

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF PROPOSED ACTION

This chapter discusses in greater detail the potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the selected alternative. As previously discussed in Chapter 2, five alternatives were originally evaluated to determine which route would limit potential environmental impacts, be feasible from an engineering and construction standpoint, and serve the purpose and need for the project. The characteristics and resources potentially affected by each alternative are summarized and compared in Chapter 2. Differences in environmental impacts between routes were generally small, with the shortest overall route, Alternative 2, being selected as the environmentally preferable alternative because it minimized right-of-way requirements, minimized disturbance to previously undisturbed areas, had minimal wetland impacts, avoided residences, required no grade crossings, avoided mining areas in Minnesota Steel's mining plan, and was practicable from an engineering and construction standpoint. The discussion in this section focuses only on Alternative 2, relying on information from SEA's field review of the proposed project area, literature review and consultation with Federal and state agencies.

4.1 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

4.1.1 Geology, Soils, and Climate

Impacts on existing land use would be limited primarily to the right-of-way of the proposed rail line. The proposed rail line is 9.2 miles in length. The right-of-way, including the rail bed and access road, would be an average of 100 feet in width, and would require approximately 111 acres. The proposed rail line does not impact Minnesota Steel's mining plan. Most of the soils in areas along the proposed rail line right-of-way are shallow soils that are easily disturbed. These soils have been disturbed previously due to mining and logging activity; therefore, no significant soil impacts are expected. The terrain along the proposed rail line right-of-way was historically level in general; however, mine pits and overburden piles left from previous mining activities have substantially altered the terrain. Cut-and-fill activities associated with the proposed rail line would result in only minimal alteration of the terrain in the immediate area of the

right-of-way. ICRRA has indicated that most of the land within the project area is owned by the State of Minnesota, Itasca County, or by companies with mining interests. ICRRA has indicated no ownership issues anticipated with land acquisition for use as right-of-way. ICRRA or Minnesota Steel have agreements (some currently only in principle) for use of these lands for construction and operation of the taconite mine and steel mill as well as associated facilities, which include the rail line.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will address potential soil erosion and sedimentation impacts during construction as part of its Section 404 permitting process (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 5). Cut and associated fill is expected to average 20 feet, but may exceed 50 feet in some areas. Soil disturbance and erosion would be limited to the proposed rail line right-of-way and immediate surrounding area. Measures would be taken to restrict soil disturbance to areas immediately surrounding the rail right-of-way, where practical.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) indicated that the proposed rail line crosses areas of soil identified as prime⁷ or prime if drained, as delineated by the Itasca County Soil Survey. NRCS requested that these soils be assessed if Federal funds are used to finance this project, per the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). ICRRA does not intend to use Federal funds for this project, and none of the land impacted by the rail corridor is currently being farmed. Nonetheless, NRCS's concerns are addressed (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 4) should the applicant's decision on the use of Federal funds change. Because of the minimal acreage of prime soils that would be taken out of potential production by construction of the rail corridor, the impacts of the project to farmland soils would be minor.

4.1.2 Surface and Ground Water

The proposed rail line would cross one small stream. There are areas along the proposed rail line where construction of the railroad and grade would be near existing

⁷ Prime farmland is listed by NRCS as land that has the physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, forage, feed, or crops, and is available for those uses. Prime farmland soils are high-quality soils that can produce high yields of crops on a consistent basis when managed correctly (USDA 2007).

water-filled mine pits, natural lakes, and wetland areas. Construction activities could potentially cause sedimentation, erosion, and drainage issues in these areas. The Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) requests that proper environmental safeguards and best management practices be used for mitigation to prevent surface and groundwater contamination during construction and operation of the line. These concerns are addressed in Chapter 5, mitigation measure 3. A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the USACE is required for projects that discharge dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the U.S. (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 8). Also, a Minnesota Wetland Conservation Act permit would be needed from the Minnesota Board of Water and Soil Resources (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 11). During construction, erosion and sedimentation control measures would be employed along the right-of-way to minimize potential impacts to the surrounding bodies of water, as stipulated in Chapter 5, mitigation measure 6. The proposed rail line would not impact the Wellhead Protection Area (WHPA) and Drinking Water Supply Management Area (DWSMA) for the town of Marble.

