High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program

Application Form

Track 1b–PE/NEPA

Welcome to the Track 1b – Preliminary Engineering (PE)/National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) Application for the Federal Railroad Administration's High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program. Applicants for Track 1b-PE/NEPA are required to submit this Application Form and Supporting Materials (forms and documents) as outlined in Section G of this application as well as detailed in the HSIPR Guidance.

We appreciate your interest in the program and look forward to reviewing your application. If you have questions about the HSIPR program or this application, please contact us at HSIPR@dot.fra.gov.

Instructions:

- Please complete this document and provide any supporting documentation electronically.
- In the space provided at the top of each section, please indicate the project name, date of submission (mm/dd/yy) and the application version number. The distinct Track 1b project name should be less than 40 characters and follow the following format: State abbreviation-route or corridor name-project title (e.g., HI-Fast Corridor-Track Work IV).
- For each question, enter the appropriate information in the designated gray box. If a question is not applicable to your PE/NEPA Project, please indicate "N/A."
- Narrative questions should be answered concisely in the space provided.
- Applicants must upload this completed application form and any supporting documentation to www.GrantSolutions.gov by August 24, 2009 at 11:59pm EDT.
- Fiscal Year (FY) refers to the Federal Government's fiscal year (Oct. 1- Sept. 30).
- Please direct questions to: HSIPR@dot.gov

A.Point of Contact and Application Information

(1) Application Point of Contact (POC) Name: Rodney P. Massman		**POC Title:** Administrator of Railroads		
Street Address: P.O. Box 270	**City:** Jefferson City	**State:** Missouri	**Zip Code:** 65102	**Telephone Number:** 573-751-7476
Fax: 573-526-4709		**Email:** Rodney.massman@modot.mo.gov		
(2) Name of lead State or organization applying: Missouri Department of Transportation				
(3) Name(s) of additional States and/or organizations applying in this group *(if applicable):* N/A				
(4) Is this PE/NEPA Project related to additional applications for HSIPR funding (under this track or other tracks)? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Maybe **If "Yes" or "Maybe" provide the following information:**				

Other Program/Project Name	Lead Applicant	Track	Total HSIPR Funding Requested *(if known)*	Status of Application
MO-KC to STL Corridor-2nd Rail Bridge over Osage River	Missouri	Track 1a - FD/Construction	$28.3 M	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Missouri Rail Crossing Safety Improvements	Missouri	Track 1a - FD/Construction	$3.2 M	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Webster Universal Crossover	Missouri	Track 1a - FD/Construction	$4.4 M	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Bonnots Mill Universal Crossover	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$5.6 M total, $764,000 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Knob Noster Passing Siding Extension	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$8.5 M total, $836,800 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Hermann Universal Crossover	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$5.2 M total, $712,500 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-3rd Mainline Track in Jefferson City Yard	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$9.7 M total, $930,000 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Kingsville Passing Siding	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$11.5 M total, $958,800 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-Strasburg Grade Separation	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$15 M total, $1,700,000 PE-NEPA	Applied
*MO-KC to STL Corridor-Double Track Lee's Summit to Pleasant Hill	Missouri	Track 1b - PE/NEPA	$56.6 M total, $1,418,800 PE-NEPA	Applied
MO-KC to STL Corridor-New Locomotive Equipment	Wisconsin-MO	Track 2	$50 M total, undetermined PE-NEPA	Will Apply

* This project would immediately <u>follow</u> the asterisk (*) highlighted project in priority order.

