Zoom Controls

Ask a question and share comments

Drop down menu to check microphone and speakers

Raise your hand - *9 for users dialing in (Alt + Y to raise your hand)

If you cannot access the internet or have technical problems, please call into the meeting at 301-715-8592, Webinar ID: 8735108 4276

Closed Captioning Generated by CART Services

If you have any trouble with the meeting technology during the presentation, please call:

1-888-799-9666
Notifications & Procedures

Notification of Recording

• This virtual public meeting will be recorded. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation may choose to retain and distribute the video, still images, audio, and/or transcript. By continuing attendance with this virtual public meeting, you consent to participate in a recorded event.

• If you are not comfortable being recorded, please turn off your camera, and keep your microphone muted, or you may choose to excuse yourself from the meeting.

Other Important Notes

• Your microphone and webcam are automatically disabled upon entering this meeting.

• The meeting will be open to questions and answers at the end of the formal presentation.
Thank you for attending

We appreciate your participation!

Notice Of MassDOT/MBTA Policy Diversity and Civil Rights

All MassDOT/MBTA activities, including public meetings, are free of discrimination. MassDOT/MBTA complies with all federal and state civil rights requirements preventing discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, limited English proficiency, and additional protected characteristics. We welcome the diversity from across our entire service area. If you have any questions or concerns, please visit these sites to reach the Office of Diversity and Civil Rights:

https://www.mass.gov/nondiscrimination-in-transportation-program

www.mbta.com/titlevi

All questions and comments are welcome and appreciated, however, we do request that you refrain from any disrespectful comments.
Agenda

• Study Process

• Presentations and Discussion
  • Module 1: Alternatives Development Approach and Methods
  • Module 2: Evaluation of Phase 1 Alternatives
  • Module 3: Looking Ahead to Phase 2
Study Process

1. Public Participation
   - Public Involvement Plan

2. Documenting Past Efforts
   - Data Collection

3. Market Analysis
   - Demographics, Land Use, Current and Projected Future Travel Patterns

4. Physical, Regulatory, and ROW Ownership
   - Opportunities and Constraints

5. Potential Service Plans and Alternatives
   - Develop Up to 6 Service Alternatives

6. Alternatives Evaluation and Cost Estimate
   - Ridership Analysis, Benefit-Cost Analysis

7. Development of Recommended Next Steps
   - Short- and Long-Term Recommendations, Funding Opportunities, Draft and Final Report
Alternatives Development Approach and Methods
Two-Phase Alternatives Development

Study will evaluate alternatives in two phases – Phase 1 will show how alternatives are shaped and evaluated to assist in developing Phase 2 alternatives.

**PHASE 1**

- Lower investment & higher investment

**PHASE 2**

- Four additional alternatives
### Phase 1 Service Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service Type</td>
<td>One-seat ride from North Adams to Boston North Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stations</td>
<td>4 (North Adams, Greenfield, Fitchburg, Boston North Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>5 trains daily (1 AM peak, 2 midday, 1 PM peak, 1 evening)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Times</td>
<td>Schedule times selected for trip purposes; secondary bias toward connection with North-South Service at Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other uses of ROW</td>
<td>Assumes commuter schedules and freight trains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwell Time at Stations</td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Type</td>
<td>Diesel trains with Amfleet passenger cars and same consist as Valley Flyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBTA Infrastructure</td>
<td>No modification to MBTA infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>Limited to signal improvements (including PTC) and upgrade of Class 1 track at East Deerfield Yard; some trackage additions to support meet-pass locations; no change in superelevation on PAS corridor</td>
<td>More track rehabilitation and improvements to support superelevation and increase in track class to fully use capability of the train to match superelevation; some trackage additions to support meet-pass locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rail Simulations 101

Rail Traffic Controller (RTC) is the industry standard for simulating rail service to estimate train performance and trip times for each train.

**STEP 1**

The simulation model is coded using detailed inputs about track designs, train configurations, and their proposed schedules.

**STEP 2**

The RTC software "dispatches" the trains through the network. RTC will attempt to resolve any conflicts by delaying or rerouting a train.

