

5.0 Rail Needs Prioritization

5.1 Overview

Strategic investment in freight and passenger rail infrastructure and services can produce a wide variety of benefits for Florida’s railroads, ports, businesses, and residents. In addition to increasing the efficiency and safety of rail transport, well-planned and coordinated rail investment can help Florida to achieve its goals of mitigating congestion, reducing transportation-related emissions, and supporting economic development. To leverage limited available funding and maximize the potential benefits associated with future rail investments, the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) evaluated the rail needs presented in Section 4.0 using multiple of criteria and assigned each need a project priority classification based on its readiness for implementation, coordination with other plans and projects, and potential regional and/or statewide impact. FDOT will use this analysis and priority classification to guide its future investments and other decisions regarding freight and passenger rail projects.

The analysis in Section 5.0 is based on data provided directly by stakeholders and on-line survey respondents (as discussed in Section 4.0), as well as information gathered through review of state, metropolitan, and local jurisdictions’ transportation plans, Transportation Improvement Programs, and other documents. Of the 235 near-, medium-, medium-to-long-, and long-term capital improvement projects and other initiatives identified as rail needs, this prioritization effort identified 22 projects estimated at \$4.8 billion⁴¹ as “Very High” priorities for FDOT.

The remainder of Section 5.0: Rail Needs Prioritization is outlined as follows:

- **Purpose** describes the purpose of prioritizing freight and passenger rail investments;
- **Methodology** discusses the methodology used for prioritizing rail needs;
- **Priority Rail Needs Overview** describes prioritized rail investment needs by time-frame, geographic location, project type, railroad, and port; and
- **Detailed Prioritized Needs Table** contains a comprehensive matrix of prioritized passenger and freight rail needs in Florida.

⁴¹Costs are estimated in Year 2009 dollars.

1 ■ 5.2 Purpose

2 The primary purpose of the rail needs prioritization effort is to rank each of the necessary
3 and desired freight and passenger rail improvements listed in Section 4.0 based on their
4 eligibility for state and Federal funding, level of planning and coordination, and ability to
5 be implemented a near to medium-term timeframe. This process will assist FDOT to:

- 6 • Identify projects that can be quickly implemented with limited additional support;
- 7 • Select projects that should be recommended for Federal funding opportunities; and
- 8 • Assess areas where near-term needs may require additional support (e.g., planning
9 coordination, funding assistance) in order to be successfully implemented on schedule.

10 Railroad needs, for the purposes of this rail plan, are restricted to capital needs identified
11 through the needs assessment described in Section 4.0. **It is important to note that inclu-**
12 **sion of a need in the Investment Element of the Florida Rail System Plan does not con-**
13 **stitute a commitment on the part of the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT)**
14 **or the State of Florida to provide funding. Similarly, the project priorities assigned to**
15 **needs in this section do not constitute a level of commitment on the part of FDOT or**
16 **the State of Florida to provide funding. Project priorities shown in this section reflect**
17 **only the State’s investment priority. Other agencies or private interests may hold these**
18 **projects in higher priority for providing their funding. Also, many projects shown may**
19 **currently have a lower priority because of a lack of information or detail on the project.**
20 **In this case, the projects may increase in priority in future plans as details are made**
21 **known.**

22 ■ 5.3 Methodology

23 In past Florida Rail System Plan Updates, FDOT assessed the public benefits associated
24 with select rail investments using a Freight Rail Investment Calculator developed for
25 FDOT. This software calculates the benefit/cost ratio for each rail project, considering
26 factors such as avoided highway maintenance costs, shipper logistics costs, new or
27 retained jobs, safety improvements, and environmental quality improvements. The
28 Freight Rail Investment Calculator formed one component of the overall decision process
29 of how public funds should best be invested to spur economic growth and enhance freight
30 and passenger mobility in Florida.

31 With the expansion of the needs assessment for the 2010 Florida Rail System Plan update
32 to include passenger rail projects as well as projects identified by a broader range of
33 stakeholders, FDOT was required to develop a new approach to assess and prioritize
34 potential rail investments. The procedure used to identify specific project prioritization
35 criteria and the overall project prioritization approach is outlined in Table 5.1.