B. Project Overview

(1) PE/NEPA Project Name: MO-KC to STL Corridor-*Real-Time Passenger Information Displays*

(2) Indicate the activity(ies) for which you are applying:

☒ Preliminary Engineering (PE) ☒ NEPA site-specific

(3) What are the anticipated start and end dates for this PE/NEPA Project? *(mm/yyyy)*

Start Date: *Depending on programming, but latest is 02/2010 **End Date:** 02/2011

(4) PE/NEPA Project Narrative. *Please limit response to 4,000 characters.*

Describe the PE/NEPA activities that would be completed with HSIPR Track 1 funding through this application. Include the design studies and the resulting project documents for PE activities. For NEPA activities, address the technical and field studies that would be completed and documents that would be prepared, including:

- Project component studies
- PE/NEPA tasks / milestones
- Preparation of documents

Describe the agency and public involvement approach including key activities and objectives (including permitting actions). Address the coordination plan with affected railroads and right-of-way owners.

Provide an overview of the main features and characteristics of the FD/Construction Project, including:

- The location of the project including name of rail line(s), State(s), and relevant jurisdiction(s) (include map if available in supporting documentation).
- Identification of service(s) that would benefit from the project, the stations that would be served, and the State(s) where the service operates.
- How the project was identified through a planning process and how the project is consistent with an overall plan for developing High-Speed Rail/Intercity Passenger Rail service.
- How the project will fulfill a specific purpose and need in a cost-effective manner.
- The project's independent utility.
- The specific improvements contemplated.
- Any use of railroad assets or rights-of-way, and potential use of public lands and property.

This project will likely require a categorical exclusion, and may require extremely minimal environmental impacts depending on final design. The station displays are free-standing, kiosk structures to be erected in the passenger waiting area at the eight non-staffed stations. The readouts will inform passengers of the trains' arrival and provide general Amtrak information regarding schedules.

This project will coordinate GPS technology in conjunction with UP and Amtrak to set up a system that detects trains along the route and relays their location to the kiosks. The kiosks will be about 10-ft. high and supported by a single post. They will contain a display area of about 2 ft. by 5 ft.

Depending on the study, the environmental aspects should be minimal if GPS can be used for each train and if they can be detected using non-land based detectors. The kiosks will be placed where there is no flooding and where they are easily visible to passengers. The kiosks information is needed to inform the public since at most stations there are no staff or volunteers to relay information to travelers. A reliable and informative presence will help with the desolation felt when arriving at non-staffed stations. It is unlikely Amtrak ticket agents will ever staff any of these stations.

This project was identified in the 2007 Missouri Rail Revitalization proposal that also presented a need for more advertising revenue to make the service more appealing and more widely known. For safety benefits, in case of accidents or personal

injuries on the train, the train's location could be identified to assist first responders or other emergency personnel. PE and NEPA should be minimal, and preliminary engineering will involve a solicitation in open bidding for a private vendor to design and propose a GPS-based system acceptable to both Amtrak and to UP, and meets the needs of informing all potential passengers along the route.

This proposed project is located on the Union Pacific Railroad in Missouri along the *Missouri River Runner* route, which is the Amtrak-state supported service. There are 10 Amtrak stations along the route that include St. Louis, Kirkwood, Washington, Hermann, Jefferson City, Sedalia, Warrensburg, Lee's Summit, Independence and Kansas City. There is no commuter rail service on this line. The only freight use is by Union Pacific freight trains, which will also benefit from the shovel-ready project. There will be no donated land from the railroad in order to construct the project.

MoDOT understands that normal FHWA-approved methods of achieving environmental compliance are not sufficient to document these FRA methods. MoDOT plans to achieve environmental compliance with FRA's permission through procedures similar to the following.

Categorical Exclusions (CE)
MoDOT steps:

- Project screening by Environmental Specialist to determine project's impact – includes literary research, contacting agencies and field reconnaissance
- Document findings, prepare cover letter and submit for federal review and approval

(If the project has minimal impacts, it could qualify for a Programmatic CE, which allows MoDOT to approve certain projects as CE's without FHWA concurrence and exempts 21 types of projects from formal NEPA documentation.)

