

# Narrative Application Form – Individual FD/Construction 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 FD/Construction project should be listed and described in Section G of this form. Questions about the HSIPR program or this application should be directed to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) at [HSIPR@dot.gov](mailto: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, along with all supporting documentation, electronically by uploading them to [www.GrantSolutions.gov](http://www.GrantSolutions.gov) by 8:00 p.m. EDT on April 4, 2011.

### A. Point of Contact and Applicant Information

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

<b>(1) Name the submitting agency:</b> Illinois Department of Transportation		<b>Provide the submitting agency Authorized Representative name and title:</b> George Weber, Acting Deputy Director of the Division of Public and Intermodal Transportation		
<b>Address 1:</b> JRTC, Suite 6-600	<b>City:</b> Chicago	<b>State:</b> IL	<b>Zip Code:</b> 60601-3229	<b>Authorized Representative telephone:</b> (312)793-4222 ext. N/A
<b>Address 2:</b> 100 West Randolph Street		<b>Authorized Representative email:</b> george.weber@illinois.gov		
<b>Provide the submitting agency Point of Contact (POC) name and title (if different from Authorized Representative):</b> ,		<b>Submitting agency POC telephone:</b> ( ) - ext. <b>Submitting agency POC email:</b>		
<b>(2) List out the name(s) of additional State(s) applying (if applicable):</b> Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin				

## B. Eligibility Information

Complete the following section to demonstrate satisfaction of an application’s eligibility requirements.

- (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
  - Group of States
  - Amtrak
  - Amtrak in cooperation with one or more 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 G.2 of this application.

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

- (2) Indicate the planning processes used to identify the proposed FD/Construction project.** As defined in Section 3.5.1 of the NOFA, the process should analyze the investment needs and service objectives of the service that the individual project is intended to benefit. Refer to the FD/Construction Application Package Instructions for more information. The appropriate planning document must be submitted with the application package and listed in Section G.2 of this application.

- State Rail Plan
- Service Development Plan (SDP)
- Service Improvement Plan (SIP)
- Statewide Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP)
- Other, please list this document in Section G.2 with “Other Appropriate Planning Document” as the title
- This project is not included in a relevant and documented planning process

- (3) Verify the completion of Preliminary Engineering requirements.** List the documents that establish completion of Preliminary Engineering for the project covered by this application. Refer to the NOFA and FD/Construction Application Package Instructions for more information. Any document not available online should be submitted with the application package and listed in Section G.2 of this application. If more rows are required, please provide the same information for additional PE requirements in a separate supporting document and list it in Section G.2 of this application.

Documentation	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link (if available)
N/A	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**(4) Verify the completion of NEPA documentation.** Indicate the date the document was issued and how the document can be verified by FRA. A NEPA decision document (Record of Decision, Finding of No Significant Impact, or FRA Categorical Exclusion concurrence) is not required for an application but must have been 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. Verified documents can be submitted as a supporting document or referenced through an active public URL. Any document not available online should be submitted with the application package and listed in Section G.2 of this application. Refer to the NOFA and FD/Construction Application Package Instructions for more information.

Documentation	Date of Issue (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	Web Link (if available)
<b>NEPA Documentation</b>			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exclusion Documentation (worksheet)	3/2011	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Assessment	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Final Environmental Impact Statement	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Project NEPA Determination</b>			
<input type="checkbox"/> Categorical Exclusion	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Finding of No Significant Impact	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/> Record of Decision	/	<input type="checkbox"/>	

**(5) Select and describe the operational independence of the proposed FD/Construction project.**<sup>1</sup> Refer to Sections 3.4.4 and 3.5.2 of the NOFA for more information about operational independence and applications related to previously-selected projects.

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

Briefly clarify the response:

The purpose of this project is to purchase Next Generation pooled equipment to replace Amtrak owned equipment.

Illinois: Chicago to Carbondale, Chicago to Quincy, and 1 proposed service corridor (Chicago to Dubuque, IA).

Michigan: Blue Water (Chicago to Port Huron), Pere Marquette (Chicago to Grand Rapids), Wolverine (Chicago to Pontiac).

Missouri: River Runner (Saint Louis to Kansas City)

Wisconsin: Hiawatha (Chicago to Milwaukee)

<sup>1</sup> A project is considered to have operational independence if, upon implementation, 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.



## C. FD/Construction Project Summary

Identify the title, location, and other information of the proposed project by completing this section.