**STEP 3**

The RTC software resolves all conflicts and produces detailed outputs on the systems performance.
Rail Simulation Inputs

- **Track Condition**
  - FRA Track Class speed
  - Timetable speed restrictions

- **Track Geometry**
  - Grades
  - Curves

- **Track Configuration**
  - Single track mainline
  - Single track with passing siding
  - Double track mainline

- **Train Schedules**
  - Freight trains
  - Proposed passenger trains

- **Signal Control System**
  - Automatic blocks
  - Centralized traffic control
  - Positive train control (PTC)

- **Grade Crossings**
  - Average daily vehicle traffic
  - Type of crossing protection

Note: Inputs are based on currently available data and tools, and may be refined as additional information is available.
Rail Simulation Outputs

- Animation of Train Movements
- Time-Distance Diagrams (Stringlines)
- Train Performance Calculator Profiles Displaying:
  - Elevations
  - Speed
  - Throttle
  - Brake settings
  - Cumulative distance
  - Run time
- Track Occupancy Chart
- Detailed Train Status
- Timetables
- Operating Statistics
  - At the individual train level
  - Or summarized by train type
  - Or at a system-wide level
Lower Investment Alternative

- New North Adams Station and Platform
- New Platform and Reconfiguration of Greenfield Station
- Layover and Train Facilities Site
- Double Track Upgrade
- Upgrade Track
- MP-390
- MP-385
- MP-330
- MP-340

**Table: Eastbound Run Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Adams</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 hour 19 minutes</td>
<td>2 hours 53 minutes</td>
<td>3 hours 55 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table: Westbound Run Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>North Adams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>2 hour 35 minutes</td>
<td>3 hours 59 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Higher Investment Alternative

- New North Adams Station and Platform
- New Platform and Reconfiguration of Greenfield Station
- Double Track Upgrade
- Double Track Upgrade
- Layover and Train Facilities Site

**Eastbound Run Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Adams</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47 minutes</td>
<td>1 hour 50 minutes</td>
<td>2 hours 48 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Westbound Run Times**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>North Adams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59 minutes</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>2 hours 58 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poll Question 1

What type of trip would you use the train for under the lower investment alternative?

- Work
- Visiting family and friends
- Day-trips
- Attending games, concerts, or events
- Extended vacations
- Other
Poll Question 2

• What type of trip would you use the train for under the higher investment alternative?

• Work
• Visiting family and friends
• Day-trips
• Attending games, concerts, or events
• Extended vacations
• Other
• Understanding the potential ridership is one way to help weigh the benefits and costs of a new passenger rail service

• Estimating ridership requires data about where people currently travel

• Analytical tools and data inform us about travel markets – where, how and why people travel

• Analysis of travel markets builds estimates of potential new trips on rail and potential shifts from auto to rail

• Auto trips may move to rail for many reasons including:
  • Frequency of service
  • Overall travel time

• Pairing demographic information with ridership projections enables equity analysis of the impact of the rail project
Defining the Overall Travel Market

• Travel market analysis for study based on *existing travel flows* which can be changed by service and policies

• Study analysis is a good approach for feasibility testing, with more detailed approach available as needed

• Discussion focuses on a range of estimates, because of less available detail about impact of change at this early stage
Overview of Data Sources

• **Streetlight Data Location-based Services (LBS)** - Anonymized location records from smart phones and navigation devices.
  
  - Streetlight Data has a 1-35% sample rate of the total travel market

• **American Community Survey (ACS) Journey to Work** – Census collected information on locations of household and workplaces
  
  - Based on five-year average of survey results between 2015-2019
Overview of Travel in the Corridor

Daily Trip Origins by Corridor Segment (2019)

- **Non-Work Trips**: 83%
- **Work Trips**: 12%
- **Central**: 5%

Source: Streetlight Data, 2019
Ridership Estimation Process

**Step 1**
- Develop Model to Predict Ridership based on Observed MBTA and Streetlight Data
  - Inputs include: MBTA Boardings, MBTA Commuter Rail Trains per Station, StreetLight Data LBS Trips from Station Catchment Areas to Boston

