Corridor Program Name: Date of Submission: Version Number:

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

## Track 2–Corridor Programs:

## **Application Form**

Welcome to the Application Form for Track 2–Corridor Programs of the Federal Railroad Administration's High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program.

This form will provide information on a cohesive set of projects—representing a phase, geographic segment, or other logical grouping—that furthers a particular corridor service.

<u>Definition</u>: For purposes of this application, a "Corridor Program" is "a group of projects that collectively advance the entirety, or a 'phase' or 'geographic section,' of a corridor service development plan." (*Guidance*, 74 Fed, Reg. 29904, footnote 4). A Corridor Program must have independent utility and measurable public benefits.

In addition to this application form and required supporting materials, applicants are required to submit a Corridor Service Overview.

An applicant may choose to represent its vision for the entire, fully-developed corridor service in one application or in multiple applications, provided that the set of improvements contained in each application submitted has independent utility and measurable public benefits. The same Service Development Plan may be submitted for multiple Track 2 Applications. Each Track 2 application will be evaluated independently with respect to related applications. Furthermore, FRA will make its evaluations and selections for Track 2 funding based on an entire application rather than on its component projects considered individually.

We appreciate your interest in the HSIPR Program and look forward to reviewing your entire application. If you have questions about the HSIPR program or the Application Form and Supporting Materials for Track 2, please contact us at <a href="https://example.com/HSIPR@dot.gov">HSIPR@dot.gov</a>.

Instructions for the Track 2 Application Form:

- Please complete the HSIPR Application electronically. See Section G of this document for a complete list of the required application materials.
- In the space provided at the top of each section, please indicate the Corridor Program name, date of submission (mm/dd/yyyy), and an application version number assigned by the applicant. The Corridor Program name must be identical to the name listed in the Corridor Service Overview Master List of Related Applications. Consisting of less than 40 characters, the Corridor Program name must consist of the following elements, each separated by a hyphen: (1) the State abbreviation of the State submitting this application; (2) the route or corridor name that is the subject of the related Corridor Service Overview; and (3) a descriptor that will concisely identify the Corridor Program's focus (e.g., HI-Fast Corridor-Main Stem).
- Section B, Question 10 requires a distinct name for each project under this Corridor Program. Please the following the naming convention: (1) the State abbreviation; (2) the route or

corridor name that forms part of the Corridor Program name; and (3) a project descriptor that will concisely identify the project's focus (e.g., HI-Fast Corridor-Wide River Bridge). For projects previously submitted under another application, please use the **same name** previously used on the project application.

- For each question, enter the appropriate information in the designated gray box. If a question is not applicable to your Track 2 Corridor Program, please indicate "N/A."
- Narrative questions should be answered within the limitations indicated.
- Applicants must up load this completed and all other application materials to www.GrantSolutions.gov by October 2, 2009 at 11:59 pm EDT.
- Fiscal Year (FY) refers to the Federal Government's fiscal year (Oct. 1- Sept. 30).

Corridor Program Name: OKLA Portion of South Central HSR Corrid Date of Submission: 10-1-09 Version Number:

## A. Point of Contact and Application Information

(1) Application Point of Cont Gary Ridley	POC Title: Secretary of Transportation			
Applicant State Agency of State of Oklahoma	or Organization Name:	I		
Street Address: 200 NE 21 <sup>st</sup> Street	City: Oklahoma City	State: OK	Zip Code: 73105-3204	Telephone Number: 405-522-1800
Email: gridley@odot.org		Fax: 40	05-522-1805	

Corridor Program Name: OK South Central HSR Date of Submission: 09-20-09 Version Number: 1

### B. Corridor Program Summary

(1) Corridor Program Name: OK South Central HSR Tulsa to Ft. Worth

(2) What are the anticipated start and end dates for the Corridor Program? (mm/yyyy)

**Start Date:** 04-01-2010 **End Date:** 03-31-2016

(3) Total Cost of the Corridor Program: (Year of Expenditure (YOE) Dollars\*) \$ 2,096,960

Of the total cost above,, how much would come from the FRA HSIPR Program: (YOE Dollars\*\*) \$ 2,096,960

Indicate percentage of total cost to be covered by matching funds: 0 %

Please indicate the source(s) for matching funds: State will commit funds/ level not set

\*\* This is the amount for which the Applicant is applying.

(4) Corridor Program Narrative. Please limit response to 12,000 characters.

Describe the main features and characteristics of the Corridor Program, including a description of:

- The location(s) of the Corridor Program's component projects including name of rail line(s), State(s), and relevant jurisdiction(s) (include a map in supporting documentation).
- How this Corridor Program fits into the service development plan including long-range system expansions and full realization of service benefits.
- Substantive activities of the Corridor Program (e.g., specific improvements intended).
- Service(s) that would benefit from the Corridor Program, the stations that would be served, and the State(s) where the service operates.
- Anticipated service design of the corridor or route with specific attention to any important changes that the Corridor Program would bring to the fleet plan, schedules, classes of service, fare policies, service quality standards, train and station amenities, etc.
- How the Corridor Program was identified through a planning process and how the Corridor Program is consistent with an overall plan for developing High-Speed Rail/Intercity Passenger Rail service, such as State rail plans or plans of local/regional MPOs.
- How the Corridor Program will fulfill a specific purpose and need in a cost-effective manner.
- The Corridor Program's independent utility.
- Any use of new or innovative technologies.
- Any use of railroad assets or rights-of-way, and potential use of public lands and property.
- Other rail services, such as commuter rail and freight rail that will make use of, or otherwise be affected by, the Corridor Program.
- Any PE/NEPA activities to be undertaken as part of the Corridor Program, including but not limited to: design studies and
  resulting program documents, the approach to agency and public involvement, permitting actions, and other key activities
  and objectives of this PE/NEPA work.

\*Location: Congress has designated the South Central High Speed Rail Corridor from San Antonio to Tulsa. As a critical component of that corridor, the Oklahoma High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Corridor (OK HSIPR) begins at Ft. Worth, Texas, proceeds north to Oklahoma City, then travels northeasterly to Tulsa OK. The Ft. Worth to OKC segment includes upgrades to the existing Amtrak Heartland Flyer line on BNSF's Ft. Worth and Red Rock Subdivisions. This segment of

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

the corridor will operate at an average speed of 90 mph. Service from OKC to Tulsa will utilize a portion of the Missouri-Kansas-Texas (MKT) RR from downtown to suburban NE OKC (Edmond), new construction on 75 miles of alignment along the Turner Turnpike, a segment of existing ODOT rail line, and the BNSF Madill Subdivision and will terminate near Tulsa's Union Station. The OKC to Tulsa arm of the OK HSIPR will operate up to speed of 150 mph. (See map in support documents).

\*Corridor fits into Service Development Plan: The Service Development Plan (SDP), as included in this application packet, explains the rationale for the type, location, and train technology for the Oklahoma HSIPR service. The SDP describes the methodology for developing ridership estimates, operating and maintenance costs, and revenue forecasts. The SDP includes the timing and sequencing of improvements, services to be provided, including train schedules as depicted in string diagrams. From the aforementioned components, crew schedules and equipment needs were also defined. Future plans involve connecting the South Central Corridor to the Chicago Hub Network via Kansas City or St. Louis Missouri.

\*Substantive activities and specific improvements: Improvements to the Amtrak Heartland Flyer line between Ft. Worth, TX and OKC include: subgrade stabilization, tie replacement, additional ballast and surfacing; addition of a mainline track between OKC and Norman on BNSF ROW; and track reconfigurations at the OKC Santa Fe Station.

Specific improvements anticipated in the OKC to Tulsa segment include: OKC Santa Fe station platform and facility upgrades, construction of OKC HSR refueling and layover facility, modification of OKC/Edmond park and ride lot, design and construction of approximately 75 miles of high speed rail track to include installation of approximately 30 miles of double track (centered in Stroud) to facilitate bi-directional operations, construction of Stroud maintenance facility, construction of new Sapulpa park and ride facility, construction of Tulsa layover facility, and renovation of Tulsa Union Station.

