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Austin - San Antonio Rail Corridor Overview

- Union Pacific owns right of way through Austin-San Antonio corridor
- Previous conversations to relocate have been unsuccessful
- Union Pacific has no current incentive to move
- **Operations:**
  - The right-of-way varies between 50 and 100 ft
  - Tracks designed for 70 mph but used at an average of 25 mph
  - Carries construction materials, coal, chemical products, and many NAFTA goods
Guiding Questions

1. What is the ideal alignment and why?
2. Where is the opposition going to come from?
3. Where is the subsidy going to come from?
4. Who stands to make money?
Outside of Report Scope

- Detailed alignment recommendations
- Recommended operating details (for freight or passenger rail)
- Precise station locations

Image courtesy of Meg Merritt
History
## Freight Line History

- Austin-San Antonio rail line originally established by International-Great Northern Railroad
- Missouri Pacific (MoPac) Railroad acquired line in 1920s and merged with Union Pacific in 1982
- This rail line has played an integral in the region's economic development, helping move goods across the region and country

### Problem/Opportunity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>The Solution</th>
<th>Freight Corridor</th>
<th>Passenger Corridor</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Freight Corridor

- Single & Double Track
- Triple & Quadruple Track
- Trackage Rights

### Passenger Corridor

Source: Union Pacific

Source: Trains.com
Freight deregulation is highly contentious
Critics argue deregulation has led to lower safety standards, higher risks for workers and the public
Examples include:
  - Staggers Rail Act of 1980 (limited gov. ability to regulate rates)
  - 2016 withdraw of long-held rail industry safety rule requiring two-person crews

Source: NBC News
Central Texas Population

1870

- = 500 residents

2020
Texas Passenger Rail Context

- Texas trails other states in passenger rail development, forgoing economic opportunities
  - TxDOT builds roads
  - Lack of clear goals and initiatives
  - Limited pursuit of funding
- Austin-San Antonio regional growth
  - Population growth
  - Economic development
  - Infrastructure investments


Source: Federal Railroad Administration
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**Legend**

- LSTAR Regional/Passenger Rail
- Proposed Future Extension
- Proposed Station Location
- Universities
- Freight Rail Relocation Study Area
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# What Has Changed Since These Projects?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem/Opportunity</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>The Solution</th>
<th>Freight Corridor</th>
<th>Passenger Corridor</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal infrastructure bill increased passenger rail funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TxDOT applied for federal passenger rail study funding for the first time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent freight derailments have mounted political and social pressure to improve safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sentiment towards climate crisis has created interest in more sustainable transportation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile costs have continued to rise, creating financial strain and stress on American households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Problem & The Opportunity
East Palestine derailment controlled chemical burn  Source: NPR
Clear and Present Environmental Dangers

- Relaxed safety standards = more derailments
- Approximately three trains derail each day in the US
- 5,000 HazMat spills or leaks in the last decade
Unsustainable Growth

- The Austin-San Antonio corridor is home to 4.3M and expected to double by 2030
- Annual population growth is 3% year over year in the region
- Sprawl in outskirts of the cities incentivizes use of private vehicles

Subdivisions in Hill Country Source: San-Antonio Express News
I-35 is Overburdened

• For each 1% increase in population, there is a 3-4% increase in traffic on I-35
• Most congested road in Texas for truck causing major delays
• Annual congestion costs between Austin and San Antonio are $500M
## Existing Amtrak Service

**Existing Amtrak service is slow and unreliable**

- Track priority not enforced
- One train per day
- Long run times
- 1+ hour delayed ~70% of the time
## Current Amtrak Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Taylor</th>
<th>Austin</th>
<th>San Marcos</th>
<th>San Antonio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centrally Located</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal Connectivity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/Building</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket Counter/ Kiosk</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wifi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vending Machines</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearby Amenities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = present  ❌ = absent  ○ = present to a degree
The Opportunity

