



## Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

July 18, 2016

<http://www.fampo.gwregion.org/committees/policy-committee/>

### Members Present:

Mr. Matt Kelly, Chair, City of Frederickburg  
Mr. Mark Whitley, City of Frederickburg  
Mr. Billy Withers, City of Frederickburg  
Ms. Nancy Long, Caroline County (Non-Voting Member)  
Ms. Ruby Brabo, King George County (Non-Voting Member)  
Mr. Greg Benton, Spotsylvania County  
Mr. Tim McLaughlin, Spotsylvania County  
Mr. David Ross, Spotsylvania County  
Ms. Meg Bohmke, Stafford County  
Mr. Paul Milde, Stafford County  
Ms. Laura Sellers, Stafford County  
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald, Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC)  
Ms. Marci Parker, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Mr. Tim Roseboom, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)  
Mr. Hap Connors, Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) (Non-Voting Member)  
Mr. Todd Rump, Citizens Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG) (Non-Voting Member)

### Others Present:

Mr. Paul Prideaux, Michael Baker International  
Ms. Susan Gardner, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Mr. Stephen Haynes, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Mr. Tim Baroody, City of Frederickburg  
Mr. Rupert Farley, Citizens Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG)  
Mr. David Swan, Citizens Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG)  
Mr. Tom Hickey, Virginia Railway Express (VRE)  
Mr. Scott Shenk, Free Lance Star

### Staff Members Present:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO  
Ms. Marti Donley, FAMPO  
Mr. Nick Quint, FAMPO  
Mr. Daniel Reese, FAMPO  
Mr. Lloyd Robinson, FAMPO  
Ms. Diana Utz, GWRC  
Mr. Tim Ware, GWRC  
Ms. Leigh Anderson, GWRC  
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

**Citizens Present:**

**Caroline County:**

Douglas and Erin Cline  
Bonnie and Tom Garber

**Spotsylvania County:**

Gene Barbee  
Robert Benson, Sr.  
Gerry & Ruth Boynton  
Bill Connell  
Tim Davis  
Veronica Kelly  
Judy Polleck  
Joseph & Sherry Sharrow  
Victoria Tanenbaum  
Jimbo Van Camp

**Stafford County:**

Joyce Childress  
Randy Comer  
Richard Fensterer  
David Johnston  
Penny Matter  
Helen Norton

**CALL FAMPO MEETING TO ORDER**

Chairman Kelly called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m. and received acknowledgement that a quorum was present.

**APPROVAL OF FAMPO AGENDA**

Upon recommendation by Chairman Kelly, it was requested that agenda Item 6J (Action/Discussion Items) for discussion of the DC2RVA High Speed Rail topic be moved for discussion ahead of Item 6A.

Upon motion by Mr. Milde and seconded by Mr. Withers, with all concurring, this recommendation was adopted.

**PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

There were no public comments entered for any other agenda item and the citizen comments expressed were for discussion of the DC2RVA High Speed Rail topic which will be listed later in the agenda where the item was discussed.

## **CHAIRMAN'S COMMENTS**

None

## **ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- a.) **Approval of FAMPO Minutes of June 20, 2016** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Upon motion by Ms. Sellers and seconded by Mr. Withers, with Ms. Parker abstaining and all others concurring, the minutes from the June 20, 2016 meeting were accepted as presented.

- b.) **Approval of Resolution No. 16-35, Directing that a Public Comment Period and Public Hearing be Held Prior to the Adoption of an Amendment to the 2040 CLRP to Include Projects from GWRC Member Localities** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Upon motion by Mr. Milde and seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, with all concurring, Resolution No. 16-35 was adopted.

- c.) **Approval of Resolution No. 17-01, Amending the FY2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include the Addition of a Project to Make Safety Improvements to I-95 at Exit 130** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Upon motion by Mr. Milde and seconded by Mr. Ross, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-01 was adopted.

- d.) **Approval of Resolution No. 17-02, Approving the Slate of Officers to Serve in Fiscal Year 2017** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Ms. Bohmke asked if a Vice-Chair is selected this year, does that mean the candidate automatically serves as Chair for the next year. Mr. Kelly advised that election of a Vice-Chair for this current year does not automatically make the assumption that the Vice-Chair serves as Chair and the recommendation for a new Chair would come from the Policy Committee.

Upon motion by Ms. Bohmke and seconded by Mr. Withers, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-02 was adopted nominating Mr. Paul Milde to serve as Vice-Chair to the FAMPO Policy Committee for the 2016-2017 year.

- e.) **Atlantic Gateway Project Update** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that as result of a press release from the Governor on July 5<sup>th</sup>, that the Atlantic Gateway Project for this region has been selected for a federal FASTLANE grant in the amount of \$165 million.

Mr. Agnello stated that this project will enhance passenger and freight rail along the I-95 corridor; will improve the reliability and capacity on the East Coast's rail network; and will increase bus service. Mr. Agnello stated that the 95 Express Lanes will be extended in both the northbound and southbound directions and that will provide commuters more efficient access to Northern Virginia.

Mr. Agnello advised that the project will move to construction in phases, with portions being underway in 2017. Mr. Agnello stated that much of the upfront environmental and engineering work is either already underway or completed.

Mr. Agnello expressed appreciation to VDOT/CTB for their efforts in preparing the FASTLANE grant proposal and for it receiving the needed legislative support. Mr. Kelly stated that approval of this grant request is a great start and he too is appreciative; however, he wants to reiterate that there is still a lot of work that needs to be completed with limited resources that will be coming to the region.

