New York Metropolitan Transportation Council

New York, NY. June 20, 2013
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- Program Overview
- Alternatives Development
- Next Steps
A Rail Investment Program

- Initiated by Federal Railroad Administration in February 2012
- Focus on improving passenger rail service between Washington, D.C. and Boston
  - Intercity, commuter, regional, and connecting services
  - Accommodate freight growth
- Long-term vision for 2040 with incremental approach
  - Service Development Plan
  - Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement
Objectives

- Regional consensus on long-term plan
  - Broad, programmatic service options and infrastructure improvements needed to meet 2040 demand
  - Coordinated federal and state investment in the NEC to accommodate growth

- Opportunity for a fresh look at the NEC
  - Identify new markets and changing development patterns
  - Develop and test new types of regional and intercity service
  - Evaluate needs and options for high-speed rail service
Collaborative Process

Key Stakeholders:
- Northeast Corridor Infrastructure and Operations Advisory Commission
- Eight states and the District of Columbia
- Commuter authorities, Amtrak, and NEC freight operators
- Environmental resource agencies
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations
- Interest groups
- Technical Working Groups
Collaborative Process

General public and NEC communities:

- Website, newsletters and email list
- Scoping process – June-October 2012
- Dialogues workshops – December 2012 and April 2013
- Station outreach tour – April-May 2013
- Fall workshops 2013
- www.necfuture.com
Alternatives Development Process

1. Purpose & Need
2. Scoping
3. Data Collection
4. Stakeholder Outreach
5. Initial and Preliminary Alternatives
6. Evaluation
7. Reasonable Alternatives
8. Alternatives Comparison
9. No Action Alternative
## Alternatives Organized Around Three Key Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Markets</th>
<th>Service Options</th>
<th>Program Investment Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Where are people going?  
- Where will growth occur?  
- What markets are underserved by rail? | - What do travelers prefer?  
- More frequent  
- Faster  
- More one-seat rides | - How much capacity is required to meet service and market objectives? |
Access to the urban core is critical
  › Travelers looking for broader rail options as urban areas expand and grow more inter-connected

Most NEC intercity travel markets are already served by rail, but:
  › Some markets lack frequent direct intercity service:
    - Long Island
    - Hartford/Springfield/Worcester
  › Travelers want better connections to:
    - Existing corridors: Southeast, Keystone, Empire, Vermont
    - Potential new rail corridors: Annapolis, Lehigh Valley, Cape Cod

Strong consensus to **fix existing NEC spine first** before adding new markets/routes
Commuter Rail Markets

- Fundamental challenge is access to center city hubs
  - NJ TRANSIT/LIRR access to New York Penn Station
  - MBTA capacity at South Station
  - MARC/VRE access and midday storage at Washington Union Station
- Commuter agencies foresee significant growth
  - Incremental growth on existing lines
  - Major growth with plans to add new and extended lines
- Through-service at New York Penn Station and Washington Union Station could generate significant additional capacity and service options
Service Options

Conventional
• Maintain the mix of services offered on the NEC today, including commuter / regional trains, intercity service, and high-speed
• Each of these service types would increase in proportion to market demand

Faster
• Minimize travel time for key intercity travel markets
• Express service with limited stops on improved or new rail right-of-way
• Convenient, well-coordinated transfers at express hub stations
• Less frequent non-express service

More Frequent
• Maximize service frequency
• Maximize NEC passenger-carrying capacity
• Convenient, well-coordinated transfers at hub stations
• May limit opportunities for higher speed service and one-seat ride service from connecting corridors