- Re-domestication of production to North America (China → Mexico)
- Canadian Pacific-Kansas City Southern merger (now CPKC) is a strong NAFTA move
- 48% of U.S. NAFTA products are transported through Texas using the I-35 corridor
- Union Pacific is market leader in the corridor
The Solution:
A Tale of Two Projects
A Tale of Two Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
<th>Problem/Opportunity</th>
<th>The Solution</th>
<th>Freight Corridor</th>
<th>Passenger Corridor</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Aerial view of I-35 corridor  Source: Google Maps
Address the two projects separately

1. Bluebonnet Bypass

2. Bluebonnet Express

History

Problem/Opportunity

The Solution

Freight Corridor

Passenger Corridor

Conclusion

Union Pacific Rolling Stock | Source: Associated Press

Texas Railway Express Train | Source: Dallas Morning News
Alignment Alternatives

1. Along I-35
2. New greenfield passenger rail alignment
3. Expanded Union Pacific ROW
4. Union Pacific relocated to the east
A Win-Win Situation

Union Pacific gets:
• Improved efficiency
• Opportunity for growth
• Tracks with cost-effective grade separation and safety features

The public gets:
• High performance passenger rail service
• Separation from hazardous materials
• Economic development opportunities
• Traffic reduction
A re-brand of LSRD

- New project requires new identity
- TRAC will be the leading agency for both projects and their delivery
- A re-brand allows for the same powers as LSRD
  - Collect revenue
  - Issue debt
  - Solicit federal funds
Freight Rail Relocation
Recommendation
The Vision

Union Pacific

- With today’s line...
- With the Bluebonnet Bypass...
Costs and Benefits

Costs
• Average: $54 million per mile
• Total cost: $14-16 billion

Benefits
• Increased speed + capacity
• Economies of scale
• Costs would be shared, so Union Pacific’s net benefit will be greater
Capital Financing

Existing federal programs:

- **RRIF** (Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing)
- **TIFIA** (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)

Proposed program:

- Central Texas local freight development fund
NEPA

Complicated process requiring strong project definition

- Must prioritized and plan for NEPA throughout the entire process
- NEPA is where we humanize the project
  - Community engagement
  - Engineering and design of tangible objects
- Coordination with other entities
Passenger Corridor
### Stations

1. Downtown Austin
2. Kyle/Buda
3. San Marcos
4. New Braunfels
5. Downtown San Antonio
The Vision

Shireen

• Today...

• With the Bluebonnet Express...
## Costs and Benefits

### Costs
- Average: $54 million per mile
- Total cost: $3-5 billion

### Benefits
- Connected communities, improved quality of life, better use of time
- $639 million in annual tax revenue
- $2 million in decreased annual toxic emissions
- 51,000 project jobs, 2,500 permanent jobs created
- $600 million from extended life of highways
Capital Financing

Existing federal and state programs:

- **FSP** (Federal-State Partnership)
- **CRISI** (Consolidated Rail Infrastructure and Safety Improvements)
- **RRIF** (Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing)
- **TIFIA** (Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act)
- **TIF** (Tax Increment Financing)
Operational Financing

Possible funding streams:

• Dedicated local taxes/specific fees
• State and local bonds
• Motor fuels tax
• State transportation fund
• State general fund

Funding Sources FY 2019
### Legislative asks

- Local/state to help fund NEPA process
- Update safety regulations at federal and state level
- Use State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) to match federal financing
- Use State gas tax to be used for rail in addition to roads
Broad Political Array

A line from ATX to SATX crosses a broad array of stakeholders

- Urban, suburban, and rural
- Residents, ranchers, renters, owners
- Varied political powers and priorities

We need a Republican champion in the state legislature.
NEPA

Complicated process requiring strong project definition and strong relationship with community stakeholders

- NEPA is where we humanize the project
  - Community engagement
  - Engineering and design of tangible objects
- Coordination with other entities
Land Use

Station development = opportunity to create a *destination*

Stations should:
- Improve citizen quality of life
- Maximize potential revenue
- Increase transit ridership

*Source: North Miami Beach TOD Master Plan*
Station Design and Multimodal Connections

Key to increasing ridership and improving quality of life

• Can help solve the first/last mile problem
• Some strategies include:
  o Timed transfers
  o Crosswalks and ped safety elements
  o Bike parking
  o Shared micro-mobility
Conclusion
Conclusion