**f.) Final Presentation of I-95 Phase I Corridor Study – Mr. Paul Prideaux,  
Michael Baker International**

Mr. Paul Prideaux with Michael Baker International advised that tonight's presentation is a culmination of a seven-month effort by the I-95 Corridor Evaluation Advisory Committee. Mr. Prideaux stated that a recommendation of projects for consideration that resulted from the I-95 Phase 1 Corridor Study will be presented tonight for adoption by FAMPO.

Mr. Prideaux stated that the objectives for the Phase 1 study were to develop a master plan for I-95 between mileposts 145 and 125 that considers not only weekday travel and congestion, but also weekend travel conditions. Mr. Prideaux stated that the master plan recommended to move forward can be phased into smaller projects that could allow them to receive funding allocations from either the Smart Scale program or other grant funding opportunities.

Mr. Prideaux relayed that the final recommended alternatives includes a Future No-Build alternative, which is the baseline of the study. The recommended projects included in the No-Build alternative are as follows: 95 Express Lanes extension; a fourth southbound General Purpose lane on the Route 610 corridor; Reconstruction of the Exit 140 interchange at Stafford Courthouse; widening of Courthouse Road in Stafford County; the 95 southbound Rappahannock River Crossing project; and interchange safety improvements at the Route 3 interchange in Spotsylvania County.

Mr. Prideaux stated that draft preferred alternative being recommended for consideration to move forward includes the following: 95 Express Lanes extension to Exit 133 (Route 17 in Stafford County); the northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project; a new interchange at Harrison Road in Spotsylvania County; and General Purpose lane widening from Exit 130 to Harrison Road.

Mr. Prideaux advised that the recommended preferred alternative be delivered in the following order:

**Priority Element 1 – Near Term planned and programmed improvements:**

- Express Lane Southern Tail project
- Additional southbound fourth lane from Garrisonville Road to Courthouse Road
- Reconstruction of Courthouse Road interchange in Stafford County
- Southbound Rappahannock River Crossing CD-lane project
- Safety improvements at the Route 3 interchange in Spotsylvania County

**Priority Element 2 – Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project:**

Additional northbound fourth lane from Route 17 to Centreport Parkway  
Northbound CD-lanes from Route 3 to Route 17  
Directional flyover ramp from eastbound Route 3 to northbound I-95

**Priority Element 3 – Express Lanes extension south to Route 17:**

Direct connect ramp from Garrisonville Road to Express Lanes to and from the north  
Two reversible Express Lanes in median

**Priority Element 4 – Improvements between Route 3 and Route 1:**

New interstate access point at Harrison Road  
General Purpose widening for a fourth lane in select locations along I-95

Mr. Prideaux stated that Element 1 includes the baseline alternatives; Element 2 and 3 include the second phase of development that is reflective of the 2040 LRTP goals and objectives; and Element 4 contains the improvements recommended for the southern-most portion of the study area.

Mr. Prideaux advised that the next steps are to provide a documented report of the Phase 1 Study efforts and that a final meeting will be scheduled with the Advisory Committee in August for finalization of the Phase 1 Study efforts. Mr. Prideaux stated that the current plan is for a Phase II Study effort to commence after Phase I is finalized. Mr. Prideaux relayed that the Phase II study will focus on multi-modal transportation options and continued traffic congestion relief for the entire region (Route 610 at Garrisonville in Stafford County to the Caroline/Hanover county line).

**g.) Approval of Resolution No. 17-03, Endorsing the Recommendations from I-95 Phase I Corridor Study– Mr. Paul Agnello**

Upon motion by Mr. Milde and seconded by Mr. Withers, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-03 was adopted.

**h.) Approval of Resolution No. 17-04, Authorizing Support for GWRC and FAMPO Smart Scale Candidate Projects – Mr. Paul Agnello**

Upon motion by Ms. Sellers and seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-04 was adopted.

**1. VRE Fredericksburg Line Capacity Expansion Project – Mr. Tom Hickey, VRE**

Mr. Tom Hickey with VRE advised that the VRE Fredericksburg Line Capacity Expansion project will be submitted for Smart Scale application consideration. Mr. Hickey stated that the improvements are for adding rail capacity and coincide with VRE's 2040 System Plan. Mr. Hickey

also advised that if FAMPO approval is given, the project will be submitted by PRTC and will not be in competition with other projects being submitted throughout the region.

Mr. Hickey advised that the 2040 System Plan involves a three-phase approach. Mr. Hickey stated that currently VRE is in Phase I, and the goal is to run longer trains but not more trains. Phase I will provide for more railcars; more station parking; more train storage tracks; and second and longer train platforms at existing stations. Phases II & III will result in more trains and allow for earning additional train slots with capacity improvements to provide a 3<sup>rd</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> track on CSX; longer bridges; more parking and railcars; and the Gainesville/Haymarket extension project.

Mr. Hickey stated that the goals of the Fredericksburg Line Capacity Expansion Project includes the following: completely fund either underfunded or unfunded Phase I projects; add twelve new coaches to the line; construct a passenger tunnel at the Alexandria Station; complete platform and bridge improvements at the Quantico station; modify the existing platforms at both the Brooke and Leeland Road stations; provide an additional 675 parking spaces at the Leeland Road Station; and complete the Crossroads Maintenance Storage Facility Expansion project which would extend tracks for longer trains. Mr. Hickey relayed that the current total project expenses are \$136.6 million: \$37.7 million in committed funds; and \$98.9 million being requested.

**i.) State of Good Repair – Ms. Marcie Parker, VDOT**

Ms. Parker advised that throughout the nine VDOT districts across the state, a State of Good Repair funding source is allocated annually. These are designated funds that go for repairs to roadways, bridges, and pavements.