1 **Table 5.1 Procedure for Developing Rail Needs Prioritization Criteria**

Step	Activity
February 2009	Identify key rail stakeholders in the State of Florida.
March-May 2009	Develop Rail Needs On-Line Survey with input from FDOT and Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members.
May-July 2009	Gather specific rail needs from stakeholders using the On-Line Survey and follow-up e-mails.
Early July 2009	Develop series of potential rail performance measures based on Goals and Objectives set forth by stakeholders in the Policy Element of the Florida Rail Plan. Develop methodology to quantify and monetize benefits from investing in rail needs.
Mid July 2009	Rail Stakeholder Advisory Committee meeting to refine list of performance measures. Receive stakeholder feedback on proposed project prioritization process.
August-November 2009	Conduct two rounds of follow-up calls with all stakeholders to gather detailed information to develop and evaluate proposed performance measures for all proposed rail needs.
December 2010	Select key project prioritization criteria from list of proposed performance measures based on stakeholder feedback, ability to support with data, apply Statewide, and reflection of new Federal rail funding criteria and priorities (e.g., shovel-readiness).
January-February 2010	Review of local and state planning documents and follow-up with FDOT Districts and other project stakeholders to update data for selected project prioritization criteria.
March 2010	Refine project prioritization approach with input from FDOT.
May 2010	Develop final prioritized rail needs list.

2 Source: Cambridge Systematics.

3 The rail needs prioritization methodology presented in this section was developed, tested,
4 and refined through multiple meetings with FDOT and other stakeholders. First, a com-
5 prehensive list of potential quantitative and qualitative performance measures that could
6 be used to assess each proposed rail need's performance in relation to the rail plan's five
7 goals was developed. With input from FDOT and the Rail Stakeholder Advisory
8 Committee, this list was refined into a series of quantifiable and nonquantifiable measures
9 of the benefits resulting from investment in rail needs, shown in Table 5.2. A detailed
10 methodology for calculating each proposed rail performance measure was developed and
11 is included in Appendix B.

1 **Table 5.2 Proposed FDOT Rail Performance Measures by Goal**

Goal	Performance Measures
Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crash reduction from auto/truck diversion • Reduced exposure to grade crossings • Use of Intelligent Transportation Management technologies
Quality of Life and Environmental Stewardship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in auto/truck fuel consumption and CO₂ emissions • Noise reduction • Status of environmental screening process • Project included in land use plans, State Transportation Plan, LRTP, or County/Municipal Improvement Plan
Maintenance and Preservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train capacity increase • Consistent with asset management approach • Support modernized rail system management and operation technologies
Mobility and Economic Competitiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auto/Truck VMT reduction • Reduced travel time and vehicle operating costs • Increase in passenger rail ridership • Increase in freight ton-miles • GDP growth • Jobs created as a result of the project
Sustainable Investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project underwent public review • Support from stakeholders • Status of application for funding • Eligible for state or Federal funding • Non-Federal state/Federal funding available and programmed for project • Supports underserved areas • Project of Statewide significance

2 Source: Cambridge Systematics.

3 Over several months, follow-up calls were conducted with stakeholders to gather the
4 additional detailed data on proposed rail projects required to evaluate each of the proposed
5 performance measures for all 235 projects identified through the rail needs assessment. The
6 results of these efforts are shown in Table 5.3. Projects are sorted by timeframe and
7 estimated cost (in 2009 dollars). **Projects shown in bold are partially or fully funded as of**
8 **May 2010.** Criteria that are not applicable to specific projects or for which data is not
9 available are marked as “N/A.” The detailed project information shown in Table 5.3 is
10 current through November 2009, and was self-reported by the agency reporting the rail
11 need through the on-line needs assessment survey or through follow-up calls.

[Insert Table 5.3 Here]

1 Based on the results of these data collection efforts and additional feedback from FDOT,
2 the list of potential rail performance measures was further refined and a key set of rail
3 need prioritization criteria was selected based on:

- 4 • Availability and reliability of data for the measure;
- 5 • Ability to apply the measure to diverse projects Statewide; and
- 6 • Reflection of new Federal rail funding criteria and program priorities (e.g., shovel-
7 readiness).

8 The selected prioritization criteria, shown in Table 5.4, reflect the rail plan goals as well as
9 current priorities for FDOT as it seeks to implement projects in a constrained fiscal envi-
10 ronment where project coordination and positioning to take advantage of Federal and
11 other funding sources is vital.