Environmental Assessment
MoDOT steps:

- Identify project's purpose and need, and alternates being considered
- Early consultation, coordination with agencies with jurisdiction by law or with special expertise to specific resources
- Draft document development
- Hold public hearing
- Agency and internal review of draft document
- Identification of preferred alternate
- Final document development
- Public, agency and internal review of final document
- Letter to federal agency to accompany FONSI that states any changes to preferred alternate
- Develop Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
- Federal approval with a signed FONSI

(5) Status of Activities: In the following table, please indicate the status of planning studies/documentation supporting your planned investment. Indicate the status and key dates for each applicable activity as noted in Appendix 2 of the HSIPR Guidance.

	Select One of the Following:				Provide Dates for all activities:	
	N/A	No study exists	Study Initiated	Study Completed	Actual or Anticipated Initiation Date (mm/yyyy)	Actual or Anticipated Completion Date (mm/yyyy)
Activities/Documents						
Environmental Studies						
Final NEPA Document (Categorical Exclusion (CE) documentation, Environmental Assessment (EA), or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS))	☐	☒	☐	☐	**02/01/10**	**02/01/10**

Historic and Cultural Resource Studies	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/10
Biological Surveys and Assessment	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Wetlands Delineation and Hydrology Studies	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Community Impact Assessment	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Traffic Impact Studies	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Air Emission Studies	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Noise and Vibration Studies	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Preliminary Engineering						
Capital Cost Estimates	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/10
Travel Demand Forecasting	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Operations Analysis	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Operations & Maintenance Cost Estimates	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/11
System Safety Program Plan and Collision/derailment Hazard Analysis	☒	☐	☐	☐		
Engineering Studies - specify in space below: UP and Amtrak approval and coordination with the design is required.	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/10
Design Drawings	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/10
Project Management Plan	☐	☒	☐	☐	02/01/10	02/01/10
Other: N/A	☐	☐	☐	☐		

(6) Planned Investment. *Please limit response to 4,000 characters.*

Provide an overview of the main features of the planned investment that is the subject of the PE/NEPA Project including a brief description of:

- The location of the planned investment, including name of rail line(s), State(s), and relevant jurisdiction(s) *(upload map if applicable).*
- Identification of existing service(s) that would benefit from the project, the cities/stations that would be served, and the state(s) where the service operates.

- How the planned investment was identified through a planning process and how it is consistent with an overall plan for developing High-Speed Rail/Intercity Passenger Rail service.
- How the project will fulfill a specific purpose and need in a cost-effective manner.
- The existing and planned intercity passenger rail service(s).
- The project's independent utility.
- The specific improvements contemplated.
- Any use of railroad assets or rights-of-way, and potential use of public lands and property.
- Other rail services, such as commuter rail and freight rail that will make use of, or otherwise be affected by, the planned investment.

This project will improve on-time performance along the entire Union Pacific corridor in Missouri between St. Louis and Kansas City and will enhance the future provision of 110-mph service. This project will construct – at each of the eight intermediate stops along the route where there is no ticket office or other personnel – a GPS-based passenger information system on an LED read-out sign board informing the public of general information about the trains, including specific information on when the next train is arriving and where it currently is on the route.

This communication system will automatically update itself using GPS coordinates and will require no human intervention to update. This system will require cooperation from Union Pacific and Amtrak to implement. There are several prototypes and other similar systems on other rail and rail transit operations nationwide. This system will solve the problem of future passengers being unable to predict when the train will arrive, especially if they are not familiar with Amtrak's 800 number system, which also has some limitations in predicting the train's location after leaving a previous station.