Ms. Parker relayed that for a project to be considered for funding allocations from the State of Good Repair revenues, they need to meet the following three criteria:

**Pavement:**

- 1 – improvements to a fair or better status
- 2 – be in concurrence with the definition for pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction from FHWA
- 3 – add or restore strength to pavements

**Bridges:**

- 1 – to remove bridges from being in a structurally deficient status
- 2 – be in concurrence with the definition for a structurally deficient status according to FHWA guidelines
- 3 – add or restore strength to bridges

Ms. Parker advised that localities within the Fredericksburg District only receive a small percentage of the total State of Good Repair funding as there are only two cities or towns within its district. Ms. Parker relayed that road maintenance in the counties is the responsibility of the State and only cities and towns with over 3,500 populations maintain their own roads. As a result, in the Fredericksburg

District, only the City of Fredericksburg and the Town of Colonial Beach are eligible for State of Good Repair allocations.

Ms. Parker relayed that for this funding year, there are no paving projects in the FAMPO region and there are five bridge maintenance projects that will be eligible for the funding. The bridge projects that will qualify for consideration include 1 in Caroline County; 2 in Spotsylvania County; and 2 in Stafford County. Ms. Parker advised that the two projects in Spotsylvania County will result in full bridge replacements and not just bridge maintenance.

Mr. Connors stated that there is a lot of miscommunication about what constitutes a structurally deficient bridge, and he thinks this is a good topic that VDOT should address in detail at a future FAMPO meeting so that everyone can clearly understand the process, the criteria and the funding.

**j.) DC2RVA High Speed Rail Update – Mr. Tim Roseboom, DRPT**

Mr. Tim Roseboom with DRPT and Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) are working to improve the passenger rail service between Washington, DC and Richmond, VA. Mr. Roseboom stated that currently they are in the process of evaluating potential environmental impacts and benefits that could occur if changes are made to the CSX rail line which runs parallel to I-95.

Mr. Roseboom stated that the project will be evaluated in a Tier II Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and will describe the actions needed to expand the capacity of the rail network and to help the decision-makers understand the benefits and impacts of the project alternatives. Mr. Roseboom stated that the presentation given tonight is verbal only and not a notice of intent to proceed.

Mr. Roseboom stated that to date the EIS includes the following items:

- 2014 – Scoping
- 2015 Draft Purpose & Need & Alternatives recommended
- 2016 Draft EIS report released to the public
- 2017 Final EIS & decision

Mr. Roseboom advised that the Draft EIS is in its early stages and there is a range of alternatives that are still being considered. Mr. Roseboom stated that the purpose of the EIS is to gather data that will assist in evaluating the merits of the different alternatives being considered. Mr. Roseboom stated that a Preferred Alternative will be submitted for consideration as a part of the EIS process.

Mr. Roseboom stated that data today results in the following options being carried forward for more extensive study and recommendation. These include the following:

1. A third main-line track added through Fredericksburg on the east side of the existing tracks.
2. A two-track bypass going to the east of Fredericksburg.
3. A minor improvement option – this alternative would not add additional track but would include improvements to crossings, signals, safety and platforms.
4. A No-Build option

Mr. Roseboom stated that to date, the following questions have been asked:

1. Will roads be closed & will there be safety improvements –  
In the Draft EIS, recommendations will be made to improve crossing safety and some road closures will occur.
2. Will properties be acquired as part of the process –  
Whenever possible, the project will be designed to stay within the existing right-of-way; some additional right-of-way could be required but no property acquisition would occur until the project is approved and funds are available for construction.
3. Will passenger service and VRE services remain –  
The project is being developed to improve Amtrak's passenger rail service and to accommodate VRE's commuter service, so after a preferred alternative is approved, a service plan will be developed to establish passenger train schedules and train frequencies.

Mr. Kelly stated that having debate with one another is good but sometimes we get in a situation where people are talking over another person so please wait until you are recognized by the Chair and then make yours comments to the Chair – cooperation with this request is appreciated.

Mr. Kelly stated that he would not deny anyone from the public in attendance the opportunity to speak. Mr. Kelly asked that everyone who speaks please state their name and locality and limit their comments to three minutes per speaker. Mr. Kelly stated that if a speaker concurs with comments made by another speaker, then you can state that you concur. Mr. Kelly advised that no action is contemplated at tonight's meeting. Mr. Kelly advised that he would first ask for questions from the Board and then turn the comment time over to the public.

Mr. Benton asked if the high speed rail project was supposed to be for the benefit of the primary benefactor CSX? Mr. Roseboom stated that CSX owns the railway but he would not say that CSX is the primary benefactor; however, CSX is a primary stakeholder. Mr. Benton stated that he thought the money that may be given to this project is based on the fact that CSX will in fact become the primary benefactor. Mr. Roseboom stated that to date the only money designated to the project is for the EIS study which is being funded by DRPT.

Mr. Benton stated that he attended the presentation last week, and he does not understand how CSX is not the primary benefactor as the eastern by-pass alternative is designed to divert freight traffic as opposed to people traffic and CSX oversees all of the rail freight operations. With the eastern by-pass alternative, the freight will be diverted, going around Fredericksburg and coming to the Dahlgren spur rail lines, which will ultimately intersect with the rail lines for people. So, how would this alternative increase the people traffic when everything ultimately comes back together at some point?

Mr. Roseboom stated that the alternative proposed is being studied by both PRTC/VRE and they too are a part of the operations and will be looking at the passenger rail component to the alternatives as well.

Mr. Benton asked if PRTC/VRE is looking at the cost-benefits versus the time saved. Mr. Benton stated that the expected time to be saved is 20 minutes on the passenger rail line, which is based on a fraction of the population who are actually utilizing the VRE for their daily work commute.

