Individual FD/Construction Project Application Form

High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program

Applicants interested in applying for funding of Final Design (FD)/Construction Projects under the FY10 Individual Project solicitation are required to submit this application form and other required documents as outlined in Section H of this application. List and describe any supporting documentation submitted in Section G. Applicants should reference the FY10 Individual Projects Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for more specific information about application requirements. If you have questions about the HSIPR Program or this application, please contact the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) at HSIPR@dot.gov.

Applicants must use this form by entering the required information in the gray narrative fields, check boxes, or drop-down menus. Submit this completed form, along with any supporting documentation, electronically by uploading them to GrantSolutions.gov by 5:00 p.m. EDT on August 6, 2010.

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.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">(1) Name the submitting agency:
Missouri Department of Transportation</td><td colspan="3">Provide the submitting agency Authorized Representative name and title:
Rodney Massman, Administrator of Railroads</td></tr>
<tr><td>Street Address:
P.O. Box 270</td><td>City:
Jefferson City</td><td>State:
MO</td><td>Zip Code:
65102</td><td colspan="2">Authorized Representative telephone:
573-751-7476
Authorized Representative email:
rodney.massman@modot.mo.gov</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Provide the submitting agency Point of Contact (POC) name and title (if different from Authorized Representative):
Rodney Massman, Administrator of Railroads</td><td colspan="3">Submitting agency POC telephone: 573-751-7476
Submitting agency POC email: rodney.massman@modot.mo.gov</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">(2) List the name(s) of additional state(s) applying (if applicable):

NA</td></tr>
</table>

B. Eligibility Information

Complete the following section to demonstrate satisfaction of applicant eligibility requirements.

(1) Select the appropriate box from the list below to identify applicant type. Applicant type is defined 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 types below, additional documentation is required. Please select the appropriate box to establish applicant eligibility as described in Section 3.2 of the NOFA and list the supporting document 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 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. The appropriate planning document must be 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) Establish completion of Preliminary Engineering requirements. List the documents that establish completion of Preliminary Engineering for the project covered by this application. See Section 4.2.5 and Appendix 2.3 of the NOFA. If more than five references, please provide the same information in a supporting document and list in Section G.2 of this application. Any supporting documents submitted should be listed in Section G.2 of this application.

Documentation	**Date** (*mm/yyyy*)	**Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified** (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	**Web Link** (if available)
Project drawings and an estimate were developed by a consultant hired by TRRA for use in evaluating the proposed work.	*04/2009*	☒	
Capacity Improvement Analysis with RTC modeling	*07/2010*	☒	
Cultural Resource Assessment –Section 106 Clearance	*07/2010*	☒	

(4) Establish 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 or Finding of No Significant Impact) is not required for an application but must have been issued by FRA prior to award of a construction grant. Verified documents can be submitted as a supporting document or referenced through a public active URL. Any supporting documents should be listed in Section G.2 of this application. See Section 4.2.5 and Appendix 2.2 of the NOFA.

Documentation	**Date** (*mm/yyyy*)	**Describe How Documentation Can Be Verified** (choose one)	
		Submitted in GrantSolutions	**Web Link** (if available)
NEPA Documentation			
☒ Categorical Exclusion Documentation (worksheet)	*07/2010*	☒	
☐ Final Environmental Assessment		☐	
☐ Final Environmental Impact Statement		☐	
Project NEPA Determination			
☐ Categorical Exclusion		☐	
☐ Finding of No Significant Impact		☐	
☐ Record of Decision		☐	

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").

MO - KC to STL Corridor - Terminal Railroad Track Improvements

(2) Indicate the anticipated funding level for the FD/Construction project below. This information must match the SF-424 forms, and dollar figures must be rounded to the nearest whole dollar. When the non-Federal match percentage is calculated, it must meet or exceed 20 percent of the total project cost.

Federal Funding Request	Non-Federal Match Amount	Total FD/Construction Project Cost	Non-Federal Match Percentage of Total Project Cost
$ 3,608,700	**$** 902,200	**$** 4,510,800	20 %

(3) Indicate the activity(ies) for which you are applying. Check all that apply.

☒ Final Design ☒ Construction

(4) Indicate the anticipated duration, in months, for the FD/Construction project (e.g., 36).

Number of Months: 24

(5) List the name of the corridor where the project is located.

Kansas City to St. Louis Missouri corridor on the Terminal Railroad

(6) 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 .shp file as supporting documentation. This document must be listed in Section G.2 of this application.

The specific location is in the City of St. Louis, entirely within the state of Missouri, on track owned by the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis (TRRA) from the control point at Grand Avenue at MP 0.00 to control point at Gratiot Street at MP 2.00. The description of work is to construct 10,060 feet of a new third main track and realign 750 feet of UP yard lead tracks into the new third main track. It also includes installing two new power switch machines and controlled signals on two UP yard leads and on the new third main at control point Gratiot at MP 2.00. A copy of the plans showing these mileposts and future track layout is attached.

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

The proposed third main track, to be built on 15-foot track centers from the existing Track 56, will provide an additional 9,000 feet of clear, unrestricted track between Grand Avenue and Gratiot Street to help keep trains moving through this busy rail corridor in downtown St. Louis. It will improve access to the new signature Gateway Multimodal Center station, which provides access to both Amtrak and the light rail system in the same building. Through-train velocity will be improved by allowing the UP, BNSF and TRRA a long track to run through or temporarily hold trains, thereby reducing delays to Amtrak trains due to cross traffic and train ahead. Use of the new third main will also improve public safety by reducing potential train blockage of highway grade crossings west of Grand Avenue on the UP and BNSF mainlines. This will also allow Track 55 (currently the northernmost track and the one used by both Amtrak and freights) to be used primarily for Amtrak train access to the Gateway Station. The overall purpose of this project is to promote corridor fluidity and efficiency by making it easy for both Amtrak and freight trains to pass each other at this congested location and by removing freight trains from the track most often used by Amtrak trains to access the station.

