



CN E&E

Environmental Impact Statement

Scoping Comment for the Proposed Canadian National Railway Company Acquisition of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Company

STB Finance Docket No. 35087

Comment Form

How Do I Submit Comments?

- **Written Comments:** Complete and submit this form at the public open house scoping meeting, or follow the directions on the reverse side of this sheet to mail your comments.
- **Recorded Comments:** Provide your comments to a member of the project team or court reporter at this public open house scoping meeting, or call the toll-free project information line: 1-800-347-0689.
- **Electronic Comments:** Submit electronic comments by visiting the Surface Transportation Board's website, www.stb.dot.gov, under the heading "E-Filing."

Please refer to STB Finance Docket No. 35087 in all correspondence addressed to the Surface Transportation Board. Comments must be submitted by February 1, 2008.

See Attached Comment Pages

Surface Transportation Board

CN-EJ&E EIS - FD-35087

Log and Distribution

Date Recd: _____

HDR File No. _____

Scanned (Initial): _____

STAECT #: _____

Cc: Original - Job File

FDR

What scoping meeting did you attend? (Please circle): Mundelein, Barrington, Joliet, Matteson, Gary, West Chicago, Chicago.

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT!

Comments provided by the public help determine the scope of the environmental review.

Name: Bob Anderson

Address: 791 Clearwood Ct.

City, State, Zip: Aurora, IL 60504

Date: February 5, 2008

Home ~ 700 feet from EJE and about block and a half Southeast of Ogden Rte 34 crossing with natural gas main lines

1
TO: SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD
395 E Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20423
Attn: Phyllis Johnson-Ball
Environmental Filing
STB Finance Docket No. 35087

FROM: BOB ANDERSON
791 Clearwood Ct
Aurora, IL 60504
630-820-1546
February 5, 2008

Scoping Comment for the Proposed Canadian National Railway Co.
Acquisition of the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway Co.
STB Finance Docket # 35087

Regarding: FOREIGN/INTERNATIONAL FREIGHT and SECURITY

I think the Surface Transportation Board should consider the possibility that CN's acquisition of EJE Railway ~~COULD~~ POSE A SECURITY RISK, or AID ILLEGAL TRAFFICING. If freight is entering through Canadian West Coast Port Facilities and if Canadian security at those port facilities is less stringent than at U.S. West Coast facilities (which is very likely), this could pose additional risk to U.S. Homeland Security. Foreign governments, foreign shipping companies and foreign manufacturers or suppliers may have prompted the new West Coast facilities and even CN's acquisition to increase traffic through 'low security' entry into U.S. CN may fill EJE as mainline then refill ~~old~~ old traffic routes through Chicago with 'low security entry' freight as well. Although legitimate businesses might want this to save time, money by expediting goods through Canada into U.S., it may already be posing a risk and increased traffic on EJE line may cause additional risk.

Some key issues with this mode of entering the U.S.

- 1) Terrorists or smugglers could also use this 'back door' 'low security' mode for their own purposes!
- 2) U.S. port facilities and rail lines may suffer decreases in freight ~~and~~ traffic as business diverts to a ~~close~~ nearby 'low security' entry port in Canada!
- 3) What is the current level of Canadian port facilities security ~~worse~~ that of U.S. West coast facilities and what is the projected difference as U.S. ramps up port security, especially of intermodal freight?
- 4) Would Canada cooperate to keep all port facilities on the same level of security as U.S. with similar inspections, seizures, etc.?
- 5) Would CN allow freight entering U.S. to be reinspected at U.S./Canadian border, if that is even possible.

Other Questions of Importance

- 1) Did any government, shippers, foreign businesses request or suggest this 'back door' entry into U.S. and suggest CN's acquisition of EJE and other rail lines in U.S. for this purpose, and, if so, who were they?
- 2) Will U.S. ports and rail lines be losers through diverted freight entering through 'low security' ports
- 3) Might these security risks be increased over current levels if CN moves 'through Chicago' rail traffic to EJE but then refills the 'through Chicago' rail traffic routes
- 4) What percentage of freight entering through Canadian intermodal and other port facilities originates in Middle Eastern countries, unfriendly Middle Eastern countries,

- 4Xcont) Muslim countries (such as Malaysia and Indonesia) or countries where terrorist organizations exist and are active from time to time (such as the Philippines)?
- 5.) What percentage of freight through Canadian ports and on CN railway originates in countries where smuggling of illegal goods, drugs, or human slaves is a greater problem (such as China)?
- 6a) Are intermediary intermodal ports or other port facilities used to disguise country of origin or port of origin.
- 6b) Are complete origination and shipping histories available to U.S. and Canadian entry port security or at U.S. border where Canadian National enters U.S.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

I think this deserves a study by the Surface Transportation Board and any questions raised answered.