Mr. Roseboom stated a time savings has been identified; however, cost factors are not a consideration at this point in time in the EIS study underway. Mr. Benton stated that cost needs to be a factor and should be included at the onset. Mr. Roseboom concurred that cost factors are a critical component of the process; however, not in the initial EIS phase underway.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that this actually becomes a tax-payer-funded supported rail project. Mr. Roseboom stated the environmental components are being funded by FRA. Mr. McLaughlin stated that FRA is essentially the tax-payer, so ultimately the project is being built with tax-payer monies for a benefit to a private industry.

Mr. Roseboom stated that if the high-speed rail project moves forward, then it would require funding from different sources. Mr. McLaughlin stated there is no sense in doing the preliminary work unless there is the intent to advance the project forward.

Mr. Roseboom stated with the high-speed rail alternative being studied from Washington, DC to Charlotte, NC that this becomes a national project. Mr. McLaughlin stated that this is compliance for a national high-speed priority system; however, what is being proposed in this region is actually not in fact a high-speed rail system.

Mr. McLaughlin asked how cost cannot be one of the contributing factors – why would you even launch an EIS without having any concept/indication of what the overall costs will be for the four different alternatives. Mr. McLaughlin inquired that as cost is not considered at the on-set, would Mr. Roseboom please bring someone back to the next meeting who can actually answer the questions. Mr. McLaughlin stated that he cannot see anyone going down this path without having some understanding of the actual cost per mile or the impacts to the tax-payer for the rail project.

Mr. Milde stated that he was not in support of or against the study because he does not think the project will ever be funded as there is no money designated to the project, but as a member of the PRTC Board, he can answer some of the questions.

Mr. Milde stated that first, before any project can be advanced for any further study, funding sources, etc. the first requirement is an EIS study. Mr. Milde stated that just like with the HOT lanes project on I-95, an EIS study has to be completed to justify a project even advancing.

Mr. Milde stated that in order for VRE to be able to increase capacity and to add more trains, VRE needs to help CSX increase its capacity from Spotsylvania to Northern Virginia. Mr. Milde stated that we need to remember that this issue is not just about freight and that someone higher up in the

White House has an idea that a high-speed rail system is appropriate as a means of moving people from one point to another.

Ms. Sellers stated that it was mentioned that another option is being considered that would go through Prince William County. Ms. Sellers stated that she has not seen any information on the Prince William County option. Ms. Sellers stated that she is requesting that all options being discussed be presented to the Board and not just the alternatives being considered for this region. Ms. Sellers stated that even though she represents Stafford County she does not personally represent any of the districts that could be affected. Ms. Sellers stated that when constituents call to express opposition to the alternatives planned here, she could then at least provide them with the all of the alternatives being explored state-wide.

Mr. Roseboom stated that the alternative being studied for Prince William County is only for a third track, and the line will use the existing CSX rail lines. Mr. Roseboom stated this alternative would not be a new line and instead will be the same line with a new track.

Mr. Kelly stated that another aspect of completing an EIS study is to also look for fatal flaws which could conclude spending any additional funds and potentially bring a project to a halt if major issues are discovered with the NEPA study process. Mr. Kelly stated this is a major objective of an EIS study – to determine what is being planned; what is being looked at; and determine if the alternative has fatal flaws, etc. that would prevent it from moving forward.

Mr. Kelly stated that one thing that has become clear tonight is that there is the tendency to discuss acronyms such as “EIS”, “NEPA”, “CTB”, etc. which may be unclear to the public. Mr. Kelly stated that to date, not a very good job has been done to explain to the public the process; what is involved in the process, etc. Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Roseboom if he would walk a project through what a normal process is; who the key players are in the decision-making process; where we are; and where we hope to go.

Mr. Roseboom stated that “NEPA” means National Environmental Policy Act, so any potential project that could involve federal dollars needs to be in compliance with the NEPA guidelines. Generally, transportation projects and new constructions are required to undergo an EIS process first. An EIS study usually covers a 3-year time frame. The first phase is where all identifiable problems are studied. The second phase is for development of alternatives, finances, infrastructure, traffic impacts, etc. At the completion of the second phase, you are able to determine which alternatives will move forward. After this has been completed, you move to the engineering, funding, and construction phases.

Mr. Kelly stated that this is a federal initiative for the high-speed rail in a section on the eastern seaboard which is where the project originally started. The State is now working on our piece of a much larger project and the NEPA process is the very beginning phase of the process.

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Agnello for clarifications as the NEPA process continues, where do we, the CTB, etc. stand and who are the key players here as a project moves forward. Mr. Agnello stated that we are in the draft stage of the EIS process and are now approaching the last round of public meetings. Mr. Agnello stated that after the public meetings conclude, the likely process would be

DRPT approving the preferred alternative and submitting it to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for approval and then the State submitting the EIS to the lead Federal agency; the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) for approval. If the FRA approves the EIS, they would indicate this by a Record of Decision (ROD). So the EIS could be approved without FAMPO approval.

But, Mr. Agnello stated that for a regionally significant project to move forward to construction, the region's metropolitan planning organization (MPO) would need to approve it at some point. FAMPO serves as the MPO for the Fredericksburg region and would need to approve the preferred alternative from the EIS in order for the project to move forward to construction.

Mr. Agnello stated that there are several approvals required from the State and other federal agencies so there are still many steps in the process before a decision could be reached to advance a project further.

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Connors, as the CTB representative, if he had any additional information to add to how the process unfolds. Mr. Connors stated that the process is now in the very preliminary stage; however, he personally does not see the project ever materializing because funding is so scarce.