(8) Indicate the source, amount, and percentage of non-Federal matching funds for the FD/Construction project. The sum of the figures below should equal the amount provided in Section C.2. Click on the prepopulated fields to select the appropriate responses 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. Identify supporting documentation that will allow FRA to verify the funding source and list it in Section G.2 of this application.

Non-Federal Funding Sources	New or Existing Source?	Status of Funding[1]	Type of Funds	Dollar Amount	% of Total Project Cost	Describe Any Supporting Documentation to Help FRA Verify Funding Source
Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis (TRRA)	New	Committed	Cash	$ 902,200	20 %	Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission and Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis Memorandum of Understanding (MOU attached)
Sum of Non-Federal Funding Sources				$ 902,200	20 %	N/A

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

- ☐ Structures (bridges, tunnels, etc.)
- ☒ Track rehabilitation and construction
- ☒ Major interlockings
- ☐ Station(s)
- ☒ Communication, signaling, and control
- ☐ Rolling stock refurbishments
- ☐ Rolling stock acquisition
- ☐ Support facilities (yards, shops, administrative buildings)
- ☐ Grade crossing improvements
- ☐ Electric traction
- ☐ Other (please describe)

[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., 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 (e.g., 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).

(10) Indicate if any FD or Construction activities that are part of this proposed project are under way or completed. Check all that apply.

☐ Final Design activities are complete.
☒ Final Design activities are in progress.
☐ No Final Design activities are in progress or completed.

☐ Construction activities are complete.
☐ Construction activities are in progress.
☒ No Construction activities are in progress or completed.

Describe any activities that are under way or completed in the table below. If more space is necessary, please provide the same information 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*)
Project drawings were developed by a consultant hired by TRRA.	Evaluation of track improvements.	☒	*04/2009*	*04/2009*
Project Estimate	Evaluation of costs.	☒	*04/2009*	*04/2009*
Capacity Improvement Analysis-RTC Simulation results	Evaluation of benefits of track efficiency.for both Amtrak and freight trains.	☒	*07/2010*	*07/2010*
Categorical Exclusion Worksheet	NEPA Evaluation	☒	*07/2010*	*07/2010*
SHPO Clearance	Evaluation of historical impacts	☒	*07/2010*	*07/2010*

D. Project Success Factors Overview

Answer the following questions about the individual project that is the subject of this FD/Construction application.

(1) Indicate the expected service outcomes of the FD/Construction project. Check all that apply.

- ☐ Additional service frequencies
- ☒ Service quality improvements
- ☒ Increased average speeds/shorter trip times
- ☒ Improved operational reliability on existing route
- ☒ Improved on-time performance on existing route
- ☐ Other (please describe)

Briefly clarify your response(s) if needed:

These improvements will benefit the fluidity of all trains through this congested corridor. They will increase reliability of Amtrak trains in reaching the station. By removing freight trains from the crowded track 55, it will remove many of the current delays that occur as passengers finally reach the St. Louis station after their 5 hour, 40 minute trip from Kansas City, which can be frustrating to sit and wait within sight of the station. It will also help decrease the short by distance, but long in delays at many times, trip from Kirkwood to St. Louis. This is a trip many people take as a short trip for their first time in evaluating intercity passenger rail service. This will improve the overall functioning of the line and make a much better presentation for the passengers in that this highly busy train traffic area will become a much easier link for Amtrak to make it through and on-time.

(2) Quantify the applicable service outcomes of the FD/Construction project. Provide the current conditions and anticipated service outcomes. Future state information is necessary only for relevant service benefits.

	Frequencies[2]	**Scheduled Trip Time** (in minutes)	**Average Speed** (mph)	**Top Speed** (mph)	**Reliability –** Provide Either On-Time Performance Percentage or Delay Minutes
Current	4	540	49	79	80%
Future	4	540	55	79	85%

(3) Select and describe the operational independence of the FD/Construction project.[3]

☒ This project is operationally independent. ☐ This project is not operationally independent.

Briefly clarify your response:

Hub. This project will provide a benefit to passenger rail even if no other projects are constructed.

(4) Provide Right-of-Way ownership information in the FD/Construction project area. Where railroads currently share ownership, identify the primary owner. If Amtrak is the Type of Railroad, the Right-of-Way Owner field does not need to be completed. Click on the prepopulated fields to select the appropriate response from the lists of railroad types and status of agreements. If more than five owners please provide the same information 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 Agreements to Implement**
Other/Special Situations	Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis - see Section F(1) of this application for ownership history.	2	4	Preliminary Executed Agreement/MOU

(5) 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 prepopulated field to select the appropriate response from the status of agreement list.

Name of Rail Service Operator	**Status of Agreement**
Amtrak	Final executed agreement on project scope/outcomes

[2] Frequency is measured in daily one-way train operations. One daily round-trip operation should be counted as two daily one-way train operations.

[3] A project is considered to have operational independence if, upon being implemented, it will provide tangible and measurable benefits, even if no additional investments in the same service are made.