**(1) Provide a clear, concise, and descriptive project name.** Use identifiers such as State abbreviations, major cities, infrastructure, and tasks of the individual project (e.g., “DC-Capital City to Dry Lake Track Improvements”). Please limit the response to 100 characters.

Nxt Gen Pool Equip Procur: IL: Chi-Car, Quin and Dub; MI: Chi-PH; GR; Pont; MO: STL-KC; WI: Chi-Mil

**(2) If the applicant submitted an application for this project, or a project within the scope, that 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A <small>*Since this is a joint application, some of the states have applied for equipment in past rounds.</small> |

**(3) Indicate the activity(ies) proposed in this application.** Check all that apply.

- Final Design     Construction

**(4) Indicate the anticipated duration, in months, for the proposed FD/Construction project.** Consider that American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding must be obligated by September 30, 2017.

Number of Months: 72

**(5) Specify the anticipated HSIPR funding level for the proposed FD/Construction project.** 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 Project Cost	Non-Federal Match Percentage of Total
\$806,845,000	\$0	\$806,845,000	0 %

**(6) Indicate the source, amount, and percentage of non-Federal matching funds for the proposed FD/Construction project.**  
 The sum of the figures below should equal the amount provided in Section C.5. 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 project cost represented by each non-Federal funding source. Provide supporting documentation that will allow FRA to verify each funding source, any documentation not available online should be submitted with the application package and listed in Section G.2 of this application.

Non-Federal Match Funding Sources	Type of Source	Status of Funding <sup>2</sup>	Type of Funds	Dollar Amount	% of Total Project Cost	Describe Any Supporting Documentation to Help FRA Verify Funding Source
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
				\$	%	
<b>Sum of Non-Federal Funding Sources</b>				\$	%	N/A

**(7) Indicate whether the proposed activities in this application are also included as a component project or phase in a Service Development Program application submitted concurrently.**

- Yes, all of the activities in this application have also been submitted as a component project or phase of a Service Development Program application.
- Yes, some of the activities within this application have also been submitted as a component project or phase of a Service Development Program application.
- No, this application and its proposed activities have not been submitted as a component project or phase of a Service Development Program application.

**(8) Indicate the name of the corridor where the project is located and identify the start and end points as well as major integral cities along the route.**

Illinois: Zephyr/Carl Sandburg - Chicago to Quincy, Illini/Saluki - Chicago to Champaign to Carbondale, New Corridor - Chicago to Rockford to Dubuque

<sup>2</sup> 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.



Michigan: Blue Water-Chicago to Port Huron, Pere Marquette-Chicago to Grand Rapids, Wolverine-Chicago to Pontiac  
 Missouri: River Runner-Saint Louis to Kansas City  
 Wisconsin: Hiawatha-Chicago to Milwaukee

**(9) 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 G.2 of this application.

Illinois: Chicago to Carbondale, Chicago to Quincy and 1 proposed corridor from Chicago to Dubuque, IA  
 Michigan: Chicago to Port Huron, Chicago to Grand Rapids, Chicago to Pontiac  
 Missouri: Saint Louis to Kansas City  
 Wisconsin: Chicago to Milwaukee

**(10) Provide an abstract outlining the proposed FD/Construction project.** Briefly summarize the project narrative provided in the Statement of Work in 4-6 sentences. Capture the major milestones, outcomes, and anticipated benefits that will result from the completion of the individual project.

The purpose of the project is to collectively procure Next Generation pooled equipment on 8 corridors:

Illinois: Chicago to Carbondale (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [3], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [21: 18 bi-level, 3 business class/café]); Quincy (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [2], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [8: 6 bi-level, 2 business class/café]) and 1 proposed corridor from Chicago to Dubuque, IA (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [2], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [8: 6 bi-level, 2 business class/café])  
 Michigan: Chicago to Port Huron (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [3], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [6: 5 bi-level, 1 business class/café]); Chicago to Grand Rapids (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [3], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [6: 5 bi-level, 1 business class/café]); Chicago to Pontiac (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [7], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [25: 20 bi-level, 5 business class/café])  
 Missouri: Saint Louis to Kansas City (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [3], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [12: 9 bi-level, 3 business class/café])  
 Wisconsin: Chicago to Milwaukee (Vehicle Acquisition: Non-electric locomotive [8], Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ticketed space [14: 12 bi-level, 2 business class/café])

