

E0-2322



Re: CSXT LIRC Supplemental Ea 
David Navecky to: Louis E. Gitomer
Cc: "Hargrave, Rosemary"

05/20/2014 08:56 AM

Okay, we will use 7,200 feet as the average length of existing and proposed trains on the Indianapolis Line Subdivision.

Thanks,

Dave

Dave Navecky
Office of Environmental Analysis
Surface Transportation Board
395 E Street SW
Washington, DC 20423
202-245-0294
www.stb.dot.gov

"Louis E. Gitomer" Dave - 7200 feet is the average per train. Lou S... 05/20/2014 08:06:01 AM

From: "Louis E. Gitomer" <Lou@lgrailaw.com>
To: "David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov" <David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov>
Date: 05/20/2014 08:06 AM
Subject: Re: CSXT LIRC Supplemental Ea

Dave - 7200 feet is the average per train. Lou

Sent from my iPhone

> On May 20, 2014, at 7:46 AM, "David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov"
> <David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov> wrote:
>
>
> Lou -
>
> I'm checking in on the status of this last data request. Can you advise?
>
> The incomplete information on train length, in particular, is preventing us
> from moving forward with the noise analysis.
>
> Thanks,
>
> Dave
>
> Dave Navecky
> Office of Environmental Analysis
> Surface Transportation Board
> 395 E Street SW
> Washington, DC 20423
> 202-245-0294
> www.stb.dot.gov
> ----- Forwarded by David Navecky/STB on 05/20/2014 07:42 AM -----
>
> From: David Navecky/STB
> To: "Louis E. Gitomer" <Lou@lgrailaw.com>

> Cc: "Hargrave, Rosemary" <Rosemary.Hargrave@hdrinc.com>
> Date: 05/13/2014 03:09 PM
> Subject: Re: CSXT LIRC Supplemental Ea
>
>
> Lou -
>
> Thanks for the data received so far. We do, however, have some follow-up
> questions.
>
> Train Length
>
> CSXT stated that the rerouted trains would be "no longer than 7,200 feet"
> including two locomotives at the front. As train length will affect a
> number of our calculations (e.g., noise, crossing delay, etc), we want to
> ensure we use the appropriate number. Shall we assume that all of the
> rerouted trains under the Proposed Transaction are 7,200 feet long? What
> is the length of the existing 23 trains on the Indianapolis Line
> Subdivision? Or shall we assume all of them to be 7,200 feet long?
>
> Train Numbers
>
> To be consistent with the Draft EA, we are using 2011 as the base year and
> 2014 as the forecast year for the Proposed Transaction. Unless we are
> instructed otherwise, we will assume that the existing train numbers on the
> Indianapolis Line Subdivision and other CSXT lines being addressed in the
> Supplemental EA are the same for 2011 and 2014.
>
> Train Speed
>
> Unless instructed otherwise, we will assume that average train speeds would
> not change under the Proposed Transaction on the Indianapolis Line
> Subdivision and other CSXT rail lines being addressed in the Supplemental
> EA.
>
> Train Consist
>
> We understand that CSXT is developing the consist information.
>
> Floodway Impacts
>
> On potential floodway impacts, the potential extension of the Elvin Siding
> would require several culverts to be lengthened to accommodate the siding
> plus the L&I main line. The culverts range in size from small pipes to a
> larger box culvert that conveys Young's Creek under the L&I line (see Photo
> 23 in HDR's Field Visit Memorandum). To respond to comments in EPA's
> October 31, 2013 letter on the Draft EA, HDR's engineers have made some
> assumptions about the lengthening of the culverts and have developed
> preliminary estimates of fill volumes within the floodway. OEA would like
> to know if CSXT intends (i.e., through voluntary mitigation) to design
> these lengthened culverts such that existing flood elevations would remain
> unchanged? If CSXT does not consider the maintenance of existing flood
> elevations at the lengthened culverts to be a reasonable requirement, OEA
> requests that CSXT explain why such a requirement would not be reasonable.
> Based on CSXT's response, OEA may consider recommending the maintenance of
> existing flood elevations with respect to culvert lengthening as an
> OEA-recommended condition.
>
> Regarding the replacement of the Flatrock River bridge, OEA understands
> that the intent is to replace the superstructure but reuse the existing
> piers. Therefore, larger piers that might otherwise occupy more volume

> within the floodway, are not being proposed at this time. Additionally,
> the clearance under the replacement bridge would be increased to pass the
> current 100-year flood elevation and could assist in alleviating upstream
> flood risks. Are these correct understandings of what is proposed for the
> bridge replacement? If this is not the case, for example if additional
> piers or piers with larger footprints would be needed, OEA would need to
> estimate the proposed volume of additional fill within the floodway. OEA
> understands that the bridge replacement has not yet been designed, but any
> information that could assist OEA in making this calculation would be
> appreciated (e.g., number of potential new piers).

>
> Climate Change

>
> OEA recently received a letter from the U.S. Environmental Protection
> Agency (EPA) (see attached) in response to OEA's scoping letter on the
> Supplemental EA. In its letter, EPA requests specific information about
> CSXT's and L&I's plans for responding to global climate change. If either
> railroad has developed such plans, a summary of the scope and nature of the
> plans would be useful.

>
> Whether or not any such plans exist, OEA would like to receive a summary of
> procedures that CSXT and L&I likely have in place to respond to extreme
> weather events that could occur in the present time. For example, in
> response to extreme rainfall and flood warnings, do the railroads survey
> the rail lines to ensure rails are not flooded or culverts washed out? Do
> the railroads impose heat orders/reduced travel speeds or survey the rail
> lines in response to high heat events when rails could kink? OEA can
> present response plans for these types of extreme weather events as being
> comparable to what could be expected during climate-change-related extreme
> weather events.

>
> Please let me know if you have any questions.

>
> Thanks,

>
> Dave

>
>
> Dave Navecky
> Office of Environmental Analysis
> Surface Transportation Board
> 395 E Street SW
> Washington, DC 20423
> 202-245-0294
> www.stb.dot.gov

>
>
> (See attached file: EI_20453.pdf)

>
>
>
>
> From: "Louis E. Gitomer" <Lou@lgraillaw.com>
> To: "David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov" <David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov>
> Date: 05/12/2014 12:01 PM
> Subject: CSXT LIRC Supplemental Ea

>
>
>
> Dave - Attached is the current train count by segments and speed. Let me
> know if you have any questions. Lou

>
> Louis E. Gitomer
> 600 Baltimore Avenue, Suite 301
> Towson, MD 21204
> (410) 296-2250
> Lou@lgraillaw.com
> This email message may contain information that is privileged and/or
> confidential. The information contained in this email message is intended
> only for use of the person to whom it is addressed. If the reader of this
> message is not (1) the intended recipient or (2) the employee or agent
> responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby
> notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this
> communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this
> communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (410)
> 296-2250 or email at Lou@lgraillaw.com, and destroy the original message.
> Thank you.
> [attachment "Average Trains per day in 2013.xlsx" deleted by David
> Navecky/STB]
> <EI_20453.pdf>