

DRAFT Rail Plan Initiative Screening Sheet - Summary

Version: 12/23/2020

This is a sketch-level screening to help move from the table of reasonable possible initiatives to a shorter implementation table consistent with Agency of Transportation project selection efforts. It is for use with the update of the State Rail Plan within the Rail program and may shift as project selection methodology evolves. Note it is based on the VPSPI Qualification sheet. The results of screening are an aid in making well-informed decisions rather than a precise answer and are one of many factors considered when deciding which initiatives to advance to implementation. The intent is to keep this table easy to skim. Please see worksheets on Location-Specific and Program/Policy projects for development of scores. See the Table of Initiatives for more description of initiatives. Note that Location-Specific initiatives are scored 0-100. The Program/Policy initiatives can't readily be measured in as precise a way so are scored 1-20. Scores should be compared internally within each table.

Location Specific Initiatives										Very preliminary for discussion and refinement.		
Initiative #	Initiative Name	Goal Area	State-owned infrastructure?	Passenger or Freight	Total Score	Notes on Initiative	Cost	Feasibility	Qualitative Considerations			
100	Vermont Ext. to Montreal	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	90	Partial points for flood zone (the entire stretch of track over the Missisquoi National Wildlife Refuge is floodplain, in addition to the lake crossings) but missing data to give full points	Low	High	Previous commitment to extending this service			
116	Burlington Rail Yard Enterprise	Economic Devel.	Yes	Both	88	Burlington City Council voted to pursue funding after completion of scoping study in 2020. See: https://www.cccpvt.org/our-work/transportation/current-projects/scoping/railyard-enterprise-project/	High	Low	Multi-modal effort.			
104	Albany-Bennington-Burlington Passenger Service	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	80		High	Low	Relatively low increase in passenger ridership (64,000 - 94,000)			
102	Vermont Ext. to Montreal (X2 trips)	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	80	No resiliency or safety points as adding a 2nd service does not impact infrastructure	Medium	Medium				
112	GMRC Bridges and Track Upgrades	Expand Capacity	Yes	Freight	77	8 bridges with a load rating <286k, 17.9 miles of track is 90 lb. rail or less.	Medium	High	Critical east-west route. CP would like to see this line upgraded to 286k as a higher priority than the WACR Conn River			
113	WACR M&B Bridges and Track Upgrades	Expand Capacity	Yes	Freight	74	3 bridges not capable of handling 286k, 12.7 miles of 90 lb. rail or lower. Includes new routing	Medium	Medium	Additional track being constructed to handle pending growth in traffic (granite)			
115	WACR Conn. River Bridges and Track Upgrades	Expand Capacity	Yes	Freight	74	21 bridges load rating not sufficient for 286k, rail weight between 90 and 115 pounds	High	Low				
103	Ethan Allen Amtrak service extension to meet Vermont: Burlington to Essex Inct.	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	73	Would require #126 improving infrastructure first. Would require system schedule changes for passenger transfers between the two services	Medium	High	Initiative #126 would need to be done first			
