



Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation

CTB Rail Subcommittee Meeting
Minutes
June 16th at 8 a.m. – 10 a.m.

CTB Rail Committee Attendees:

Jim Dyke
Shannon Valentine
Robert Cole
Jennifer Mitchell
Scott Kasprowicz

Meeting was called to order at 8:05 a.m.

Director Mitchell called the meeting to order and welcomed CTB members and the public.

Jeremy Latimer, Rail Transportation Programs Administrator, presented to CTB members then following:

1. Discussion/Presentation of Proposed Policy Goal Changes – Administrator Latimer went through the presentation of proposed policy changes, which include statutory requirements and policy goals.

We have received feedback from stakeholders and would like the process to be as transparent as possible. Most of the feedback centered around project prioritization, firm project completion dates and the 70/30 match, whether it be private or local funds.

Please see attached presentation.

CTB Member, Mr. Dyke, inquired if there could be exceptions made to the match requirements. He stated that the state could waive or reduce the match if the project is a high priority to the Commonwealth; however, there would be additional criteria to meet. The shortlines disagreed with this statement as it has served them so well in the past.

Mr. Cole suggested that we also evaluate the Benefit-Cost of the total public funded project costs if more than just REF funds are used.

Committee members discussed a maximum or minimum amount for Rail Preservation, with a recommendation for a minimum amount in case there is a great need in one particular year for a project.

Mr. Kasprovicz commented that holding railroads to a specific schedule should have check in points along the way to project completion.

Mr. Kasprovicz comments that punishing grantees by withholding new funds for non-from future projects due to non-performance on a current/previous project may hurt the Commonwealth if a new project stands to benefit the Commonwealth.

2. Discussion/Presentation of Proposed BCA Enhancements

Please see attached handout

3. Public Comment

1. Thelma Drake – City of Norfolk – Ms. Drake thanked the committee and DRPT for the comments provided during the meeting. She feels that this process will be effective and efficient, and beneficial to both passenger and freight trains. She was happy to hear discussion on the claw back provision and requested an email distribution list for future meetings.
2. Cannon Moss – NPBL Railroad – Mr. Moss stated that there were some good recommendations during the meeting; however, does not feel that passenger rail should benefit from REF as it uses IPROC funds. He mentioned that the short lines have now doubled and REF and Rail Preservation are important to their operations.
3. Bruce Wingo – Norfolk Southern – Mr. Wingo agreed that the match should remain 70/30 and federal funds should not be used as they would have “no skin in the game.” He also stated that if no match was provided there is the risk that the project could no longer be viable.
4. Robb Bohannon – VRRRA – Mr. Bohannon mentioned that REF funds are a vital part to businesses within the Commonwealth.
5. Marc Perreault – VRPI – Mr. Perreault stated that he was not speaking on behalf of VRPI. He started with that the match requirement should have some flexibility but for passenger rail as well. He was skeptical for funding for maintenance or good repair needs. Mr. Perreault agreed that projects funded with REF finds should be “shovel ready”.
6. Danny Plaughter – Virginians for High Speed Rail – Mr. Plaughter spoke that the waiving the match requirement should be a Director of DRPT or CTB action taken. He also invited CTB and the public to their event on July 22 where Secretary Foxx will be speaking on The Future of Transportation

7. Dick Beadles – Mr. Beadles countered Mr. Cannon’s comments and stated that the short lines particularly Mr. Cannon’s can ask its funding partner Norfolk Southern to cover its costs.
4. Adjourned at 9:23 a.m.