**Step 2**
- Estimate Downeaster Travel Time Elasticities (i.e., each additional minute of travel time reduces boardings by X%)
  - Inputs include: Downeaster Trip Data and Travel Times to Boston

**Step 3**
- Apply MBTA Boarding Model to Estimate Corridor Boardings by Market and # of Trains
- Apply Downeaster Travel Time Elasticities to Adjust Boardings for Longer Travel Times
# Initial Ridership Estimation

## Lower Investment Scenario Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Adams</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Boardings</strong></td>
<td>220 - 440</td>
<td>2,420-6,600</td>
<td>18,480-48,730</td>
<td>19,200-50,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Travel Market</strong></td>
<td>1.5-3.0%</td>
<td>4.9-13.4%</td>
<td>3.1-8.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Higher Investment Scenario Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Adams</th>
<th>Greenfield</th>
<th>Fitchburg</th>
<th>Boston North Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Boardings</strong></td>
<td>1,430-4,180</td>
<td>7,370-20,350</td>
<td>21,120-55,330</td>
<td>27,200-72,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Travel Market</strong></td>
<td>9.7-28.2%</td>
<td>15.0-41.4%</td>
<td>3.6-9.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All estimates will be refined as part of the study process.
Ridership Estimation – Takeaways

• Baseline travel market decreases with distance along the corridor

• May be some increase for TD Garden, Red Sox, and other special events, but increase not as significant as other corridors with shorter trip times and established travel patterns
  • Little existing travel from corridor west of Fitchburg to test sample events

• Trip time has a large impact on ridership

• Changes in population and employment could impact these estimates
Poll Question 3

• Who would benefit the most from the two service alternatives?

• Commuters
• Vacationers
• Zero-car households
• Environmental Justice communities
• Individuals in the western region
• Individuals in the central region
• Individuals in the eastern region
Poll Question 4

• Who would not benefit from the two service alternatives?

• Commuters
• Vacationers
• Zero-car households
• Environmental Justice communities
• Individuals in the western region
• Individuals in the central region
• Individuals in the eastern region
Cost Estimation 101

- Cost estimation is the process of forecasting the cost of building an infrastructure project
  - Considers factors such as materials, location, equipment, and labor
  - Process depends upon level of design

- Northern Tier is at pre-design stage
  - Contingency costs account for unknown, but expected elements of the project

- Cost estimates are based on material, equipment, and labor costs from recent railroad construction projects in Massachusetts and surrounding states
# Estimating Total Project Cost

## Cost Category % Construction Costs Sample Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Category</th>
<th>% Construction Costs</th>
<th>Sample Calculations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Permitting</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Varies by alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency at 0% Design</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,650,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total Project Cost also will include escalation based on project schedule and vehicle costs.
## Construction Cost Estimation Example
### End of Siding Interlocking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Material Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$623,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Materials (20%)</td>
<td>$124,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Handling &amp; Delivery (12%)</td>
<td>$89,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Materials Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$838,252</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Labor Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreperson @ 780 hrs</td>
<td>$93,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireperson @ 3,170 hrs</td>
<td>$253,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Foreperson @ 100 hrs</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician @ 200 hrs</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Engineer @ 160 hrs</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$403,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Equipment Costs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Pick-up Truck @ 90 days</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crew Pick-up Truck @ 90 days</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe @ 15 days</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Loader @ 10 days</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boom Truck @ 35 days</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>$104,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost Estimate**  
$1,345,702

*Brunswick, Maine, Google Earth*
## Initial Lower Investment Alternative Cost Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Track Work</td>
<td>$273,400,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridges</td>
<td>$450,220,000</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signals &amp; Grade Xings</td>
<td>$145,360,000</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stations &amp; Layover</td>
<td>$44,540,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rolling Stock</td>
<td>$131,330,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,044,850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total project cost per mile = $7,358,100 (2027 Dollars)
Initial Higher Investment Alternative Cost Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track Work</th>
<th>Bridges</th>
<th>Signals &amp; Grade Xings</th>
<th>Stations &amp; Layover</th>
<th>Rolling Stock</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,418,340,000</td>
<td>$450,220,000</td>
<td>$142,920,000</td>
<td>$44,540,000</td>
<td>$131,330,000</td>
<td>$2,187,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total project cost per mile = $15,403,875 (2027 Dollars)
Total Project Cost Estimation – Takeaways

