

Re: Canaveral Port Rail, EIS Status

David Navecky

to:

GINIEWSKI, PATRICK S GS-14 USAF AFSPC 45 CES/CEI

11/16/2015 06:33 PM

Cc:

"FLEMING KEVIN J GS-13 USAF AFSPC 45 LCSS/45 SW/XPX"

Hide Details

From: David Navecky/STB

To: "GINIEWSKI, PATRICK S GS-14 USAF AFSPC 45 CES/CEI" <patrick.giniewski@us.af.mil>

Cc: "FLEMING KEVIN J GS-13 USAF AFSPC 45 LCSS/45 SW/XPX" <kevin.fleming.4@us.af.mil>
Patrick -

Your understanding of the situation, as outlined in the second paragraph of the background is correct.

At the request of CPA, the STB has temporarily suspended most work on the EIS while CPA investigates the issues of the feasibility of a potential AF route. In our letter granting the temporary suspension, the STB noted that there are many issues associated with a potential AF route, which taken collectively, suggest that a potential AF route is not reasonable or feasible, and therefore, should not be carried forward in the EIS for detailed study. But CPA requested the temporary suspension to see if they could work with the AF to resolve the many issues of feasibility. This feasibility evaluation is being led by CPA and the STB has no role in the evaluation itself. RLG has no relationship with the STB. RLG's relationship is with CPA. How CPA's feasibility evaluation moves forward considering RLG's role and the AF's current EUL rules would need to be worked out between the AF, CPA and RLG.

After the feasibility evaluation is completed, the CPA is expected to request that the STB resume work on the EIS, with or without a potential AF route, depending on the outcome of CPA's feasibility evaluation. If STB and the five federal cooperating agencies agree that a potential AF route is feasible (if that is what CPA recommends) it will be studied in the EIS.

I would be happy to address any additional questions you may have. However, I am on travel most of this week and won't be reachable by phone until Friday, November 20. Kevin Fleming has a copy of the STB's November 9 letter granting the suspension. I don't have access to the letter currently while on travel.

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

-----"GINIEWSKI, PATRICK S GS-14 USAF AFSPC 45 CES/CEI" <patrick.giniewski@us.af.mil>
wrote: -----

To: "David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov" <David.Navecky@stb.dot.gov>

From: "GINIEWSKI, PATRICK S GS-14 USAF AFSPC 45 CES/CEI" <patrick.giniewski@us.af.mil>

Date: 11/16/2015 11:46AM
Subject: Canaveral Port Rail, EIS Status

Dave, wanted to get a quick sanity check from you all on the status of the EIS and CPA and Renuart Larkin Group (RLG) involvement/actions going forward.

BACKGROUND: RLG requested a site visit and access to AF personnel to conduct fact finding on mission requirements related to the rail routes. AF told RLG that we could not conduct meetings with company who intends to submit and unsolicited proposal under the current EUL rules. RLG, in a meeting with AF Civil Engineer Center notified the center personnel the we were denying the Office of Environmental Analysis (OEA), for the Surface Transportation Board, access to complete their work on the EIS.

My understanding is that CPA requested you all put a halt on the EIS while they look at the AF options in more detail and that you all agreed, with the caveat that they would have to address all of the issues and concerns brought forward by the AF in our letter to you all. In effect, they would have to get the AF approval that a route was possible and that the AF would work with them to make it happen.

Further, my understanding was that this action was on the CPA and STB was not involved in the feasibility assessment being led by the port.

DISCUSSION: What is the status of the EIS? What role, if any, is RLG playing in the assessment of the Cape route for STB? What is the action going forward?

v/r
PATRICK S. GINIEWSKI, GS-14
Chief, Installation Management
(321) 494-2939