

COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Shannon Valentine Chairperson 1401 East Broad Street Richmond, Virginia 23219 (804) 786-2701 Fax: (804) 786-2940

MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

We are concerned about your health, and we are committed to do all we can to reduce the risk and spread of novel coronavirus. Governor Ralph Northam declared a state of emergency in Virginia on Thursday, March 12 in response to COVID-19. In light of this action, we have decided to conduct the December 18, 2020 Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) meeting using electronic communications in accord with Item 4-0.01.g. of Chapter 1289 (2020 Acts of Assembly), as the COVID-19 emergency makes it impracticable or unsafe to assemble in a single location. The purpose of the meeting is to discuss or transact the business statutorily required or necessary to continue operation of the CTB and the discharge of its lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities.

All board members will be participating remotely. The public may view the meeting via live stream by clicking the "View video" button at the following

link: http://www.ctb.virginia.gov/public_meetings/live_stream/default.asp. There will be opportunity for public comment during this meeting. Public comment can be submitted by calling the following telephone number 1-443-671-4865 followed by PIN 937 691 138# when it is announced that public comment will begin. A caller may be placed on hold until others who have called in earlier have had opportunity to speak.

In the event there is an interruption in the broadcast of the meeting, please call (804) 729-6495.

Should you wish to offer comment regarding how meetings using electronic communications technology compare to traditional meetings when the CTB is physically present, you may complete the FOIA Council's Electronic Meetings Public Comment form appearing at the end of this agenda and submit it to the FOIA Council as described on the Form.

AGENDA

December 18, 2020 9:00 a.m.

Public Comments:

OFFICE INTERMODAL PLANNING AND INVESTMENT:


<u>Presenting: Nick Donohue</u> Deputy Secretary of Transportation

1. Action on Submittal of a Project by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for SMART SCALE Evaluation

INTERCITY PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE EXPANSION: US 29 / I-81 CORRIDOR

Board Consideration of Potential Project for SMART SCALE Evaluation

Proposed Project Overview



Rail capacity improvements along the Norfolk Southern corridor to—

Add second roundtrip between DC and Roanoke, and

Extend service to the New River Valley.

Proposed Project Outcomes



- Additional Round Trip Serving Burke, Manassas, Culpeper, Charlottesville, Lynchburg and Roanoke (NB afternoon departure from Roanoke; SB morning departure from DC)
- Extend Service to New River Valley
- Total of Two Roundtrips from Christiansburg into the Northeast Corridor – 80,000 new riders estimated to be added to a route that had 220,000 riders in 2019.

Proposed Funding Request

- Applying for \$50M of funding through the SMART SCALE process
- Total project cost is subject to completion of successful negotiation with Norfolk-Southern
- Other potential funding sources include—
 - \$50M in one-time General Fund dollars included in Governor Northam's proposed budget amendments
 - Commonwealth Rail Fund
 - Interstate 81 Corridor Improvement Program
 - Federal grants

Board Consideration

- Board policy allows the CTB to submit two projects for evaluation in SMART SCALE
- Request to Board is to submit the potential Intercity Passenger Rail Service Expansion: US29/I-81 Corridor project for evaluation with a funding request of \$50M
- Retain ability to advance concept over the next year
- Submitting the project for evaluation does not determine if a project will ultimately be funded but allows it be eligible for funding through SMART SCALE



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Shannon Valentine Chairperson 1401 East Broad Street Richmond, Virginia 23219 (804) 786-2701 Fax: (804) 786-2940

Agenda Item #1

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

December 18, 2020

MOTION

Made by:

Seconded by:

Action:

<u>Title: Submittal of a Project by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for SMART SCALE Evaluation</u>

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Commonwealth Transportation Board's (CTB) SMART SCALE Policy, the CTB may by majority vote, choose to submit up to two projects to be evaluated for funding in each biennial SMART SCALE application cycle; and

WHEREAS, expanding passenger rail across Virginia is a priority and the Transforming Rail in Virginia Initiative announced in December 2019 will double Virginia-sponsored Amtrak service along the I-95 Corridor, enhance service to Hampton Roads, and increase VRE service over the next decade; and,

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth is also committed to exploring the expansion of passenger rail to the New River Valley and adding a second train along the US-29/I-81 corridor; and.

WHEREAS, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) is proposing a project to enhance passenger rail service across multiple districts as part of Round 4 of the SMART SCALE program; and,

WHEREAS, the proposed project, entitled Intercity Passenger Rail Expansion along the US 29 and I-81 Corridors, would add an additional round-trip train serving Burke Center, Manassas, Culpeper, Charlottesville, Lynchburg and Roanoke; and extend Amtrak service to Christiansburg; and,

Resolution of the Board Submittal of a Project by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for SMART SCALE Evaluation December 18, 2020 Page Two

WHEREAS, the final project scope will include multiple components and improvements to the Norfolk Southern (NS) corridor parallel to the US-29 and I-81 corridors as needed to support the additional passenger train service; and,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commonwealth Transportation Board hereby submits the Intercity Passenger Rail Expansion along the US 29 and I-81 Corridors project, application 7198, for evaluation in Round 4 of the SMART SCALE program.