I will be forwarding the above comments to U.S. Department of Homeland Security, as well.

Thank you for your consideration of this and many other issues raised in my first submission. and thank you for the additional 2 week comment period as this occurred to me on the last night of the original Scoping Comment Period.

Bob Anderson

re CN ACQUISITION UT 12 JANE
STB FINANCE DOCKET # 35087
SCOPING COMMENT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
STUDY

FROM BOB ANDERSON
791 Clearwood Ct
Aurora, IL 60504
FEB 7, 2008

Addendum On Vibration Problems

Though, in my first submission of comments, I discussed current chronic vibration effects and problems, such as ^{applied} deco brick cracks, nail pops, seam and ceiling drywall cracks which have been annoying and require repair every 3-5 years, I think that increased rail traffic levels (16-40+ trains/day. there would be the POSSIBILITY OF:

- Natural gas leaks from loosened appliance connectors, valves or line connections, appliance automatic valving, as on ranges + furnaces, gas meter connections, or even gas main lines ^{+ storage} nearby (just in back of my home in Clearwood ^{Part} about 200 ft from track)

WITH THE POSSIBILITY OF NATURAL GAS
EXPLOSIONS IN OR OUTSIDE OF HOMES
AND MASSIVE DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY
(OFTEN SEVERAL HOMES INVOLVED)

This would be more probably as lines ⁺ connections age or are repaired over time or improperly installed. I think there is a probability, though, it is a small to moderate number.

- Structural failures of roof trusses, walls, or drywall failures.
- Plumbing line, connection, valve and hot water tank failures and resulting water damage to homes.
- Gutter and Downspout Detachments
- CRACK AND FAILURE OF APPLIED DECORATIVE BRICK + STONE and TRIM, CAULK and ELECTRICAL ITEMS

RAIL TRAFFIC CAPS and LOW RAIL TRAFFIC WINDOWS

I think RAIL TRAFFIC CAPS are appropriate in this acquisition and should be required of CN.

(I'm requesting a cap of 16-24 trains a day from sources all

1.) It would keep them as a reasonable ^{good} neighbor rather than an exploitive bad neighbor.

2.) For those homeowners who purchased previous to 1996 and subsequent higher rail traffic years since (most about 8-10 trains per day average), 16-24 trains per day represents a 400%-600% increase ~~in~~ in rail traffic originally and historically since 1979 (about 2-6 trains per day).

THIS IS ABOUT ALL I WOULD BE WILLING TO PUT UP WITH. Note: TITLE ~~IS~~ GUARANTEES QUIET ENJOYMENT OF THE PROPERTY AND HOME.

3.) With newer locomotives (EPA Tier 2) AIR POLLUTION EMISSIONS REMAIN AT CURRENT LEVELS or just slightly higher.

4.) Auto traffic through at-grade crossings is minimally affected (especially with RUSH HOUR AND NOON LOW RAIL TRAFFIC WINDOWS

5.) CAPS ALLOW EASIER SCHEDULING OF LOW ~~RAIL~~ RAIL TRAFFIC WINDOWS FOR AUTO RUSH HOURS AND TRACK MAINTENANCE.

6.) CAPS WOULD ALLOW PROPERTY VALUES TO BE MINIMALLY AFFECTED (Decreases of 5%-10% rather than 10%-25%)

7) CAPS WOULD ALLOW QUIET ZONES TO BE PUT IN PLACE AND REMAIN IN PLACE.

Planned Rail Traffic Projections of Acquisition may preclude quiet zones or cancel existing quiet zones; this would be absolutely unacceptable ~~and~~ to homeowners

Note: ALL QUIET ZONES SHOULD BE APPROVED, IN PLACE, AND GUARANTEED IN PERPETUITY FOR ANY AREA THAT WANTS ONE, BEFORE ANY RAIL TRAFFIC INCREASES ARE ALLOWED.

LOW RAIL TRAFFIC WINDOWS

I think this ~~is~~ is a good idea because:

- RUSH HOUR AND NOON AUTO TRAFFIC (heaviest times) IS IMPACTED MINIMALLY AT CROSSINGS (eg 1 TRAIN EVERY 1.5-2 HRS.)
Suggest 6AM-9AM 11:30AM-1:30PM and 3:30PM-7:30PM
- SUMMER LOW TRAFFIC WINDOWS FROM MAY 1 each year to SEPTEMBER 30 each year, on WEEKEND DAYS (Saturday and Sunday 8:30 AM-8:30 PM-) would allow most residents and homeowners to enjoy their homes, families etc in a REASONABLE MANNER.

Note: This has been the case for most of the 18+ years I've lived here.