Mr. Benton asked Mr. Connors how this could be accurate if a lot of the beginning stages are already in the second year of a 3-year process, which would mean a decision being made is right around the corner. Mr. Benton stated that at the public meeting held last week, none of the citizens' questions could be answered. Mr. Benton stated that he would think if we were this far along in the EIS study that basic questions such as: what is the study being based on; how is the project rated; how will a decision be made; etc. should be able to be answered. Mr. Benton stated that out of 300+ people in attendance at that meeting, everyone was told that an information sheet and web-site was available, and if citizens had concerns they could submit them accordingly.

Mr. Roseboom stated that when the draft EIS study is completed and published then this is when the opportunity for public comment occurs. All of the comments received now go into the final EIS document; however, all that is available now is the preliminary information.

Ms. Bohmke stated that the truth of the matter is there is no matrix of what is being measured and looked for in the EIS study. Mr. Roseboom advised that he would take all of the concerns expressed back to the boards; however, the EIS study is a legal process that is being followed per federal guidelines. Mr. Roseboom stated there are prescribed elements that have to be adhered to before the EIS study can even move forward in the Phase 1 development.

Mr. Kelly advised that Mr. Roseboom is the DRPT representative for both the FAMPO Policy and Technical committees; however, he is not the decision-maker or the one who is responsible for the EIS Phase 1 study being initiated.

Ms. Long asked when the findings show, before a record of decision is made, what costs are associated with land values for properties along the rail corridor. Ms. Long stated this is when the issue no longer becomes just an economic issue but then a financial one as well.

Mr. Roseboom stated that the cost of land to be acquired along the corridors comes much later in the process and it is not part of the initial EIS draft now underway. Ms. Long asked if there will be another entire process that will look at property values, financial components, etc. before a record of decision is made. Mr. Roseboom concurred and stated that the financial process is a completely and separate process.

Ms. Long referred to the Power Point slide that shows the first two dots on the slide is completed and now indicates we are in Phase I of the EIS process. Ms. Long stated that the citizens of Caroline County received no notification of when/where public meetings would be held, so they have been overlooked for participation in at least two meetings. Ms. Long stated that she had contacted DRPT to request that a representative come to Caroline County to speak at a constituent meeting, and she was told no one was available. Ms. Long stated that fortunately GWRC/FAMPO provided a representative, but clearly the residents of Caroline County have been short-changed on being kept apprised and she thinks is very unfair to the residents in that county. Mr. Roseboom concurred that this oversight should not have occurred and he would be taking this information back to the boards.

Ms. Sellers stated that she has heard this project discussed with PRTC/GWRC for at least the last three years but that she did not think the project would ever be funded. However, she does not see the current alternatives being studied now as alternatives that had previously been submitted for study. Ms. Sellers asked if preferred alternatives have to be identified in an EIS study.

Mr. Roseboom stated that no specific areas or alternatives need to be finalized within an EIS study; however, the desire to increase the rail capacity along the I-95 corridor has been identified. Ms. Sellers stated that if the citizens do not understand the problem that is attempting to be fixed, then neither the citizens nor local officials will be in support of the project.

Mr. Kelly stated that he hopes the public has at least been given a better overview of who the players are and the process it takes for a project to evolve. Mr. Kelly asked if the public would provide written questions so a list can be compiled, submitted and answered. Mr. Kelly stated that all questions submitted tonight would be forwarded to FAMPO, to DRPT, and to CTB so follow-up can occur among all the entities.

Mr. Kelly stated that at a later date, FAMPO will be taking a position on the matter and he thinks with the questions asked tonight that there is a sense of what the action will be. Mr. Kelly stated that citizen concerns were heard and board member questions answered; however, there is still a lot of information unavailable to date, so we will ensure that follow-up after tonight's meeting occurs so additional concerns can be addressed.

Mr. Benton asked how quickly we expected to receive answers to the questions asked, as he does not see responses coming back any time soon. Mr. Kelly stated that some of the questions asked tonight are basic policy questions – i.e. who makes the decision; where is FAMPO in the process; etc. Mr. Kelly stated that the questions in regard to where the actual track would go; what properties would be affected; what impacts the track would have to property values, etc. will still remain unanswered for some time.

Mr. Benton stated that he would like to make a motion tonight and ask that a resolution be forthcoming that states that FAMPO is not in support of the project. Mr. Milde asked Mr. Benton if

he was making a motion just in opposition to the by-pass alternative or the entire project. Mr. Benton confirmed that it was a resolution of opposition to the by-pass alternative.

Ms. Long stated that Caroline County Board of Supervisors had already submitted a resolution of opposition at its last meeting and a copy of that resolution is included in tonight's agenda packet. Mr. McLaughlin advised that the Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors will be bringing up a similar resolution of opposition at their upcoming August 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. Sellers advised that the Stafford County Board of Supervisors will be taking similar action at their upcoming meeting, and opposition is expected from that Board as well.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he supports Mr. Benton's motion of requesting that FAMPO provide a resolution of opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative. Mr. McLaughlin stated that if nothing else, this resolution of opposition may force the hands of the decision-makers to make decisions and answer questions.

Mr. Milde stated that he will not support Mr. Benton's motion at this time. Mr. Milde stated that there is not enough feedback presented tonight which would indicate support of improvements to the main line. Mr. Milde state that not a single person spoke tonight in favor of the eastern by-pass; however, feedback from other citizens on whether they are for or against needs to be provided as well as if support is for or against any of the other alternatives being studied. Mr. Milde stated that clearly more consideration needs to be given to getting questions answered before this Board makes a decision. Mr. Milde stated that he realizes the decision is somewhat time sensitive; however, it is not critical that it be made tonight. Mr. Milde recommended that a decision be made at the upcoming September Policy Committee meeting, which will allow time for responses to tonight's unanswered questions. Mr. Milde stated that he did not understand why this Board would rush to oppose something we are not clearly informed on.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he was not sure what the objections would be. Mr. Milde relayed that if we were to point out in a resolution that we had multiple speakers in opposition at tonight's meeting and not anyone so far has been in opposition to the main line but in opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative, we are making the assumption that the residents in the City of Fredericksburg, where the main lines go through, have not had an opportunity to voice their concerns.

