

RAIL

MOVING AMERICA FORWARD



Corridor Identification and Development (CID) Program: Policy and Programmatic Updates

Presenters: Wynne Davis, Santiago Cruz-Rovéda, Lyle Leitelt, Barbara Moreno

Panelists



Wynne Davis
Deputy Director,
Office of Regional Outreach
and Project Delivery



**Dr. Santiago Cruz-
Roveda**
Supervisor,
Office of Regional
Outreach and Project
Delivery



Lyle Leitelt
Division Chief for
Project Planning,
Office of Planning and
Engineering



Barbara Moreno
Sponsor Outreach
Specialist,
Office of Regional
Outreach and
Project Delivery

Agenda



1

Program Overview

2

Current Status and Best Practices

3

Service Development Plan Overview

4

Policy Updates

5

Next Steps

6


Q&A

Corridor ID Program Overview

Why Is Corridor ID Important?



Partnership with corridor sponsors to develop a strategic plan for improving / expanding passenger rail in America



Corridor ID provides **sustained support** of selected corridors through the Planning and Project Development Stages




Projects on the **Project Pipeline** fully developed through the CID Program will benefit from **priority selection** under Federal-State Partnership National program




Pipeline of projects that show the **untapped potential investment**— we can show how continued investment in passenger rail will result in tangible benefits nation-wide

Corridor ID Program Overview


Corridor ID creates a foundational framework for identifying and developing new or improved intercity passenger rail (IPR) services. Under the program, FRA is:



FRA Project Lifecycle Stages—Corresponding FRA Funding Programs




Corridor ID Program = Development Stages for Passenger Rail Programs



Each step will have a separate grant agreement

For more information on the funding levels and activities for each step you can refer to the CID Webinars located : <https://railroads.dot.gov/webinars>

Corridor ID Timeline



Corridor ID Timeline

05

December 2023
Selections under **Corridor ID**
and **Fed-State Partnership**
National announced

06

February 2024
2nd **Congressional report** on
the Project Pipeline due one
year following Program
establishment

07

December 2023 – Current
Selected corridors move into
Steps 1 & 2
(55 Step 1 obligations;
One (1) Step 2 obligation)

Overview of Selections



CID Funding Availability and Allocation

*FRA is authorized to use up to 5% of FSP. Appropriation for FSP is \$36 billion, which allows for up to **\$1.8 billion** ($\$36 \text{ billion} \times 5\% = \1.8 billion) (plus annual appropriations)*

Step 1 and Step 2 Funding Allocation

- FRA will allocate up to \$800 million for Steps 1 and 2 for Corridors already selected and will reserve funding for Corridors selected under future funding notices (Next NOFO planned for 2025).
- FRA will also use the \$800 million for the development and refinement of intercity passenger rail systems planning analytical tools and models.

Step 3 Funding Allocation


- FRA will reserve the remaining up to \$1 billion for Corridors advancing into Step 3.
- Selections organized into four categories: new high-speed rail; new conventional rail; extensions to existing service; improvements to existing service.
- For Corridors advancing into Step 3, FRA will allocate Step 3 funding between the four categories—no single type will receive all Step 3 funding.
- Allocation is at the sole discretion of FRA and may change depending on how corridors progress through the program and will be updated based on future appropriations.

CID Funding Availability and Allocation

*FRA is authorized to use up to 5% of FSP. Appropriation for FSP is \$36 billion, which allows for up to **\$1.8 billion** (\$36 billion x 5% = \$1.8 billion) (plus annual appropriations)*

Step 1 and Step 2 Funding Allocation

- For Corridors already selected; includes funding reserved for Corridors selected under future funding notices (*next NOFO planned for 2025*).
- For the development and refinement of intercity passenger rail systems planning analytical tools and models.



Step 3 Funding Allocation

- Four categories of selections:
 - New high-speed rail
 - New conventional rail
 - Extensions to existing service
 - Improvements to existing service
- Funding allocated evenly between the four categories
- Allocation is at the sole discretion of FRA; may change depending on how corridors progress through the program and depend on future appropriations.