(6) Identify the types of services affected by the FD/Construction project and provide information about the existing rail services within the project boundaries (e.g., freight, commuter, and intercity passenger). Click on the prepopulated fields to select the appropriate response from the list of types of service.

Type of Service	Name of Operator	Top Existing Speeds Within Project Boundaries		Number of Route-Miles Within Project Boundaries	Average Number of Daily One-Way Train Operations[4] Within Project Boundaries	Notes
		Passenger	Freight			
Freight	Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis	0	30	4	2	This only includes the Amtrak state supported Missouri route—other passenger trains may use this area occasionally for turnarounds, storage, etc.
Freight	Union Pacific Railroad	0	30	4	46	Numbers may be higher depending on seasonal traffic, other Class I's may occasionally use corridor.
Freight	BNSF	0	30	0	10	Numbers may be higher depending on seasonal traffic, other Class I's may occasionally use corridor.
Intercity Pa	Amtrak	30	0	0	6	8 additional trains to/from Chicago, IL also enter and depart east end of project boundary into the STL Gateway Station

(7) Estimate the share of benefits that will be realized by nonintercity passenger rail services (e.g., commuter, freight) and select the approximate cost share to be paid by the beneficiary.[5] Click on the prepopulated fields to select the appropriate response from the lists of type of beneficiary, anticipated share of benefits, and approximate cost share. If more than five types of nonintercity 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 Nonintercity Passenger Rail	Expected Share of Benefits	Approximate Cost Share
Freight	Greater than 50%	0-24%

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

[5] Benefits include service improvements such as increased speed, on-time performance, improved reliability, and other service quality improvements.

E. Additional Response to Evaluation Criteria

Provide a separate response to each of the following categories of potential benefits to identify the ways in which the proposed FD/Construction project will achieve these benefits.

(1a) Transportation Benefits

Describe the ways in which the proposed FD/Construction project will address the potential of successfully executing these transportation benefits in a cost-effective manner:

- Supporting the development of intercity high-speed rail service;
- Generating improvements to existing high-speed and intercity passenger rail service, as reflected by estimated increases in ridership (as measured in passenger-miles), increases in operational reliability (as measured in reductions in delays), 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, including integration with existing intercity passenger rail services, allowance for and support of future network expansion, and promotion of technical interoperability and standardization (including standardizing operations, equipment, and signaling);
- Encouragement of intermodal connectivity and integration through provision of direct, efficient transfers among intercity transportation and local transit networks at train stations, including connections at airports, bus terminals, subway stations, ferry ports, and other modes of transportation;
- Enhancing intercity travel options;
- 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 in the project's financing, including, but not limited to, consideration of donated property interests or services; financial contributions by freight and commuter rail carriers commensurate with the benefit expected to their operations; and financial commitments from host railroads, non-Federal governmental entities, nongovernmental entities, and others;
- 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.

There are many transportation benefits associated with this project, as the corridor is already a designated high-speed rail corridor (see attached U.S. map). The *Missouri River Runner* Amtrak service has four trains per day that connect to large metropolitan areas. In St. Louis, there are connections to five Amtrak trains to Chicago, one to San Antonio and one Amtrak bus connector to Carbondale, Illinois. These connections are based in the recently expanded St. Louis Gateway Center, which makes it possible to house all services in one building. Also at the center are several intercity bus services, city bus service and MetroLink light rail system, which connects to the airport and many other areas of St. Louis metro region.

Passenger numbers are currently increasing on the *Missouri River Runner* route. These numbers increased 10 percent from fiscal year 2008 to fiscal year 2009 and by nearly again the same number to fiscal year 2010. They are also expected to significantly increase with a reliable on-time performance, something that has been sought for many years. There is no commuter rail service on the line. There is also potential for growth on the line in passenger service as both the MWRRI and a 1996 MOU between MoDOT and the UP (see attached) show that at least three further slots have been preserved for this line, which could bring the *Missouri River Runner* to five round trips per day.

In addition, since the improvement is in a yard area, it will help implement positive train control. It will also upgrade the area that would be needed to explore future service between St. Louis and Springfield, Missouri. More capacity may also be used for storage or other uses for the Chicago trains, which are expected to move from five frequencies a

day to eight when fully implemented.

See the attached findings from the UP Capacity Improvement Analysis Study using the RTC simulation results analysis dated August 2, 2010, on specific improvements to on-time performance expected as a result of this project. They show even factoring in a 23 percent growth in UP freight and a 25 percent growth in other freight that the project will lead to at least a 6 percent decrease in delays for freight. The study demonstrates that this project would also result in at least a 2 percent decrease in Amtrak delays. This project will effectively reduce the overall travel time for passengers and increase ridership.

Additional safety benefits will be realized due to less blocked crossings in areas far away from the site and less stoppage of Amtrak trains near the station in which people on the platform may attempt to reach the train. Another benefit is the timely interaction with all of the Chicago bound trains that if trains need to be switched out for performance issues, it can be accomplished in a timelier and efficient manner with this added capacity than can be accomplished now. The increased rail capacity will further open options for both Amtrak and freight trains.

Positive Train Control (PTC) refers to technology that will eventually be used on this line that is capable of preventing train-to-train collisions, over speed derailments and casualties or injuries to roadway workers. It is a process by which the train can detect speed reductions and the train will automatically slow down or come to a complete stop if the engineer does not respond in a timely manner. The proposed upgrades listed in this grant application will allow for the upgrades of signalized circuitry on these projects and a smoother transition from the standardized signal systems to the new circuitry that is compatible with positive train control equipment. Therefore, such upgrades will encourage the railroads to take a more immediate role in implementing PTC on the corridor, permitting freight and passenger trains to interact within a safer environment, especially in congested areas such as St. Louis.

Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis is contributing 20 percent of the costs for the project improvements. This is the first project that MoDOT is doing in cooperation with the Terminal Railroad, and the TRRA has been an effective and interested partner in immediately committing from its funds the required monies. The final parts of the line run on terminal railroads in both St. Louis and Kansas City, so the better relationship there is with the terminals; the better the line will run and the more effective the Amtrak trains will be at getting through on time. The RTC modeling completed on this project also shows a positive effect on the St. Louis to Chicago trains. The first project with a terminal railroad in Missouri, when completed successfully and begins to show operational benefits, will positively affect the health of future projects and how they are implemented, and will provide a major "how-to" guide and pathway to future projects benefitting not only Missouri's projects, but the Illinois trains that terminate in St. Louis and the proposed future Kansas trains that will terminate in Kansas City.

(1b) Other Public Benefits

Demonstrate the potential of the proposed project to achieve other public benefits in a cost-effective manner:

- Environmental quality and energy efficiency and reduction in dependence on foreign oil, including 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;
- Promoting interconnected livable communities, including complementing local or state efforts to concentrate higher-density, mixed-use, development in areas proximate to multi-modal transportation options (including intercity passenger rail stations);
- Improving historic transportation facilities; and
- Creating jobs and stimulating the economy. Although this solicitation is not funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-5), these goals remain a top priority of this Administration. Therefore, Individual Project applications will be evaluated on the extent to which the project is expected to quickly create and preserve jobs and stimulate rapid increases in economic activity, particularly jobs and activity that benefit economically distressed areas, as defined by section 301 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3161) ("Economically Distressed Areas").

The main project goal is to dramatically decrease overall wait times for both passenger and freight trains traveling on this section of line owned by Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis. By reducing the wait times for trains traveling in and out of the St. Louis metro area, the amount of wasted fuel by necessary engine idling will also

decrease. Based on the reduction in idling, emission reductions for the criteria pollutants of NOx, CO and PM were calculated. As a diesel engine also emits CO2, reducing idling will also cut CO2 emissions. However, at this time, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has not released a guidance document on how to calculate CO2 emissions and reductions for diesel train engines.

Reducing the emissions of NOx, CO and PM will also result in environmental benefits to the surrounding area. This project is located in part of the St. Louis ozone and annual PM nonattainment areas. Any actions that reduce the emissions of PM and NOx will help improve air quality in a region already deemed by the EPA to have unhealthy levels of pollutants. NOx is a major constituent of diesel emissions and is one of the two pollutants that combine to form ozone. Ozone is another criteria pollutant that has a well-documented negative impact on the environment, specifically vegetated and human health.

Diesel exhaust is high in various types of PM, some of which are classified as hazardous air pollutants (considered to be hazardous to human health). The health impacts of fine particulates are well documented and include decreased lung function, aggravation of asthma, irregular heartbeat and premature mortality in those who suffer from cardiac and lung disease. In addition to reducing the impact of the facility's emissions on the overall region's air quality, localized impact on all aspects of the environment including wildlife, nearby citizens and vegetation will be reduced.

Emission reduction calculations were performed for NOx, CO and PM to assess the environmental benefits of the TRRA Grand Avenue track improvements. Using a modeled delay reduction for both Amtrak and Union Pacific trains, average fuel use per engine at idle, and EPA emission factors relating pollutant mass emissions to each gallon of fuel consumed, emission reductions were estimated. Emissions of NOx are estimated to decrease by 52.98 pounds per year after completion of the track improvements. CO emissions will decrease by 8.42 pounds per year, and PM emissions will decrease by 1.84 pounds per year.

These emissions estimates were only calculated for emission reductions in the Terminal Railroad yard. If trains are currently held on the lines due to congestion within the yard, this information is recorded as line delays, these reductions in idling were not included in the fuel and emission reduction calculations.

Rail travel consumes less energy per passenger mile than car or air travel. By diverting 10 percent of the freight moved on highways to rail, the nation could save as much as one billion gallons of fuel annually. Amtrak is committed to a 6 percent reduction in carbon dioxide emissions by voluntary committing to meet greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.

Please reference the additional analysis report on environmental impacts specific to this project, which is attached.

In addition, one of the goals of the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail 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. There is no intercity bus service on the same parameters as the Amtrak service (see attached map), so there obviously is a need for the service.

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 the trains in response to passengers' desiring to take bikes along for trail rides. One of the easiest and most-well liked "day trips" from St. Louis is to Washington, Missouri, for winery and historic tours, in addition to eating out. Washington, at MP54, can easily be given as an example of a place where formerly a car was used for a day trip that can now be used as a train trip.

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 interconnect ability 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.

This Terminal Railroad project will also increase the ability to sort freight and passenger trains in and out of the St. Louis area. Project construction is located in the economically distressed area of St. Louis, which will increase jobs in the construction industry. Total project investment is $4.5 million and is estimated to create seven jobs in the construction phase and one job in the operations phase on average annually. As materials are made, bought and consumed for this project, a need for additional resources will occur that will provide opportunities for U.S. manufacturing firms to increase their production of these items. The sources of supply for these items and the procurement contracts covering their acquisition and installation will include "Buy America" provisions and requirements, which will help support the U.S. industry as a whole.