\*Services that would benefit from the Corridor Program

Ft. Worth to OKC: Fewer passenger-freight train conflicts; Improved speed, reliability, and on-time performance;

Both routes will foster connectivity with privately operated bus systems, and local public transit services. Stations/states that would be served: TX: Ft. Worth TX; OK: Ardmore, Pauls Valley, Purcell, Norman, OKC, OKC/Edmond Park & Ride, Sapulpa Park & Ride, Tulsa. Traffic flows on I-35, I-44 (Turner Turnpike) and major arterials will improve through implementation of the HSR program.

\*Anticipated service design of the corridor:

Existing Heartland Flyer service from OKC to Ft. Worth:

Added mainline service from OKC to Norman, increased design speed from 79 to 90 mph; more reliable on time performance with anticipated increase in ridership; better connectivity with other Amtrak cross country routes. Modest fares increases are expected on the OKC to Ft. Worth segment. Key variables affecting this are expected to be average fuel price, and availability of transit connections at destination points.

New alignment, OKC to Tulsa: Anticipated service is based on three train sets, minimum of 2 locomotives and 4 coaches per set; 6 round trips per day with a tie-in to the Heartland Flyer schedule; 150 mph design speed; Stations in OKC and Tulsa will be ADA compliant, staffed with station attendants, and linked to a local intermodal facility. Fare revenue is a critical component in the train's operating budget. The ODOT view of fare pricing is to establish a structure that balances the rider's need and desire for the service with consideration for perceived cost of personal vehicle travel, and with ODOT's need to recoup a percentage of the operating and maintenance costs. This approach provides for a fare based upon perceived economic benefit to the user, but does not take into account the social benefits of the reduction of traffic on the roadways, reduced fuel consumption, reduced accident costs and various other measures of sustainability. As this is a new system established between OKC and Tulsa, there is an assumption that this is a price elastic marketplace in which ridership will be sensitive to fare structure. The items to be considered by ODOT in the determination of fare include but are not limited to: assumed average vehicle gas mileage, trip distance, average fuel price, tolls on turnpike, time (and use of it), availability of transit connections at destination points

\*Planning process for corridor: In 1995, the State's first Intermodal Transportation Plan, identified the absence of passenger rail service in the State (since 1979) as a significant issue. The Plan noted that in 1989, the State conducted a study to determine the feasibility of passenger rail service between OKC and Tulsa, and between Tulsa and Bartlesville. The study concluded that intercity travel demand would continue to increase, and that sometime in the future, service such as Amtrak would be a viable option. In 1997, the Oklahoma State Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 12, calling for a Task Force to study high speed rail service between OKC and Tulsa and to review the state's efforts to establish Amtrak service between OKC and Ft. Worth. The Heartland Flyer -Amtrak route from OKC to Ft. Worth made its first run In June 1999. The Oklahoma Passenger Rail Feasibility Study was completed in May 2001.

Patronage on the Heartland Flyer route has grown consistently over its decade of service, and passenger rail service in other

parts of the state continues to be identified as a necessary modal option. The OK HSIPR is consistent with the State, and the Oklahoma City and Tulsa TMA Long Range Transportation Plans. The project is in harmony with previous and current analysis conducted as a part of the State and metropolitan long range planning processes, and is reflected in the related planning document goals and objectives. In keeping with the financial constraint guidance, regional and State Transportation Improvement Programs stand ready to be amended for inclusion of the project as funding becomes available.

\*Specific purpose: HSR has been examined in this corridor for years due to it compelling attributes to provide a needed transportation alternative to the single occupant vehicle or air service. The combination of metro population centers in OKC and Tulsa, at or near the one million mark, and the Dallas Ft. Worth area at 6 million people, is described by urban planners as a type of mega-region. Mega-regions are extended networks of cities and communities with shared identities, characterized by economic, social, environmental and cultural similarities. Facilitating easy commutes and communication within and between these multi-city or multi-state areas strengthens the individual metro areas, and provides a solid coalition for being competitive in the global marketplace.

\*Corridor's independent utility: The OKC to Ft. Worth Corridor has demonstrated its ability to operate independently. The OKC to Tulsa Corridor has been the subject of several studies, and strong ridership projections between the State's two major metro areas indicate it will be a strong and highly used segment. Providing seamless service from Tulsa through OKC to Ft. Worth and other Texas cities will only fortify two already strong segments.

\*New technology: Recently developed technologies in positive train control devices will be integrated into the train sets as well as related facilities. The Ft. Worth to OKC segment is one of the first locations in the nation to implement this technology.

\*Use of RR assets or public property: Most of this project is on currently used BNSF track or on privately held ROW adjacent to the Turnpike. However, portions of the new alignment from OKC to Tulsa will be on State owned rail right-of-way. Additionally, portions of the OKC to Tulsa segment lie on land owned by the Central Oklahoma Transportation & Parking Authority, a trust of the City of Oklahoma City.

\*Other rail services affected by Corridor: On the Ft. Worth to OKC segment, current and future freight rail service will be affected. Current conflicts between freight and passenger rail service will be alleviated by the addition of a second track between OKC and Norman. On the OKC to Tulsa segment, as the line nears downtown Tulsa, track configuration will bypass the existing Cherokee Yard (currently used by BNSF for freight operations).

\*PE/NEPA activities: Significant preliminary engineering studies and alternatives analysis have been performed for the OKC to Tulsa segment. The application includes the Draft Tier I Environmental Assessment; future work on the corridor would include tasks required to receive a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and subsequent Tier 2 project level environmental analysis and documentation. Public involvement will be an integral of the NEPA process. All necessary permits will be obtained through the appropriate regulatory agency. Plans, specifications, and estimates (PS&E) will be produced by the engineers for each construction segment upon completion of the environmental process. These investments will accommodate true high speed (150+) mph passenger trains and callow continued faster passenger rail service on today's heavily used freight tracks.

trains and o	trains and callow continued faster passenger rail service on today's heavily used freight tracks.					
(5) Describe the service objective(s) for this Corridor Program (check all that apply):						
<ul> <li>☑Additional Service Frequencies</li> <li>☑Improved Service Quality</li> <li>☑Improved On-Time performance on Existing Route</li> <li>☐Reroute Existing Service</li> </ul>		☐ Increased Average Speeds/Shorter Trip Times ☐ New Service on Existing IPR Route ☐ New Service on New Route ☐ Other (Please Describe):				
(6) <b>Right-of-Way-Ownership.</b> Provide information for all railroad right-of-way owners in the Corridor Program area. Where railroad currently share ownership, identify the primary owner. <i>If more than three owners, please detail in Section F of this application</i> .						
Type of Railroad	Railroad Right-of-Way Owner	Route Miles	Track Miles	Status of agreements to implement projects		

Class 1 Freight	BNSF Railway Company	238.77	147.77	No Agreement, but Host Railroad Suppo
Class 1 Freight	UPRR	238.77	1.2	No Agreement, but Host Railroad Suppo
Class 1 Freight				Master Agreement in Place

(7) **Services.** Provide information for all existing rail services within Corridor Program boundaries (freight, commuter, and intercity passenger). *If more than three services, please detail in Section F of this application.* 

Type of			Average Number of Daily One-Way Train			
Type of Service	Name of Operator	Passenger	Freight	Route Miles Within Boundaries	Operations within Boundaries <sup>1</sup>	Notes
Freight	BNSF		60	153.27	27	
Freight	UPRR		10	1.2	2/ week	
Freight	AMTRAK	79		132.5	1	

(8) Rolling Stock Type. Describe the fleet of locomotives, cars, self-powered cars, and/or trainsets that would be intended to provide the service upon completion of the Corridor Program. *Please limit response to 2,000 characters*.