Recommendations:

- Approach the project as two separate, but related efforts
- Reframe the Union Pacific relocation as a safety need with added economic opportunities
- Identify a political champion/s to shepherd the process
- Empower a leading organization who can manage the NEPA process
- Employ available funding and financing strategies to build the passenger and freight corridors
- Leverage the opportunity for transit-oriented development
Thank you
Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Benefits for UP</th>
<th>Drawbacks for UP</th>
<th>Benefits for residents</th>
<th>Drawbacks for residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I-35</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td>• Stations would be located near existing population centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight and passenger trains operate on separate ROWs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially little displacement along route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Curvature of highway would require trains to go slower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would require significant political capital to get TXDOT on board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. New Greenfield Passenger Alignment</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td>• Freight and passenger trains operate on separate ROWs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would require significant displacement at high cost or would be located far from existing population centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Add additional tracks for passenger rail on existing Union Pacific ROW</td>
<td>• Upgraded track • Grade separated crossings</td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td>• Stations would be located near existing population centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals remain in heavily populated areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight and passenger trains operate on the same ROW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Relocate freight rail to eastern alignment</td>
<td>• Faster travel times between Taylor and San Antonio • New track with the latest safety enhancements • Grade separated crossings • Removes hazardous chemicals from heavily populated areas • New freight line is potentially located near emerging industries</td>
<td>• Some existing costumers, such as quarries, may no longer be served</td>
<td>• Removes hazardous chemicals from heavily populated areas</td>
<td>• Displacement of ranchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stations would be located near existing population centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight and passenger trains operate on separate ROWs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially little displacement along route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hazardous chemicals still located near smaller population centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UP = Union Pacific, PAX = passenger rail, ROW = right of way
A Tale of Two Projects

The Win-Win Situation

- **Union Pacific:** improved service, opportunity for growth, tracks with cost-effective grade separation and safety features
- **The public:** high performance passenger rail service, separation from hazmat, economic development opportunities, traffic reduction
Freight Relocation Benefits

Additional benefits

- More expensive as development expands east
- Infrastructure improvement
- Regulatory compliance
New Alignment Speed Range Time Savings Estimate

*one hour saved = $709 (2023 dollars); Base current speed: 25mph, 30 trainsets per day; 300 operational days per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Speeds</th>
<th>Time &amp; Cost Savings</th>
<th>ALT 4A</th>
<th>ALT 4B</th>
<th>ALT 4C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low (28 mph)</strong></td>
<td>Time Saved</td>
<td>0.45 hr</td>
<td>0.31 hr</td>
<td>0.10 hr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Year Cost</td>
<td>$2.89 million</td>
<td>$1.98 million</td>
<td>$0.61 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings (low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High (35.5 mph)</strong></td>
<td>Time Saved</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Year Cost</td>
<td>$518.4 million</td>
<td>$222.2 million</td>
<td>$18.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savings (low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Costs

How much might this project cost?

• Weighted average: $39M per mile
• Est. Project cost:
  o ALT 4a: $7.7B to $9.8B
  o ALT 4b: $7.3B to $9.3B
  o ALT 4c: $7.2B to $9.2B
### Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Amount per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time savings</td>
<td>$4.3 million - $8.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver cost savings</td>
<td>$24,770 - $41,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion mitigation</td>
<td>$25.14 per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax revenue generation</td>
<td>$639 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended highway life</td>
<td>Maintenance savings: $15.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction savings: $587 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job creation</td>
<td>2,327 – 2,821 sustained jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51,117 project-related jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased toxic emissions</td>
<td>$1.9 million - $2.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost avoidance of car crashes</td>
<td>$78 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Costs

How much might this project cost?

- Average: $54M per mile
- Est. Project cost: $7-10 billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freight Corridor</th>
<th>Passenger Corridor</th>
<th>Cost per Mile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRE</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalTrain</td>
<td></td>
<td>$47.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSRD estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXRail</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39.8M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver Line</td>
<td></td>
<td>$73.1M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Line</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7.3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>