Statewide Impact of Terminal RR Improvements Project as of 7/2010:

During the next seven years, every dollar of project investment returns (benefit-cost ratio):
0.05 : 1.00 in new net general revenues totaling $0.211 million,
1.20 : 1.00 in new personal income totaling $ 5.020 million,
1.98 : 1.00 in new value-added (GSP) totaling $8.313 million, and
3.09 : 1.00 in new economic activity (output) totaling $12.983 million.

On average each year, the project creates:
7 new jobs annually paying an average wage of $68,359 per job,
$ 0.02 million in new net general revenues annually,
$ 0.50 million in new personal income annually, and
$0.83 million in new value-added to the economy annually, and $ 1.298 million annually in new economic activity.

(See attached 2010 MERIC report.)

(2) Project Delivery Approach

Consider the following factors to determine the risk associated with the proposed project's delivery within budget, on time, and as designed:

- The adequacy of any completed engineering work to assess and manage/mitigate the proposed project's engineering and constructability risks;
- The sufficiency of system safety and security planning; and
- The project's progress, at the time of application, towards compliance with environmental review requirements under NEPA and related statutes.

The factors that were considered include the experience of the Terminal Railroad in completing former construction tasks, of which it has a good history, and also the fact that the Terminal Railroad is governed and has the backing of five major Class I railroads in its daily operations. The Terminal Railroad is well-suited to continue its reputation as an even-handed and solver of bottleneck train problems in the St. Louis area. The work completed so far includes estimates and descriptions of work needed from site preparation to utilities. It also includes many areas of signal work necessary for intergrated train operations and shows the background work that has been done to keep the project from adversely affecting any current train traffic.

Safety and system security planning is a priority for TRRA and remains so in this project. The TRRA has a safety record that is extremely thorough. Safety is also always a top priority for any MODOT project. The synopsis of the process used by agencies similar to TRRA and in which MODOT oversees in other areas to ensure that planned and scheduled internal safety reviews are performed to evaluate compliance with all safety protocols for all track improvement projects, and would be required to be used on this project, includes: (i) identification of functions subject to review; (ii) responsibility for scheduling reviews; (iii) process for conducting reviews, including the development of checklists and procedures and issuing of findings; (iv) review of reporting requirements; (v) tracking the status of implemented recommendations; and (vi) coordination with the Grantee Agency (MODOT) and the Grantor Agency (FRA). The TRRA's internal incident plan is attached. Amtrak also has its own system safety plan and the Class I Railroads that support TRRA also have their own plans. A further description of the measures, controls and assurances in place to ensure that safety principles, requirements and representatives are included in the process will be developed in conjunction with MODOT's final signing of the grant agreement for this project.

NEPA requirements have always been of critical importance to MODOT in the relaying of its projects from the design stage to the construction stage. The NEPA requirements for this project are currently on schedule to be resolved by a categorical exclusion document that fulfills all FRA requirements. The ending portion of the document states that no property acquisition is necessary and no water effects have been documented. Additionally, no historic properties will be impacted. The relative disturbance of the environment, as they relate to other projects, is minimal in that the area to be improved has already had railroad track either on or contiguous to the same places this project will be constructed on and will minimize the consequences.

(3) Sustainability of Benefits

Address the likelihood of realizing the proposed project's benefits:

- The quality of financial planning documentation that demonstrates 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 for the benefiting intercity passenger rail service(s);
- The quality and adequacy of project identification and planning;
- The reasonableness of estimates for user and non-user benefits for the project;
- The comprehensiveness and sufficiency, at the time of application, of agreements with key partners (including the railroad operating the intercity passenger rail service and infrastructure-owning railroads) that will be involved in the operation of the benefiting intercity passenger rail service, including the commitment of any affected host-rail carrier to ensure the realization of the anticipated benefits, preferably through a commitment by the affected host-rail carrier(s) to an enforceable on-time performance of passenger trains of 80 percent or greater;
- The favorability of the comparison between the level of anticipated benefits and the amount of Federal funding requested; and
- The applicant's contribution of a cost share greater than the required minimum of 20 percent.

The HSIPR project that will benefit from this planning is the *Missouri River Runner* Amtrak service, which has been in existence for 31 years and continues to thrive. Recent increases in on-time performance and in passenger increases in numbers have made it a route with a great future. Although it is funded by the state's general revenue and like every other state, Missouri has had an extremely tight budget the last few years, there is no reason to expect that the service will not continue, especially as other projects to improve on-time service come on line and further support its funding.

The list of projects identified for this project were essentially the same as are being used with some exceptions from the University of Missouri study in 2007. All of these projects present a comprehensive and complete overview of the entire line and the needs along the line. This project is in a small area that was specifically identified in the 2007 study as the area between "XGA" (Grand Avenue, a control point for UP) and the St. Louis station as being an area of needed improvements that when totalled equal 4.5 percent of all delays on the line, so the spirit and intent of the project is well within the guidelines of the study. The study has garnered great attention and continues to do so, and as the projects in the study are funded, it creates even greater support and continuing emphasis on all projects in the study being funded.

Estimates for users vary, but in light of the fact that Track 55 will be supported and used by Amtrak trains on track now used mostly or in nearly all cases exclusively for Amtrak, this will create an excellent service method for trains to use in order to quickly access the station. It is estimated that a substantial portion of the freight trains now using Track 55 will be diverted to other tracks at the times the Amtrak trains are in the station.