Mr. Milde stated that possibly consideration should be given to having a modified alternative after more information has been provided – i.e. stay on the main line with some modifications. This way, we are not flatly stating opposition to the entire project.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that he thinks what Mr. Benton asked for was a resolution of support in opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative only. Mr. McLaughlin stated that he does not believe the federal government is going to spend \$50 million on an EIS study when they have no idea of the total project cost. Mr. Milde stated that the discussion is about the motion, not about the cost of the project.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the project cost is in fact part of the motion and part of the discussion so that is why he supports Mr. Benton's motion. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the federal government can still continue on with the goals or even come back to provide an amazing plan that everyone supports, but he does not see this happening. At the end of the day, this option seems to be the most expensive alternative after you pay to acquire all of the properties that would be involved. Mr.

McLaughlin stated that is why the question was asked earlier as to who would be purchasing the properties – is it for CSX, which if so, is a private entity. Mr. McLaughlin stated that under the Constitution you cannot take properties to benefit the private sector, and if we give these properties to CSX this is essentially what would occur.

Mr. Benton stated again that his motion tonight is not saying we are in opposition to the entire project but would specifically be stipulating non-support of just the eastern by-pass alternative. Mr. Withers asked if at this time we have the exact location of where the proposed eastern by-pass alternative would go, or do we know for sure that it would not work. Mr. Withers stated that the discussions that have occurred tonight do not indicate that either of the two questions has been answered.

Mr. Withers stated that the information presented tonight does not indicate that a route is either a fixed or designated one. Mr. Withers stated that after more information has been provided and questions have been answered, we may find that we do not support one option, but that does mean we are not endorsing any eastern by-pass alternative.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that if the federal government has already spent \$50 million of tax-payer money, they better have a specific route they are looking at. Ms. Sellers stated that the reason she is not in support is that with the five alternatives, two of them are going through Stafford County and she does not feel that Stafford County will be in support. Ms. Sellers stated that it puts way too many of our citizens in serious safety issues. Ms. Sellers stated that neither of the large subdivisions that could be affected is represented by her, but the whole concept is a bad idea. Therefore, she will second the motion made by Mr. Benton. Ms. Bohmke stated that she agrees with Ms. Sellers and she is not favor of the eastern by-pass alternative and will also support the motion put forth.

Mr. Kelly stated that the project is a big project with a lot of moving parts, and like everything else involving transportation, it is always complicated. However, there are still a lot of questions that remain unanswered – i.e. what are we doing; what the goals are; even with VRE receiving some benefit, he does not like the fact that money is being diverted away from things that need to be addressed. At the same time, he does not like making decisions when the following criteria are in play:

1 – the item was not advertised on the agenda noting that a decision would be made tonight – the item was advertised as a discussion item only and not an action item.

2 – it is a big project, resulting in big decisions, and he feels for the Board to make a “spur-of-the-moment” decision is not the best way to approach the project. However, he would be in support of accepting a substitute motion being made that states a resolution will be brought back in opposition of the eastern by-pass alternative, and this will be properly advertised as an action item for the September Policy Committee meeting.

3- also, by waiting until September when it has been properly advertised, this will also enable us to have more time to get additional input, to get questions answered, and to give additional citizens the opportunity to make public comments, so to vote on this tonight is not a good idea for the FAMPO body.

Mr. Milde asked Mr. Kelly if his statement was being made as a substitute motion. Mr. Kelly stated that as Chair, he cannot make a motion. Mr. Milde stated that he was then making a substitute motion that a resolution of non-support for the high-speed rail eastern by-pass alternative be added to the upcoming September agenda for discussion and adoption. Mr. Withers seconded the substitute motion.

Ms. Brabo stated that just so the citizens are aware, that both representatives from Caroline and King George counties are non-voting members of FAMPO, so there is no question as to why they are not voting. However, in regard to the motions on the table, again as the high-speed rail project has no impact to King George County, other than supporting the colleagues within the region, she is a firm believer of representing constituents, and if the constituents are telling you they do not want something, then why wait?

Mr. Benton stated that we already have Caroline, Spotsylvania and Stafford making a decision, or planning too very shortly, and the questions that have been repeatedly asked by the citizens have still not been answered; they have been given just a web-site source for contact; and why would we even consider spending federal money that we do not have, all shows him that there is no reason why a decision should be postponed.

Mr. Milde stated that he thinks the opposition being stated is reflective of not taking in a constituent's requests are not a true statement. If you eliminate the eastern by-pass alternative and still support high-speed rail, then you are saying you want the project to run right through Fredericksburg. This item could be put on the upcoming September agenda so the public can become more informed and those not aware tonight could be invited to attend and comment as well. Mr. Milde stated he thinks for most Boards, and he for certain in Stafford County, that an item of this large significance is not brought up and voted on the same night. There is nothing to be lost by postponing the decision until September. Mr. Milde stated that tonight we still have a host of questions that were not answered and we are tasked from this body to get answers. Mr. Milde stated that in the spirit of openness, transparency and debate, why would we rush a decision?