Current operations consist of 1 trainset composed of 1 diesl locomotive/1non-powered control unit/1 snack coach and 2 regular coaches; all are high-level equipment; future trainsets to be 4 Talgo XXI sets consisting of push-pull dual locomotive units with 4 coaches, each set expected to have a snack coach.

(9) Intercity Passenger Rail Operator. If applicable, provide the status of agreements with partners that will operate the benefiting high-speed rail/intercity passenger rail service(s) (e.g., Amtrak). If more than one operating partner is envisioned, please describe in Section F.

Name of Operating Partner: AMTRAK

Status of Agreement: Partner consulted, awaiting support commitment

<sup>1</sup> One round trip equals two one-way train operations.

(10) Master Project List. Please list all projects included in this Track 2 Corridor Program application in the table below. If available,

include more detailed project costs for each project as a supporting form (see Section G below).

merade more detained pr	9	r each project as a suppor		Estimated Project Cost (Millions of YOE Dollars, One Decimal)		Was this Project included in a prior HSIPR	Are more detailed project costs included in
Project Name	Project Type	Project Description	Project Start Date (mm/yyyy)	Total Cost	Amount Applied For	application? Indicate track number(s).	the Supporting Forms?
BNSF Ardmore Switch	Construction				1.4		Yes
BNSF RedRock Sub Improvements	Construction				11.8		Yes
BNSF OKC to Norman Doubletrack	Final Design/(				84.6		Yes
BNSF OKC Switch Santa Fe Station	Construction				1.9		Yes
Santa Fe Station Improvements/trains	Final Design/C				32.3		Yes
Urban connector track	Final Design/0				27.5		Yes
Refuel Facility/layover/ park and ride	Final Design/0				33.4		Yes
MKT track and signals	Final Design/(				252.0		Yes
Turnpike track alignment package	Final Design/C				1000.4		Yes
Stroud maint facility/ dispatch center/etc	Final Design/(				127.4		Yes
BNSF Madill Sub to downtown Tulsa	Final Design/C				74.8		Yes
Tulsa station/layover	Final Design/(				7.7		Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes
	PE/ NEPA						Yes

**Note:** In addition to **program** level supporting documentation, all applicable **project** level supporting documentation is required prior to award. If project level documentation is available now, you may submit it; however, if it is not provided in this application, this project may be considered as a part of a possible Letter of Intent but will not be considered for FD/Construction grant award until this documentation has been submitted.

In narrative form, please describe the sequencing of the projects listed in Question 10. Which activities must be pursued sequentially, which can be done at any time, and which can be done simultaneously? Please limit response to 4.000 characters.

Tiered documents are for making broad program decisions for large expanse corridors where the following might be present: 1) projects are too big to be addressed in detail in one document; 2) are phased over time; 3) where future phases are not fully defined; or 4) when major routing or service alternatives need to be evaluated. This Tier 1 Service Environmental Assessment falls into the category of being too big to fully address the potential impacts with the limited time frame available. Also projects within this corridor may be phased in over time depending on funding and priority.

For this high speed rail corridor from Oklahoma City to Tulsa covering over 106 miles and four counties a preferred alignment has been selected and introduced to the public. The previous studies and interest in high speed rail in Oklahoma has prepared the State for this mode of travel. A plan for implementing project improvements has been developed.

If a Finding of No Significant Impact is forthcoming for the Tier 1 Corridor Evaluation, then projects with independent utility with narrower scope and magnitude will be evaluated for Tier 2 Categorical Exclusion, Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement, whichever is appropriate. The narrower projects envisioned at this time for future Tier 2 environmental analysis include main line rail improvements on existing rail alignment from Santa Fe Station in Oklahoma City North to the Edmond Park and Ride Lot (also known as the Santa Fe Station HSR connector), which includes the UPRR Harter Yard Bypass, then connecting to new alignment along the Turner Turnpike, then continuing on to downtown Tulsa, known as the BNSF Subdivision, Madill Subdivision and Cherokee Yard Improvements. These improvements would be considered one project for detailed project level environmental analyses, identifying impacts, and mitigation measures to be included in the project segment is anticipated to be a Environmental Assessment with sufficient avoidance, mitigation and best management practices to existing environmental conditions to obtain a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Other projects are also envisioned to be evaluated as Tier 2 Environmental Review, with independent utility. These projects are anticipated to be reviewed as Categorical Exclusions due to their limited scope and little to no new right-of-way requirements. These include the following projects:

- Oklahoma City Station Platform and Facility
- Oklahoma City HSR Refueling and Layover Facility
- Edmond Park and Ride Lot Facility
- Stroud Maintenance Facility
- Sapulpa Park and Ride Facility
- Tulsa Layover Facility
- Tulsa Depot Rehabilitation

Corridor Program Name: OKLA South Central HSR Corridor Date of Submission: 10-1-09 Version Number:

# C. Eligibility Information

(1) Select applicant type, as defined in Appendix 1.1 of the HSIPR Guidance:  State Amtrak  If one of the following, please append appropriate documentation as described in Section 4.3.1 of the HSIPR Guidance: Group of States Interstate Compact Public Agency established by one or more States Amtrak in cooperation with a State or States						
(2) Establish completion of all elements of a Service Development Plan. Note: One Service Development Plan may be referenced in multiple Track 2 Applications for the same corridor service. Please provide information on the status of the below Service and Implementation Planning Activities:						
			Provide Da			
No study exists	Study Initiated	Study Completed	Start Date (mm/yyyy)	Actual or Anticipated Completion Date (mm/yyyy)		
	Service Pla	anning Activ	ities/Documents			
				9-28-09		
				9-29-09		
				10-1-09		
				9-25-09		
				9-24-09		
				9-30-09		
Imp	olementatio	n Planning A	Activities/Documents			
		$\boxtimes$		9-27-09		
		$\boxtimes$		9-30-09		
		$\boxtimes$		10-01-09		
	ing, please apport of stablished by or ration with a Stablished by or ration with a Stablished by or ration on the Select No study exists	ing, please append appropriate stablished by one or more Staration with a State or States on of all elements of a Service Applications for the same contraction on the status of the Select One of the Following exists Service Plate Service Pl	ing, please append appropriate documental ct stablished by one or more States ration with a State or States  on of all elements of a Service Developmen Applications for the same corridor service. The ormation on the status of the below Service Select One of the Following:  No study Study Completed  Service Planning Active  Service Planning Active  Implementation Planning Active	ing, please append appropriate documentation as described in Section ct stablished by one or more States ration with a State or States  on of all elements of a Service Development Plan. Note: One Service Dapplications for the same corridor service.  Applications for the status of the below Service and Implementation Plant Select One of the Following:  Provide Da  No study exists  Service Planning Activities/Documents  Service Planning Activities/Documents  Implementation Planning Activities/Documents		

(3) Establish Completion of Service NEPA Documentation (the date document was issued and how documentation can be verified by FRA). The following are approved methods of NEPA verification (in order of FRA preference): 1) References to large EISs and EAs that FRA has previously issued, 2) Web link if NEPA document is posted to a website (including www.fra.gov), 3) Electronic copy of non-FRA documents attached with supporting documentation, or 4) a hard copy of non-FRA documents (large documents should not be scanned but should be submitted to FRA via an express delivery service). See HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6 and Appendix 3.2.9.

Note to applicants: Prior to obligation of funds for FD/Construction activities under Track 2, all project specific documents will be required (e.g. Project NEPA, Financial Plan, and Project Management Plan).

Documentation	Date (mm/yyyy)	Describe How Documentation Can be Verified
Tier 1 NEPA EA	10-1-09	uploaded
Tier 1 NEPA EA		
Tier 1 NEPA EA		

#### (4) Indicate if there is an environmental decision from FRA (date document was issued and web hyperlink if available)

Documentation	Date (mm/yyyy)	<b>Hyperlink</b> (if available)
Finding of No Significant Impact		
Finding of No Significant Impact		
Finding of No Significant Impact		

Version Number: Corridor Program Name: OKLA South Central HSR Corridor Date of Submission:

### D.Public Return on Investment

(1) 1A. Transportation Benefits. See HSIPR Guidance Section 5.1.1.1. Please limit response to 8,000 characters.