(7) Indicate the expected service objectives *(check all that apply):*

- ☐ Additional Service Frequencies
- ☒ Service Quality Improvements
- ☐ Other *(Please Describe):*
- ☐ Improved On-Time performance on Existing Route
- ☐ Increased Average Speeds/Shorter Trip Times

(8) Indicate the type of expected capital investments to be included in the planned investment *(check all that apply):*

- ☐ Structures (bridges, tunnels, etc.)
- ☐ Track Rehabilitation
- ☐ Major Interlockings
- ☐ Station(s)
- ☒ Communication, Signaling and Control
- ☐ Rolling Stock Refurbishments
- ☐ Rolling Stock Acquisition
- ☐ Support Facilities (Yards, Shops, Admin. Buildings)
- ☐ Grade Crossing Improvements
- ☐ Electric Traction
- ☐ Other *(Please Describe)*:

(9) Total Cost of PE/NEPA Project: (Year of Expenditure (YOE) Dollars*) $750,000.00

Of this amount, how much would come from the FRA HSIPR Program: (YOE Dollars)** $ $700,000.00

Indicate the percentage of total cost to be covered by matching funds: % 7%

***** Year-of-Expenditure (YOE) dollars are inflated from the base year. Applicants should include their proposed inflation assumptions (and methodology, if applicable) in the supporting documentation

** This is the amount for which the applicant is applying.

(10) Right-of-Way Owner(s): Provide the status of agreements with railroad(s) that own the right-of-way. If appropriate, "owner(s)" may also include operator(s) under track age rights or lease agreements. *If more than two railroads, please detail in "Additional Information" in Section F of this application.*

Railroad owner 1 (Name): Union Pacific Railroad

Status of railroad owner 1 *(Click on the appropriate option from the dropdown menu shaded in gray)*: Preliminary executed agreement/MOU

Railroad owner 2 (Name):	N/A
Status of railroad owner 2 *(Click on the appropriate option from the dropdown menu shaded in gray)*:	Master Agreement in place

(11) Intercity Passenger Rail Operator: If applicable, provide the status of agreement(s) with partner(s) that will operate the benefiting planned High-Speed Rail/Intercity Passenger Rail services after completion of the planned investment (e.g., Amtrak). *Click on the appropriate option from the dropdown menu shaded in gray*:

Name of Operating Partner: Amtrak

Status of Agreement: Final executed on project scope/outcomes

(12) Benefits to Other Types of Rail Service: If benefits to non-intercity passenger rail services are foreseen from the planned investment, please briefly describe those agreements and provide details on their status if applicable. *Please limit response to 1,000 characters.*

The GPS system aids emergency services by determining a train's location and serves customers by providing information, especially about train connections.

In St. Louis, Amtrak has 5 trains to Chicago, 1 to San Antonio and 1 Amtrak bus connector to Carbondale, IL -- all based in the St. Louis Gateway Center that includes intercity bus and city bus services, and MetroLink light rail system, connecting to the airport and other areas.

In Kansas City, Amtrak has 1 train to Chicago and 1 to Los Angeles. Plans are to provide amtrak connections to Wichita, Oklahoma City and Dallas by the states of Kansas and Oklahoma. Amtrak accomodations are based in Kansas City in the Union Station complex that joins to hotels and attractions by a skyway.

All ARRA projects in Tracks 1a and 1b highlight a university study of Amtrak delays. Passengers increased 10% on the route between fiscal years '08-'09 and expect to continue increasing with reliable on-time performance.

There is no commuter rail service. If developed, this system could include commuter train and passenger information.

C. Eligibility Information

(1) Select applicant type, as defined in Appendix 1.1 of the HSIPR Guidance *(check the appropriate box from the list)*:

☒ State
☐ Amtrak

If one of the following, please append appropriate documentation as described in Section 4.3.1 of the HSIPR Guidance:

☐ Group of States
☐ Interstate Compact
☐ Public Agency established by one or more States
☐ Amtrak in cooperation with one or more States

D. Public Return on Investment

(1) Transportation Project Benefits. *Please limit response to 2,000 characters.*

Describe the transportation benefits that are anticipated to result from the planned investment for which you are conducting PE/NEPA, including the extent to which the planned investment may be expected to:

- Lead to benefits for Intercity Passenger Rail including travel time reductions, increased frequencies, and enhanced service quality
- Address safety issues
- Address intercity passenger rail reliability issues
- Be integrated and complementary to the relevant comprehensive planning process (23 U.S.C. 135)
- Provide benefits to other modes of transportation, including benefits to Commuter Rail Services, Freight Rail Service, and Highway and Air Congestion Reduction and Delay or Avoidance of Planned Investments

The project's overall aim is to provide current information to passengers and prospective passengers about the status of trains. This is especially critical in the stations that do not have staff on site. There are eight non-staffed stations along the route with no plans to provide staffing.