12 The procedure for prioritizing projects using the identified prioritization criteria involved
13 four steps:

- 14 1. Establish each project's current funding status (e.g., fully funded, partially funded,
15 currently unfunded) by reviewing needs assessment survey responses, the Five-Year
16 Work Program, STIP, and local TIPs;
- 17 2. Identify current funding sources for funded projects and future potential Federal and
18 state funding sources for partially funded or unfunded projects;
- 19 3. Rank/score each of the criteria listed in Table 5.2 based on a review of needs assess-
20 ment survey responses, project web sites (if applicable), local planning documents,
21 and follow-up calls to stakeholders; and
- 22 4. Calculate overall project priority rank/score based on the methodology shown in
23 Table 5.4.

24

1 **Table 5.4 Criteria Used for Prioritizing FDOT Rail Needs Projects**

Criteria	Ranking (Score)	Definition
Funding Status	High (3)	Project is currently funded or partially funded.
	Medium (2)	Project is not currently funded, but is eligible for funding from one or more sources.
	Low (1)	Project is not currently funded and no potential/eligible funding sources have been identified.
Coordination Status	High (3)	Project has consulted with multiple plans (e.g., Florida Transportation Plan, local comprehensive plans), agencies, and stakeholders; and has received public support.
	Medium (2)	Project has consulted with one or more plans or agencies and/or has received some public support.
	Low (1)	No evidence of coordination with other plans and/or agencies and no evidence of public support.
State and/or Regional Significance	High (3)	Project is of statewide significance.
	Medium (2)	Project is of regional significance.
	Low (1)	Project is not of statewide or regional significance.
Environmental Review Status <i>(criteria considered only as a component of shovel readiness)</i>	High (3)	All environmental review for the project has been completed, or environmental review is not necessary.
	Medium (2)	Required environmental review for the project is currently underway.
	Low (1)	Environmental review of the project has not yet been undertaken or information about the environmental review status of the project is not available.
Design Completeness and Right-of-Way Acquisition <i>(criteria considered only as a component of shovel-readiness)</i>	High (3)	Right-of-way for the project has been acquired and design is complete.
	Medium (2)	Negotiations are underway to acquire right-of-way for the project and/or project design is underway.
	Low (1)	Right-of-way has not yet been acquired for the project, design has not yet been initiated, and/or information about the status of project design and right-of-way is not available.
Eligibility for Federal Grants <i>(criteria considered only as a component of shovel-readiness)</i>	High (3)	Project is eligible for Federal monies.
	Medium (2)	Project is potentially eligible for Federal funding.
	Low (1)	Project is not eligible for Federal funding or proof of eligibility for Federal grants is not available.

1
2**Table 5.4 Criteria Used for Prioritizing FDOT Rail Needs Projects
(continued)**

Criteria	Ranking (Score)	Definition
Included in TIP and/or STIP <i>(criteria considered only as a component of shovel-readiness)</i>	High (3)	Project is currently included in the STIP.
	Medium (2)	Project is currently included in a local TIP.
	Low (1)	Project is not currently included in the STIP or a local TIP, or information about the project's status is not available.
Shovel Readiness	High (3)	Average score/ranking for Environmental Review Status, Design Completeness and Right-of-Way Acquisition, Eligibility for Federal Grants, and Included in TRIP and/or STIP criteria of 2.5 or greater.
	Medium (2)	Average score/ranking for Environmental Review Status, Design Completeness and Right-of-Way Acquisition, Eligibility for Federal Grants, and Included in TRIP and/or STIP criteria of 1.5 to 2.4.
	Low (1)	Average score/ranking for Environmental Review Status, Design Completeness and Right-of-Way Acquisition, Eligibility for Federal Grants, and Included in TRIP and/or STIP criteria of 1.4 or less.
Overall Project Priority	Very High	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 2.5 or greater.
	High	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 2.0 to 2.4.
	Medium-High	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 1.6 to 1.9.
	Medium	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 1.5.
	Low-Medium	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 1.1 to 1.4.
	Low	Average score/ranking of Funding Status, Coordination Status, State or Regional Significance, and Shovel Readiness criteria of 1.0.

3

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

5.4 Priority Rail Needs Overview

The needs assessment and review identified \$50.4 billion in unconstrained passenger and freight needs on the Florida rail system. Using the prioritization methodology described in Section 5.3, each need was assigned a ranking of very high, high, medium-high, medium, low-medium, or low priority based on its funding status, coordination level, state or regional significance, and shovel-readiness.