How is the Corridor Program anticipated to improve Intercity Passenger Rail (IPR) service? Describe the overall transportation benefits, including information on the following (please provide a level of detail appropriate to the type of investment):

- Introduction of new IPR service: Will the Corridor Program lead directly to the introduction of a new IPR service that is not comparable to the existing service (if any) on the corridor in question? Describe the new service and what would make it a significant step forward in intercity transportation.
- IPR network development: Describe projected, planned, and potential improvements and/or expansions of the IPR network that may result from the Corridor Program, including but not limited to: better intermodal connections and access to stations; opportunities for interoperability with other services; standardization of operations, equipment, and signaling; and the use of innovative technologies.
- IPR service performance improvements (also provide specific metrics in table 1B below): Please describe service performance improvements directly related to the Corridor Program, as well as a comparison with any existing comparable service. Describe relevant reliability improvements (e.g., increases in on-time performance, reduction in operating delays), reduced schedule trip times, increases in frequencies, aggregate travel time savings (resulting from reductions to both schedule time and delays, e.g., expressed in passengerminutes), and other relevant performance improvements.
- Suggested supplementary information (only when applicable):
  - o Transportation Safety: Describe overall safety improvements that are anticipated to result from the Corridor Program, including railroad and highway-rail grade crossing safety benefits, and benefits resulting from the shifting of travel from other modes to IPR service.
  - o Cross-modal benefits from the Corridor Program, including benefits to:
    - ✓ Commuter Rail Services Service improvements and results (applying the same approach as for IPR above).
    - ✓ Freight Rail Services Service performance improvements (e.g., increases in reliability and capacity), results (e.g. increases in ton-miles or car-miles of the benefiting freight services), and/or other congestion, capacity or safety benefits.
    - ✓ Congestion Reduction/Alleviation in Other Modes; Delay or Avoidance of Planned Investments Describe any expected aviation and highway congestion reduction/alleviation, and/or other capacity or safety benefits. Also, describe any planned investments in other modes of transportation (and their estimated costs if available) that may be avoided or delayed due to the improvement to IPR service that will result from the Corridor Program.

\*New IPR Service--This Oklahoma City-Tulsa HSIPR line will provide a new service that is not currently available in the approximately 100-mile-long corridor connecting the two largest cities in Oklahoma, although basic passenger rail service was available historically in this corridor. The proposed service is programmed to reach 150 mph and include six trips per day in each direction. This speed and frequency of service will draw significant ridership, projected to yield 1,400 trips per day going between the state's two large urban areas.

\*Network Development--The Oklahoma City-Tulsa HSIPR service will connect with the Heartland Flyer, the Amtrak passenger rail line between Oklahoma City, OK and Fort Worth, TX, which is funded by both Oklahoma and Texas and which is part of the federally-designated South Central HSR corridor. The Oklahoma City-Tulsa HSIPR line will likely be connected with Kansas City, MO in the future, which will offer a link to the Chicago Hub Network. Greyhound opertes downtown bus stations in both Oklahoma City and Tulsa, OK. Some of the routes that Greyhound operates and some of the Amtrak bus service routes in both cities may be candidates to include a stop at the high speed rail stations to capture these

pasengers in a seamless trip. Both Oklahoma City with Metro Transit and Tulsa with Tulsa Transit operate city bus service generally focused on downtown where the the HSIPR service will come to Oklahoma City's downtown Bricktown area and to Tulsa's Union Station. Both Metro Transit and Tulsa Transit are interested to meet the service needs of their constituents and will look to adjust routes and increase frequency where needed to distribute high speed rail passengers in the downtown area and to connect them with Greyhound. Also, limousine and taxi services will respond to the market created by the high speed rail passengers and provide new connecting service. In additon, ODOT will take into consideration with its equipment purchases choosing vendors that other properties in the US are using so that ODOT may achieve any economies of scale in the purchase of equipment or future sharing of equipment for special situations.

\*Transportation Safety--Providing new HSIPR service in the Oklahoma City-Tulsa, OK corridor, where no pasenger rail service is provided today, will draw motorists from their gas-burning single-occupant autos, SUVs, and trucks on 75-mph Turner Turnpike (I-44), and reduce highway crashes and resulting injuries and fatalities. Improved service between OKC and FT. Worth will also reduce the magnitude of single occupant vehicle travel and related collitions.

I-44 from OKC to Tulsa, and I-35 from OKC to the Ok/Tx stateline have an average of 14 fatalities and 2360 collisions/year. Based on Oklahoma City and Tulsa metro area transit ridership data, it is reasonable to estimate that the project would eliminate one-half of one percent (0.5%) of fatalities and crashes annually. This equates to .07 fatalities (@\$6.0/million fatality) and 12 accidents (@\$7500 \* accident) each year, providing estimated savings of 10.2 million over 20 years. The HSIPR service will also reduce gasoline consumption as result of the diverted trips.

\*Congestion Reduction--Population in the Oklahoma City and Tulsa Transportation Management Areas (TMA boundaries are roughly similar to metropolitan areas) is expected to increase from a combined 1.8 million in 2008 to 2.2 million in 2030. This growth represents the addition of 350 thousand inhabitants or approximately 16 thousand new residents/year. Employment increases in the state's two major urban centers are expected to be in the range of 185 thousand over the 20 plus years, with average annual employment growth estimated at slightly over 8000. This growth is anticipated to increase congestion along major freeways and arterials in both metropolitan regions. High speed rail service will help to accommodate this growth, while reducing congestion and harmful vehicle emissions especially on I-35, I-44, and other major arterials.

Planned Investment Delay/Avoidance--Providing HSIPR in an alignment that parallels the Turner Turnpike for most of its route between Oklahoma City and Tulsa will draw motorists from the turnpike and delay the need to repair the roadway as a result of reduced traffic and will likely forestall a need to widen the Turner Turnpike to accommodate otherwise growing congestion. The HSIPR route will represent a better investment of resources than putting additional investment in the Turner Turnpike because the HSIPR will provide a more energy-efficient and environmentally-friendly modal trip choice

**1B. Operational and Ridership Benefits Metrics:** In the table(s) below, provide information on the anticipated levels of transportation benefits and ridership that are projected to occur in the corridor service or route, following completion of the proposed Corridor Program.

Note: The "Actual—FY 2008 levels" only apply to rail services that currently exist. If no comparable rail service exists, leave column blank.

			Projected Totals by Y	'ear
Corridor Program Metric	Actual – FY 2008 levels	First full year of operation	Fifth full year of operation	Tenth full year of operation
Annual passenger-trips	80300	142173	290975	688490
Annual passenger-miles (millions)	16.38	29	45.8	97.8
Annual IPR seat-miles offered (millions)	33.06	66.12	6473.159	6515.457
Average number of daily round trip train operations (typical weekday)	1	2	8	9
On-time performance (OTP) <sup>2</sup> — percent of trains on time at endpoint terminals	76.4	85	88.5	85.47
Average train operating delays: minutes of en-route delays per 10,000 train-miles <sup>3</sup>	4			
Top passenger train operating speed (mph)	79	79	150	150
Average scheduled operating speed (mph) (between endpoint terminals)	48.2	48.2	70.1	68.9

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 'On-time' is defined as within the distance-based thresholds originally issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, which are: 0 to 250 miles and all Acela trains—10 minutes; 251 to 350 miles—15 minutes; 351 to 450 miles—20 minutes; 451 to 550 miles—25 minutes; and 551 or more miles—30 minutes.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> As calculated by Amtrak according to its existing procedures and definitions. Useful background (but not the exact measure cited on a route-by-route basis) can be found at pages E-1 through E-6 of Amtrak's May 2009 Monthly Performance Report at <a href="http://www.amtrak.com/pdf/0905monthly.pdf">http://www.amtrak.com/pdf/0905monthly.pdf</a>

(2) A. Economic Recovery Benefits: Please limit response to 6,000 characters. For more information, see Section 5.1.1.2 of the HSIPR Guidance.