This project will provide real-time information regarding passenger services and would bring a link to each community that functions 24 hours a day in areas that currently operate without any connection to Amtrak. Having quality information would enhance passengers' view of the services' reliability, and increase their awareness of train arrival and departure times in order to plan their travels. It would also provide benefits to other modes of transportation. For example, taxis could use the system to know when trains would be arriving to schedule their pickup and departure times at the station.

There is also the possibility the system could be used to update passengers and those waiting on connections to other modes of transportation. In addition, there is a safety issue of keeping this information centralized in a platform kiosk that keeps people away from the tracks in their zeal to "look for" approaching trains.

(2) Environmental Project Benefits Narrative. *Please limit response to 1,000 characters.*

Describe the intended contribution of the planned investment for which you are conducting PE/NEPA towards improved environmental quality, energy efficiency and reduction in the dependence on oil.

Allowing MoDOT to pursue the PE/NEPA study for real-time passenger information displays will confirm that freight and passenger rail travel improves the environment by providing a service compatible to other modes. Reliable traveler information increases ridership. The project positively affects passenger and freight rail travel by strengthening the Missouri corridor, increasing on-time performance and providing growth opportunities for additional freight and passenger trains, while offering many environmental benefits to the state.

- Each ton-mile of freight moved by rail reduces greenhouse gas emissions by 2/3, compared to truck transportation.
- Freight trains are almost 4 times more fuel-efficient than trucks and have less impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

- Rail travel generates less carbon dioxide and consumes less energy per passenger mile than cars or planes.
- Amtrak has committed to a 6% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by volunteering to meet reduction targets.

(3) Livable Communities Project Benefits Narrative. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters.*

Describe the anticipated benefits of the planned investment for which you are conducting PE/NEPA for fostering and promoting Livable Communities, and include information on the following:

- Integration with existing high density, livable development (including relevant details on livable development (e.g., central business districts with walking and public transportation distribution networks with transit oriented development)).
- Development of intermodal stations with direct transfers to other transportation modes (both intercity passenger transport and local transit).

One of the project's goals is to improve dependability and speed of Amtrak service between St. Louis and Kansas City. This service connects 10 diverse communities including Missouri's two largest major metropolitan areas, the state capital and several popular historic towns. Improving the service will synergistically support the existing transportation systems providing intermodal access to an abundance of work- and tourist-related locations within these 10 communities. The Gateway Transportation Center in downtown St. Louis combines access from Amtrak to the local transit systems (light rail and bus), taxis and intercity buses.

In Hermann, Sedalia and Jefferson City, passengers can access the Katy Trail State Park, which is Missouri's most popular hiking/biking facility and the nation's longest rails-to-trails conversion. Amtrak and Missouri partnered to provide specific accommodation for bicycles on board the trains in response to passengers' desiring to take bikes along for trail rides. Also in Sedalia, the OATS transit system shares the building with the Amtrak station.

In Warrensburg, home of the University of Central Missouri, the local bus system includes the Amtrak station along with 14 other regular stops. In Kansas City, the Amtrak station is located at Union Station, which is a local bus transfer facility offering access to the metropolitan area.

In addition to these locations with interconnectability to other transportation facilities, six of the Amtrak stations provide direct access to historic downtown business areas with stores, restaurants, wineries and lodging within walking distance. The expected improvements to Amtrak service will foster positive enhancement to livable communities.