108	1 Valley Flyer extended to WRJ	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	65		Medium	Medium				
125	Montpelier Main St. bike path and grade crossing improvements	Safety	Yes	Other	63	2020 VTtrans Bicycle & Ped. grant, See 2019 Scoping study https://www.montpelier-vt.org/DocumentCenter/View/7105	Low	High				
126	NECR Winooski Track and Bridge Updates (Burlington - Essex Inct)	Increase Use	No	Freight	63	Pending details about 286k bridge needs in the corridor, non-State owned asset. Currently Class I rail. See #103 - this initiative would be necessary for that one.	Medium	Medium				
110	VTR Upgrade to CWR and 115lb (Rut-Manch)	Maintenance	Yes	Both	63	Higher track weight to allow for higher train speeds (passenger and freight) as well as maintain State of Good Repair (SGR)	Low	High	Would take advantage of work completed under BUILD and TIGER grants in the Western Corridor.			
107	2nd service on Ethan Allen	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	60		High	Medium				
106	Western Corridor to 79mph	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	58	Hard to estimate if this would improve resiliency. This is assumed to not include track re-alignment. If track re-alignment was included, the resilience score could increase.	High	Low				
105	Vermont to 79mph	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	58	Hard to estimate if this would improve resiliency. This is assumed to not include track re-alignment. If track re-alignment was included, the resilience score could increase.	High	Low				
109	Connection to future rail @ Springfield: MTL-BOS	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	56	Intended to connect with future service (not Lake Shore Limited). Scores MTL-Springfield segment	Low	Low				
111	Passenger Rail Station Improvements	Intermodal Conn.	Yes	Passenger	55	Montpelier (2022), Bellows Falls (2022), Brattleboro (2022-23), Essex Junction (2023) have projects planned by Amtrak. Rutland, WRI are VT/City responsibility and not scheduled	Low	High				
122	Gates/flashes at existing and planned Amtrak public road grade crossings	Safety	Yes	Both	55	Long-term goal of State. Phased deployment at 80 public road crossings include Ethan Allen (to Burlington) and Vermont (to Montreal) routes.	High	High	Cost of upgrades and maintenance could increase subsidy required of State for Amtrak service. Crossings are being improved through several programs.			
123	Whistle stop in Brandon and Shelburne	Increase Use	Yes	Passenger	51	Brandon is approx. 15 miles from both Rutland and Middlebury, Shelburne is approx. 15 miles from Vergennes and 7 miles from Burlington. Would need to assess balance of added access with added overall time	Low	Low				
120	NECR Full Double Stack Clearance	Expand Capacity	No	Freight	49	Project unlikely to improve flood resiliency or environmental protection	High	Low				
121	GMRC/CLP Full Double Stack Clearance	Expand Capacity	Yes	Freight	49	Project unlikely to improve flood resiliency or environmental protection	High	Medium				
124	Quiet Zone - South Summit St. Essex Inct	Maintenance	No	Other	19	Could be included as part of EAE to Essex Junction if that initiative is advanced and this one is not	Low	Medium				