Describe the contribution the Corridor Program is intended to make towards economic recovery and reinvestment, including information on the following:

- How the Corridor Program will result in the creation and preservation of jobs, including number of onsite and other direct jobs (on a 2,080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis), and timeline for achieving the anticipated job creation.
- How the different phases of the Corridor Program will affect job creation (consider the construction period and operating period).
- How the Corridor Program will create or preserve jobs or new or expanded business opportunities for populations in Economically Distressed Areas (consider the construction period and operating period).
- How the Corridor Program will result in increases in efficiency by promoting technological advances.
- How the Corridor Program represents an investment that will generate long-term economic benefits (including the timeline for achieving economic benefits and describe how the Corridor Program was identified as a solution to a wider economic challenge).
- If applicable, how the Corridor Program will help to avoid reductions in State-provided essential services.

\*The Oklahoma High Speed Rail project is expected to create significant near-term economic benefits for the Federally designated South Central High Speed Rail Corridor. Oklahoma's immediate economic benefits from the project would be driven by an increase in construction spending in the region. These project expenditures would generate a short term increase in demand for construction-related labor and material as well as engineering and technical services.

In total, the project is projected to create 26,084 person years of employment, including 12,807 direct job person years, in addition to generating approximately \$3 billion in real economic output (measured in 2009 dollars), with over \$396 million dollars of economic output generated in 2010. An estimated average of 4,173 jobs will be created annually by the project, including an average of 2,049 direct jobs per year.

\*The project's construction phase lasts between the 2nd quarter of 2010 and the 2nd quarter of 2016. The project is expected to provide an approximate annual average of 2,049 jobs during this period, with a peak of approximately 2,271 jobs anticipated in the 1st and 2nd quarters of 2012 and a low of 1,780 anticipated jobs in the 2nd quarter of 2016.

As expected, during the construction period of the project, the civil engineering construction industry is estimated to receive the largest increase in jobs from the project (10,381 person years), almost all of which are direct jobs created.

\*The economic benefits from this project will create new jobs and business opportunities for populations living in Economically Distressed Areas, as the Oklahoma portion of the South Central High Speed Rail Corridor traverses the following Economically Distressed Counties: Tulsa (part), Creek, Lincoln, Oklahoma (part), Garvin, Murray, Carter, and Love.

Spending from the project will also result in indirect and induced jobs for other industries, thereby providing expanded economic opportunities in the corridor region. The industries that will see a significant number of jobs created include health care (2,455 person years), professional services (2,425 person years), retail trade (2,335 person years), manufacturing (1,844 person years), food services (1,174 person years), administration and waste management (962 person years), and other services (818 person years). The majority of jobs generated by the project would receive compensation above \$20,000/year, indicating that the project would generate average paying jobs that would help stimulate the regional economy.

\*Technological advances: Oklahoma is participating in advance studies in positive train control (PTC) technologies, which will be fully implemented in the state prior to the national deadline.

**2B. Job Creation.** Provide the following information about job creation through the life of the Corridor Program. Please consider construction, maintenance and operations jobs.

Anticipated number of onsite and other direct jobs created (on a 2080 work-hour per year, full-time equivalent basis).

FD/ Construction Period

First full year of operation

Fifth full year of operation

Tenth full year of operation

2,049 Avg.	137 Avg	684 Avg	684 Avg
Annual	Annual		Annual
FTE	FTE	Annual FTE	FTE

#### (3) Environmental Benefits. Please limit response to 6,000 characters.

How will the Corridor Program improve environmental quality, energy efficiency, and reduce in the Nation's dependence on oil? Address the following:

- Any projected reductions in key emissions (CO2, O<sup>3</sup>, CO, PMx, and NOx) and their anticipated effects. Provide any available forecasts of emission reductions from a baseline of existing travel demand distribution by mode, for the first, fifth, and tenth years of full operation (provide supporting documentation if available).
- Any expected energy and oil savings from traffic diversion from other modes and changes in the sources of energy for transportation. Provide any available information on changes from the baseline of the existing travel demand distribution by mode, for the first, fifth, and tenth years of full operation (*provide supporting documentation if available*).
- Use of green methods and technologies. Address green building design, "Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design" building design standards, green manufacturing methods, energy efficient rail equipment, and/or other environmentally-friendly approaches.

\*Emissions: The proposed project is predicted to demonstrate an overall reduction in emissions as a result of decreased roadway VMT in the study area. The overall emission benefits of the project account for both the reduction in auto emissions as well as the additional diesel train emissions. In the first year of operations (2013), CO2 emissions would decrease by 1,978 tons and CO emissions would decrease by 58 tons. In the fifth year of operations (2018), CO2 emissions would decrease by 3,918 tons and CO emissions would decrease by 109 tons; in the tenth year (2023) CO2 emissions would decrease by 16,740 tons and CO emissions would decrease by 326 tons.

VOC emissions would also decrease in all analysis years, and PM10/PM2.5 levels would either slightly decrease or remain the same. NOx emissions, however, are predicted to increase due to the additional emissions resulting from the use of the diesel locomotive. In the first year of operation, NOx emissions would increase by 33 tons. In the fifth and tenth years of operations, NOx emissions would increase by 66 and 79 tons, respectively.

\*Energy savings: The project is predicted to result in energy savings due to decreased fuel consumption. The overall fuel benefits of the project account for both the reduction in auto fuel usage as well as the additional diesel fuel required for the trains.

In the first year of operations, the project would result in an overall energy savings of 25,955 million Btus (mBtus), the equivalent of 219,508 gallons of fuel. In the fifth year of operations, the project would result in an overall energy savings of 51,685 mBtus, or 443,708 gallons of fuel. In the tenth year of operations, the project would result in an overall energy savings of 217,103 mBtus, or 1,771,739 gallons of fuel. Table 1 (Attached) highlights the emission burdens and energy usage of the various modes in 2008, 2013, 2018 and 2023.

\*Green methods:ODOT will require that rail passenger stations and maintenance facilities are designed and built so that they can be LEED certified. The buildings associated with the high speed rail project will consider energy savings strategies for lighting, heating and cooling, in addition to organizing the project to reduce construction waste, improve water efficiency, use materials with good life cycle assessment ratings, consider natural ventilation and daylighting, enhance the indoor air quality and use low VOC products. The sourcing of materials will consider the embodied carbon of the major building components, steel, aluminum and concrete, and consider ways in which waste and recycled material can be used as fill. Materials and equipment that are manufactured in an environmentally responsible manner, by companies who have satisfied the requirements for ISO 14001 and 18001, will be sourced, to the greatest extent possible, so that the entire life cycle impact of materials and equipment is prioritized.

High-speed rail, regardless of its fuel source is greener than its alternatives. For reasons of vehicle stability, high-speed rail vehicles must be light. Most high-speed locomotives tend to have weights approximately ½ of a freight locomotive. An effect of being light is a significant decrease in the torque required to achieve a certain acceleration. High-speed trains also are streamlined to reduce the horsepower required to maintain a certain speed. Both of these advantages lead to smaller power plants and less fuel consumption. A automobile will use 3600 BTU of energy to carry a person a mile, an airliner will use 6900 BTU and a high-speed train will consume 2620 BTU. Trains, high-speed or conventional, have an advantage in the steel wheel running on the steel rail. This combination has

very low rolling resistance; several times lower than rubber-tired vehicles.	A train can carry a ton of freight 436 miles on a gallon of
fuel where a rubber tire truck will only take that ton 80 to 120 miles.	