More One-Seat Rides
• Maximize one-seat rides on and off NEC spine
• Run-through service from connecting corridors
• More choices of direct service to various destinations
• Each individual train service would be less frequent
### Program Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level: A (Low)</th>
<th>Program Level: B (Medium Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Allows for modest increases in service along the existing spine</td>
<td>• Allows service expansions in all markets on the existing spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Addresses some of the worst choke points along the corridor</td>
<td>• Provides additional capacity for some new types of express and regional service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improves off-corridor connections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level: C (Medium High)</th>
<th>Program Level: D (High)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Major increase in service to all markets on the existing spine</td>
<td>• Supports a major increase in the amount, quality, and variety of services offered on the NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Targeted investments to serve new markets and provide robust regional service</td>
<td>• Adds a second spine between Washington D.C. and Boston, allowing for high-speed rail connections and robust regional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significantly expands service to connecting corridors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces trip times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15 Alternatives

- All 15 maintain and improve service on the existing NEC Spine
- Alternatives 1 through 7 remain along the existing NEC Spine
- Alternatives 8 through 11 focus improvements on the existing NEC Spine, and provide potential service to downtown Baltimore, Center City Philadelphia, and some off-corridor markets
- Alternative 12 adds a second NEC Spine roughly parallel to the existing spine
- Alternatives 13 through 15 add a second NEC Spine on a new route
## Preliminary Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alt</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Service Outcomes</th>
<th>Service Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Meets 2040 demand.</td>
<td>Conventional intercity/commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some increase in service and capacity along the existing NEC spine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional intercity/commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intra-urban metropolitan service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Modest service expansion.</td>
<td>Conventional intercity/commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased service to existing and connecting markets along the existing NEC spine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Maximize train frequency / service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Minimize travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Maximize one-seat ride options on and off NEC spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Best we can do on the existing NEC spine.</td>
<td>Conventional intercity/commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Targeted expansion of the existing NEC spine to serve new markets, reduce trip time, and introduce robust regional services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Maximize train frequency / service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Minimize travel time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus: Maximize one-seat ride options on and off NEC spine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Additional of Second Spine</td>
<td>Generally parallel to existing NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated high speed rail; robust intercity and regional services on existing NEC spine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Via Danbury-Hartford-Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Via Suffolk-Hartford-Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Via Delmarva and Nassau-Stamford-Danbury-Springfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Route for Preliminary Alternative 13

LEGEND
- Existing NEC Spine
- Second NEC Spine
- Existing Connecting Rail Corridor
- Potential Connecting Service
- Commuter/Regional Rail
- Existing Rail Station
- Potential Rail Station
Route for Preliminary Alternative 14
Route for Preliminary Alternative 15

LEGEND
- Existing NEC Spine
- Second NEC Spine
- Existing Connecting Rail Corridor
- Potential Connecting Service
- Commuter/Regional Rail
- Existing Rail Station
- Potential Rail Station
Approach to Defining Screening Criteria

- Screen Preliminary to Reasonable Alternatives
- Use a wide range of criteria
- Reflect comments received from agencies and public
  - Scoping process
  - Dialogues workshops
  - NEC Commission
  - Technical Working Groups
Preliminary Screening Criteria

- Incremental Rail Ridership
- Capital Cost
- Service Effectiveness
- System Resiliency
- System Connectivity
- Support Economic Development
- Ability to Accommodate Freight
- Project Constructability
- Project Phasing
- Environmental Benefit/Impacts
2013 Technical Work

- Review Preliminary Alternatives with stakeholders and public
- Develop screening methodology to guide evaluation
- Evaluate Preliminary Alternatives
  - Estimate future ridership
  - Create prototypical rail service plans
  - Identify operating impacts and capacity requirements
  - Define infrastructure improvements and estimated capital costs
  - Screen alternatives based on quantitative and qualitative criteria
- Develop Reasonable Alternatives
- Prepare for environmental impact analysis of Reasonable Alternatives
Environmental Analysis

- **Study Area**
  - Entire NEC FUTURE Study Area
  - Identification of key environmental features

- **Existing Conditions**
  - Normalized data for consistency throughout NEC

- **Affected Environment**
  - Resource-specific methodologies
  - On-corridor (NEC Spine) and off-corridor affected environment swaths defined to focus existing conditions discussion
Questions?