There is every reason to expect that the support for the Amtrak service will continue and grow in the future.

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION AND PLANNING

Planning for intercity passenger rail service along this corridor began in the 1990s, where stakeholders identified the lack of passenger rail service as a major impediment to mobility and economic development. In 2001, Amtrak developed a Service



G. Statement of Work

The Statement of Work (SOW) is a required document. This must be submitted using the Narrative Application Form Part II. Statement of Work available on FRA's website to provide the required information. The quality and completeness of this document will be measured as a Project Readiness evaluation criterion, as outlined in Section 5.2.1 of the NOFA.

Please provide the SOW as a separate document and list it in Section H.2 of this application.

The SOW is a description of the work that will be completed under the grant agreement and must address the background, scope, and schedule, and include a high-level budget for the proposed Service Development Program.

(1) The SOW is required for a complete application package.

(2) The SOW should contain sufficient detail so that both FRA and the applicant can:

- a. Understand the expected outcomes of the work to be performed by the applicant, and
- b. Track applicant progress toward completing key project tasks and deliverables during the period of performance.

(3) The SOW should clearly describe project objectives, but allow for a reasonable amount of flexibility regarding how the objectives will be accomplished. It is important to describe the overall approach to and expectations for project/activity completion.

(4) If the SOW describes work for phases and/or groups of component projects, the larger program should be explained in the background section of the SOW. The remainder of the SOW should be limited to describing the activities that directly contribute to the combined FRA and applicant effort which is funded under the grant agreement.

H. Optional Supporting Information

Provide a response to the following, as necessary, for the Service Development Program.

(1) Please provide any additional information, comments, or clarifications and indicate the section and question number that being addressed (e.g., Section E. 2). Completing this question is optional.

PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS FOR NEW YORK STATE HSIPR-FUNDED PROJECTS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE OF THE ETHAN ALLEN EXPRESS (SECTION C.2)

- 1) Livingston Avenue: PE/NEPA for Bridge Replacement - Completion of environmental studies/analysis and preliminary engineering required to replace the Livingston Avenue Bridge, which is nearing the end of its serviceable life. Benefits Amtrak Empire service. (\$2,000,000)
- 2) Adirondack Corridor: Ballston Spa Capacity Improvements - Final design and construction of 2.27 miles of third mainline track on a portion of the Delaware and Hudson Railway used by Amtrak's state-supported Adirondack (New York - Montreal) and Ethan Allen Express (New York - Rutland, VT) services. (\$3,318,333)
- 3) Empire Corridor South: Albany to Schenectady 2nd Track - Installation of a second track where there is currently only one and will reconfigure interlockings between MP QC 143.3 and 160.3 to eliminate the existing bottleneck. The project will also upgrading existing warning device systems at grade crossings within the project area to include warning signs, automatic flashers, gates and predictors. (\$91,200,000)
- 4) Empire Corridor South: Grade Crossing Improvements - CSXT Milepost 75 to 143 - Improvements to the reliability of the existing grade crossing warning device equipment, allowing them to provide satisfactory approach warning times without the need for further upgrade if higher rail speeds are implemented. This project is located at 12 grade crossing locations on the CSXT Hudson subdivision (MP 75.95-126.98). (\$2,450,000)
- 5) Empire Corridor Planning - Development of a Service Development Plan (SDP) and a Tier 1 Service Level Programmatic Draft Environmental Impact Statement (PDEIS) for high-speed rail enhancements throughout the Empire Corridor, particularly between Albany, NY and Niagara Falls, NY, with a goal of introducing passenger train speeds of up to 110 mph between Schenectady and Buffalo, NY. (\$1,000,000)

(2) Please provide a document title, filename, and description for all optional supporting documents. Ensure that these documents are uploaded to GrantSolutions.gov with the narrative application form and use a logical naming convention.

Document Title	Filename	Description and Purpose
424D Certifications & Assurances	424D Certifications & Assurances.pfd	Required certifications and assurances for construction projects.
FRA Certifications & Assurances	FRA Certs.pfd	Required certifications and assurances for FRA projects.
Corridor Program Location Maps	Corridor Program Location Maps.pdf	Location maps
Economic Impact Analysis	Economic Impact Analysis.pdf	Document detailing job creation, long-term economic impact and benefit-cost analysis.
Economically Distressed Areas Map	Economically Distressed Areas Map.pdf	Map detailing the location of Vermont's Economically Distressed Areas.
Scope of Work/Preliminary Engineering Materials	SOW-PE Materials.pdf	Advance project design and develop engineering details.
Service Development Plan	Service Development Plan.pdf	A planning document that lays out the overall scope and approach for the proposed IPR service.
State Statutes Rail Authority	State Statutes Authority for Rail.pdf	State legislation that authorizes the modernization of state owned rail lines.

Plan References	State-Regional-Local Plan References.pdf	Planning documents that demonstrate both the support for and planning for the Service Development Program
ACT123	ACT123.pdf	Vermont's Transportation Law that authorizes and directs the use of the state's bonding authority to meet the non-federal funds match requirement.
NEPA - Bennington to Burlington Project NEPA	NEPA - Bennington to Burlington Project NEPA.pdf	The NEPA document that provides a Categorical Exclusion for a set of projects within the state-owned portions of the IPR Corridor.
NEPA - Clarendon & Pittsford Line	NEPA - CLP.pdf	The NEPA document that provides a Categorical Exclusion for a set of projects within the privately-owned CLP line of the IPR Corridor.
NEPA - Service NEPA	NEPA - Service NEPA.pdf	The Corridor-Wide Environmental Assessment NEPA document which examines the potential impacts of the service.
Project Management Plan	Project Management Plan.pdf	Outlines the Service Development Program Approach
Financial Plan	Financial Plan.pdf	Addresses financial requirements laid out in the HSIPR NOFA
Letters of Support	Letters of Support.pdf	Letters of Support from affected and supportive organizations
424C Budget Information-Construction	424C Budget Information-Construction.pdf	Required Application Form
EAE Safety & Security Plan	EAE Safety & Security Plan.pdf	Describes the rail operator's safety and security procedures and planning.
State Amtrak Funding & MOW of Capitalized Improvements	State Amtrak Funding & MOW of Capitalized Improvements.pdf	Describes Amtrak's operations funding from the state, and maintenance of way.
Agreement in Principal	AIP.pdf	Agreement between the state, rail operator and Amtrak governing the implementation of the SDP