(4) Livable Communities Corridor Program Benefits Narrative. (For more information, see Section 5.1.1.3 of the HSIPR Guidance, Livable Communities). Please limit response to 3,000 characters.

How will the Corridor Program foster Livable Communities? Address the following:

- Integration with existing high density, livable development: Provide specific examples, such as (a) central business districts with walking/biking and (b) public transportation distribution networks with transit-oriented development.
- Development of intermodal stations: Describe such features as direct transfers to other modes (both intercity passenger transport and local transit).

The Oklahoma HSIPR application will foster and be bolstered by Livable Communities initiatives in the State. Due to space limitations and the geography of the Oklahoma application, this discussion will focus on the state's two largest cities: Oklahoma City, Tulsa, and their surrounding metropolitan areas. Additional information will be provided on Ardmore, the 23rd largest city in the State and the last stop in southern Oklahoma for the train. Description of livability issues will be from south to north in the State.

City of Ardmore: premier Main Street program that emphasizes stabilizing and renovating downtown area; Ardmore Main Street program recognized in 2009 by National Trust for Historic Preservation as friendly, walkable livable city. Historic Depot serves as Welcome Center for Amtrak's Heartland Flyer. Heartland Flyer patrons include business and leisure travelers to/from San Antonio, Dallas, Forth Worth, Oklahoma City. Frequent destinations in Ardmore are Lake Murray Lodge and Arbuckle Wilderness Center. Transportation options in Ardmore: cab, resort shuttles, Southern Oklahoma Rural Transportation System (SORTS), and private vehicles.

City of Oklahoma City: characterized by a grid street network emanating from the Central Business District; Metro Transit, operated by Central Oklahoma Transportation and Parking Authority (COTPA), is city bus system with 100 vehicles and 27 fixed service routes. In 2005, COTPA completed a Fixed Guideway Study and identified 11 candidate corridors for possible fixed guideway transit technology including commuter rail, modern streetcar, BRT, enhanced local bus, etc. An Alternatives Analysis for the downtown circulator is currently underway. Also the City has formally requested the OKC area MPO to conduct a Commuter Rail Transit Hub Study.

Population in OKC's CBD is 4000, with employment in that area at 27,000. OKC metro has 200 miles of on-street and paved off-street trails, with approximately 10 % of these in downtown OKC.

City of Tulsa: second largest city in the state and traditionally an oil and gas center; in the past two decades has moved economic focus to finance, aviation, healthcare, and telecommunications. Tulsa is currently nearing completion of the of Comprehensive Plan Update, PLANiTULSA, which consists of a blueprint for the entire city and a special look at the downtown area. Downtown Master Plan calls for improved transit options, more intense downtown residential development, expanded employment centers and investments in arts and open spaces.

Downtown Tulsa and near-downtown areas are identified for transit-oriented development.

Tulsa and the Tulsa MPO are exploring commuter rail options to integrate current bus system Tulsa's pivotal position as the origin of the South Central HSR Corridor, and other modal choices including its extensive on-street and paved trail bike lanes. Tulsa's Plan calls for an intermodal transit center in the down town as well.

Corridor Program Name: OKLA South Central HSR Corridor Date of Submission: Version Number:

### E. Application Success Factors

(1) Project Management Approach and Applicant Qualifications Narrative. Please provide separate responses to each of the following. Additional information on program management is provided in Section 5.1.2.1 of the HSIPR Guidance, Project Management.
 1A. Applicant qualifications.
 Management experience: Does the applicant have experience in managing rail investments and Corridor Programs of a

similar size and scope to the one proposed in this application?

Yes - Briefly describe experience (brief project(s) overview, dates)

No- Briefly describe expected plan to build technical and managerial capacity. Provide reference to Project Management Plan.

Please limit response to 3,000 characters.

- ODOT has a one hundred year history of designing, constructing and operating transportation infrastructure and stands ready to undertake a project of this magnitude. The state of Oklahoma owns in excess of 860 miles of rail line, placing it in the top tier of states with significant rail facility ownerships. Further, the Department anticipates utilizing our experience with managing those assets, as well as our recent experience of designing and constructing the I-40 Crosstown Expressway in OKC to establish the project management approach for the Oklahoma High Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program (HSIPRP). ODOT fully intends to utilize the I-40 Crosstown Expressway project as a model for the approach to the HSIPRP project.
- The I-40 Crosstown Expressway project represents a \$644 million improvement with multiple design firms and over twenty independent construction contracts. The Crosstown has provided the Department with a host of lessons learned in designing, managing and implementing a major transportation undertaking with multiple interrelated construction projects with one central goal and project management team. This \$644 million realignment of nearly five miles of urban interstate facility represents the largest, most complex project ever undertaken by ODOT. The new interstate corridor, with mixed historical land uses, and containing three railroad companies operating on four rail lines presents a multitude of challenges. In addition to phasing and sequencing the numerous temporary rail shoofly alignments, interim connections and permanent facility for each railroad, the Department is conducting the scheduling of over twenty individual construction projects within the corridor. These projects were established in such a way as to ensure that project sizes and estimates coincided with the incremental infusions of federal funds as they became available. Project extents were established in a manner that minimized the potential for contractor conflicts by providing geographically distinct project limits that were separated from concurrent projects.

With an early recognition of the need for a detailed and dedicated effort on this corridor, the Department in 1996 established dedicated resources specifically for this project during the early portion of the environmental clearance process. Additions to the resources occurred in 2000 and a full project management team was more formally established in 2003. All aspects of the project flow through the project management team. A Project Management Plan (PMP) was established by the team in order to formalize the methods utilized to ensure the success of the I-40 Crosstown Expressway realignment project. Through a dedicated effort to plan, design, coordinate and construct this project, the Department has been successful in authorizing approximately \$430 million to date on this corridor. The PMP has incorporated some of the lessons learned in completing the project to this point.

- 1B. Describe the organizational approach for the different Corridor Program stages included in this application (e.g., final design, construction), including the roles of staff, contractors and stakeholders in implementing the Corridor Program. For construction activities, provide relevant information on work forces, including railroad contractors and grantee contractors. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.
- The Department anticipates patterning the HSIPRP after the I-40 Crosstown Expressway experience. The Project Management Plan (PMP) will incorporate the use of a strong ODOT Project Manager (PM) who will serve as the focal point of the entire undertaking. Assisting the PM will be a Project Management Consultant (PMC) to supplement the Department with the resources and expertise necessary to successfully complete this endeavor. A series of Design Engineering Firms (DEFs) will be utilized to complete the final construction design plans for those projects directed by ODOT. These plans will be the basis of the contract documents established for the competitively bid construction contracts. Certain other projects within the

HSIPRP will be managed through force account agreements with the appropriate railroad company. Those project segments within the control of the BNSF or Union Pacific will be designed and constructed via their respective efforts, but will be coordinated, tracked and monitored by the ODOT project management team.

ODOT anticipates that the HSIPRP will consist of twelve segments, each with unique geographic components and individual construction contracts. The PM, with the assistance of the PMC, will coordinate all aspects of the project. The PMP will define the roles of all parties involved in the process of designing, preparing and constructing the HSIPRP and be dynamic enough to allow modification to adapt to any unforeseen circumstances that may arise. The PM, with the assistance of the PMC, will initiate the development of all engineering contracts. As a strong leader, the PM will be a driving force to ensure timely completion of the environmental clearance processes. Upon environmental clearance, the PM will direct the acquisition of right-of-way and relocation of utilities with the assistance of the PMC and ODOT Right-of-Way Division. The PM will provide guidance to the DEFs on design criteria and schedules for the projects. As project plans are complete and funding secured, the PM will submit the contract documents for competitive bid. The PM will maintain the overall schedule and work together with the ODOT Operations staff to monitor the progress of construction projects. ODOT Operations will appoint a Construction Contract Coordinator (CCC) to coordinate and oversee the construction contracts and activities. The PM will track the authorization and use of funds and will ensure that all reporting activities are completed as necessary.