Mr. McLaughlin stated that the high-speed rail public meetings were not only for the eastern by-pass alternative but instead for all options, so therefore the residents from the City of Fredericksburg could have come to these meetings to express any concerns. Mr. McLaughlin stated that they were either unaware or not as concerned. Mr. McLaughlin stated there is absolutely nothing but opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative, so let us take a position now.

Mr. Withers stated that he represents the City of Fredericksburg and he does not feel the residents in the City will be in favor of having the trains come right through the City. Mr. Withers stated that he is a process guy and to have an item on an agenda listed as a discussion item only and then rush through discussion at one meeting and then decide to vote on it the same night is something that procedurally he cannot support. Mr. Withers stated that he felt that with an item of such magnitude we need to take the extra time to obtain as much information as we possibly can before any action is taken.

Mr. Kelly stated that for members to say tonight that we do not have answers and we do not expect to get answers tonight, but therefore, we are ready to vote, is surprising to hear. It is our job to get answers, and from talking with Mr. Roseboom and Mr. Connors tonight, they clearly got the

message and have agreed to follow-up accordingly. Mr. Kelly stated that he sees no reason whatsoever why a vote would be taken without having all of the information. Also, Mr. Kelly stated that he agrees that there were many concerned citizens here tonight who expressed valid comments, but are we to just listen to those who spoke tonight?

Mr. Kelly stated that he felt it was the Board's responsibility to represent all of the citizens in the region before a vote is taken. Mr. Kelly stated that any project that is approved will ultimately affect neighborhoods, properties, etc. but we always balance the pros and cons before making a decision. However, what the Board is saying tonight is that we are not interested in getting answers, nor do we care how other citizens feel, but instead we just want to push forward a "no" vote. Mr. Kelly stated that if the Board moves in this fashion that this sets a very bad precedence in governance.

Mr. Kelly stated that he was going to call for the vote. First, on the substitute motion that is asking that a resolution of opposition be brought before the September Policy Committee meeting for discussion and action on the eastern by-pass alternative of the high-speed rail project. The substitute motion was previously made by Mr. Milde and seconded by Mr. Withers. Mr. Kelly asked for a hand vote and the vote count was as follows:

Substitute Motion – (5 no; 4 yes; & 2 abstentions)

Mr. Greg Benton -	No
Ms. Meg Bohmke -	No
Mr. Matt Kelly -	Yes
Mr. Tim McLaughlin -	No
Mr. Paul Milde -	Yes
Mr. David Ross -	No
Ms. Laura Sellers -	No
Mr. Mark Whitley -	Yes
Mr. Billy Withers -	Yes
Ms. Marcie Parker -	Abstain
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald -	Abstain

Mr. Kelly then called for the original motion, which was made by Mr. Benton and seconded by Ms. Sellers, asking that a resolution in opposition of the eastern by-pass alternative be approved. Mr. Kelly asked for a hand vote and the vote count was as follows:

Original Motion – (5 yes; 4 no; & 2 abstentions)

Mr. Greg Benton -	Yes
Ms. Meg Bohmke -	Yes
Mr. Matt Kelly -	No
Mr. Tim McLaughlin -	Yes
Mr. Paul Milde -	No
Mr. David Ross -	Yes
Ms. Laura Sellers -	Yes
Mr. Mark Whitley -	No
Mr. Billy Withers -	No

Ms. Marcie Parker - Abstain  
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald - Abstain

1. **Public Involvement for DC2RVA High Speed Rail** – Citizen Comments are included for review at the end of the minutes and are listed as a separate document.

### **FAMPO CORRESPONDENCE**

Included in agenda packet and are self-explanatory.

### **STAFF REPORT**

None

### **MEMBER REPORTS**

None

### **FAMPO COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

The minutes from both the FAMPO CTAG meeting and the FAMPO Technical Committee meeting are included in tonight's agenda packet.

### **ADJOURN FAMPO MEETING/NEXT MEETING, SEPTEMBER 19, 2016**

The FAMPO meeting for July 18th was adjourned at 9:42 p.m. The next meeting will occur on September 19, 2016 at 7:15 p.m.

## **CITIZEN COMMENT – July 18<sup>th</sup> Policy Committee Meeting – Regarding High-Speed Rail – Eastern By-Pass Alternative**

The following comments were made in opposition to the eastern by-pass high-speed rail alternative:

Citizen stated they received a letter in May, which was after the fact, as the process at that point was already underway. The question was asked as to why wasn't the public notified at the onset because property owners were not notified until after the first process was underway. If the property owners were not notified at the onset, does this mean the process needs to start over? The complaint was that the public and property owners should have been notified in 2015 when the process began and not a year later when studies were underway.

Citizen stated that they specifically purchased their home in a rural setting of the county for a peaceful county life-style. A life-style that did not include freight trains going through and around the properties. As the freight trains utilize 2/3 of the tracks, then 2/3 of the eastern by-pass train traffic will be of benefit to the freight carriers. Having freight trains run through a property completely changes the character and concept of one's property. The area would also require extensive modifications to the current road crossings. How can the citizen be expected to maintain and pursue regular lifestyles until the eastern by-pass alternative is removed from consideration? Citizen's lives and properties are in limbo for the next several years while the federal government decides whether the project will move forward.