The TRRA is commited by its MOU and also by one of its parent companies, the UP, to the succcess of this project. The TRRA maintains that this project will not only improve Amtrak on-time performance, but it will also remove freight trains from Track 55 and move them onto the new track, thereby making the solution for all parties better and more comprehensive. Not only is the TRRA committed to at least an 85 percent on-time performance on its own portion of the track overwhich Amtrak runs, but the cooperation and support of its UP parent company, with its own history of an MOU with MODOT, to accomplish the same goals on their portions of the track, will contribute to a synthesis of both parties so that the on-time performance hopefully is realized over 95 percent of the route. The overall OTP for the entire route including both UP and TRRA lines was 92 percent. The amounts requested are 80 percent federal, and the TRRA funding is at 20 percent.

These amounts are commensurate with the overall benefits in stated in the RTC modeling in that the Amtrak benefits will be immediately apparent when in place. The freight benefits will, over a number of years and along with future projects for both the Missouri and the Illinois services for passenger trains, show how the additional capacity provided helps remove freight trains from former bottlenecks and puts them on a track to success with fewer problems in accessing

stations. As the frequencies on both the Illinois and the Missouri services may be expected to increase in the future, the types of access and infrastructure improvements sought, such as the existing project, will be clearly the type of projects with the most delivery at the least cost.

F. Statement of Work

Provide a detailed response for how the FD/Construction project will be carried out in the text fields and tables provided. The tables in this section are unlocked; applicants can add rows, as necessary, for additional tasks. If you reference a supporting document, it must be listed in Section G.2.

(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 rational planning process used to analyze the investment needs and service objectives of the full corridor on which the individual FD/Construction project is located.

Since 1889, the Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis has played a vital role in the railroad operations and growth of the St. Louis metropolitan area. The association was originally created to satisfy the need for an efficient, safe and economical method of interchanging rail traffic at the railroad hub of St. Louis, Missouri, and over 120 years later continues to make the same commitment. The company's present-day owners are the Union Pacific Railroad, BNSF Railway, CSX Transportation, Canadian National Railroad and Norfolk Southern Corporation. The proposed project is within a 2-mile section of the old Mill Creek Valley in downtown St. Louis from Grand Avene to Gratiot Street. This area was once full with tracks and support facilities for hundreds of freight trains and passenger trains that passed through St. Louis and Union Station. Even today, it is one of the busiest rail corridors in the metropolitan St. Louis area. In 2009, there was an average of 64 trains per day with an average 75 cars per train that passed through the TRRA control point at Gratiot Street, which is the eastern entrance to the Gateway Intermodal Station.

Today, there are four east-west mainline tracks between the control points of Grand Avenue (TRRA MP 0.00) and Gratiot Street (TRRA MP 2.00). Track 55 and Track 56 are the two mainlines owned and operated by TRRA. The west entrance to the Amtrak St. Louis Gateway Station is accessed by a power-operated switch at the control point of 23rd Street (MP 1.06) on Track 55. The east entrance to the Amtrak Station is also on Track 55 and is accessed by a power-operated switch at MP 1.77 inside the control point of Gratiot Street (MP 2.00). UP #1 and UP #2 are the two mainlines owned and operated by the Union Pacific Railroad. The west entrance to the UP 12th Street yard is accessed by an electric lock switch on UP #1 track near Ohio Street (UP MP 1.05). The east entrance to the UP 12th Street yard is also on UP #1 track and accessed by an electric lock switch near 12th Street (UP MP 0.00). There is also a west entrance to the UP 12th Street yard on the TRRA side called the New Lead.

Because the Amtrak St. Louis Gateway Station and UP 12th Street yard are accessed by two of the four mainlines between Grand Avenue and Gratiot Street, the use of these two main tracks for through trains is reduced. Eastbound and westbound Amtrak trains are arriving and departing throughout the day and night. Amtrak also comes out of Gateway Station every day to turn some trains around, east of Gratiot, using two adjacent control points, Poplar Street and Poplar South. Union Pacific runs trains in and out of their 12th Street yard around the clock.

The overall purpose of this project is to promote corridor fluidity and efficiency by making it easy for both Amtrak and freight trains to pass each other at this congested location. Through-train velocity will be improved by allowing the UP, BNSF and TRRA a long track to run through or temporarily hold trains, thereby reducing delays to Amtrak trains due to cross traffic and train-ahead problems. Use of the new third main line will also improve public safety by reducing potential train blockage of highway grade crossings west of Grand Avenue on the UP and BNSF mainlines. This will also allow Track 55 to be used primarily for Amtrak train access to the Gateway Station, which will further improve on-time performance and will reduce the factor of people being stuck on the train within sight of the station but not being able to approach the station immediately because of congestion.

(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.

This project includes track and signal improvements on the Terminal Railroad route located in downtown St. Louis, Missouri. The work includes construction of a new 10,000-foot third main track connecting to the existing control points of Grand Avenue (TRRA MP 0.00) and Gratiot Street (TRRA MP 2.00).

MoDOT will perform all tasks required for the project through a coordinated process with the railroad owner (Terminal

Railroad Association of St. Louis), the operator (Amtrak) and the FRA. Natalie Roark is the MoDOT High-Speed Rail Project Manager responsible for facilitating the coordination of all activities between Terminal Railroad, MoDOT, and the FRA for implementation of the high-speed rail projects through completion of construction. This also includes facilitating the completion of all stakeholder agreements and the final FRA grant agreement. Jonathan Carnes is the Terminal Railroad President responsible for facilitating the completion of the construction and grant agreements and all activities between Terminal Railroad, MoDOT and the FRA through completion of the project. The Amtrak point of contact is Michael Franke, Assistant Vice President of State and Commuter Partnerships.