• Passenger rail needs are different from freight rail needs
  • This is reflected in the project costs
  • Example: Passenger service needs more reliable track and signal infrastructure to ensure predictable on-time-performance

• Introduction of passenger rail service requires significant investment, even for moderate improvements in speeds

• Extent of rail upgrades is a major differentiator

• Costs include contingencies at Pre-Feasibility stage
  • More detailed design provides more certainty in estimating; less or no design requires contingency budget for more realistic estimates
# Summary of Initial Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Type</strong></td>
<td>One-seat ride from North Adams to Boston North Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Stations</strong></td>
<td>4 (North Adams, Greenfield, Fitchburg, Boston North Station)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dep North Adams (Dep North Station)</strong></td>
<td>6:32 am – 9:32 am – 12:32 pm – 3:32 pm – 6:32 pm 10:05 am – 1:05 pm – 4:05 pm – 7:05 pm – 10:05 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule Times</strong></td>
<td>Schedule times selected for trip purposes; secondary bias toward connection with North-South Service at Greenfield</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other uses of ROW</strong></td>
<td>Assumes commuter schedules and freight trains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwell Time at Stations</strong></td>
<td>2 minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Type</strong></td>
<td>Diesel trains with Amfleet passenger cars and same consist as Valley Flyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MBTA Infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>No modification to MBTA infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Track Infrastructure Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Limited to signal improvements (including PTC) and upgrade of Class 1 track at East Deerfield Yard; some trackage additions to support meet-pass locations; no change in superelevation on PAS corridor</td>
<td>More track rehabilitation and improvements to support superelevation and increase in track class to fully use capability of the train to match superelevation; some trackage additions to support meet-pass locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Poll Question 5

• What would you change about the two service alternatives?
  • Number of stations
  • Cost
  • Travel times
  • Number of trains per day
Poll Question 6

• What would you keep the same about the two service alternatives?
  • Number of stations
  • Cost
  • Travel times
  • Number of trains per day
Q&A/Discussion

• What is one question you still have about rail simulations?

• What did you find most helpful in learning about the ridership estimation process?

• What did you find most helpful in learning about the construction cost estimation process?
Share Your Questions & Comments

• Submit your questions and comments using the Q&A button

• “Raise your hand” to be unmuted for verbal questions, (Alt + Y to raise your hand)

• Please state your name before your question

• Please share only 1 question or comment at a time, limited to 2 minutes, to allow others to participate.

• To ask a question via phone, dial *9 and the moderator will call out the last 4-digits of your phone number and unmute your audio when it is your turn.

All questions and comments are welcome and appreciated, however, we do request that you refrain from any disrespectful comments
Evaluation of Phase 1 Alternatives
Study Goals

Goal: Support economic development along the Northern Tier corridor
• Improve connectivity and access to destinations (e.g., jobs and services, academic institutions, tourist attractions, etc.)
• Support the advancement of relevant economic development-related policies, plans, and designations.
• Minimize impacts to freight rail operations

Goal: Promote transportation equity
• Increase mobility options between Western and Eastern Massachusetts
• Improve connectivity and reliability
• Enhance Safety

Goal: Minimize impacts on public health and the environment from transportation
• Improve public health outcomes
• Minimize air/noise pollution and greenhouse gas emissions
• Minimize or avoid impacts to cultural or natural resources
Evaluation of the Phase 1 Service Alternatives

**What do we know?**
- Station locations
- Frequency of service
- Span of service
- Travel times
- Estimated ridership
- Physical improvements needed