(4) Economic Recovery Benefits. *Please limit response to 2,000 characters.*

Estimate the benefit that the PE/NEPA Project and the planned investment for which you are conducting PE/NEPA will make towards economic recovery and reinvestment, including information on the following:

- How both the PE/NEPA Project and the planned investment will result in the creation and preservation of jobs (including number of onsite and other direct jobs (on a 2080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis). Include a timeline for the anticipated job creation; specifying which jobs would be created for the PE/NEPA studies and an estimate for the planned investment (consider the construction period and operating period).
- How the project represents an investment that will generate long-term economic benefits (including the timeline for achieving economic benefits) and describe, if applicable, how the project was identified as a solution to a wider economic challenge.
- If applicable, how the project will help to avoid reductions in State-provided essential services.

The *High-Speed Intercity Rail Plan's* goal is to reduce delay time for both passenger and freight trains by adding additional rail sidings and enhancing existing rail infrastructure. The project would span the distance between Kansas City and St. Louis. The first phase involves three corridor improvement projects with a combined investment of $36 million. Additional projects along the corridor would complete phase two with a combined investment of $115 million. The total investment for the Missouri plan is estimated at $151 million.

The project's recovery benefits could be tremendous because a large part will be consulting work that refines the basic idea of the communication system in the early stages of its implementation. Jobs would be created or continued at consulting firms in order to design and refine and then implement the system. The final design could be popular with both Amtrak routes in other states and with other types of rail systems as well. The benefits could be enormous if the system could be

replicated by other systems in other places.

E. Project Success Factors

(1) Project Management Approach and Applicant Qualifications. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters.*

Describe qualifications of the applicant and its key partners for undertaking the PE/NEPA Project, include the following information:

- Management Experience – provide relevant information on experience in managing rail programs and planning activities of a similar size and scope to the one proposed in this application. Provide an organizational chart (or equivalent) that outlines the roles played by key project team members in completing activities as well as information on the role of contract support, engineering support and program management.

- Financial Management Capacity and Capability– provide relevant information on capability to absorb potential planning project cost overruns.

- Risk Assessment – provide a preliminary assessment of uncertainties within the planning process and possible mitigation strategies (consider grantee risk, funding risk, schedule risk and stakeholder risk).

The applicant previously secured a grant from the Federal Railroad Administration, Intercity Passenger Rail Program, Grant No. 6048 of $3,292,684, to construct a new siding at Shell Spur on the same Union Pacific-Amtrak corridor of this project. The award was made Sept. 30, 2008, and construction began May 29, 2009. Work is on going and will be complete by Dec. 31, 2009. The award was matched to a $5 million state appropriation. An MOU and a later multifaceted agreement were signed in 2009 with the Union Pacific Railroad to facilitate the project. A grant agreement was also signed with the FRA.

Both application and the current grant oversight are efforts on behalf of many areas of expertise in the Missouri Department of Transportation. These areas include but are not limited to environmental, design, controller's office, transportation planning, governmental relations and multimodal operations. The key stakeholder/project driver in MoDOT is the railroad section. Each of these units also interfaces with Union Pacific and the actual contractor as well in order to solve problems and expedite solutions.

The project is not similar to any other Track 1a or Track 1b; however, another Track 1b project -- the Knob Noster siding extension was designed using part of the monies from the same Shell Spur grant. The expectation is that this project would involve a similar procedure in which design is procured first followed by construction. MoDOT has been extensively involved in all areas of the Shell siding project including design, pre-bid process and daily updates with the contractor.