The overall purpose of this project is to promote corridor fluidity and efficiency by making it easy for both Amtrak and freight trains to pass each other at this congested location.

(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.

The work includes construction of a new 10,000-foot third main track connecting to the existing control points of Grand Avenue (TRRA MP 0.00) and Gratiot Street (TRRA MP 2.00). The west end of the proposed new track will tie into the end of Track 56 with a new #15 power-operated switch. The east end of the new track will tie into the New Lead at 12th Street, and two existing hand-throw switches on the New Lead will be removed and replaced with two new #12 power-operated switches to be realigned to the UP 12th Street yard. Associated new interlocking signals will be added at Grand Avenue and Gratiot Street for the new track, and intermediate block signals will be installed near 23rd Street.

The proposed third main track, to be built on 15-foot track centers from the existing Track 56, will provide an additional 9,000 feet of clear, unrestricted track between Grand Avenue and Gratiot Street to help keep trains moving through this busy rail corridor in downtown St. Louis. The current TRRA mainlines have only 13-foot track centers that restrict passage of two trains with any excessive-width dimensional loaded cars, such as transformers, military equipment and steel plates. Trains with these dimensional loads will be able to use the new third main without any restrictions. This will also allow Track 55 to be used primarily for Amtrak trains, which will in turn create better access to the Gateway Transportation Center.

This new third main track will benefit the current Amtrak *Missouri River Runner* trains between Kansas City and St. Louis (two trains in, two trains out) on the UP Jefferson City Subdivision, as well as the Amtrak *Texas Eagle* train coming from the UP Desoto Subdivision (one in, one out). The proposed new third main will improve through-train velocity in St. Louis by allowing the UP, BNSF and TRRA a long track to run through or temporarily hold trains, thereby reducing delays to Amtrak trains due to cross traffic and train ahead. Use of the new third main will also improve public safety by reducing potential train blockage of highway grade crossings west of Grand Avenue on the UP and BNSF mainlines.

The improved fluidity of train traffic to be realized by the construction of the proposed new third main track will also benefit the 10 daily Amtrak moves (five trains in, five trains out) between St. Louis and Chicago that are paid for by the state of Illinois. These benefits will be even more important in the future with the expectation of additional Amtrak trains on both Illinois and Missouri routes, the return of freight traffic to pre-recession levels and the capability to better accommodate future growth, as well as, seasonal and economic surges in traffic volumes.

MoDOT will perform all tasks required for the project through a coordinated process with the railroad owner (Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis), the operator (Amtrak) and the FRA. The Terminal Railroad, in coordination with subordinates and MODOT, will perform final design (100 percent design) of the track and signal improvements. The new third line track will be located at the existing location of a former track, so no new right of way acquisition is necessary. Final Engineering Drawings will be furnished to the FRA after the final design check is complete. In addition, route and aspect charts depicting the proposed signal configuration for the project and adjacent blocks will also be provided.

Terminal Railroad will perform all necessary track and signal work. Items of Work include the following.

- Property, Utilities and Permitting
- Site Preparation, Construction and Roadbed
- Drainage, Structure/Bridges
- Track Work
- Track Engineering/Geotechnical/Supervision
- Signal Work - Gratiot/12th Street

- Signal Work - 23rd Street
- Signal Work - Grand Avenue

The project will take approximately 24 months, beginning in March 2011 or as soon as the grant agreement is executed.

Upon award of the project, MoDOT will monitor and evaluate the project's progress through the administration of regular progress meetings scheduled throughout the project duration. Topics of discussion may include: review of construction activities, field observations, identification of problems incurred and decisions/fixes for those problems, identification of potential future problems that could impede progress and proposed corrective measures to regain projected schedule, review of project schedule and progress, and review of billing invoices. There will be continued communication by all parties involved.

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

	Deliverable	Task
1	Project drawings and an estimate	Evaluation of track improvements.
2	Capacity Improvement Analysis-RTC Simulation	Evaluate benefits of track efficiency.
3	Track Design Drawings	Design details of track work.
4	Categorical Exclusion Worksheet	NEPA Evaluation

(3) Project Schedule. In the table below, estimate the approximate duration for completing each task in months (e.g., 36). For total project duration, reference Section C.4.

	Task	Task Duration
1	FD/Engineering	6
2	Construction	18
	Total project duration	24

(4) Project Cost Estimate/Budget. Provide a high-level cost summary of FD/Construction work in this section, using Appendix 3 of the NOFA and the HSIPR Individual Project Budget and Schedule form 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 in Section C of this application. 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 this application, the lesser amount will be considered as the Federal funding request. Round to the nearest whole dollar when estimating costs.

The total estimated FD/Construction project cost 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 FD/Construction project shall be borne by the Grantee.

FD/Construction Project Overall Cost Summary		
#	Task	Cost in FY11 Dollars
1	FD/Engineering	$ 462,000
2	Construction	$ 4,048,800
	Total FD/Construction project cost	$ 4,510,800

Federal/Non-Federal Funding			
		Cost in FY11 Dollars	Percentage of Total Activities Cost
	Federal funding request	$ 3,608,700	80 %
	Non-Federal match amount	$ 902,200	20 %
	Total FD/Construction project cost	$ 4,510,800	100 %

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 you are addressing (e.g., Section E, Question 3). Completing this question is optional.

n/a

(2) Please provide a document title, filename, and description for all optional supporting documents. Ensure that these documents are uploaded to GrantSolutions.gov using a logical naming convention or that an active link is provided with your application.