Program/Policy Initiatives										Very preliminary for discussion and refinement.		
Initiative #	Initiative Name	Goal Area	State-owned infrastructure?	Passenger or Freight	Total Score	Notes on Initiative	Cost	Feasibility	Qualitative Considerations			
3	Maintain State-owned freight trackage at FRA Track Class II or better and state-owned passenger rail trackage at Class III or better where viable based on geography	Maintenance		Both	16	Class II is 25 MPH for freight, 30 MPH for passenger. Class III is 40 MPH for freight, 60 MPH for passenger.	High	High				
2	Upgrade all lines to 286k weight-bearing capability	Expand Capacity		Freight	13	286,000 pound is the national standard for freight rail cars. Increasing all Vermont lines to this standard will improve regional and national connections and enhance freight business opportunities in the State.	High	High				
18	Seek grants and innovative funding approaches for freight and passenger rail	Funding		Both	13	Continue to position state to pursue federal grant opportunities and work collaboratively with ACCD and other economic development agencies to identify opportunities for freight funds	Low	High				
13	Increase resilience of rail system to make critical infrastructure more resilient now and to prepare for increasing storm severity	Safety		Both	13	180 miles of rail (109 state owned) in flood risk areas. Work with railroads to identify priorities and funding to increase resilience	High	Medium				
6	Preserve rail siding access to existing industrial sites.	Economic Development		Freight	12	Update inventory and help publicize industrial zoned land near existing or potential sidings	Low	High				
8	Facilitate development of freight transload and intermodal terminals in or near Vermont	Intermodal Connectivity		Freight	12	As demand warrants, work with customers and railroads to identify opportunities to expand or develop new transload or intermodal freight facilities in the State	Medium	Medium				
17	Preserve and fully use parcels with access to rail spurs	Economic Development		Freight	10	Coordinate with railroads, agencies, economic develop groups, RPCs, etc.	Low	Medium				
19	Publicize existing voluntary efforts of railroads and encourage "freight as a good neighbor" (NCRP Synthesis 200) while respecting rail's exemptions from local control.	Safety		Freight	10	Highlight and support coordination on rail maintenance, operations, and construction activities.	Low	High				
9	Maintain and improve freight access to regional short-rail markets and competitive Class I railroad connections	Intermodal Connectivity		Freight	9	Advocate on behalf of Vermont businesses for operating agreements between shortline and Class I railroads to improve efficiency of interchanges	Low	Medium				
16	Improve pedestrian and bicycle access and facilities at and near Amtrak stations	Intermodal Connectivity		Passenger	9	Work with municipalities to develop station area plans, improve wayfinding, and enhance bicycle and pedestrian accommodations (crosswalks, bicycle lanes, bicycle parking)	Medium	Medium				
7	Develop quick-response capability to leverage economic development opportunities	Economic Development		Freight	8	Collaborate with state and local economic development agencies to develop tools to help identify, promote, and calculate public/private benefits of developing rail-served sites	Low	High				
4	Further enhance marketing of Vermont passenger rail	Increase Use		Passenger	8	Work more closely with ACCD, economic development and tourist groups, chambers, etc.	Low	High				
10	Maintain, publicize, and enhance appropriate communication regarding rail movement and storage of hazardous materials (hazmat) while respecting rail exemptions from local control	Safety		Freight	8	Publicize voluntary efforts by railroads. Share the big picture. Maintain appropriate communication. Explore opportunities as part of shift underway to Statewide Emergency Planning Committee.	Low	Medium				
14	Improve multi-modal connections to Amtrak stations	Intermodal Connectivity		Passenger	7	Work with transit & tourist services to match scheduling, increase comfort and reliability of transfers	Medium	Medium				
15	Improve wayfinding signage and explore transit-oriented development (TOD)	Intermodal Connectivity		Passenger	7	Work with municipalities. Support TOD near Amtrak stations.	Medium	High				
1	Post freight rail system performance measures, including trends	Maintenance		Freight	7	Performance measures may need to be modified. Could be in VTransparency or elsewhere	Low	High				
20	Maintain and modernize freight rail yards such as NECR and CP Yards	Maintenance		Freight	7	Supports sorting of cars for various destinations and support functions such as car/locomotive maintenance, storage and inspection	Medium	Medium				
11	Workforce Development	Economic Development		Freight	6	Partner on job training with DOL, educational facilities, and businesses	Medium	Medium				
12	Track and respond to COVID-related changes regarding impacts on the passenger and freight rail systems, both direct and from demographic changes	Funding		Both	6	Work with Dept. of Health, Education (school enrollment), and RPCs, & others. to understand demographic and transportation change. Increase advertising and bike/ped station access where population is increasing; engage more with e-commerce shippers	Low	High				
5	Educate shippers about rail and intermodal service options and contracting approaches.	Economic Development		Freight	5	Work with economic development agencies to encourage intermodal rail freight use by private businesses where viable	Low	Medium				