4.1.3 Air Quality

During rail line construction activities, there would be some diesel emissions from heavy construction equipment and fugitive dust in the immediate area along the rail alignment. The use of water trucks and chemical adhesives would be employed as necessary to mitigate fugitive dust emissions. Mitigation measures 1 and 2 in Chapter 5 address fugitive dust concerns. After construction has been completed, fugitive dust issues and diesel emissions related to the rail line construction would cease. During operation of the rail line, fugitive dust issues would be insignificant.

Air emission increases for key pollutants resulting from locomotive operation as proposed by the applicant are shown in Table 4-1. SEA compared the results of its analysis to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) major source thresholds for stationary sources (Table 4-1). This use of threshold screening levels is consistent with previous SEA studies. EPA's major source thresholds for stationary sources provide the

Table 4-1 Air Emissions as a Result of Rail Line Operation

Pollutant	Area Designation	Emissions Screening Levels (tons/year)	Proposed Project Emissions Levels (tons/year)
Nitrogen Oxides (NO _x)	1. Attainment/Maintenance for NO ₂ 2. Marginal/Moderate ozone 3. Ozone Attainment	100	56.62
Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs)	1. Attainment/Maintenance for Ozone 2. Marginal/Moderate Ozone Non-attainment	100	3.18
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	1. Attainment/Maintenance for CO 2. Marginal/Moderate Ozone Non-attainment	100	8.46
Particulate Matter	1. PM Attainment or Maintenance 2. PM Moderate Non-attainment	100	2.14

* Emissions rates conservatively based on use of Tier 0 locomotives generating 2,000 horsepower each. Tier 0 includes locomotives manufactured between 1973-2001.

emissions level for each criteria pollutant at which a stationary source of that air pollutant would be required to apply for a major construction or operating permit. No thresholds are currently established for mobile emission sources, such as locomotives. Therefore, SEA used the EPA stationary sources as a reference. Emissions for oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), particulate matter (PM), and volatile organic compounds (VOC) were calculated using emission factor data for both load and idle-speed fuel-consumption rates measured in grams per gallon (EPA 1997). Emissions for each pollutant were calculated in tons per year, and are shown in Appendix E.

Diesel emissions resulting from the proposed rail line operation would not exceed EPA thresholds because of the small number of train locomotives and the short distances traveled by them each day. The proposed rail line operation is not expected to adversely affect local or regional air quality.

The construction and operation of the proposed rail line would eliminate the need for the use of trucks to meet the transportation requirements of the Minnesota Steel plant should the rail line not be constructed. Hauling materials and product to and from the Minnesota Steel plant by truck would increase air emissions more than those of rail because truck transport is less efficient than rail. Construction and operation of the proposed rail line would minimize truck emissions, since most if not all material and product associated with Minnesota Steel would be shipped via rail. Air emissions associated with the construction and operation of the proposed rail line would not be expected to affect Itasca County's air attainment status.

4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

4.2.1 Vegetation and Wetlands

Vegetation impacted during construction of the proposed rail line alignment would include coniferous and deciduous trees such as white pine (*Pinus strobus*), white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*), white birch (*Betula pubescens*), and red maple (*Acer rubrum*). Various species of grasses and shrubs such as white-flowered thimbleberry (*Rubus parviflorus*) and dwarf birch (*Betula nana*) would also be impacted during construction. These species are common throughout the project area and the small loss of vegetation as a result of rail line construction and operation would not have a significant impact within the area. The greatest impact would be confined to the rail line right-of-way. A total of 25,284 feet (approximately 58.0 acres) of woodland would be crossed and cleared for the proposed rail line. These areas generally consist of previously logged second-growth woodlands that have re-established on previously disturbed mine lands. Disturbed areas outside the rail bed would be revegetated after construction as required by mitigation measure 5 in Chapter 5.