**What can we measure?**
- Mobility and access improvements
- Economic impact
- Impacts on freight and MBTA commuter rail service
- Environmental and cultural impacts
- Social equity and fairness
- Cost effectiveness
- Safety
### Evaluation of Mobility and Access

**Travel Times By Mode:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between North Adams and Boston</th>
<th>Between Greenfield and Boston</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car (AM Peak)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>NOT AVAILABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service (Lower)</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service (Higher)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car (AM Peak)</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service (Lower)</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Service (Higher)</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Need to consider the different trip making patterns, as well as issues and opportunities related to accessing local attractors
Partial List of Attractors

North Adams

- North Adams Campus of Berkshire Medical Center
- MASS MoCA
- North Adams Historical Society
- Western Gateway Heritage State Park
- Potential future Station Location
- Colegrove Park Elementary School
- Berkshire Art Museum
- MA Registry of Motor Vehicles
- MA College of Liberal Arts
Partial List of Attractors
Greenfield

- Bay State Medical Center
- Federal Street Elementary School
- Museum of Our Industrial Heritage
- Paws Park
- Green River Cemetery
- Greenfield Public Works Department
- Energy Park
- Greenfield Station and Platform
- Hillside Park
- Franklin County Fairgrounds
Partial List of Attractors - Fitchburg

- Fitchburg Art Museum
- Fitchburg Health Department
- Fitchburg Station and Platform
- Fitchburg State University
- St. Bernard's Cemetery
- St. Bernard's High School
- St. Bernard's Elementary School
- St. Anthony School
- Notre Dame Preparatory School
- South Street Elementary School
- Parkhill Park
- Laurel Bank Conservation Area
- Coolidge Park
Partial List of Attractors

North Station
Museum of Science
North Station (MBTA)
Massachusetts General Hospital
Fenway Park
Charles River Esplanade
Boston City Hall
Boston Common
Prudential Mall
Bunker Hill Monument
Boston Logan International Airport
Institute of Contemporary Art
MIT
Evaluation of Economic Impact

Economic Impact: Direct, Indirect, and Induced

Potential Benefits to Individuals and Businesses

• Individuals could save by switching to rail travel
• May provide access to jobs in new regions/cities with potential for higher earnings
• Could create new jobs (construction, business relocation)
• May attract new residents to the region, who patronize businesses
• Potential increase in property values in communities hosting a train station

Potential Benefits to Towns and Cities

• Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) could lead to new housing, retail, and office space
• May increase local tax base
• Could preserve natural resources by reducing pressure for green field development
Evaluation of Economic Impact

Estimated Transportation Cost Savings = auto trip costs + parking costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Build</th>
<th>Higher Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Auto Trip Cost</td>
<td>$796,000 to $2,100,000</td>
<td>$1,292,000 to $3,485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Parking Savings</td>
<td>$452,000 to $1,193,000</td>
<td>$640,000 to $1,708,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,248,000 to $3,293,000</td>
<td>$1,932,000 to $5,193,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Costs based on:

- **Average car occupancy** = 1.7 (Federal Highway Administration estimate from 2018)
- **Auto mileage costs** = $.585 per mile (as of 1/1/22 from General Services Administration)
- **Estimated cost of parking in Boston** = $40 per day
Evaluation of Economic Impact

Calculating Primary Construction Impacts

Low Build and High Build construction cost estimates → Feed into REMI econometric model → Impacts: output, income, and employment estimates per year of construction

Assumptions:
• 3 years of construction for low build, 4 years for high build
• Impact results are statewide
• 50% contingency applied to costs
• Design & permitting occur within MA
• Vehicle procurement occurs outside MA

Definition:
An econometric model specifies the statistical relationship between the various economic quantities pertaining to a particular economic phenomenon, in this case construction of transportation infrastructure.
## Evaluation of Economic Impact

### Estimated Primary Construction Impacts – Lower Build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1 (in $ Millions)</th>
<th>Year 2 (in $ Millions)</th>
<th>Year 3 (in $ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td>424</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>2,964</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Output - total value of goods/services/income that result from the construction work
- Income – derived from resultant sales and employment
- Employment - total of the three types of jobs created by the construction – direct (performing construction), indirect (supporting construction), and induced (developed as a result of the construction)
## Evaluation of Economic Impact