DRAFT Rail Plan Initiative Screening Sheet
Version: 12/29/2020

This is a sketch-level screening to help move from the table of reasonable initiatives to a shorter implementation table consistent with Agency of Transportation project selection efforts. It is to be used with the updates of the State Rail Plan within the Rail program and may differ as project selection methodology evolves. Note it is based on the VTRP Qualification sheet. The results of screening are an aid in making well-informed decisions rather than a perfect answer and are one of many factors considered when deciding which initiatives to advance to implementation. The intent is to keep this table easy to skim, with technical notes referenced in brackets and assumptions explained as to the bottom. See the Table of Initiatives for more detail about each. Note that program/policy initiatives are scored in a more general but parallel manner in the next worksheet. **RPC and municipal staff are requested to provide the information in rows shaded blue.**

Initiative Number	116	124	100	102	109	110	112	118	119	120	121	103	104	105	106	107	108	123	126	111	122	125
Initiative Name	Burlington Rail Yard Enterprise	Quiet Zone - South Summit St. Essex Jct	Vermont Ext. to Montreal	Vermont Ext. to Montreal (2 Stuyvesant)	Connection to Future rail @ Springfield MTL-ROC	VTR Upgrade to CWR and 115lb (Bus-Main)	GMCC Bridges and Track Upgrades	WAC M&B Bridges and Track Upgrades	WAC Conn. River Bridges and Track Upgrades	NEC Full Double Stack Clearance	GMCC/CP Full Double Stack Clearance	EAE Burlington to Essex Jct.	Albany-Burlington Burlington Passenger Service	Vermont to 75mph	Western Corridor to 75mph	2nd service on Ethan Allen	1 Valley Flyer extended to WRU	Whistle stop in Brandon and Shelburne	NEC Woodstock Track and Bridge Updates (Burlington - Essex Jct)	Passenger Rail Station Improvements	Gates/Fletcher at existing and planned Amtrak public road grade crossings	Montpelier Main St. bike path and grade crossing improvements
Does it relate to State-owned rail infrastructure?	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does initiative improve freight rail, passenger rail, both, or other?	Both	Other	Passenger	Passenger	Passenger	Both	Freight	Freight	Freight	Freight	Freight	Passenger	Passenger	Passenger	Passenger	Passenger	Passenger	Freight	Passenger	Both	Both	
Possible Points	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
SAFETY - 20 Points																						
Are there existing crash locations within the initiative area? (CRSIS 2018 data)																						
>> If "Yes", will the initiative improve safety at existing crash locations or reduce train derailments?	20	0	0	10	0	0	20	10	10	10	0	0	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
>> If "No", have any safety issues been identified in a plan or report that will be improved by the initiative (for example, Section 136 grade crossing ranking or an RPC or municipal study)?	15	15	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0
ASSET CONDITION - 20 Points																						
Does this initiative maintain or improve assets?																						
>> If yes, and if passenger, does the initiative maintain or improve track to Class 1 or better? (yes 30 pts, no 5 pts)	10	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0
>> If yes, and freight only, does the initiative maintain or improve track to Class 2 or better? (yes 10 pts, no 5 pts)	15	0	0	0	0	0	15	5	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Does this initiative upgrade or maintain rail or rail bridge capacity to 286k?	10	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	10
Does the initiative upgrade or maintain State of Good Repair on new rail or new bridge assets (e.g., stations, access roads, maintenance facilities, etc.)?	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	5	0
Does this initiative modernize and enhance the rail system through ITS, signal upgrades, computer upgrades, communications systems?	20	20	5	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	15	20	15	15	15	15	15	15	20	20	15	20
MOBILITY - 5 Points																						
Is the initiative necessary for the network role of the rail system beyond State boundaries (bring track, structure, or clearance to necessary national standards, complete new rail passenger connectivity connections)?																						
Mobility Max Points =																						
CONNECTIVITY - 10 Points																						
Does this rail initiative enhance or improve connectivity for pedestrians or bicyclists?																						
>> If "Yes", is the initiative located on a "High Priority" bicycle corridor identified by Vermont Connectivity as critical to the main way to get points (station located w/in 0.5 miles of High Priority Bicycle Corridor)?	4	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	4	4	4
RPC and municipal staff: If "Yes", is the initiative included in an RPC or municipal plan to enhance connectivity for pedestrians or bicyclists?																						
>> If "Yes", is the initiative located completely or partially within an area designated as a Downtown, Village Center, New Town Center, Growth Center or Neighborhood Development? (http://maps.vermont.gov/ACD/PlanningAtlas/index.html?view=map/PlanningAtlas)	4	4	4	4	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	0	4	4	4
RPC and municipal staff: If "Yes", is the initiative included in an RPC-designated area comparable to the State centers and growth areas?																						
Does this rail initiative improve connectivity for transit users (physical infrastructure, amenities, or new access to existing public transit services)?	4	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	0