The proposed rail line right-of-way would cross several small wetlands. The Environmental Protection Agency⁸ (EPA) requested that wetland acres impacted by the

⁸ On May 16, 2007, EPA issued comments regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Minnesota Steel Industries Taconite Mine and Steel Mill Project. These comments focused on the steel mill and ancillary facilities, although wetland impacts associated with connected actions were included in

proposed rail line be quantified and community types be identified. Areas affected by the proposed rail line are classified as palustrine unconsolidated bottom, emergent, scrub shrub and forested wetlands according to USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) data. Based on review of NWI maps, as noted in Chapter 2, Table 2-1, the proposed rail line would incorporate approximately 5.4 acres of unconsolidated bottom, 2.0 acres of scrub shrub, 2.6 acres of emergent wetland, and 0.1 acres of forested wetland within the right-of-way.

ICRRA has conducted a detailed delineation of wetlands (AMEC, 2007) within 150 feet on either side of the centerline (300 ft. corridor) of the alignment of Alternative 2. However, the proposed rail line right-of-way will be 100 feet (50 feet on either side of the centerline), so actual wetland acres impacted by the proposed rail line right-of-way are expected to be substantially less than those calculated in ICRRA's delineation. Based on ICRRA's delineation, wetlands encountered by the proposed rail line corridor could include:

<u>Type</u>	<u>Acres⁹</u>
Palustrine Forested	2.18
Palustrine Emergent	21.38
Palustrine Scrub-Shrub	14.60
Palustrine Unconsolidated Bottom	6.13
<u>Lacustrine Aquatic Bed</u>	<u>0.54</u>
Total Acres	44.83

Soils and vegetation in areas occurring within the rail line right-of-way would be disturbed or lost by construction of the rail line right-of-way. However, only wetlands filled by the actual railbed would be lost completely. It is possible that wetland areas outside the rail bed but within the right-of-way may remain undisturbed.

the comments. ICRRA's proposed rail line project is considered a connected action; therefore, only EPA comments specifically applicable to the rail line are included in this section.

⁹ These acreages are based on a 300-foot wide corridor. As the actual rail right-of-way will be approximately 100 feet wide, wetland impacts are anticipated to be substantially less than these totals.

The USACE will require that a completed Clean Water Act Section 404 permit application be submitted for the proposed rail line project. Mitigation measures number 7, 8, 11, and 12 found in Chapter 5 address wetland concerns.

4.2.2 Wildlife

Wildlife habitat impacted by the proposed rail line would include forests, open glades, wetlands, and brushy areas. Approximately 111 acres of land would be converted to rail line right-of-way. However, much of this area provides only marginal habitat due to the extensive former disturbance associated with mining activities. Wildlife within the project area would be exposed to sporadic, temporary disturbance from noise and human activity associated with construction activities, which would be limited to the proposed rail line right-of-way and immediate surrounding area (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 9). Some species, such as whitetail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), black bear (*Ursus americanus*), and bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), may be temporarily displaced due to increased noise and human activity associated with construction equipment, but these disturbances would be temporary and are not expected to cause a permanent redistribution of resident species. Some mortality of small, less-mobile animals, such as the star-nosed mole (*Condylura cristata*), deer mouse (*Peromyscus maniculatus*), and various species of snakes and turtles may occur during construction due to the operation of heavy equipment in the area. Operation of the proposed rail line could cause some mortality of animals due to collisions with train locomotives. However, this mortality would be insignificant when compared with the overall populations of these species in the project area.

Construction and operation of the rail line would create a cleared right-of-way through the area. Corridors previously cleared for mine access roads, old rail beds, distribution lines, and transmission lines are abundant throughout the area to be crossed by the proposed rail line. Wildlife species needing unfragmented habitat are not found in the project area due to these previous fragmentations. Further habitat fragmentation is not expected to impede wildlife movement or impact wildlife species populations currently inhabiting the area (MNDNR and USACE 2007, Section 4.9.1, pages 168-177), and it is

anticipated that these species will adapt to new corridors in the same manner as they have to existing corridors.