**(11) Indicate the type of expected capital investments included in the proposed FD/Construction project.** Check all that apply.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <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 interlocking                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Support facilities (yards, shops, administrative buildings) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Positive Train Control                | <input type="checkbox"/> Track rehabilitation and construction                       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rolling stock acquisition  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)                                     |

**(12) Indicate the anticipated service outcomes of the proposed FD/Construction project.** Check all that apply.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Additional service frequencies              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improved operational reliability on existing route                      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Service quality improvements     | <input type="checkbox"/> Improved on-time performance on existing route                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increased average speeds/shorter trip times | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe) Rolling stock acquisition for proposed corridor |

Briefly clarify the response(s) if needed:

The purpose of the project is to collectively procure Next Generation pooled equipment on 8 corridors:

Illinois: Chicago to Carbondale, Chicago to Quincy and 1 proposed corridor from Chicago to Dubuque, IA  
 Michigan: Chicago to Port Huron, Chicago to Grand Rapids, Chicago to Pontiac

Missouri: Saint Louis to Kansas City

Wisconsin: Chicago to Milwaukee

**(13) Provide the following information about job creation through the life of the proposed FD/Construction project.** Please consider construction, maintenance, and operations jobs.

Anticipated number of <u>annual</u> onsite and other direct jobs created (on a 2080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis).	FD/ Construction Period	First full Year of Operations	Fifth full Year of Operations
	1200	0	0
Indicate the anticipated fiscal year.	N/A		

**(14) Quantify the applicable service outcomes of the proposed FD/Construction project.** Provide the current conditions and anticipated service outcomes. Future state information is required only for the service outcomes identified in Section C.11.

	Frequencies <sup>3</sup>	Scheduled Trip Time (round-trips, in minutes)	Average Speed (mph)	Top Speed (mph)	Reliability – Provide Either On-Time Performance Percentage or Delay Minutes
<b>Current</b>	Please see attached Section G.2-Optional Supporting Information				
<b>Future</b>					

<sup>3</sup> Frequency is measured in daily round-trip train operations. One daily round-trip operation should be counted as one frequency.

**(15) Indicate if any FD or Construction activities that are part of this proposed project are underway or completed.** Check all that apply.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Final Design activities are complete.                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction activities are complete.                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Final Design activities are in progress.                            | <input type="checkbox"/> Construction activities are in progress.                            |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Final Design activities are in progress or completed. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Construction activities are in progress or completed. |

Describe any activities that are underway or completed in the table below. If more space is necessary, please provide the same information for additional activities underway or completed in a supporting document and list in Section G.2 of this application.

Activity	Description	Completed? (If yes, check box)	Start Date (mm/yyyy)	Actual or Anticipated Completion Date (mm/yyyy)
Feasibility Study	Chicago to Dubuque, IA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	/	6/2007
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/
		<input type="checkbox"/>	/	/

## D. Infrastructure Owner(s) and Operator(s)

Address the section below with information regarding railroad infrastructure owners and operators of the proposed FD/Construction Project. 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 on the prepopulated list, select “Other” and type the name in the adjacent text box within that field. Should the application have more than five owners, please provide the same information for additional owners in a separate supporting document and list it in Section G.2 of this application.

Type of Railroad	Right-of-Way Owner	Route-Miles	Track-Miles	Status of Agreement to Implement
Please see attached Section G.2-Optional Supporting Information				

**(2) Name the Intercity Passenger Rail Operator and provide the status of agreement.** If applicable, provide the status of the agreement with the partner that will operate the planned passenger rail service (e.g., Amtrak). Click on the gray box to select the appropriate response from the status of agreement list. 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 G.2 of this application.

Name of Rail Service Operator	Status of Agreement
Please see attached Section G.2-Optional Supporting Information	

**(3) Provide information about the existing rail services within the project boundaries (e.g., freight, commuter, and intercity passenger).** Click on the gray boxes to select the appropriate response from the list of types of service. 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 Existing Speeds Within Project Boundaries (mph)		Number of Route-Miles Within Project Boundaries (miles)	Average Number of Daily One-Way Train Operations <sup>4</sup> within Project Boundaries
		Passenger	Freight		
Please see attached Section G.2-Optional Supporting Information					

<sup>4</sup> 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 passenger rail services and select the approximate cost share to be paid by the beneficiary.**<sup>5</sup> 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 G.2 of this application.