Table 5.5 shows the number of projects and total estimated cost of needs in each priority category. Twenty-two very high-priority projects estimated at \$4.8 billion account for 9.4 percent of needs. These projects include \$3.5 billion for high-speed rail connecting Tampa and Orlando; \$615 million for Sunrail commuter rail service between Deland and Poinciana, \$143 million for infrastructure investments to restore Amtrak service on the Florida East Coast Railway, \$245 million for capacity upgrades to CSX facilities, and \$88.3 million to construct a bridge over Dora Canal on the Florida Central Railroad and a four-lane overpass over Eller Drive at Port Everglades.

Table 5.5 Railroad Needs by Priority
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

Priority	No. of Projects	Cost
Very High	22	\$4,748,473
High	34	\$20,741,304
Medium-High	52	\$20,991,990
Medium	34	\$3,251,463
Low-Medium	13	\$677,195
Low	1	\$18,129
Total	149	\$50,428,554

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

From a project cost perspective, a larger percentage of passenger needs are identified as very high or high-priority projects than freight needs (Table 5.6). Over 52 percent of passenger needs are identified as very high or high-priority needs, compared to only 26.1 percent of freight needs. The majority of freight needs (42.2 percent) are identified as medium priority projects. The priority differential is largely driven by current Federal policy and funding support for high-speed and other passenger rail services, which has motivated a large number of requests for new commuter, intercity, and light rail services.

Table 5.6 Railroad Priorities by Type of Service
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

Priority	Freight	Passenger	Total Costs
Very High	\$333,305	\$4,415,168	\$4,748,473
High	\$488,294	\$20,253,010	\$20,741,304
Medium-High	\$752,040	\$20,239,950	\$20,991,990
Medium	\$1,327,263	\$1,924,200	\$3,251,463
Low-Medium	\$228,380	\$448,815	\$677,195
Low	\$18,129	-	\$18,129
Total	\$2,782,411	\$47,281,143	\$50,428,554

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

As illustrated in Table 5.7, the majority of needs identified through the assessment (\$47.3 billion) are related to new or expanded passenger services and freight lines. Investments in high-speed rail account for 55.6 percent of needs identified as very high to high-priority in Florida. New commuter rail needs such as expanded service on the Florida East Coast Railway also make up a significant portion (40.8 percent) of very high and high-priority projects. The six new freight service needs in the State were all identified as high to medium priority.

Table 5.7 Summary of Priorities for New Freight and Passenger Rail Service
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

Priority	Freight	Commuter Rail	High-Speed Rail	Intercity	Light Rail	Total
Very High		\$615,000	\$3,525,000	\$143,000		\$4,283,000
High	\$204,500	\$9,468,434	\$10,200,000		\$537,281	\$20,410,215
Medium-High	\$52,000	\$2,501,019		\$11,929,191	\$5,401,529	\$19,883,739
Medium	\$450,000	\$1,800,340				\$2,250,340
Low-Medium		\$260,000		\$130,000		\$390,000
Total	\$706,500	\$14,644,793	\$13,725,000	\$12,202,191	\$5,938,810	\$47,217,294

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

Each of the unconstrained needs identified in the assessment is assigned to a timeframe based on when the identified service is estimated to begin operation or construction of the identified improvement is estimated to be completed (Table 5.8). Of the \$4.7 billion in very high-priority needs, 97.2 percent (\$4.6 billion) are identified as short-term rail investment needs (to be considered for inclusion in the Department’s upcoming 5-year Work Program) and the remainder – 2.8 percent (\$132 million) – are identified as medium or medium-long term (6- to 20-year) needs. The majority (53.2 percent) of high-priority projects, on the other hand, are identified as medium-term (6- to 10-year) needs. This includes \$10.2 billion for high-speed rail connecting Orlando to Miami.

Table 5.8 Railroad Priorities by Timeframe
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

Priority	Near-Term (1 to 5 Years)	Medium-Term (6 to 10 Years)	Medium-to-Long-Term (11 to 20 Years)	Long-Term (More Than 20 Years)	Total
Very High	\$4,616,305	\$68,852	\$63,316		\$4,748,473
High	\$238,412	\$11,034,458	\$9,468,434		\$20,741,304
Medium-High	\$390,732	\$6,608,782	\$4,930,910	\$9,061,566	\$20,991,990
Medium	\$287,260	\$386,673	\$545,000	\$2,032,530	\$3,251,463
Low-Medium	\$2,500	\$57,745	\$226,950	\$390,000	\$677,195
Low	\$18,129				\$18,129
Total	\$5,553,338	\$18,156,510	\$15,234,610	\$11,484,096	\$50,428,554

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

Table 5.9 shows a summary of priorities by project type. Capacity upgrades are the highest priority need for freight rail in the State. New service is the highest priority need for passenger rail, followed by rolling stock investments.