Several of the HSIPRP segments require close cooperation with other entities. The BNSF, UPRR, City of Oklahoma City and City of Tulsa are listed as a few of the critical stakeholders. The PM will establish a close working relationship with those, and other involved parties. Regular meetings between the PM, PMC, CCC, DEFs, contractors and key stakeholders will be held to discuss the status of all aspects of the various components to ensure the success of this crucial program.

regulation? (Reference to or discussion of potential waiver petitions will not affect FRA's handling or disposition such waiver petitions).	1C.	y part of the Corridor Program require approval by FRA of a waiver petition from	a Federal railroad safety
such waiver natitions)		on? (Reference to or discussion of potential waiver petitions will not affect FRA's h	andling or disposition of
such waiver pentions).		iver petitions).	

YES- If yes, explain and provide a timeline for obtaining the waiver
⊠NO
Please limit response to 1,500 characters.

1D. Provide a preliminary self-assessment of Corridor Program uncertainties and mitigation strategies (consider funding risk, schedule risk and stakeholder risk). Describe any areas in which the applicant could use technical assistance, best practices, advice or support from others, including FRA. Please limit response to 2,000 characters.

Projects of this magnitude always involve funding risks. These funding risks evolve from the lack of priority that is given to the project by stakeholders and project sponsors. As Project Sponsor for the High Speed Rail initiative, The State of Oklahoma has demonstrated the priority it places on providing quality passenger rail service through its commitment to AmTrak's Heartland Flyer that operates between Oklahoma City and Ft. Worth. This commitment is in the form of operational and financial support through the Department of Transportation.

The Governor and the State Legislature created appropriate legislation to provide annual funding for the State's commitment to passenger rail service. This financial commitment provides the necessary dedicated revenue to support the operation and maintenance cost (O & M) for the Heartland Flyer. The annual O & M cost for the Heartland Flyer is completely subsidized with state funds at approximately \$2.3 million annually. With that continued level of commitment, it is the intent of the State to provide full funding for the O & M cost of the Oklahoma City to Tulsa High Speed Rail corridor.

(2) Stakeholder Agreements Narrative. Additional information on Stakeholder Agreements is provided in Section 5.1.2.2 of the HSIPR Guidance.

Under each of the following categories, describe the applicant's progress in developing requisite agreements with key stakeholders. In addition to describing the current status of any such agreements, address the applicant's experience in framing and implementing similar agreements, as well as the specific topics pertaining to each category.

**2A. Ownership Agreements** – Describe how agreements will be finalized with railroad infrastructure owners listed in the "Right-of-Way Ownership" and "Service Description" tables in Section B. If appropriate, "owner(s)" may also include operator(s) under trackage rights or lease agreements. Describe how the parties will agree on Corridor Program design and scope, benefits, implementation, use of Corridor Program property, maintenance, scheduling, dispatching and operating slots, Corridor Program ownership and disposition, statutory conditions and other essential topics. Summarize the status and substance of any ongoing or completed agreements. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

Please see our Project Management Plan.

**2B. Operating Agreements** – Describe the status and contents of agreements with the intended operator(s) listed in "Services" table in the Application Overview section above. Address Corridor Program benefits, operation and financial conditions, statutory conditions, and other relevant topics. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

We currently have an operating agreement with AMTRAK. For further details on operating agreements please see our Project Mangement Plan.

**2C. Selection of Operator** – If the proposed operator railroad was not selected competitively, please provide a justification for its selection, including why the selected operator is most qualified, taking into account cost and other quantitative and qualitative factors, and why the selection of the proposed operator will not needlessly increase the cost of the Corridor Program or of the operations that it enables or improves. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

The State of Oklahoma already has a well-established operating partnership with AMTRAK. We envision broadening this relationship due to the obvious benefit of having a single operator running and maintaining contiguous service from Ft. Worth, Texas to Tulsa, Oklahoma to avoid complications caused by the inability to share equipment and other features.

**2D**. **Other Stakeholder Agreements** – Provide relevant information on other stakeholder agreements including State and local governments. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

We share operations of the Heartland Flyer with the State of Texas, and we have been given commitments from the City of Oklahoma City, the City of Tulsa, the State of Oklahoma, COTPA and BNSF and UPRR have committed their support in writing to work through all the remainig issues on the corridor beyond the segments they have already provided documentation on. Please see our Project Management Plan for a more thorough analysis and list.

**2E. Agreements with operators of other types of rail service -** Are benefits to non-intercity passenger rail services (e.g., commuter, freight) foreseen? Describe any cost sharing agreements with operators of non-intercity passenger rail service (e.g., commuter, freight). *Please limit response to 3,000 characters.* 

Definite and quantifiable freight benefits are a direct result of the entire package of this corridor. Several of them are listed in the various corridor narratives found throughout this application.

(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information  3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information  3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information  3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
<ul> <li>(3) Financial Information</li> <li>3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).</li> </ul>		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
(3) Financial Information 3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).		
3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applicable).	(3) Financial Information	
	3A. Capital Funding Sources. Please provide the following information about your funding sources (if applications)	able).

OMB No. 2130-0583

Track 2

Non FRA Funding Sources	New or Existing Funding Source?	Status of Funding <sup>4</sup>	Type of Funds	Dollar Amount (millions of \$ YOE)	% of Program Cost	Describe uploaded supporting documentation to help FRA verify funding source
State of Okla	Existing	Committed	State revenues	\$2.3m	100%	
State of Texas	Existing	Committed	State revenues	\$2.3	100%	
State of Okla	New	Planned	State revenues			
Cities of						
OKC&Tulsa	New	Planned	City revenues			letters of support

**3B.** Capital Investment Financial Agreements. Describe any cost sharing contribution the applicant intends to make towards the Corridor Program, including its source, level of commitment, and agreement to cover cost increases or financial shortfalls. Describe the status and nature of any agreements between funding stakeholders that would provide for the applicant's proposed match, including the responsibilities and guarantees undertaken by the parties. Provide a brief description of any in-kind matches that are expected. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

The State of Oklahoma is financially committed to delivering this project with the assistance of no less than two significant partners and stakeholders. The City of Oklahoma City and the City of Tulsa have agreed in principle to financially participate in the project. The State of Oklahoma is willing and able to commit the necessary funding to complete the capital project and provide any necessary match to funding provided by the federal government. Financial contributions by the other stakeholders will provide relief to the State but it will not diminish the State's financial commitment.

#### 3C. Corridor Program Sustainability and Operating Financial Plan.

Please report on the Applicant's projections of future financial requirements to sustain the service by completing the table below (in YOE dollars) and answering the following question. Describe the source, nature, share, and likelihood of each identified funding source that will enable the State to satisfy its projected financial support requirements to sustain the operation of the service addressed in this Corridor Program. *Please limit response to 2,000 characters*.

The specific source of the funding to satisfy the necessary financial support is unknown at this time, it is the commitment of the State of Oklahoma along with the City of Oklahoma City and the City of Tulsa to provide priority funding for the operation and maintenance of the rail line.

In 2005 the Governor and the State Legislature elevated the priority of transportation in the State Oklahoma. By doing so the Department of Transportation (ODOT) began receiving annually increasing amounts of money for various modes of transportation including passenger rail service. Each year ODOT received \$17.5 million plus the amount received the previous year. The money is provided to ODOT as a dedicated portion of Income Tax revenue provided for transportation before any other allocations are made to other components of state government. Legislation in 2007 and 2008 provided for an increase in the amount of annual change that is provided for transportation. With these pieces of legislation, the annual increase added to the previous year allocation grew to \$30 million from \$17.5 million. Also, the level of funding allocated from Income Tax revenues will cause the state funds for transportation to more than double from \$200 million to \$570 million annually. These legislative efforts indicate the commitment the State of Oklahoma made to create a preeminent state wide transportation system which includes high speed rail as a major component.