Step 1 Status and Best Practices

CID Steps 1 + 2 Obligation Status as of July 29, 2024



58

Step 1 Obligations



8

Remaining Step 1 Obligations



1


Step 2 Obligation



3

Total Projects in Step 2

Step 1 Deliverables



Step 1 Project Management Plan

Dictates how the Sponsor will manage their Step 1 grant



Gap Analysis

Opportunity to highlight and review any previous planning work done on the corridor that could count towards the Service Development Plan (SDP)



Statement of Work

Detailed instructions on how the Sponsor will complete the Service Development Plan in Step 2



Schedule

Describes how long the Sponsor anticipates it will take to complete the Service Development Plan



Budget

Detailed break down on what roles and number of hours are required to complete the Service Development Plan

Step 1 PMP Best Practices

- Use the FRA template
- Make sure information provided aligns with the Step 1 Grant Agreement, and explain any differences
- Briefly detail team roles and responsibilities (including those of consultants)
- Highlight how you will manage risks around QA/QC, schedule, and budget

Subtask 1.2: Corridor ID Step 1 Project Management Plan (PMP)

Team Organization
The (Name of Recipient) will provide an Organizational Chart and contact information (name, email, and phone number) in the following table (add more rows as applicable) for the (Name of Corridor) Corridor team identifying:

- Project Partners (as applicable)
- Project Manager/Deputy Project Manager
- Contractors (as applicable)
- Governance of Step 1 (as applicable)
- Operator (as applicable)

Names on the organizational chart and the below table must match.

Name	Organization	Email	Phone Number

Team Roles and Responsibilities
Instructions: Along with the Organizational Chart and contact information for the team, please complete the following table (add more rows as appropriate) and indicate the roles and responsibilities of each team member listed in the organizational chart. Please make sure you answer: Who is responsible for ensuring the deliverables in the schedule are completed on time and within budget?

Name	Organization	Role	Responsibilities

Gap Analysis Checklist Best Practices

- Set up meeting with the FRA Planners to go over the project history and discuss scoping questions
- Complete the FRA Gap Analysis template
- Place all relevant documents in a Shared Drive and request from FRA all necessary parties that need access

		Sponsor	
Subtask	Subtask Component	Submitted Document Addressing the Component	Section Num Doc
Draft Purpose and Need Statement	[statutory] Description of how the corridor would contribute to the development of a multi-State regional network of intercity passenger rail		
Draft Purpose and Need Statement	[FRA] Does the purpose and need consider the broad market conditions that inform the corridor? [HRA] Analysis of the existing and projected characteristics of the transportation market to be served.		
Market Analysis	Typical analysis includes passenger travel volumes in the corridor by mode, current and future quality of transportation service and		
Railroad Stakeholder Engagement Plan	[FRA] Description of railroad stakeholder engagement activities related to planning and alternatives analysis processes		
SDP Agency Coordination Plan	[FRA] Description of key contacts within potential state, local, and federal agencies, and tribal governments		
SDP Agency Coordination Plan	[FRA] Description of previous agency or tribal coordination efforts		
Public Coordination Plan	[FRA] Description of key contacts within civic and business groups, public officials, non-federally recognized tribes, relevant interest groups, present and potential riders/users, private service providers/shippers, communities with environmental justice concerns, and the public		


Step 1 Scoping Questions Best Practices

- Scoping clarifies what the sponsor is intended to achieve under CIDP
- Objective is to understand the “delta” between the work that’s been completed and what the SDP is intended to address
- FRA Planners can provide questions upon request
- May require meetings with key stakeholders such as host railroads

- Questions focus on:
 1. Background
 2. Goals
 3. Stakeholders
 4. Current Efforts
 5. Potential Challenges
 6. Feasibility
 7. Financial Considerations

Statement of Work Best Practices


- Use the latest version
(currently v2, released March 2024)
- SOWs should align with the Gap Analysis results
- Acknowledgment and planning around overlapping corridors/ terminal areas
 - Identification of roles and responsibilities related to the geographic overlap
 - Concurrence on frequencies and initial schedules



[SDP SOW](#)

Contingency

- Statement of Work to include and allow for a contingency to account for potential unknowns and/or additional technical analysis
- Contingency amount is based on a percentage of the total SDP budget
- Contingency would still require 90/10 match
- Use of contingency requires FRA acceptance and approval



Schedule Best Practices

- Be in alignment with the needs and requirements detailed in the Statement of Work
- Reflect the potential iterative reviews of some analyses
- Allow for adequate FRA review
- Prioritize stakeholder coordination and the required time to complete it
- Factor in tasks that can be done at the same time

SDP Schedule Template

START DATE				YEAR ONE							
January 01, 2025				<-- Enter initial Start Date to populate Timeline dates.							
Enter each Task Start and End Date per Project, below. Project Dates and # of Days will calculate automatically.				Y1Q1		Y1Q2			Y1Q3		
PROJECT NAMES + TASK TITLES	START DATE	END DATE	# of Days	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mar 2025	Apr 2025	May 2025	Jun 2025	Jul 2025	Aug 2025
TASK 1: PROJECT ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT	01/00/00	01/00/00	0								
Subtask 1.1: Project Management			0								
Subtask 1.2: Step 2 Project Management Plan			0								
Subtask 1.3: Project Closeout			0								
TASK 2: DRAFT PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT & STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION	01/00/00	01/00/00	0								
Subtask 2.1: Draft Purpose and Need Statement			0								
Subtask 2.2: Market Analysis			0								
Subtask 2.3: Railroad Stakeholder Engagement			0								
Subtask 2.4: SDP Agency Coordination			0								