Citizen stated that he appreciates the discussion that has occurred tonight. Due to the fact that the information has been limited and sparsely given to the public, he has been forced to educate himself on transportation, groups and decisions. It has been said over and over again that the project is a long way off from being approved and there is/will be plenty of time to comment. However, this is not true. The citizens do not have a lot of time to react/comment. The Draft EIS study will be completed this fall and at that time a preferred alternative would be recommended to move forward. Currently, it appears that 1 of 3 alternatives are being studied. If an alternative is selected as a result of the EIS study, it will then be difficult or impossible to have it removed if the federal government is in support. The advisory board has stated that they are already in favor of the eastern by-pass alternative, even before the EIS study has been completed. He stated he does not know what else the Board needs to hear because all he is hearing is that the by-pass alternative is the preferred alternative. This project will be a huge & expensive project and will have negative impacts to the area with no positive impacts to off-set. Again, he does not know what else this Board needs to hear to make a decision to say this is something that is not good for this region. In the fall after the EIS document is released, he will never be able to sell his home; never be able to put on an addition; and will never be able to do anything. He stated that he is one of many people being affected in three counties: Caroline, Spotsylvania, and Stafford. He is strongly requesting that FAMPO endorse a resolution of opposition for the eastern by-pass alternative. Anything this Board does prior to the completion of the EIS study will have a strong impact on DRPT's decision so it is important for action to be taken now, whether we think it will materialize or not. As soon as the by-pass alternative is off the table, then everyone here tonight can breathe again as now no one can live their life they would previously. Everyone is in limbo and this cannot be emphasized enough – we need action to have the by-pass alternative removed as it is not good for any of us. We need citizen and local government to be in support of having the by-pass alternative project removed as the clear benefits will be for the federal government and to CSX. In 2012 the US Constitution clearly states

that imminent domain cannot be utilized for private benefactors and there is nothing that can be said to convince the citizens that CSX will not become a prime benefactor.

Citizen stated she resides in a residential area in Stafford County that will be seriously impacted by the increased noise from the freight trains, the increased traffic, etc. She agrees with the citizen who stated that an impact statement that makes a recommendation to proceed is more than likely what the federal government will follow. Citizen asked that FAMPO take a stand and endorse a resolution in opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative.

Citizen stated that his property is approximately 100 yards from the Dahlgren Spur line in Ferry Farm where the rail crossings go on Ferry Road. He cannot see how this will not cause a tremendous bottle neck with the increase of freight/rail traffic. He also stated that the by-pass alternative would be constructed to the inner side of the tracks – this would impact the property owners and provides no benefit or revenue to the region. The only one to benefit would be CSX. Citizen asked that FAMPO take a stand and vote in opposition of an eastern by-pass alternative.

Citizen stated resident of Stafford County – currently she lives on a dead-end street where the railroad tracks currently go. There is a light and no railroad crossings that come down. If we increase the freight rail traffic to 30 trains per day, it then becomes a safety issue for the residents in this subdivision. They will not be able to get into our out of their subdivisions should an emergency situation arise. Also requests that FAMPO oppose the eastern by-pass alternative.

Citizen stated that they are in support of everything that has been previously said. Also had a question to Mr. Roseboom in regard to the map that was distributed at last week's public meeting. Does the EIS study just study the blue line indicated on the map, or is it studying all of the options. Mr. Roseboom advised that the EIS study is applicable to all of the options and not just one. Citizen also asked that FAMPO be in support of opposition to an eastern by-pass alternative.

Citizen stated that the letter that was mailed to Caroline County residents was quite vague, and communication with Caroline County residents has been poor. Citizen stated that homeowner contact is important and appreciates any help FAMPO can provide in asking for better information to be provided.

Citizen concurs with what has been said tonight by others. Urging FAMPO to draft a resolution of opposition to the proposed eastern by-pass alternative. Having this resolution to be included with the draft EIS study cannot hurt and possibly will become a part of the Draft EIS statement that will make the stakeholders aware that a large number of people do not want this alternative to move forward. Still has not heard any justification on why an eastern by-pass alternative would be a viable option, and you would just be moving the choke point from one place to another. Also requests that FAMPO pass a resolution for opposition to the proposed eastern by-pass alternative from moving forward.

Citizen stated she had questions for Mr. Roseboom: who is the chair in command; when a decision is made, who would have to say yes to implement the alternative; & who are the names of the agencies that would approve this alternative becoming a reality.

Mr. Roseboom stated that ultimately the Federal Railroad Administration has the final say; however, this would also need to be endorsed and supported by the State and USDOT, as funding would be allocated from these entities as well. DRPT has a director; Vice-Secretary of Transportation would have administrative authority; the CTB; Federal Highway Administration; etc. – so there are many agencies, local governments, and federal agencies that would need to provide a resolution of support.

Three other citizens did not express any additional comments; however, all three asked that FAMPO adopt a resolution in opposition to the eastern by-pass alternative.

The following comments were made from FAMPO CTAG members; however, the members were speaking as private citizens and were not speaking on behalf of CTAG.

Rupert Farley - Mr. Farley stated that there is more than one option being studied with one going right through downtown Fredericksburg; one going by existing tracks that would have turning issues; etc. so at least consideration of a by-pass alternative would give options for future expansion.

David Swan – Mr. Swan stated that clearly this project is significant and he thinks the citizens, the officials, the state government, etc. all have been somewhat neglected throughout this initial process. He thinks better communication to everyone from the stakeholders is critical, as all of the pieces to the equation still remain as unknowns.

Todd Rump – CTAG Chair – Mr. Rump stated that CTAG had discussed the high-speed rail project, but at this time did not make a definitive recommendation for either support of or support against the proposed eastern by-pass alternative, as a lot of questions still needed to be answered and more information was needed.

However, on a personal note, Mr. Rump stated that he is a commuter who utilizes the VRE, and he is encouraging the citizens to not only reach out to their local governments, state officials and FAMPO, but also to Senators Kaine & Warren. Mr. Rump stated that he too thinks this is an item that has federal favor, and as many endorsements one can obtain, the better the opinion carries.