Does this rail initiative enhance or improve connectivity for freight (e.g., rail freight transfer with trucks, transfer between modes)?	8	8	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
ECONOMIC ACCESS - 10 Points																						
Does the initiative significantly serve an area designated for growth by the State (Downtown, Village Center, New Town Center, Growth Center, Neighborhood Development)?																						
Does the initiative significantly support an effort identified in the State CEDS Plan?	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RPC and municipal staff: Does the initiative significantly serve an area designated for growth by the RPC in its CEDS or regional plan? Use partial points if in just one (3)																						
Does the initiative enhance competition and/or reduce transportation costs for Vermont businesses? (See Notes on Economic Competitiveness)	3	3	0	2.5	2.5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	0	0
Does the initiative reduce transportation system capital and/or maintenance costs for the State (this could be on the rail line or by reducing truck impacts to the road system)?	3	3	0	3	3	0	5	3	5	5	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	3
RESILIENCY - 10 Points																						
Is more than 50% of this initiative in a flood risk area? Initiative must realistically be able to improve flood resiliency (e.g., clearance projects need not cover) (see additional notes about this).																						
Does the initiative help to accommodate disruptions and changes in network demand (e.g. trees falling, high winds, soil erosion/track sinkage, infrastructure damage)?	5	5	0	5	5	2.5	0	5	5	5	0	2.5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0
ENVIRONMENT - 10 Points																						
Will the initiative reduce vehicle miles traveled and/or vehicle emissions at a back-of-the-envelope level, including by reducing related congestion?																						
Environment Max Points =																						
COMMUNITY - 10 Points																						
RPC and municipal staff: Has the municipality or RPC endorsed the initiative, while recognizing that railroads are exempt from local controls? May give half points if consistent but not listed.																						
Is this the type of initiative that is intended to improve the municipality's sense of community (provide for public space, traffic calming, trees, lighting, gateway, historic preservation)? Does this initiative provide opportunities for residents to connect to community resources?	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	5	5
HEALTH ACCESS - 5 Points Being awarded to all rail initiatives on the assumption is all rail projects improve health access by freer vehicles on roads.																						
Does the initiative provide improved access by transit, walking, or biking to major medical facilities or healthy food destinations (grocery store, low income meals program)?																						
Does the initiative improve access to physical activity facilities (golf center, park, trails, school)?	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
COMMENTS - Information about an initiative not captured above																						
https://www.vermont.gov/transit/transportation/projects/cape/tailed-enterprise-project/	Could be included as part of EAE to Essex Junction if that initiative is advanced and this one is not.	Partial points for Flood zone (the entire stretch of track over the Middlebury Refuge is the lake crossings) but missing data to give full points. Includes minor safety improvements associated with adding/maintaining service, but not substantial infrastructure improvements. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	No flood zone resiliency or safety points as adding a 2nd service does not impact infrastructure. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Intended to connect with future service near Lake Shore Springfield segment. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	3 bridges with a load rating <286k, 17 miles of track is 90 lb. rail or less. CP would like to see this line upgraded to 286k. It is a higher priority than the WACR Conn River	3 bridges not capable of handling 286k. 12 3' rail weight between 90 and 115 pounds.	Project unlikely to improve flood resiliency or environmental protection	Project unlikely to improve flood resiliency or environmental protection	Includes minor safety improvements associated with adding/maintaining service, but not substantial infrastructure improvements. Realistically would need to be paired with or follow initiative #126. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Includes minor safety improvements associated with adding/maintaining service, but not substantial infrastructure improvements. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Hard to estimate if this would improve resiliency. This is assumed to not include track re-alignment. If track re-alignment was included, the resiliency score could increase. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Hard to estimate if this would improve resiliency. This is assumed to not include track re-alignment. If track re-alignment was included, the resiliency score could increase. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	No flood zone resiliency or safety points as adding a 2nd service does not impact infrastructure. Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.	Will reduce VMT and improve safety statewide as rail is a safer mode of travel than vehicle.
Initiative Total Score	88	18	90	80	16	83	77	74	74	48	48	73	80	58	58	66	51	83	95	55	55	63