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

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

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

Page 23

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> <u>Reference Notes:</u> The following categories and definitions are applied to funding sources:

Note: Please enter supporting projections in the Track 2 Application Supporting Forms, and submit related funding agreements or other documents with the Supporting Materials described in Part G of this Track 2 Application. The numbers entered in this table must agree with analogous numbers in the Supporting Forms.

		Projected Totals by Year (\$ Millions Year Of Expenditure (YOE)* Dollars - One Decimal)				
Funding Requirement (as identified on the Supporting Form)	Baseline Actual-FY 2009 Levels (State operating subsidy for FY 2009 if existing service)	First full year of operation	Fifth full year of operation	Tenth full year of operation		
Indicate the Fiscal Year	2009	2013	2018	2023		
Surplus/deficit after capital asset renewal charge <sup>5</sup>	2.3	5.3	40.7	48.2		
Total Non-FRA sources of funds applicable to the surplus/deficit after capital asset renewal	2.3	5.3	40.7	53.7		
Funding Requirements for which Available Funds Are Not Identified	0	0	0	0		

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

Note: Data reported in this section should be consistent with the information provided in the Operating and Financial Performance supporting form for this application.

\_\_\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> The "capital asset renewal charge" is an annualized provision for **future** asset replacement, refurbishment, and expansion. It is the annualized equivalent to the "continuing investments" defined in the FRA's Commercial Feasibility Study of high-speed ground transportation (*High-Speed Ground Transportation for America*, September 1997, available at <a href="http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/515">http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/515</a> (see pages 5-6 and 5-7).

(4) Financial Management Capacity and Capability – Provide audit results and/or other evidence to describe applicant capability to absorb potential cost overruns, financial shortfalls identified in 3C, or financial responsibility for potential disposition requirements (include as supporting documentation as needed). Provide statutory references/ legal authority to build and oversee a rail capital investment. *Please limit response to 3,000 characters*.

The following statutory reference provides the legal authority for the State of Oklahoma to build and oversee a rail capital investment, specifically passenger rail infrastructure: §66-321 the "Oklahoma Tourism and Passenger Rail Act". The provisions of this act are utilized to manage and oversee the operations and funding of the current Heartland Flyer train that operates between Oklahoma City and Ft. Worth, Texas.

The Department of Transportation has a history of acquiring, and significant experience managing, railroad infrastructure. In the early 1980s, the Department of Transportation began acquiring abandoned rail lines under the statutory authority provided by the "Railroad Revitalization Act" contained in state statute §66 302.1. During that period of time the legislature appropriated \$40.9 million for the acquisition and preservation of rail lines in Oklahoma. In 2009 dollars that amount equates to \$97 million. Today the state of Oklahoma owns 953 miles of railroad that are leased to short line railroads.

The Department of Transportation (ODOT) has a history of receiving unqualified opinions on annual audits conducted by the State Auditor and Inspector (SA&I). Copies of these audits are available from the SA&I or ODOT. Additionally, ODOT is periodically reviewed or audited by the USDOT Office of Inspector General and the Federal Transit Administration. The Federal Highway Administration conducts both financial and operation reviews related to ODOT's highway program.

The Department of Transportation has significant experience funding and financing all aspects of major transportation infrastructure projects. ODOT provides essential funding for cost overruns and that amount is accounted for as a part of the project estimate and budget. Consequently, when overruns occur the necessary financing has been provided and does not impede progress toward completion of the project. The average cost of overruns on the construction program administered by ODOT is less than 1% annually.

(5) Timeliness of Corridor Program Completion – Provide the following information on the dates and duration of key activities, if applicable. For more information, see Section 5.1.3.1 of the HSIPR Guidance, Timeliness of Corridor Program Completion.

Final Design Duration:	36 months
Construction Duration:	57 months
Rolling Stock Acquisition/Refurbishment Duration:	24 months
Service Operations Start date:	07/2012 (mm/yyyy)

- (6) If applicable, describe how the Corridor Program will promote domestic manufacturing, supply and industrial development, including furthering United States-based equipment manufacturing and supply industries. *Please limit response to 1,500 characters.*
- (7) If applicable, describe how the Corridor Program will help develop United States professional railroad engineering, operating, planning and management capacity needed for sustainable IPR development in the United States. Please limit response to 1,500 characters.
  - We believe due to the geography of our HSR leg from Oklahoma City to Tulsa, Oklahoma along a very straight transportation corridor that this track has a very real chance to emerge as the single fastest in-operation rail segment in the United States when initially put into operation. Its open nature allows for various testing and practice operations that would be difficult to perform in typical crowded urban corridors where heavy development has occurred as is the case for many high speed corridors.

Corridor Program Name: OK South Central HSR Date of Submission: 9-30-09 Version Number: 1

#### F. Additional Information

- (1) Please provide any additional information, comments, or clarifications and indicate the section and question number that you are addressing (e.g., Section E, Question 1B). *This section is optional.* 
  - We have attached emissions reports and full jobs analysis as well as other pertinent items in our"additional items" section of our upload application area. We have provided route maps, project location maps, as well as string diagrams depicting ultimate service lines between Kansas City and Ft. Worth at a time competitive with air travel
  - Also please note that we have obtained commitment and partnership letters from the City of OKC, the City of Tulsa, both of their MPO and Transit Authorities, the BNSF, the UPRR, as well as the COTPA who are a vital component of our easily and quickly clearing the Urban Connector Environementally to begin ROW and FD on this segment.

Corridor Program Name: OKLA South Central HSR Corridor Date of Submission: 10-1-09 Version Number:

## G.Summary of Application Materials

Note: In addition to the requirements listed below, applicants must comply with all requirements set forth in the HSIPR Guidance and all applicable Federal laws and regulations, including the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) and the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA).

Application Forms	Required for Corridor Programs	Required for Projects [See Note Below]	Reference	Comments
☐ This Application Form	<b>√</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	
Corridor Service Overview (Same Corridor Service Overview may be used for multiple applications)	<b>✓</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	
Supporting Forms (Forms are provided by FRA on Grant Solutions and the FRA website)	Required for Corridor Programs	Required for Projects [See Note Below]	Reference	Comments
☐ General Info	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.5	FRA Excel Form
□ Detailed Capital Cost Budget	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.5	FRA Excel Form
Annual Capital Cost Budget	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.5	FRA Excel Form
Operating and Financial Performance and Any Related Financial Forms	<b>√</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 5.3.5	FRA Excel Form
Program or Project Schedule	✓	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.5	FRA Excel Form

<b>Supporting Documents</b> (Documents to be generated and provided by the applicant)	Required for Corridor Programs	Required for Projects [See Note Below]	Reference	Comments
	<b>√</b>		Corridor Service Overview Question B.2	
Service Development Plan	<b>√</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6.2	
☐ "Service" NEPA	<b>~</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6.2	
□ Project Management Plan	<b>√</b>		HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.2	
"Project" NEPA (Required before obligation of funds)		<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6.2	
□ PE Materials	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6.2	
	<b>√</b>	<b>√</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.2	
☐ Financial Plan	<b>~</b>	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.2	
	<b>√</b>	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 1.6.2	
<b>Standard Forms</b> (Can be found on the FRA website and www.forms.gov)	Required for Corridor Programs	Required for Projects [See Note Below]	Reference	Comments

SF 424: Application for Federal Assistance	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Form
SF 424C: Budget Information- Construction	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Form
SF 424D: Assurances-Construction	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Form
FRA Assurances Document	<b>✓</b>	HSIPR Guidance Section 4.3.3.3	Form

Note: Items checked under "Corridor Programs" are required at the time of submission of this Track 2 Corridor Programs application. Items checked under "Projects" are optional at the time of submission of this Track 2 Corridor Programs application, but required prior to FD/Construction grant award.

PRA Public Protection Statement: Public reporting burden for this information collection is estimated to average 16 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.