CTB Decision Brief

Submittal of a Project by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for SMART SCALE Evaluation

December 18, 2020

Issue: The CTB is considering the submittal of a project for evaluation in the SMART SCALE process for the purpose of expanding passenger rail service in the US 29 and I-81 corridors, including a second round-trip train between Washington, DC and Roanoke; and expanding passenger rail service to the New River Valley. The project will serve multiple CTB districts, including the Culpeper, Lynchburg and Salem districts. DRPT and Norfolk Southern are in ongoing discussions regarding the final components of this project.

Facts: Submission of the Intercity Passenger Rail Expansion along the US 29 and I-81 Corridor by the CTB will allow the project to be considered for SMART SCALE funding.

- The final scope of the project will provide rail capacity improvements to support a second daily Amtrak round trip serving Alexandria, Burke Center, Manassas, Culpeper, Lynchburg and Roanoke; extend Amtrak service to Christiansburg; and reduce conflicts between passenger and freight rail services.
- Total project cost is subject to completion of successful negotiation with Norfolk-Southern. The total amount requested through the SMART SCALE process is \$50M. Other potential funding sources include Commonwealth Rail Funds, funds in the Governor's proposed budget, funds designated by the CTB for multimodal improvements in the I-81 corridor, and Federal sources.

Recommendation: Approval of the attached resolution.

Action Required by CTB: Approval of the attached resolution.

Options: Approve, Deny or Defer.



VIRGINIA FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ADVISORY COUNCIL COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

ELECTRONIC MEETINGS PUBLIC COMMENT FORM

WE NEED YOUR HELP--Please give us your feedback regarding how meetings using electronic communications technology compare to traditional meetings where everyone is present in the same room at the same time.

| 1. Name of the public body holding the meeting: | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------|----------|---------|--------------|--|--|--|
| 2. Date of the meeting: | | | | | | | | |
| 3. W | . Date of the meeting: | | | | | | | |
| 4. W | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | O 1 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | |
| | | ou able | to hear | everyo | one who spok | e at the meeting (members of the body and members of the | | |
| • | | r | | | Excellent | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | CO | MMEN | VT | | | | | |
| 7. H | ow eas | sy was | it for y | ou to o | btain agenda | materials for this meeting? | | |
| | Eas | y | • | _ | Difficult | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | CO | MMEN | VT | | | | | |
| | | | | | | kers said or did static, interruption, or any other | | |
| | Eas | y | | | Difficult | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| 9. If | | | used au | idio/vi | | gy, were you able to see all of the people who spoke? | | |
| | | - | 2 | 4 | • | | | |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | |
| | CO | MMEN | VT | | | | | |

| COMMENT 11. Were the members as a Less 1 2 3 COMMENT 12. Were there differences with the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partice Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technology Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | 4 5 | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 11. Were the members as a Less 1 2 3 COMMENT 12. Were there differences y With the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partic Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | | | | | | | |
| Less 1 2 3 COMMENT | | | | | | | | |
| COMMENT 12. Were there differences y With the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partic Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | nd did they participate as much as you would have expected? | | | | | | |
| COMMENT 12. Were there differences y With the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partic Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | Mo | ore | | | | | | |
| Were there differences y With the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partic Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | 4 5 | | | | | | | |
| With the other mem Very Different 1 2 With members partice Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 1 2 COMMENT 1 2 COMMENT 1 4 COMMENT 1 1 2 COMMENT 1 2 COMMENT 1 1 2 COMMENT 1 2 COMMENT 1 2 | | | | | | | | |
| Very Different 1 2 With members partice Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technology Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | ed in how the members interacted? | | | | | | |
| With members partice Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | bers prese | | | | | | | |
| With members partice Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technology Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | No Difference | | | | | | |
| Very Different 1 2 With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | |
| With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | With members participating from other locations: | | | | | | | |
| With the public: Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | No Difference | | | | | | |
| Very Different 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | |
| 1 2 COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | | | | | | | |
| COMMENT 13. Did you feel the technol Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | No Difference | | | | | | |
| 13. Did you feel the technology Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | | | | | | | |
| Hindered 1 2 COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | logy was a | a help or a hindrance? | | | | | | |
| COMMENT 14. How would you rate the Poor | | Helped | | | | | | |
| 14. How would you rate the | 3 4 | 5 | | | | | | |
| Poor | | | | | | | | |
| Poor | overall e | wality of this meeting? | | | | | | |
| | | cellent | | | | | | |
| 1 4 5 | 4 5 | cenent | | | | | | |
| 00) D TTVT | | | | | | | | |
| COMMENT | | | | | | | | |

10 TC /1

Council using the following contact information:

Virginia Freedom of Information Advisory Council General Assembly Building, Second Floor 201 North 9th Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219 foiacouncil@dls.virginia.gov/Fax: 804-371-8705/Tele: 866-448-4100