### Estimated Primary Construction Impacts – Higher Build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output (in $ Millions)</strong></td>
<td>714</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income (in $ Millions)</strong></td>
<td>492</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment</strong></td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>4,910</td>
<td>4,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>2,578</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>2,512</td>
<td>2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced</td>
<td>1,608</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,667</td>
<td>1,606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Economic Impact

Example: Downeaster in MA, NH, and ME

ECONOMIC BENEFITS:

Pre-pandemic record ridership of ~60,000 trips in August 2019. Ridership in June 2022 was ~42,000 (88% of June 2019 levels).

Transit-Oriented Development in downtowns and city centers surrounding train stations. $100 million+ of TOD built in Downeaster communities in first seven years of service (through 2008).

Job creation attributed to direct construction and operation of rail service and due to more convenient commute.

Transportation cost savings by switching travel mode from automobile to train for individuals.

Visitor and tourist spending in downtown districts.

Note Differences between Northern Tier and Downeaster include Downeaster hubs are larger. Downeaster service is mature.

AMTRAK DOWNEASTER: Overview of Projected Economic Impacts, Center for Neighborhood Technology
Evaluation of Economic Impact

Example: Hartford Line

ECONOMIC BENEFITS:

*Transit-Oriented Development* resulted in $430 million of investment, and construction/design of 1,400 housing units and 240,000 sq ft of commercial/office space one year after the start of service.

*In Meriden, CT, TOD has resulted in $150 million of investment, ~300 apartments, 31,100 sq ft of retail, and a new 14-acre park.*

*Ridership* averaged 51,000 trips per month in the first year of service. Throughout 2022, ridership is rebounding at ~70% of pre-pandemic ridership.

Sources: *Transit-Oriented Development Factsheet, CTDOT, Hartford Line Year One Report, CTDOT*

Image Source: CTRail
Evaluation of Social Equity and Fairness

Access for Zero-Car Households:

- Rail service may be a new travel option for zero-car households around Greenfield and North Adams.
Evaluation of Social Equity and Fairness

Access for Environmental Justice Communities:

- Rail service may be a new travel option for Environmental Justice Communities around Greenfield and North Adams
Evaluation of Impacts on Rail Capacity

Freight Operations
- RTC model calculated average freight train delay of about 10 minutes

Passenger Operations
- Northern Tier trains scheduled to run between the intervals of MBTA commuter rail trains
- Not expected to impact MBTA operations

Note: Assumptions based on currently available data and information which may change due to the Pan Am sale
Environmental and Cultural Site Constraints could include:

- Wetlands and waterways
- FEMA designated floodplain
- Open space and recreational parklands
- State designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)
- National Register listed Historic Districts and Properties
- Protected species habitat
- Residential, commercial and institutional land uses

Both alternatives limit improvements to existing Right-of-Way, minimizing potential impacts

Detailed evaluation of impacts to adjacent site constraints for both alternatives will occur as the conceptual design is advanced. Impacts will be avoided and/or minimized to the maximum extent practicable.
Evaluation of Impacts on Environmental and Cultural Resources

Example: Potential Layover Facility in North Adams

- Outside existing right-of-way = more potential impacts
- Adjacent to the Hoosic River
- Outside of Cultural and Open Space areas
Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness

A Standard for Comparison Across Scenarios

• Cost per mile = Total Project Cost / Length of the Project
• Cost per rider = Total Project Cost / Total Number of Riders

Can also be compared to other projects, important for grant competitiveness

Sample includes MBTA Projects, CTDOT Walk Bridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
<th>Sample Cost/Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per mile</td>
<td>$7,358,100</td>
<td>$15,403,875</td>
<td>$6,900,000 to $9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost per rider</td>
<td>$18,735-$49,472</td>
<td>$27,390-$73,107</td>
<td>$2,807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness

Operating & Maintenance Costs

• Operating Cost per rider = Annual Operating Costs / Total Number of Riders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
<th>Sample Cost/Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per rider</td>
<td>$215 to $568</td>
<td>$150 to $401</td>
<td>$15 to $50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Estimated ridership is a factor in the cost difference
• Sample includes Pere Marquette (IL-WI), Downeaster (ME-MA), Vermonter (D.C.-VT)
Evaluation of Safety and Air Quality

Reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

• Fewer cars on the road could mean lower emissions of pollution and greenhouse gases

• A decrease in vehicular travel could lead to a disproportionately greater reduction in traffic congestion, and less idling could mean even fewer emissions

• Fewer cars and less congested roadways could mean fewer crashes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual VMT Reduction</td>
<td>-2,313,821 to -6,105,127</td>
<td>-3,754,257 to -10,128,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Route 2 VMT</td>
<td>0.10% to 0.27%</td>
<td>0.17% to 0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How the First Two Alternatives Compare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How are they the same?</th>
<th>How are they different?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Coverage area and populations served</td>
<td>• Travel times and estimated ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Estimated environmental impacts</td>
<td>• Extent of economic impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No passenger rail impacts</td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Freight rail impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• VMT reduction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Phase 1 Service Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Lower Investment</th>
<th>Higher Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coverage Area and Populations Served</strong></td>
<td>Service between Boston North Station, Fitchburg, Greenfield, and North Adams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Minimal potential environmental impacts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passenger Rail Impacts</strong></td>
<td>Not expected to impact MBTA operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Times</strong></td>
<td>3 hours 55 minutes eastbound, 3 hours 59 minutes westbound</td>
<td>2 hours 48 minutes eastbound, 2 hours 58 minutes westbound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impacts</strong></td>
<td>$1,248,000 to $3,293,000 transportation cost savings, 2,964 construction jobs (year 1), $424,000,000 construction output (year 1)</td>
<td>$1,932,000 to $5,193,000 transportation cost savings, 4,912 construction jobs (year 1), $714,000,000 construction output (year 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>$7,358,100 capital cost per mile, $18,735 to $49,472 capital cost per rider, $215 to $568 annual operating cost per rider</td>
<td>$15,403,875 capital cost per mile, $27,390 to $73,107 capital cost per rider, $150 to $401 annual operating cost per rider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freight Rail Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 minutes of average freight train delay estimated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual VMT Reduction</strong></td>
<td>-2,313,821 to -6,105,127</td>
<td>-3,754,257 to -10,128,225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q&A/Discussion

• What aspects of the evaluation process are most important to you?

• Do you think either of these alternatives fully satisfies the project goals? Why or why not?

• Has reviewing the evaluation of these service alternatives changed your overall impression of them?

• What would you change about the two service alternatives?
Share Your Questions & Comments

• Submit your questions and comments using the Q&A button

• “Raise your hand” to be unmuted for verbal questions, (Alt + Y to raise your hand)

• Please state your name before your question

• Please share only 1 question or comment at a time, limited to 2 minutes, to allow others to participate.

• To ask a question via phone, dial *9 and the moderator will call out the last 4-digits of your phone number and unmute your audio when it is your turn.

All questions and comments are welcome and appreciated, however, we do request that you refrain from any disrespectful comments
MODULE 3

Looking Ahead to Phase 2
Welcome to the Northern Tier Bistro!

• Developing service alternatives is like building the menu for your own restaurant

• An influential food critic is coming to your restaurant, and we need to make sure we have a high quality, but varied menu ready for them

• We have our first two dishes but need to create four more!
### Varied Ingredients for the Service Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredient</th>
<th>Range of Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stations                        | • Increase or decrease number of stations  
• Locations could change                                                                                                      |
| Coverage Area                   | • Limited to Massachusetts vs. extended into Vermont and New York                                                                                     |
| Service Structure               | • Direct service to Boston vs. transfer to other services (e.g., MBTA Commuter Rail, Valley Flyer)                                                        |
| Frequency of Service            | • Increase or decrease number of daily trains                                                                                                     |
| Span of Service                 | • Full day service vs. commuter peak  
• Daily vs. seasonal                                                                                           |
| Travel Time Between Stations    | • Existing freight train speeds to full high-speed rail (slow to very fast)                                                                      |
| Physical Improvements           | • Incremental State of Good Repair, full reconstruction in existing alignments, new alignments                                                   |
Stations and Coverage Area