(2) Funding Sources: In the following table, please provide the requested information about your funding sources *(if applicable)*

Non FRA Funding Sources	New or Existing Funding Source?	Status of Funding[1]	Type of Funds	Dollar Amount (YOE $)	% of Total Project Cost	Describe any uploaded supporting documentation to help FRA verify funding source
Union Pacific	New	Committed	Cost share	$50,000.00	7%	MOU attached

(3) Project Implementation Narrative. *Please limit response to 1,000 characters.*

Provide a preliminary self-assessment of PE/NEPA Project uncertainties and mitigation strategies (consider grantee risk, funding risk, schedule risk and stakeholder risk). Describe any areas in which you could use technical assistance, best practices, advice or support from others, including FRA.

There is no known funding risk if approved per the cost-sharing terms with Union Pacific per the MOU. The project can be completed in a 2-year construction timeframe, so barring extreme unforseen 'acts of God,' such as earthquakes, tornados, floods or fires, there are no schedule risks. Amtrak has shown no propensity to discontinue service as long as there is state financial support, which has been in place for more than 30 years. Many communities have invested substantial funds in their train stations and have a vested interest in ensuring the route's success, so there is no substantial risk of cities discontinuing support of their station stops.

If this application is approved, MoDOT will appreciate an expedited completion of the grant agreement, so the project can be quickly started. MoDOT will require minimal technical assistance similar to the FRA assistance requested during the successful implementation of the application for an intercity passenger rail grant in 2008.

***(4)* Timeliness of Project Completion.** *Please limit response to 1,000 characters.*
Describe the extent to which the PE/NEPA Project will lead to future project and/or Service Development Program applications for Tracks 1 FD/Construction and Track 2 Programs.

All projects MoDOT is applying for under Track 1b for PE/NEPA are on schedule. When PE and NEPA are completed, the projects can be moved to Track 1A-FD/Construction at the next available funding cycle. Each of the projects has been estimated in terms of projected costs and are refinanced in one or both of the following: (1) the University of Missouri Engineering School's detailed capacity analysis of the line and its subsequent updates, and (2) the memorandum of understanding signed between MoDOT and Union Pacific – a result of MoDOT's efforts to pursue projects for funding along the present UP corridor for its state-supported trains and in conjunction therewith to secure minimum levels of performance.

[1] Reference Notes: 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. legislative referendum) 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 (CIP) or appropriation. 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 CIP that has yet to be committed in their near future. Funds will be classified as budgeted where available funding cannot be committed until the grant is executed, or due to the local practices outside of the project sponsor's 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 CIP.

F. Additional Information

(1) Please provide any additional information, comments, or clarifications and indicate the section and question number that you are addressing (e.g., Section D, Question 3). *This section is optional.*

The overall impact of this application could be tremendous in that updated information is of paramount importance to any passenger or prospective passenger. Implementation of this system could change dramatically how the average passenger is informed of current activities at every non-staffed station. This improvement will result in a higher quality of service and therefore an increased number of passengers who chose passenger rail services as an efficient mode of transportation.

G.Summary of Application Materials

Program Forms	Required	Optional	Reference	Description	Format
☒ Application Form	✓		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	This document to be submitted through *GrantSolutions.*	Form
Supporting Documentation	**Required**	**Optional**	**Reference**	**Description**	**Format**
☒ Planned Investment map		✓	Application Question B.6	Map of the Planned Investment location. Please upload into *GrantSolutions*.	None
Standard Forms	**Required**	**Optional**	**Reference**	**Description**	**Format**
☒ SF 424: Application for Federal Assistance	✓		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Please submit through *GrantSolutions*	Form
☒ SF 424A: Budget Information-Non Construction	✓		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Please submit through *GrantSolutions*	Form
☒ SF 424B: Assurances-Non Construction	✓		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Please submit through *GrantSolutions*	Form
☒ FRA Assurances Document	✓		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	May be obtained from FRA's website at http://www.fra.dot.gov/downloads/admin/assurancesandcertifications.pdf. The document should be signed by an authorized certifying official for the applicant. Submit through *GrantSolutions.*	Form

PRA Public Protection Statement: Public reporting burden for this information collection is estimated to average 32 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, a federal agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is **2130-0583**.