Table 5.9 Summary of Priorities by Project Type
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

	Project Type	Very High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Low-Medium	Low	Total
<i>Freight Rail</i>	Capacity Upgrade	\$245,000	\$108,450	\$33,004	\$387,985	\$68,000		\$842,439
	Grade Separation	\$87,000	\$80,000	\$474,630	\$473,861	\$127,880		\$1,243,371
	New Line		\$204,500	\$52,000	\$450,000			\$706,500
	Rehabilitation and Maintenance	\$1,305	\$28,091	\$90,205	\$15,417	\$0		\$135,018
	Corridor Preservation					\$30,000		\$30,000
	Rolling Stock					\$2,500		\$2,500
	Signal Upgrade		\$20,403	\$27,688				\$48,091
	Track Upgrade		\$46,850	\$74,513			\$18,129	\$139,492
<i>Passenger Rail</i>	Capital Improvements		\$28,848	\$133,856	\$0			\$162,704
	Grade Separation			\$240,000				\$240,000
	New Service	\$4,283,000	\$20,205,715	\$19,839,262	\$1,800,340	\$390,000		\$46,518,317
	Rehabilitation and Maintenance			\$250				\$250
	Rolling Stock	\$132,168						\$132,168
	Station Improvements		\$18,447	\$26,582	\$123,860	\$58,815		\$227,704
Total		\$4,748,473	\$20,741,304	\$20,991,990	\$3,251,463	\$677,195	\$18,129	\$50,428,554

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

Summary by Railroad

Table 5.10 provides a high-level summary of the priority rankings of proposed improvements along various rail lines in the State. Detailed descriptions of the needs are contained in Table 5.14. Very high-priority projects for CSXT include capacity upgrades and improvements in the Baldwin area, estimated at \$67.4 million, and 14 smaller capacity upgrade projects throughout the State, estimated at \$177.7 million. Very high-priority improvements on the Florida East Coast Railway involve improvements to reinstate Amtrak passenger rail service between Jacksonville and Miami. On the South Florida Rail

1 Corridor, very high-priority needs include purchasing 26 new passenger rail cars and 16
2 new locomotives over the next five to 25 years.

3 **Table 5.10 Summary of Priorities by Railroad**
4 *Thousands of 2009 Dollars*

Railroads	Very High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Low-Medium	Low	Total
Alabama and Gulf Coast				\$6,327			\$6,327
CSX Transportation	\$245,000	\$168,000	\$15,350,506	\$589,861	\$217,880		\$16,571,247
Florida Central	\$1,305	\$13,100	\$1,153	\$150,000	\$2,500		\$168,058
Florida East Coast	\$268,000	\$9,502,428	\$44,585	\$385,075		\$18,129	\$10,218,217
Florida Midland			\$23,755				\$23,755
Florida Northern		\$4,500					\$4,500
Georgia and Florida Railway			\$52,000				\$52,000
Seminole Gulf Railway			\$60,425		\$8,000		\$68,425
South Florida Rail Corridor/Tri-Rail	\$132,168	\$584,576	\$381,629	\$123,860	\$58,815		\$1,281,048
South Central Florida Express		\$24,500	\$30,767				\$55,267
Total	\$646,473	\$10,297,104	\$15,944,820	\$1,255,123	\$287,195	\$18,129	\$28,448,844

5 Source: Cambridge Systematics.

6 Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not
7 have been identified by the source(s).

8 Summary by Port

9 Table 5.11 provides a high-level summary of the priority rankings of proposed improve-
10 ments at various seaports in the State. Detailed descriptions of the needs are contained in
11 Table 5.14. Very high-priority needs at Port Everglades include a four-lane Eller Drive
12 Overpass which will increase safety and promote efficient freight movement, estimated at
13 \$87.0 million. High-priority needs at the Port of Palm Beach include rail switching
14 improvements, estimated at \$3.7 million, and construction of track connecting Hialeah rail
15 yard to the Intermodal Logistics Center, estimated at \$100 million.

