

ATTACHMENT A

State Rail Plan Implementation Program

Nation	Planning Entity	Long Term Plan	Implementation Plan	Planning Period	Political Approval	Guaranteed Rail Investment in Planning Period (USD/yr)	Construction Funding Prior to Design Completion?	Full Funding?
Norway	Ministry of Transport	Capacity Strategy	National Transport Plan	12 years including 6 year subperiods	Parliament	\$3.5b	No	Yes
Germany	Federal Ministry of Infrastructure	Germany Timetable	Federal Transportation Infrastructure Plan	15 years, with updates aka "requirements plans" every 5 years	Parliament	\$1.8b	No	Yes
Italy	Rete Ferroviaria Italiana (network manager)	Sustainable Urban Management Plan	Program Contract	5 years	CIPESS: National economic planning council	\$2.6b	No	Yes
Switzerland	Federal Office of Transport	Rail Vision 2050	Expansion Phase	4/8 years	Parliament; national vote for megaprojects like tunnels.	\$2b	No	Yes
United Kingdom	Network Rail (network manager)	Long Term Plan	Control Period	5 years	Parliament	\$2.8b (renewals only)	No	Yes
California	Caltrans	State Rail Plan	Transit Intercity Rail Program	5 years	No	\$0	Yes	No

International Comparison of Investment Frameworks

Background

- Since 2015 the TIRCP program has provided capital funding to transit and intercity rail expansion, capacity and rolling stock.
- The Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program has not delivered substantial outcomes for rail and transit service
- The TIRCP program has no requirement that investment relate to state or regional service planning goals.
- Without direction by an overarching service plan the TIRCP investment has been scattered and ineffective.
- TIRCP is a competitive, discretionary grant program with broad eligibility and partial awards
- The pattern of reliance on funding projects with a patchwork of partial awards leads at an early stage of design leads to [cost escalation and project delay](#) —.

- Without an overarching plan or goal, many sponsor agencies have used TIRCP to backfill other funding sources for projects due to cost increases due to external demands or project mismanagement.
- New mandates like zero emissions rolling stock have resulted in a surge of TIRCP grant applications for capital funding that are needed but provide no additional service.
- Agencies can project the potential for TIRCP to relieve them of their particular cost pressures, but such funding is never guaranteed.
- **After ten years, it is time for California to implement [global transit best practices by integrating state and regional service plans with capital investment](#).**

Program reform goals

- Advance implementation of the [State Rail Plan](#) by transforming plan documents to concrete and steel infrastructure and to service that reduces VMT and GHG emissions.
- Nurture projects that meet State Rail Plan service goals from inception through final design and full funding.
- Provide full funding of projects only after design is complete
- Provide an orderly and rational way to evaluate project costs and benefits prior to making commitments for full funding construction awards.
- Create a project pipeline structure that encourages project sponsors to minimize costs and non-essential scope while maximizing service benefits.

Proposed Reforms

- Leave rolling stock and capital projects for transit as-is: competitive discretionary grant program through TIRCP
- Create a State Rail Plan Implementation Program (SRPIP) for Intercity and Regional Rail
 - Funded by commitment of 1/3 of total transit capital allocation from Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund
 - New guidelines will be developed over two years to establish a) SRPIP b) Eligibility rules for construction funding
 - SPRIP - 5 year framework agreement with project sponsors; based on Corridor ID process developed by FRA.
 - Project sponsors can apply to enter a 5 year framework agreement once
 - In the State Rail Plan as a service concept
 - preferred alternative is selected
 - a preliminary designer has been identified
 - 20% local match for preliminary design work
 - Projects that enter a 5 year framework agreement receive funding for Caltrans staff, sponsor agency staff or consultants to progress design
 - Declare intent of Legislature for Caltrans to provide more planning and design support for SRP implementation.
 - Projects that fail to progress design may be passed up for final design funding.

- Projects that add non-essential scope or decrease service benefits may lose priority for design or construction funding.
- Provides certainty to project sponsors to progress and complete design.
- Provides competitive pressure for project sponsors to focus on keeping costs low and benefits high.
- Eligibility guidelines for construction funding
 - In the State Rail Plan as a service concept
 - Be part of the 5 year Framework Agreement for the State Rail Plan
 - Design maturity at 100%
 - A positive cost/benefit ratio
 - Projects that concede essential scope or water down service will be de-prioritized for construction awards relative to competitors
 - Full funding of construction costs; avoid partial awards
- **First two years: SRPIP construction funding eligibility as bridge period as guidelines are fully developed**
 - In the State Rail Plan as a service concept
 - Design maturity at 90%