4.2.3 Endangered, Threatened and Rare Species

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, the Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) is the only Federally-listed threatened species which occurs in Itasca County. The Canada lynx is known to inhabit mature coniferous and mixed-forest habitat within the county, mainly within the Chippewa National Forest which is located approximately seven miles west of the project area. Habitat fragmentation and disturbance from previous mining and logging activity makes the proposed project area less than ideal habitat for the Canada lynx. Construction of the proposed rail line alignment would further fragment potential Canada lynx habitat in the area. There are no confirmed Canada lynx dens known to occur within the proposed rail line right-of-way, and no Canada lynx or sign were observed during field investigations of the area conducted as part of the Minnesota Steel EIS process (MNDNR and USACE 2007).

A Canada lynx Biological Assessment was prepared by the USACE for the Minnesota Steel project (MNDNR and USACE 2007, Appendix D). As a result, the USACE made a determination that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the Canada lynx. The USFWS concurred with the USACE determination, thus completing the Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation process. The area impacted by the proposed rail line alignment was included in the study area for the Biological Assessment, and construction and operation of the proposed rail line is not expected to significantly impact populations of Canada Lynx. To address Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, SEA submitted a letter to the USFWS referencing these previous studies and requesting their concurrence with SEA's determination that the proposed rail line may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Canada lynx (Appendix B, Exhibit 5). By letter of February 29, 2008, USFWS concurred with this determination. The response from the USFWS is included in Appendix B, Exhibit 6.

The Minnesota Natural Heritage database lists three vascular plant species which may occur in the project area as state-threatened or endangered: blunt-lobed grape fern (*Botrychium oneidense*), pale moonwort (*Botrychium pallidum*), and St. Lawrence grape fern (*Botrychium rugulosum*). The blunt-lobed grape fern, pale moonwort, and St. Lawrence grape fern all inhabit upland coniferous pine forest, upland deciduous hardwood forest, and upland deciduous aspen forest. These habitat types are present within the project area, and according to a Minnesota Natural Heritage database search, all three of these species are known to occur near the proposed rail line right-of-way. The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MNDNR) requests a botanical survey be conducted along the proposed rail line right-of-way prior to construction to determine if any of these species will be impacted. If any of these species are encountered along the proposed rail line right-of-way, ICRRA would coordinate with MNDNR (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 10) to develop appropriate mitigation.

4.3 NOISE

During construction, noise levels along the proposed rail line would increase temporarily due to the increased truck traffic and heavy equipment in the area. Noise generated during construction and operation should have minimal, if any, impacts to any noise-sensitive receptors. Upon completion of the rail line, construction noise would cease. Noise concerns are addressed in Chapter 5, mitigation measures 13 and 14.

ICRRA estimates that two trains/day would operate over the proposed rail line. For two trains per day, the distance (contour) at which the average daily noise level (L_{dn}) would be equal to 65 decibels (dB) would be 50 feet for wayside noise and 350 feet for horn noise. Horn noise is not expected to impact residences because the rail line would not cross any public roads, eliminating the need for horn soundings at road crossings. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development consider occasional noise levels up to 65 decibels to be acceptable for most noise-sensitive receptors. The proposed rail line passes through a rural area with few residences and no other noise-sensitive receptors. The nearest residences are located

more than 0.5 mile (2,640 feet) away from the proposed rail line, and would therefore not be expected to experience adverse noise levels as a result of train operations.

EPA has requested that noise issues be evaluated as a possible impact to local Native American tribal ceremonies. The following Native American tribes with possible interests in the project area were contacted via letter by SEA: White Earth Band of Ojibwe, Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe, Grand Portage Chippewa, Red Lake Band of Chippewa, Bois Forte Band of Chippewa, and Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa. No concerns were expressed by any of the tribes contacted during the environmental consultation process.

