

CTB Rail Subcommittee Meeting Minutes
VDOT Central Office Training Room
1221 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
December 5, 2017

The Meeting began at 9:00 am.

CTB Rail Subcommittee Members Present: Jennifer Mitchell, Scott Kasprovicz, Shannon Valentine, Mary Hughes-Hynes, and Court Rosen

DRPT Director Jennifer Mitchell introduced the agenda for the day and said that there would be a change to the order of the agenda. The meeting would begin with the Rail Plan and conclude with a DC2RVA update.

1. Rail Plan Presentation-Mike Todd

Mike Todd gave an update on changes that had been made to the Rail Plan since the last meeting. He highlighted page 14 of the plan and said that the greatest change to the plan was on this page. A statewide rail map was added which depicts some of the major investments outlined in more detail in Chapter 5 of the Rail Plan. He said that DRPT had met one on one with CTB Rail Subcommittee members to discuss the plan, members indicated that the details in Chapter 5 are hard to wade through so DRPT inserted a summary map in the Executive Summary. The Rail Plan has been posted since September 19th and DRPT has received lots of comments on the plan which have been incorporated into the document that will be voted on during the December 6th Action Meeting. The following discussion occurred after Mike's presentation.

- a. Jennifer Mitchell thanked Mike Todd for all of his hard work on the plan. She said that CTB member Shannon Valentine, who had not yet arrived at the meeting, called DRPT last week to ask a question on the economic benefits number outlined on pg. 2 of the Executive Summary. Mike Todd said that the economic benefits highlighted in the Executive Summary has a very narrow purpose. This number did not include benefits such as tourism. This number highlighted direct benefits to the highway network. The measures used to obtain this number were objective and credible. Scott Kasprovicz said that the rail subcommittee had asked for an objective and credible number. The other benefits would be hard to quantify. Jennifer Mitchell said that Shannon has asked to highlight larger benefits.
- b. Jennifer Mitchell proposed that the CTB be asked to approve the policy as it is. DRPT will continue to pull out information from Chapter 2 to highlight in the

Executive Summary. If it needs to be refined DRPT can bring it back to the CTB to amend in the future.

- c. Scott Kasprovicz asked about the 2.2 billion annual benefits number. He said that it should say “direct benefits” and that there should be an asterisk on the word direct with an explanation that details what the number means.
 - d. Court Rosen said the number should be included but not in the executive summary. The tourism number would only be an estimate.
 - e. Jennifer Mitchell said that Shannon Valentine wants to highlight a broader number in the executive summary to make the case for rail.
 - f. Mary Hynes said the tourism number would need to be easily replicable year after year.
2. Station Stop Policy-Jeremy Latimer
- a. Scott Kasprovicz asked if the CTB would be voting on the station policy during the December 7th action meeting. Jennifer Mitchell said that they would not be voting on the station policy until January.
 - b. Jeremy highlighted some of the comments that were received by the agency. The initial draft of the station policy did not give DRPT a way to initiate a project. DRPT had envisioned working with localities, but there needs to be a way for the agency to initiate a project.
 - c. Jeremy discussed the consideration factors. He said that intend to establish a methodology to rank/weight them. The proposer will be asked how their plan affects the consideration factors on a case-by-case basis. He asked the subcommittee members if they had any concerns about the policy. Jennifer Mitchell said the policy will be pulled out of the rail plan and discussed separately before it is voted on.
 - d. Mary Hynes remarked that if the station policy is pulled out from the rest of the rail plan then there will be a separate resolution for the rail plan which she thinks is better.
 - e. Shannon Valentine arrived at the meeting at 9:15.
3. CTB Policy Update Effort-Renewal of RIA Policy-Jeremy Latimer
- a. Jeremy told the subcommittee that as part of the effort to clean up the CTB’s review of their policies, it was determined that nothing had been updated on the Rail Industrial Access policy since 1995. He said that some parts of the policy are still relevant and that some have changed. DRPT has heard from the short line’s that this policy could be better utilized if changes were made to make smaller grants possible. Scott Kasprovicz asked Jeremy to elaborate on this. Jeremy Latimer said that scoring of applications is based on capital expenditures. DRPT is looking at the Pennsylvania program as a model. The Pennsylvania program has a match.