TECHNICAL NOTES - Sources, Assumptions, Etc.
[CWR] See page 27, 28 of Tech Memo #1 for more information on track classes.
[Risk] Is this initiative in a 100-year flood plain (damage during storm events) or the All-Weather Corridor (where there are trying to shift) or a dam inundation area? This is an attempt to be consistent with TRP as that methodology develops. This may be replaced by an expanded TRP in the future. Points are awarded if an initiative would logically improve asset conditions on the risk area to help prevent future damage.
[Compet] Does this initiative promote competition by providing an alternative to an existing mode of service, by introducing a competing service provider, and/or does this initiative otherwise reduce transportation costs for Vermont businesses?

DRAFT Rail Plan Initiative Screening Sheet - Programs and Policies

Version: 12/23/20

This is a sketch-level screening to help move from the table of reasonable possible initiatives to a shorter implementation table consistent with Agency of Transportation project selection efforts. It is for use with the update of the State Rail Plan within the Rail program and may shift as project selection methodology evolves. Note it is based on the VPSP2 Qualification sheet.

The results of screening are an aid in making well-informed decisions rather than a precise answer and are one of many factors considered when deciding which initiatives to advance to implementation. The intent is to keep this table easy to skim, with technical notes referenced in brackets and assumptions explained at the bottom. See the Table of Initiatives for more detail about each one.

This worksheet screens initiatives that are not specific to a place, such as programs and policies. It uses a more qualitative approach within the same goal categories as on the specific initiatives worksheet—see that worksheet for more information. This screening uses a 1-20 scale as a reminder of the more general analysis, though weighting of categories is the same carrying through from VPSP2.

RPC and municipal staff are requested to particularly review the columns shaded blue in the context of their plans and studies. If an initiative should get points based on RPC or municipal work, please briefly explain in the Notes field

Initiative Number	Initiative Name	Goal Area	Does initiative improve freight rail, passenger rail, both, or other?	Possible Points	4	4	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	20	Notes
				Safety	Asset Condition	Mobility	Connectivity	Economic Access	Resiliency	Environment	Community	Health Access	Total		
1	Post freight rail system performance measures, including trends	Maintenance	Freight		2	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	7	
2	Upgrade all lines to 286K weight-bearing capability	Expand Capacity	Freight		0	4	1	2	2	1	2	0	1	13	
3	Maintain State-owned freight trackage at FRA Track Class II or better and state-owned passenger rail trackage at Class III or better where viable based on geography	Maintenance	Both		4	4	1	1	2	2	1	0	1	16	
4	Further enhance marketing of Vermont passenger rail	Increase Use	Passenger		0	0	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	8	
5	Educate shippers about rail and intermodal service options and contracting approaches.	Economic Development	Freight		0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	
6	Preserve rail siding access to existing industrial sites.	Economic Development	Freight		0	4	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	12	
7	Develop quick-response capability to leverage economic development opportunities	Economic Development	Freight		0	2	0	0	2	0	1	2	1	8	
8	Facilitate development of freight transload and intermodal terminals in or near Vermont	Intermodal Connectivity	Freight		0	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	12	
9	Maintain and improve freight access to regional short-haul markets and competitive Class I railroad connections	Intermodal Connectivity	Freight		0	0	1	2	2	1	2	0	1	9	
10	Enhance communication and coordination regarding rail movement and storage of hazardous materials (hazmat) movement by rail and storage on rail sidings while respecting rail exemptions from local control	Safety	Freight		4	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	
11	Workforce Development	Economic Development	Freight		0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	6	
12	Track and respond to COVID-related changes regarding impacts on the passenger and freight rail system, both direct and from demographic changes	Funding	Both		0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	6	
13	Increase resilience of rail system to make critical infrastructure more resilient now and to prepare for increasing storm severity	Safety	Both		2	4	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	13	
14	Improve multi-modal connections to Amtrak stations	Intermodal Connectivity	Passenger		0	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	7	
15	Improve wayfinding signage and explore transit-oriented development (TOD)	Intermodal Connectivity	Passenger		0	0	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	7	
16	Improve pedestrian and bicycle access and facilities at and near Amtrak stations	Intermodal Connectivity	Passenger		0	2	0	2	0	0	2	2	1	9	
17	Preserve and fully use parcels with access to rail spurs	Economic Development	Freight		0	2	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	10	
18	Seek grants and innovative funding approaches for freight and passenger rail	Funding	Both		2	2	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	13	
19	Promote and encourage "freight as a good neighbor" (see reference at end) while respecting rail's exemptions from local control. This could be an annual workshop on freight movement in Vermont with alternating years focusing on rail. This would support implementation of the Vermont rail and freight plans.	Safety	Freight		2	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	10	
20	Maintain and modernize freight rail yards such as NECR and CP Yards	Maintenance	Freight		0	4	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	7	