4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

A preliminary search of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and Minnesota Historical Society websites revealed no historic or cultural resources immediately surrounding the area of the proposed rail line alignment. A comprehensive records search of the Minnesota Archaeological Inventory and Historic Structures Inventory revealed that no archaeological sites are recorded within the proposed rail line right-of-way or project area. SEA sent letters requesting comments regarding the proposed rail line to the seven Federally-recognized tribes which were identified as having a possible interest in the project area to determine potential impacts on tribal resources and land-use in the area. There have been no responses from any tribes indicating concerns about tribal cultural resources within the project area.

Three historic sites (Marble Village Hall, Oliver Mining Company Boarding House, and Hill Annex Mine) were identified within the project area as being listed or eligible for listing on the NRHP. These sites are not within the proposed rail line right-of-way and are not expected to be impacted by the proposed rail line. The Marble Village Hall and Oliver Mining Company Boarding House are located in the town of Marble and are approximately one mile from the proposed rail line right-of-way. A portion of the Hill Annex Mine is located immediately to the south of the proposed rail line right-of-way,

but historic structures within the mine are located at least 3500 feet from the proposed rail line right-of-way.

The USACE and the Minnesota SHPO have executed a Programmatic Agreement (PA) as part of the Minnesota Steel Industries, LLC environmental review for compliance with the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). SEA will become a signatory to this agreement by amendment (Appendix D). ICRRA will be required to adhere to the stipulations of the PA during any rail line construction or connected actions (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 15). The PA addresses the proper identification and handling of archaeological and cultural resources. The PA, which is included as Appendix C, requires the identification of potential cultural and historical resources within the project area before work is conducted. Upon identification, the PA requires an evaluation of these resources to determine eligibility for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). If eligible properties are found, effects of the proposed project must be assessed for these properties. If effects are determined to be adverse, ICRRA will work with interested parties and agencies to avoid or reduce any effects on cultural or historic properties. If cultural or archaeological resources not previously identified are inadvertently discovered during construction of the rail line, ICRRA will be required to notify the SHPO and coordinate appropriately to protect these resources (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 16).

4.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/WASTE SITES

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. (2007), a database search service, was contracted to conduct a search of Federal, state, local, and Native American tribal records to determine if any hazardous materials/waste sites are located along or in the vicinity of the proposed rail line right-of-way. The only record found was for the Taconite Municipal Dump, which is located approximately 0.10 mile south of the proposed rail line near its origin in the town of Taconite. This site is labeled under the Minnesota Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup Program (VIC) as a landfill. No construction-related materials would be deposited at this site, and the site is not expected to be affected in any way by the construction or operation of the proposed rail line. All construction-related debris

would be removed and disposed of according to local, state, and Federal standards (Chapter 5, mitigation measure 17).

4.6 SOCIOECONOMIC SETTING

Positive socioeconomic impacts are anticipated in connection with the construction and operation of ICRRA's proposed rail line. The new rail line would provide temporary employment opportunities during the construction phase of the project. Local merchants could experience a temporary increase in sales with the increase of construction workers in the area. Maintenance and operation of 9.2 miles of new rail line would provide employment opportunities for additional workers. The rail line would also provide opportunity for additional businesses to locate along the line, with potential to create more employment opportunities in the county.

4.7 RECREATION

No public recreational lands are crossed by the rail corridor. Hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling, and ATV riding are popular forms of recreation on area private lands. Construction of the proposed rail line alignment would remove some wildlife habitat, but is not expected to affect game populations in the area. Hunting opportunities are not expected to be affected, although some lands along the immediate rail line right-of-way may no longer be open for public use suitable for pursuing some game species. Fishing in area lakes and streams is not expected to be impacted, as care would be taken to control erosion and sedimentation during and after construction. No snowmobile, hiking, or ATV trails will be impacted by the proposed rail line as a result of rail line crossings. A bike trail is proposed to be constructed near the rail line alignment. The proposed bike trail would require two private at-grade crossings of the proposed rail line (McKenzie 2007).