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

<sup>5</sup> Benefits include service improvements such as increased speed or on-time performance, improved reliability, and other service quality improvements.

## E. Additional Response to Evaluation Criteria

Respond to each of the following evaluation criteria in the gray text boxes provided to demonstrate how the proposed FD/Construction project will achieve these benefits.

### (1) Project Readiness

Describe the feasibility of the proposed FD/Construction project 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 Individual FD/Construction Projects 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.

The purpose of this project is to procure Next Generation pooled equipment to replace Amtrak-owned equipment.

Illinois: 2 existing (Chicago to Carbondale, Chicago to Quincy) and 1 proposed service corridors (Chicago to Dubuque, IA). The proposed service corridor has advanced collaboratively with Amtrak and CN.

Michigan: Blue Water (Chicago to Port Huron), Pere Marquette (Chicago to Grand Rapids), Wolverine (Chicago to Pontiac).

Missouri: River Runner (Saint Louis to Kansas City)

Wisconsin: Hiawatha (Chicago to Milwaukee).

### (2a) Transportation Benefits

Describe the transportation benefits that will result from the proposed FD/Construction project and how they will be achieved in a cost-effective 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.

Benefits include continued State supported service in existing corridors that generate cross-modalism, intergrate a rail network, encourage connectivity and intergration, ensure good repair of assets, promotes Next Generation rolling stock, improves operations, State supported financial participation.

**(2b) Other Public Benefits**

Describe the other public benefits that will result from the proposed FD/Construction project 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>.

This project demonstrates the continued commitment by the States of Illinois, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin to existing service and expansion to new corridors. This, in turn, will continue to create and preserve jobs and stimulate economic activity, enhance environmental quality, and promote livable communities.

**(3) Project Delivery Approach**

Describe the risk associated with the delivery of the proposed FD/Construction project 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 documentation;
- 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.

The States of Illinois, Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin have a long history of successful passenger rail project implementation. All States are thoroughly experienced in administering grants and projects. The project cost development has been carefully developed and based on recent procurement development experience. Engineering work has been developed and continues to be advanced. The successful safety and security of the systems is well planned and documented.

**(4) Sustainability of Benefits**

Identify the likelihood of realizing the proposed FD/Construction project’s benefits, including addressing:

- The applicant’s financial contribution to the project;
- The quality of a financial planning documentation that analyzes the financial viability of the HSIPR service that will benefit from the project;

- The availability of any required operating financial support, preferably from dedicated funding sources;
- The quality and adequacy of project identification and planning; and
- The reasonableness of estimates for user and non-user benefits for the project.

Operating financial support is in place for the existing service corridors. The planning work completed for the proposed service from Chicago to Dubuque, IA is thorough and accurate. Estimates of benefits have been well documented and are defensible.

## F. 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 G.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 of the proposed project.

- (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.

## G. Optional Supporting Information

Provide a response to the following questions, as necessary, for the proposed FD/Construction project.

**(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.

**(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
Table C.13	Part I.pdf	Job Creation Documentation
Table C.14	Part I.pdf	Applicable Service Outcomes of the Proposed FD/Construction Project
Table D.1	Part I.pdf	Right-of-Way Owners
Table D.2	Part I.pdf	Intercity Passenger Rail Operator and Status of Agreement
Table D.3	Part I.pdf	Existing Rail Services Within The Project Boundaries
Statement of Work (SOW)	Part II.pdf	Narrative Application Form Part II
IL Transportation Plan	<a href="http://www.illinoistransportationplan.org/index.html">http://www.illinoistransportationplan.org/index.html</a>	Long Range Plan
MI State Rail Plan	<a href="http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-11056-242455--,00.html">http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,1607,7-151-11056-242455--,00.html</a>	Long Range Plan
MO State Rail Plan	<a href="http://www.modot.mo.gov/Multimodal/">http://www.modot.mo.gov/Multimodal/</a>	Long Range Plan
WI Rail Plan 2030	<a href="http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/state/railplan-chapters.htm">http://www.dot.wisconsin.gov/projects/state/railplan-chapters.htm</a>	Long Range Plan
Proposed Amtrak Service; Chicago to Rockford, IL to Galena, IL to Dubuque, IA	<a href="http://www.dot.state.il.us/amtrak/RCK_Feasibility.pdf">http://www.dot.state.il.us/amtrak/RCK_Feasibility.pdf</a>	Feasibility Report (by Amtrak)
CE Worksheet	Section 5.2.pdf	NEPA Document
Project Management Documentation	Section 6.1.pdf	Project Management Documentation
Financial Planning Documentation	Section 6.2.pdf	Financial Planning Documentation
Safety System Planning Documentation	Section 6.3.pdf	Safety System Planning Documentation
Railroad & Project Sponsor Agreements	Section 6.4.pdf	Railroad & Project Sponsor Agreements
Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)	Section 6.4.pdf	Illinois with Michigan, Missouri, Wisconsin
Letter of Support	Section 6.4.pdf	From Amtrak