POTENTIAL STOPS

OPTION A FEW STOPS

OPTION B SELECTIVE STOPS

OPTION C ALL STOPS
Stations and Coverage Area

Potential Alternatives for Phase 2

• An alternative that adds station stops at Orange, Gardner, Ayer, and Porter Square
• An alternative that adds station stops at Athol, Ayer, and Waltham

Other Options

• Station stops in Williamstown, Charlemont, Shelburne Falls, Miller’s Falls, Erving, Baldwinville, North Leominster, and/or Littleton/Route 495
• Extension of service to Albany on existing lines via Schenectady
• Extension of service to Albany on new alignment via Cohoes/Troy
### Service Structure, Frequency, and Span of Service

#### DIRECT SERVICE
- **OPTION A**: Direct Service
- **OPTION B**: Transfer Required
- **OPTION C**: Transfer Required with Midday Direct Service
- **OPTION D**: Blended Express and Local Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FREQUENT</th>
<th>SELECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-F</strong></td>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>M-F</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S</strong></td>
<td><strong>M-F</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **FREQUENT**
  - 5AM
  - 7AM
  - 9AM
  - 11AM
  - 1PM
  - 3PM
  - 5PM
  - 7PM
  - 9PM
  - 11PM

- **SELECTIVE**

---

**MODULE 3**
Service Structure, Frequency, and Span of Service

Potential Alternatives for Phase 2

• An alternative that terminates Northern Tier service at Fitchburg, allowing transfers to MBTA Commuter Rail for trip to Boston North Station
• An alternative that provides seven daily trains

Other Options

• Terminate Northern Tier service at an intermediate station between Fitchburg and Boston
Travel Time between Stations and Physical Improvements

- New Alignments
- New Sidings
- New Platforms and Stations
- Signal System
- Track
- Railroad Ties
- Ballast
Travel Time between Stations and Physical Improvements

Potential Alternatives for Phase 2

• An alternative that electrifies the rail
• An alternative that constructs a new alignment between Gardner and Fitchburg

Other Options

• Double track the whole Northern Tier corridor line
• New alignment through Athol and Royalston
Q&A/Discussion

• How would you create your menu?

• What ingredients are most important to you?

• What ingredients are least important?

• Are there any other ingredients missing?
Share Your Questions & Comments

• Submit your questions and comments using the Q&A button
• “Raise your hand” to be unmuted for verbal questions, (Alt + Y to raise your hand)
• Please state your name before your question
• Please share only 1 question or comment at a time, limited to 2 minutes, to allow others to participate.
• To ask a question via phone, dial *9 and the moderator will call out the last 4-digits of your phone number and unmute your audio when it is your turn.

All questions and comments are welcome and appreciated, however, we do request that you refrain from any disrespectful comments.
Next Steps

1. Public Participation
   - Public Involvement Plan

2. Documenting Past Efforts
   - Data Collection

3. Market Analysis
   - Demographics, Land Use, Current and Projected Future Travel Patterns

4. Physical, Regulatory, and ROW Ownership
   - Opportunities and Constraints

5. Potential Service Plans and Alternatives
   - Develop Up to 6 Service Alternatives

6. Alternatives Evaluation and Cost Estimate
   - Ridership Analysis, Benefit-Cost Analysis

7. Development of Recommended Next Steps
   - Short- and Long-Term Recommendations, Funding Opportunities, Draft and Final Report
Learn More

Please visit the Study website to receive Study updates and to view past materials and meeting recordings:
https://www.mass.gov/northern-tier-passenger-rail-study

Please visit the PIMA website to submit your comments and questions:
https://tinyurl.com/NTPRS-COMMENTS