4.8 TRANSPORTATION

The construction and operation of the proposed rail line is expected to have minimal permanent impact on transportation in the area. During construction of the proposed rail line, there may be a temporary increase in local truck traffic due to delivery of rail

construction materials. A permanent access road would be constructed alongside the proposed rail line to provide for maintenance of the line. No public roads would be crossed by the proposed rail line. Therefore, there would be no emergency vehicle response delays, safety concerns, or vehicle delays resulting from trains crossing roads. Once the rail line is operational, product from the Minnesota Steel plant would be primarily shipped via rail, so truck traffic that might otherwise be used to serve the Minnesota Steel site would not increase on area roadways.

4.9 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As noted in the Minnesota Steel Final EIS (MNDNR and USACE 2007, page EX-9), a number of connected actions to the steel mill and taconite mine are anticipated. These actions include the rail line addressed specifically by this EA. These actions, including the rail line, are subject to separate environmental review and consideration. However, the Minnesota Steel Final EIS generally presents the environmental impacts potentially resulting from construction and operation of the rail line and other connected actions.

A thorough investigation and evaluation of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions was conducted as part of the Minnesota Steel Final EIS (MNDNR and USACE 2007). SEA did not identify any additional activities that would require evaluation beyond that already conducted for the Final EIS. In considering the cumulative impacts of the steel mill, taconite mine, and connected actions, the Minnesota Steel Final EIS (MNDNR and USACE 2007, page 5-1) identified the following areas with potential for cumulative impacts:

- Class I Area Air Quality Impacts due to particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM₁₀)
- Class I Area Air Quality Impacts due to acid deposition and ecosystem acidification
- Mercury emissions, deposition, and bioaccumulation
- Visibility
- Loss of threatened and endangered plant species
- Loss of wetlands
- Wildlife habitat loss/fragmentation

- Wildlife corridor obstruction

Although the Minnesota Steel Final EIS generally considered the rail line as part of its analysis, including cumulative impacts, as noted above, SEA evaluated the potential impacts of the proposed rail line to determine if any additional cumulative impacts beyond those discussed in the Minnesota Steel Final EIS would result from rail line construction and operation. SEA determined, as discussed in Chapter 2, that the proposed rail line route would not result in significant impacts to any natural or human resources within the project area. Therefore, SEA determined that the rail line construction and operation would only contribute to the cumulative impacts in those areas as identified in the Minnesota Steel Final EIS and noted previously. SEA therefore limited its cumulative impact review to the areas of air quality and visibility, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, and wildlife.

In conducting this analysis, SEA compared the potential impacts of the overall Minnesota Steel project with those of the proposed rail line. SEA determined that emissions from rail line construction and operation (Table 4-1) would be insignificant compared to the overall Minnesota Steel project emissions (MNDNR and USACE 2007, Table 4.7.3, page 4-93), with only NOX (comprising approximately 3 percent of the total NOX generated by the other facilities) exceeding 1 percent of Minnesota Steel project-related emissions. SEA thus concluded the rail line would not add appreciably to the air quality and visibility-related impacts of the Minnesota Steel project. Cumulative impacts to air quality and visibility would not differ from those presented in the Minnesota Steel Final EIS.

The proposed taconite mine and steel mill facilities would disturb over 3,500 acres, including over 700 acres of wetlands (MNDNR and USACE 2007, pages 4-8 to 4-17). By contrast, the proposed rail line would affect approximately 111 acres. All of these areas would be within the overall impact area of the taconite mine and steel mill. Of the total land disturbance, the rail line area would comprise approximately 3 percent. As such, construction and operation of the rail line would result in an insignificant portion of

the overall project effects to wetlands, threatened and endangered plant species, and wildlife habitat and movement concerns. Due to the minor impacts associated with rail line construction and operation and the fact that these impacts would be within the impact area already considered for cumulative impacts in the Minnesota Steel Final EIS, SEA determined no additional cumulative impacts would result from the proposed rail line.