**(Table C.13) Provide the following information about job creation through the life of the proposed FD/Construction project.** Please consider construction, maintenance, and operations jobs.

	<b>FD/Construction Period</b>	<b>First full Year of Operations</b>	<b>Fifth full Year of Operations</b>
Anticipated number of annual onsite and other jobs created (on a 2080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis).	1200	0	0

**Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement: Job Creation**

Illinois DOT led procurement of Next Generation pooled equipment to replace existing equipment on 7 existing service corridors and 1 proposed corridor. All procurement projects are operationally independent. Illinois DOT will lead the effort on behalf of the other participating states with a Memorandum of Understanding executed.

The project entails the manufacturing and construction of coaches and locomotives totaling \$806,845,000. As a result, there are no operational jobs estimated as part of this project. All jobs created are estimated as manufacturing jobs that will occur during the construction period of the equipment (72 months).

An order of equipment of this size would result in a boost to the rail equipment industry specifically, and the transportation equipment industry in general. Given that many of the rail equipment and locomotive manufacturing capabilities are located in the metropolitan area of Chicago, the estimate of job creation is partially based on an assumption of the impact of such an order on this type of local industry. Of course, similar increases could be seen in whatever location is chosen for the manufacture of the rail equipment through a competitive bidding process.

Based on industry employment estimates from the State of Illinois (Where Workers Work, <http://lmi.ides.state.il.us/wwwork.htm>), there were more than 12,000 jobs in the transportation equipment sector in the six-county Chicago region as of March 2010.

In order to estimate the jobs created by this level of investment, the impact to the local transportation equipment industry has been estimated at 5% to 15%, with a mid-range estimate of roughly 1,200 jobs created by the construction of these materials.

<b>Industry</b>	<b>Total Employment (March 2010)</b>	<b>Estimated Impact</b>	<b>Jobs Created</b>
Transportation Equipment (NAICS 37)	12,358	Low (5%)	618
		Medium (10%)	1,236
		High (15%)	1,854

*Source: Where Workers Work, Illinois Department of Employment Security*

# Narrative Application Form Individual FD/Construction Part II Statement of Work



## High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program

### Statement of Work

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. The applicant must provide a sufficient level of detail regarding scope, schedule, and budget that demonstrates the project is ready to immediately advance to award. Tables have been provided as illustrative examples for capturing data however, applicants can delete or adjust the tables as necessary. This form must be listed in Section G.2 of the Narrative Application Form Part I.

- (1) **Background.** Briefly describe the events that led to the development of this FD/Construction project and the issue the project will address. Also describe the transparent, inclusive planning process used to analyze the investment needs and service objectives of the full corridor on which the individual FD/Construction project is located.

**Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement: There is a multi-state need to upgrade existing rail equipment that will be state owned on 7 existing and 1 proposed operationally independent corridors.**

- (2) **Scope of Activities.** Clearly describe the scope of the proposed FD/Construction project and identify the general objective and key deliverables.

(2a) **General Objective.** Provide a general description of the work to be accomplished through this grant, including project work effort, project location, and other parties involved. Describe the end-state of the project, how it will address the need identified in Background (above), and the outcomes that will be achieved as a result of the project.

**Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement: Illinois DOT led procurement of Next Generation pooled equipment for 7 existing and 1 proposed corridor on behalf of the States of Michigan, Missouri and Wisconsin. The end-state of project will satisfy the need for new equipment. The new equipment will be maintained and operated by Amtrak or a non-Amtrak entity with state agreements.**

(2b) **Description of Work.** Provide a detailed description of the work to be accomplished through this grant by task (e.g., FD and Construction) including a description of the geographical and physical boundaries of the project. Address the work in a logical sequence that would lead to the anticipated outcomes and the end state of the activities.

**Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement: Illinois DOT led procurement of Next Generation pooled equipment to replace existing equipment on 7 existing service corridors and 1 proposed corridor. All procurement projects are operationally independent. Illinois DOT will lead the effort on behalf of the other participating states with a Memorandum of Understanding executed.**

(2c) **Deliverables.** Describe the work products of the project to be completed to FD, or constructed in accordance with the FD that were provided to FRA during the application process or will be completed as a part of this grant. In the table provided, list the deliverables, both interim and final, that are the outcomes of the project tasks.

	Deliverable	Task
1	NEPA	Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement
2	PE	Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement

3	FD	Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement
4	Vehicle Acquisition; Non-electric locomotive (31)	Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement
5	Veh Acq; Loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space (100)	Illinois Next Generation Pooled Equipment Procurement

**(3) Project Schedule.** In the table below, estimate the approximate duration for completing each task in months. For total project duration, reference Section C.4 in the Narrative Application Form Part I.

	Task	Duration		
		Start Month	to	End Month
1	Chicago to Quincy, IL	9/2011	to	7/2017
2	Chicago to Carbondale, IL	9/2011	to	7/2017
3	Chicago to Dubuque, IA	9/2011	to	7/2017
4	Chicago to Port Huron, MI	9/2011	to	7/2017
5	Chicago to Grand Rapids, MI	9/2011	to	7/2017
6	Chicago to Pontiac, MI	9/2011	to	9/2017
7	Saint Louis to Kansas City, MO	9/2011	to	7/2017
8	Chicago to Milwaukee, WI	9/2011	to	9/2017
	Total project duration	72 months		

**(4) Project Cost Estimate/Budget.** Provide a high-level cost summary of FD/Construction work in this section, using the FD/Construction Application Package Instructions, the HSIPR Individual Project Budget and Schedule form, and the Narrative Application Form Part I as references. The figures in this section of the Statement of Work should match exactly with the funding amounts requested in the SF-424 form, the HSIPR Individual Project Budget and Schedule form, and Section C of the Narrative Application Form Part I. If there is any discrepancy between the Federal funding amounts requested in this section, the SF-424 form, the HSIPR Individual Project Budget and Schedule form, or Section C of the Narrative Application Form Part I, the lesser amount will be considered as the Federal funding request. Round to the nearest whole dollar when estimating costs.

*The total estimated cost of the proposed FD/Construction project is provided below, for which the FRA grant will contribute no more than the Federal funding request amount indicated. Any additional expense required beyond that provided in this grant to complete the proposed FD/Construction project shall be borne by the Grantee.*

FD/Construction Project Overall Cost Summary		
#	Task	Cost in FY11 Dollars
1	Chicago to Quincy, IL (2 non-electric locomotive, 8 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [6 bi-level, 2 business class/café])	\$ 60,710,000
2	Chicago to Carbondale, IL (3 non-electric locomotive, 21 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [18 bi-level, 3 business class/café])	\$ 141,375,000
3	Chicago to Dubuque, IA (2 non-electric locomotive, 8 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [6 bi-level, 2 business class/café])	\$ 60,710,000
4	Chicago to Port Huron, MI (3 non-electric locomotive, 6 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [5 bi-level, 1 business class/café])	\$ 57,525,000
5	Chicago to Grand Rapids, MI (3 non-electric locomotive, 6 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [5 bi-level, 1	\$ 57,525,000

	business class/café)	
6	Chicago to Pontiac, MI (7 non-electric locomotive, 25 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [20 bi-level, 5 business class/café])	\$ 195,715,000
7	Saint Louis to Kansas City, MO (3 non-electric locomotive, 12 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [9 bi-level, 3 business class/café])	\$ 91,065,000
8	Chicago to Milwaukee, WI (8 non-electric locomotive, 14 loco-hauled passenger cars w/ ticketed space [12 bi-level, 2 business class/café])	\$ 142,220,000
	Total FD/Construction project cost	\$ 806,845,000
<b>Federal/Non-Federal Funding</b>		
		<b>Cost in FY11 Dollars</b>
		<b>Percentage of Total Activities Cost</b>
	Federal funding request	\$ 806,845,000
	Non-Federal match amount	\$ 0
	Total FD/Construction project cost	\$ 806,845,000