Budget Best Practices

- Be in alignment with the needs detailed in the Statement of Work and the timeframes set out in the schedule
- Break out costs by subtask
- Provide a breakout of labor hours for each subtask
- This will be the budget for your Step 2

TASK	Senior Project Manager	Project Manager	Outreach Specialist	Senior Planner
TASK 1: PROJECT ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT				
Subtask 1.1: Project Management				
Subtask 1.2: Step 2 Project Management Plan				
Subtask 1.3: Project Closeout				
TASK 2: DRAFT PURPOSE AND NEED STATEMENT & STAKEHOLDER COORDINATION				
Subtask 2.1: Draft Purpose and Need Statement				
Subtask 2.2: Market Analysis				
Subtask 2.3: Railroad Stakeholder Engagement				
Subtask 2.4: SDP Agency Coordination				
Subtask 2.5: Public Coordination Plan				
TASK 3: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS				
Subtask 3.1: Route Options Analysis				
Subtask 3.2: Service Options Analysis				
Subtask 3.3: Investment Package Options Analysis				
Subtask 3.4: Design Options Analysis				

CID Step 1 Deliverables Received as of July 29, 2024

44



Step 1 Project
Management Plan

15



Gap Analysis

3



Statement
of Work

3



Schedule


2



Budget

Service Development Plan Overview

Role of the Service Development Plan



Service Development Plans Answer Important Questions

Task 2: Draft Purpose & Need Stakeholder Coordination

What is the corridor and who does it serve?

What are the goals for new or improved service?

Who are the relevant stakeholders?

Task 3: Alternatives Analysis

What are the alternatives to achieve the goals?

Task 4: Transportation Planning

What alternatives make sense from a transportation perspective?

Task 5: Environmental Planning

What alternatives make sense from an environmental perspective?

Task 6: Financial Planning & Economic Evaluation

What are the improvements required for service, how much do they cost, and how do we pay for it?


Task 7: Governance

Who's in charge of which aspects of the program?



Task 8: Implementation Phasing

What order should improvements advance and be constructed?

Service Development Plan Draft SOW Framework



Iterative Tasks 3, 4 & 5



SDP Best Practices

- Advise sponsors not to engage in contractual agreements with corridor stakeholders (host railroad NDAs) prior to consultation with FRA
- Advise sponsors against the early release of information and to do so in consultation with FRA
- Set realistic expectations



Step 2 Policy Updates

Overlapping Corridors / Terminal Areas

Overlapping corridors will require **coordination** during the Corridor ID Program.


Step 1

- Identification of **roles and responsibilities** related to the geographic overlap
- Concurrence on **frequencies and initial schedules**


Step 2

- One sponsor conducts **technical analysis associated with the geographic overlap** and identifies implementation roles and responsibilities related to the geographic overlap
- **Information is shared** with other project sponsor as required for incorporation into shared aspect of other SDP


Shared Markets



Shared Segments



Shared Stations/ Terminals




Long-Distance Service Considerations



- Existing Long-Distance routes should be included and assessed under relevant SDP efforts
- New and enhanced Long-Distance routes selected into CIDP should be included and assessed as an overlapping corridor effort in corresponding SDPs. These corridors include:
 - *Daily Sunset Limited*
 - *Daily Cardinal*
 - *Big Sky North Coast Corridor*
- Other Long-Distance routes identified under FRA's Long-Distance Service Study are not required to be assessed in CIDP SDP efforts


Phased Implementation for New Conventional Corridors

- During service planning, sponsors may decide to implement corridor in phases and request to focus more detailed service-planning efforts on the first implementation phase
- FRA may approve this approach if:
 - Sponsor has completed a market analysis, a route options analysis, and an existing conditions assessment for the full corridor
 - Sponsor determines a rough order of magnitude estimate of investment requirements for later phases (preferably in coordination with host railroad)
- Approval of this approach is at FRA's discretion




Multiple Planning Efforts for Existing Corridors

- In some instances, during the Step 1 scoping process, FRA and the Corridor Sponsor may determine that two or more distinct planning efforts are required for a single corridor
- This approach will only be advanced if:
 - Clear, defined scope of work for each effort, there is no duplication of effort
 - Clear description of how the distinct efforts are to be coordinated as appropriate
 - Clear justification that the outcomes of either effort will not conflict with the longer-term Implementation of the Corridor
- Approval of this approach is at FRA's discretion