Document Title	Filename	Description and Purpose
Project Drawings	Plans of Proposed Track.pdf	Provides layout and general description of project.
Project Estimate	Third Main Track Estimate 072810.pdf	Identifies itemized costs of project.
Capacity Improvement Analyis – RTC Simulation	Capacity Improvement Simulation Analysis with RTC Modeling.pdf	Evaluates impact to all passenger and freight trains in area.
Support letter from East West Gateway, a Metropolitan Planning Organization	East West Gateway Letter of Support-TRRA project.pdf	Demonstrates support of local planning organization.
Support letter from City of St. Louis	City of St. Louis.pdf	Demonstrates City's support for project.
SHPO Clearance	Terminal SHPO Clearance.docx	Evaluates historical impacts.
Categorical Exclusion Worksheet	CE Worksheet TRRA.doc	Evaluates environmental impacts.
MOU between MHTC and Terminal Railroad	MOU withTerminal_08_02_10_revised.doc	Demonstrates support of project by both parties.
System Safety Plan	Internal_Incident_Plan.pdf	Demonstrates safety measures of TRRA.
Topographical map	Terminal RR Topo Map with Intro Letter.pdf	Demonstrates location of existing track.
Introductory letter from MoDOT Interim Director	1Intro LETTER signed by KKeith.pdf	Cover letter for the HSIPR projects signed by MoDOT Interim Director
Project Overview	2Project Overview.pdf	Introduction to HSIPR projects for 2010
HSIPR Projects Division of Costs	3HSIPR RAIL PROJECTS DIVISION OF COSTS July 2010.pdf	HSIPR Projects Division of Costs
Project Map and Partner Signature Map	4Project Map and Partner Signature Map.pdf	Detailed project map and same map with signatures of support
Governor's MOU	5Multi-StateGovernorsMOUSigned.pdf	Signed copy of Multi-State Governors' MOU
States for Passenger Rail High Speed Rail Corridors	6US Federally Designated High Speed Rail Corridor Map.pdf	US Federally Designated High Speed Rail Corridor Map
Letters of Support	7Complete Letters of Support-reduced.pdf	Letters of Support
Rail Capacity Analysis I & II	8Rail Capacity Analysis Reports I and II.pdf	Rail Capacity Analysis Reports I and II
2009 MERIC Analysis Report	9MERIC HSIPR Statewide and Longterm Impacts 2009.pdf	HSIPR Statewide and Longterm Impacts 2009 study prepared by MERIC
2010 MERIC Analysis Report	10MERIC HSIPR Economic Impacts of Terminal RR.pdf	HSIPR Economic Impacts of Terminal RR study prepared by MERIC
MO Passenger Rail Schedule	11MO Passenger Rail Schedule.pdf	Missouri Passenger Rail Schedule
MO Intercity Bus Stops	12Intercity Bus Stops.pdf	Missouri Intercity Bus Stops
STIP 2011-2015 and East West Gateway	13STIP 2011-2015 plus East West	HSIPR Projects on MoDOT's 2011-2015

Support Letter	Gateway Support Letter.pdf	STIP to include support letter from East West Gateway
Amtrak-MoDOT MOU	14Amtrak-MoDOT MOU.pdf	Amtrak-MoDOT MOU
Amtrak Operating Agreement	15Amtrak Operating Agreement.pdf	Amtrak Operating Agreement
UP-MoDOT MOU	16UP-MODOT MOU signed copy.pdf	UP-MoDOT MOU
Terminal-MoDOT MOU	17Terminal-MoDOT MOU.pdf	Terminal-MoDOT MOU
’96 Agreement	18-1996 agreement between MODOT and UP to preserve 3 more slots.pdf	1996 agreement between MODOT and UP to preserve 3 more slots
UP Track Layout	19UP Track Layout.pdf	UP Track Layout
Shell Spur Agreement	20Shell Spur Agreement.pdf	Shell Spur Agreement

H. Checklist of Application Materials

Use this section to determine the thoroughness of your FD/Construction application prior to submission.

Documents	Format
1. Application Form	
☒ HSIPR Individual Project Application Form – FD/Construction	Form
2. Budget and Schedule Form	
☒ HSIPR Individual Project Budget and Schedule Form	Form
3. OMB Standard Forms	
☒ SF 424: Application for Federal Assistance	Form
☒ SF 424A: Budget Information-Non Construction	Form *
☒ SF 424B: Assurances-Non Construction	Form *
☒ SF 424C: Budget Information-Construction	Form **
☒ SF 424D: Assurances-Construction	Form **
4. FRA Assurances Document	
☒ FRA Assurances Document (See Section 4.2.4 of the NOFA)	Form
5. Project Development Supporting Documentation	
☒ Project Planning Documentation (See Section 4.2.5 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
☒ Preliminary Engineering (PE) Documentation (See Section 4.2.5 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
☒ NEPA Documentation (See Section 4.2.5 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
6. Project Delivery Supporting Documentation	
☒ Project Management Documentation (See Section 4.2.6 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
☒ Financial Planning Documentation (See Section 4.2.6 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
☒ System Safety Plan (See Section 4.2.6 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
☒ Railroad and Project Sponsor Agreements (See Section 4.2.6 of the NOFA)	No Specified Format
7. Optional Supporting Documentation	
☒ Other Relevant and Available Documentation (See Section 4.2.7 of the NOFA)	n/a

* These documents are required for FD/Construction projects that include investments that are not construction activities.
** These documents are not required for FD/Construction applications that only include investments that are not construction activities.

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**.