



CTB Rail Subcommittee Meeting
Minutes
April 18, 2017

Meeting began at 9:05 am.

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

DRPT Director Jennifer Mitchell opened the meeting and introduced Linda Balderson of DRPT who began her presentation on the Rail Preservation Program and Projected Shortline Needs.

1. Rail Preservation Program and Projected Shortline Needs-Linda Balderson

Linda gave her presentation and a discussion with the CTB members ensued. The CTB members stated that since bridge upgrades and repairs are the shortlines' first priority, a bridge asset inventory, including number of bridges and percent in disrepair, and/or condition assessment of bridge inventory be prepared for them. This information will be pulled together for presentation in the next few months. Director Jennifer Mitchell explained that the Rail Safety Task Force created by the Governor after the Lynchburg accident found that more money for safety and security inspections was needed. The State Corporation Commission has a group of inspectors who act on behalf of the FRA, but that group is very small. Director Jennifer Mitchell said that from a policy standpoint, the big bridge projects will need more funding from RPF and could possibly need more REF funds. The CTB asked if there is any distinction between State of Good Repair (SOGR) and maintenance. Linda Balderson explained that SOGR refers to a programmatic approach to maintaining or reaching FRA Class II track safety standards and that spot maintenance is not supported by DRPT grant programs. The CTB requested that DRPT's guidance to applicants and grantees set out specific definitions for State of Good Repair and Maintenance. Linda Balderson presented statistics on the number of trucks taken off of the roadways as a result of the shortline rail network. The CTB asked what percent of the overall truck traffic this equates too. In a group discussion, committee members explored the idea of expanding the sources for supplementing the Rail Preservation Program. Jennifer Mitchell indicated that DRPT would support expanding the program, but would want to make sure that DRPT is not violating any statutory funding requirements, and that they do not negatively impact other

programs. The CTB requested that at the next meeting information be brought to them so they can better understand the value of the rail network and that the value can be marketed with easily understood metrics.

2. Rail Plan Update-

Mike Todd presented an update on the Rail Plan. Scott Kasprovicz stated that the plan needs to have a compelling vision statement that will give visibility to the rail system and highlight what the impacts would be to the highway system without the rail system.

Mary Hynes Hughes said that the vision statement should be more of a condition statement that is easy to read and that has bullets highlighting our vision and mission for rail. The CTB said that rail traffic should be shown as a percentage of truck traffic even if it is a higher percentage of trucks and that the rail plan should break down economic impacts per region and then demonstrate what the economic impact would be if the rail system ceased to exist. Scott Kasprovicz requested that DRPT add a footnote on the metric of \$3 million per mile of rail construction. The footnote should state that this is a private investment and is privately owned and that the property is giving money back to the locality and state. The footnote should state the total amount of property taxes collected per year from railroads. The CTB asked Mike to check on the figure given for the amount of money spent per mile of highway construction, there was concern that what was stated was too low. The CTB said that the plan should aggregate numbers upward to a higher level to aggressively support the rail industry and that rail traffic should be broken down by region.

3. DC2RVA Update- Emily Stock

Emily Stock presented an update on the DC2RVA study. The DEIS is expected to be available this summer. The release will be accompanied by a 60-day public comment period and a series of public hearings. Director Mitchell clarified that while the DEIS identifies preferred alternatives for much of the corridor, the preferred alternative for the Ashland area remains to be determined. DRPT is conducting community-based process to develop consensus for a preferred alternative recommendation to FRA, as well as analysis to validate DEIS results. Shannon Valentine asked that tunneling technology be kept in mind for Ashland. All alternatives will be considered in the Ashland area.

4. Public Comment-No one signed up for Public Comment.

5. Meeting was adjourned at 9:50 am.