Table 5.11 Summary of Priorities by Port
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

Port	Very High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Low-Medium	Total
Port Canaveral				\$50,000		\$50,000
Port Everglades	\$87,000	\$60,500			\$87,000	\$147,500
Port of Jacksonville			\$14,000	\$12,000		\$26,000
Port of Miami			\$36,900			\$36,900
Port of Palm Beach		\$103,700				\$103,700
Port of Tampa			\$11,450			\$11,450
Total	\$87,000	\$164,200	\$62,350	\$62,000	\$87,000	\$375,550

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

Summary by District

Table 5.12 contains a summary of priority rankings by district. Note that a “multiple” category was created under the District heading to account for projects that cross several district jurisdictions. This was necessary since project cost information by District is not available at this time.

Table 5.12 Summary of Priorities by District
Thousands of 2009 Dollars

District	Very High	High	Medium-High	Medium	Low-Medium	Low	Total
1	\$116,050	\$45,500	\$84,055	\$211,000	\$98,000		\$554,605
2	\$92,950	\$168,226	\$1,010,787	\$15,484			\$1,287,447
3		\$35,500		\$6,327	\$0		\$41,827
4	\$87,000	\$719,928	\$280,288	\$105,304	\$58,815		\$1,251,335
5	\$650,755	\$17,600	\$2,001,153	\$205,043	\$2,500		\$2,877,051
6		\$60,689	\$1,198,889	\$369,593			\$1,629,171
7		\$23,250	\$11,583,119	\$1,913,201	\$517,880		\$14,037,450
Multiple	\$3,801,718	\$19,670,611	\$4,833,699	\$425,511	\$0	\$18,129	\$28,749,668
Total	\$4,748,473	\$20,661,304	\$20,706,990	\$3,251,463	\$677,195	\$18,129	\$50,428,554

Source: Cambridge Systematics.

Note: A blank cell does not necessarily indicate an absence of projects in this category. Project cost may not have been identified by the source(s).

1 ■ 5.5 Detailed Prioritized Needs Table

2 Table 5.13 contains the project needs identified by stakeholders participating in the 2010
3 Florida Rail System Plan Update, prioritized based on the criteria described in Section 5.3.
4 The table presents, in detail, every project identified through the process described in
5 Section 4.0. The table is sorted by project priority and then by timeframe. **Projects that**
6 **are fully or partially funded as of May 2010 are shown in bold.** Each project is further
7 identified by the following attributes:

- 8 • ID attribute as identified in the on-line rail survey;
- 9 • Project name;
- 10 • Project description;
- 11 • Owner or operator;
- 12 • Freight or passenger rail;
- 13 • Project type (maintenance and repair, grade crossings, etc.);
- 14 • Location;
- 15 • Timeframe;
- 16 • Cost estimate (in current 2009 dollars);
- 17 • Work program status;
- 18 • Current or potential funding sources;
- 19 • Overall project priority; and
- 20 • Project prioritization criteria:
 - 21 o Funding status;
 - 22 o Coordination level;
 - 23 o State or regional significance;
 - 24 o Shovel readiness;⁴²
 - 25 o Environmental review status;
 - 26 o Eligibility for federal grants;
 - 27 o Design completeness and right-of-way acquisition; and
 - 28 o Inclusion in the STIP or TIP.

⁴²Shovel readiness is based on the average of Environmental Review Status, Eligibility for Federal Grants, Design Completeness and Right-of-Way, and Inclusion in STIP or TIP scores.

1 Each project is color coded based on the timeframe it is estimated to begin operation in
 2 and the project's overall project priority ranking. The color schemes used are illustrated
 3 in Table 5.13.

4 **Table 5.13 Project Timeframe and Priority Color Coding Scheme**

Timeframe	
	Near-term (1-5 years)
	Mid-term (6-10 years)
	Mid-to-long (11-20 years)
	More than 20 years
Project Priority	
	Very High = Average Score of Over 2.5 to 3.0
	High = Average Score of Over 2.0 to 2.5
	Medium-High = Average Score of Over 1.5 to 2.0
	Medium = Average Score of 1.5
	Low-Medium = Average Score of over 1.0 to Less Than 1.5
	Low = Average Score of 1.0

5 Source: Cambridge Systematics.

[Insert Table 5.14 Here]