

EO-2320



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

05/13/2014 03:09 PM

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



"Louis E. Gitomer"

Dave - Attached is the current train count by seg...

05/12/2014 12:01:03 PM

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]