- b. Mary Hynes asked DRPT to come back to the next meeting with information on how the program has been utilized over the last 5 years and how much money has been spent.
 - c. Jennifer Mitchell elaborated that this policy had come up as part of a broader review of CTB policies but that it was very timely to look at it. DRPT receives a lot of questions on RIA applications and should look at other ways to improve this program.
 - d. Scott Kasprovicz asked to see the number of active industrial sidings in the commonwealth and asked how this program would add to that.
 - e. Shannon Valentine said that she thinks the members would be surprised by that number.
 - f. Jeremy Latimer said the current policy is meant to be kept until it is replaced. Mary Hynes said there will be no vote on this policy tomorrow.
 - g. DRPT will bring back recommendations on how to improve this policy at the next meeting.
 - h. Jennifer Mitchell said that she wanted to go back to the rail plan discussion now that Shannon Valentine was present.
 - i. Shannon Valentine said that she was concerned about the 190 million number in the rail plan when the Port of Virginia's website says their economic impact is 600 billion. Shannon Valentine said that the rail network is critical to the Port so she knows that we impact that somehow.
 - j. Jennifer Mitchell directed the DRPT team to make Scott's edits and to look at the numbers in Chapter 2 of the rail plan and see if anything could be amended.
 - k. Mary Hynes asked if anyone knew how the Port had generated its number. We should see how it is calculated before determining if it should be replicated.
 - l. Shannon Valentine said it is so important to make the case for rail in the executive summary because it will be used as the marketing piece.
4. DC2RVA Update-Emily Stock
- a. Emily Stock said that there had been new developments since the November 9th meeting. DRPT had received many comments and letters, some of which were part of the formal public comment period and some which had been received after. They are currently working on the recommendation report which will go out in the month of December. It will reflect the vote of the CTB.
 - b. Emily Stock said that there would be a clause in the resolution about Randolph Macon College. It will say that DRPT will avoid property acquisitions.
 - c. She said that other comments had been received in regards to cultural resource analysis, specifically slave trade sites in Shockoe Bottom. At Main Street station the platforms will be lengthened. Existing assets will be used and the only increase to the physical footprint would be some additional pilings.
 - d. Emily Stock said that the Section 106 process had been followed. There are 2 known archaeological sites that are documented in the DEIS. The increase to the footprint would still be more than 125 feet away from the closest known

archaeological site and more than 200 feet away from the slave burial ground. She said that she knows there are more resources in the area than what is currently documented and that the goal will be to minimize disturbance to cultural resources.

- e. Jennifer said that there will be more discussion on this at the CTB workshop and that there will be a vote on the proposed resolution during the action meeting on Wednesday.
 - f. Mary Hynes said that if you were to read the DC2RVA resolution you would have no idea what they were actually recommending because of the way the alternatives are described.
 - g. Jennifer Mitchell said that DRPT can make changes to the resolution or attach documents to it that would make the recommendations more clear. DRPT is not trying to obscure what the actual recommendation is. She will ask Carol and Joann what the best way to handle this is.
5. Public Comment-
- a. Mayor Jim Foley of Ashland signed up to make public comment. He said that he agreed with Mary Hynes suggestion to put the recommendations in plain English. He said that he was disappointed that the resolution did not mention the narrow right of way in Ashland. He hopes that the CTB, DRPT and the localities can continue to work together to find other options to address the bottlenecks.
 - b. Mary Hynes asked DRPT staff how the Roanoke train was doing. Jeremy Latimer said that they did not have numbers yet but that it looked like around Thanksgiving there were trains that were sold out. Court Rosen said that the feedback in the community had been positive. Jennifer Mitchell said that after two years of service DRPT would look at what would be required to extend or add stations. Court Rosen said that New River Valley has a site for a station identified and purchased. Court Rosen sent them the draft station policy.
6. The meeting adjourned at 9:35.