Projects on Existing Corridors Ready to Advance to Step 3

- Existing corridors may have projects that are ready to advance to Step 3 based on previous service development planning work or a comparable planning effort
 - FRA may (at its discretion) consider advancing such projects (initial project inventory) into Step 3 if:
 - If readiness criteria are met
 - The capital projects are still relevant
 - Outstanding commitments from the prior effort are achieved
- ❖ *The CID Program will meet you where you are in the planning process*



Operator Selection

Current SDP SOW Framework


The Recipient will identify key entities necessary to implement the SDP (consistent with 49 U.S.C. 25101(d)(4)) and to progress the corridor including:

- The proposed entity who will manage the corridor's development and operation;
- The proposed entities required to implement the corridor project inventory from Step 2 of the CIDP into Step 3 (consistent with 49 U.S.C. 25101(d)(2)(A)(ii));
- ***The proposed operator or type of operator for the service; and***
- The entities who will comply with all safety and security laws, orders, and regulations (consistent with 49 U.S.C. 25101(d)(5)).

Identifying an operator type at the end of the SDP is necessary to finalize the following elements:

- Operations Analysis
- Revenue Evaluation
- Capital and O&M Cost Assumptions
- Planning stakeholder engagement and future governance strategies

Operator Selection




Other Considerations

- Key terminal areas may require FRA to play a coordination role across multiple corridors
 - FRA Regional Rail Plans identified the need for further enhanced terminal analyses in Chicago and Atlanta
 - FRA's involvement is tied to the number of diverse stakeholders and the number of competing efforts across the project lifecycle stages
- Incorporation of commuter rail and other modal decisions into SDP
 - Account for all railroad stakeholders in the operations analysis
 - Step 3: Only joint-use or intercity passenger rail-specific projects will advance
 - Commuter-rail specific projects would need to be advanced by other entities, including FTA
 - SDP may include advancing other capital projects managed by FTA/FHWA, if relevant and appropriate



Other Considerations

- Potential advancement of capital project options into Step 3
 - SDP includes a “Corridor project inventory that identifies the capital projects necessary to achieve the proposed service,” [49 U.S.C. 25101\(d\)\(2\)](#)
 - Potential variations in solutions to proposed service outcomes may exist, which may result in distinct investment packages and individual capital projects
 - In some cases, it may be appropriate to advance multiple distinct capital project options for further analysis into Step 3
 - One of the alternatives should have the support of the host railroad(s)



Readiness Criteria to Advance to Step 3

1. Corridor Sponsor has the support of participant stakeholders (identified in the SDP)

- ✓ State leadership, participant state leadership, host railroads and other participant stakeholders and funding partners
- ✓ Letters of support / documentation indicating stakeholders are generally supportive of the proposal and will participate in the corridor's advancement

2. Governance structure and institutional capacity exists to implement and maintain on-going service

- ✓ Structure is inclusive of all required parties; all parties are active participants in structure
- ✓ Corridor sponsor(s) demonstrates adequate institutional capacity exists to advance the corridor into the Project Development phase

3. Funding is identified for implementation and on-going operations support

- ✓ Corridor Sponsor provides evidence that funding is likely to be available by the time the Corridor (or Corridor Implementation Phase) enters the Implementation Stage of the FRA Project Lifecycle
- ✓ Sponsor provides FRA with a description of the terms and types of funding expected to be committed, such as state bonds, loans, future federal funding, along with projected timeframe for the commitment

4. There is a defined standalone benefit for the Corridor (or Corridor Implementation Phase)

ArcGIS Story



Next Steps

Upcoming Materials

Near-Term:

- Step 1 Scoping Questions
- Revised Step 2 SDP Draft SOW Framework
 - Incorporation of Previous Service Development Plans (as appropriate)
 - Clarifications in O&M and Capital Cost Estimating
 - Restructuring Benefit Cost Analysis to Economic Evaluation
 - Inclusion of Contingency
- Draft Service Development Plan Annotated Outline
- Methodology Templates

Long-Term:

- Standard Methodologies
- Additional technical and process-oriented guidance documents

RFI—Collaboration and Data-Sharing for Railroad Operations Analysis

- As a result of the CID Program, there is an increased need for FRA and rail stakeholders to participate in Operations Analyses (OA) and evaluate results
- FRA finds value in conducting OAs in a collaborative manner to promote increased confidence in the OA among stakeholders and support FRA investments in infrastructure projects
- FRA seeks public comments on the challenges involved in Railroad Operations Analysis (OA), how FRA may address those challenges, and how FRA may improve OA for Federally funded railroad projects
 - Published in the Federal Register on Monday, August 5
 - Comments may be submitted through September 19, 2024

QUESTIONS?