

**Decision No. 28329**

Service Date: **October 7, 1997**  
Comment Due Date: **October 27, 1997**

# **Environmental Assessment**

**Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub No. 1)**

**CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation, Inc.,  
Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Company**

—Control and Operating Leases/Agreements—

**Conrail Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation**

## **Crestline**

**Conrail Rail Line Connection –  
Crestline, Ohio, Crawford County, Ohio**

Information Contact:

Elaine K. Kaiser, Chief  
Section of Environmental Analysis  
Surface Transportation Board  
1925 K Street NW, Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20423  
(888) 869-1997

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation Inc. (CSX), Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Corporation (NS), and Conrail Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation (Conrail) have filed a joint Application with the Surface Transportation Board (the Board) seeking authorization for the acquisition of Conrail by CSX and NS.

As a part of their joint Application, CSX proposes to construct a rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio to permit traffic movements between the CSX and Conrail systems. The Board's Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to determine whether construction of this connection would have any significant effects on the environment.

The proposed 1,507-foot connection is located in the Village of Crestline, Crawford County, Ohio. The new connection would be built in the northeastern quadrant of the intersecting Conrail lines in the southern portion of the Village of Crestline. The connection would link the Conrail lines north of the intersection of Lincoln Avenue and Ohio State Route 61 (SR 61, also known as Thoman Street). The proposed connection would be built entirely within existing railroad right-of-way. The land surrounding the project is a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial uses. The new connection would create an alternative east-west route on the CSX system for slower moving freight. CSX anticipates that an average of 5 trains per day (single commodity, or unit trains and intermodal trains with an average length of 6,200 feet) would operate over the new connection. The potential environmental effects of constructing the proposed connection are summarized in the table on the following page.

Based on its independent analysis of all the information available at this time, SEA concludes that construction of the proposed rail line connection would not significantly affect the quality of the environment with the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in this EA. Accordingly, SEA recommends that the Surface Transportation Board impose the mitigation measures set forth in Chapter 5.3 as conditions in any final decision approving construction of the proposed rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio.

**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**  
**–CONRAIL RAIL LINE CONNECTION–**  
**CRESTLINE, OHIO**

<b>Effect Type</b>	<b>Assessment Criteria</b>	<b>Effects</b>
Land Use	New Right-of-Way Required Prime Farmland Affected Within Coastal Zone Management Area	None None No
Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice	Disproportionate Effect on Minority and Low Income Groups	None
Transportation and Safety	Train Movements Over Connection New Grade Crossings Grade Crossing Safety/Delay Effects Effect on Transportation of Hazardous Materials Hazardous Waste Sites Affected	5.2 trains per day None None None None
Water Resources	Effect on Surface Water Wetlands Affected	None None
Biological Resources	Loss of Critical Habitats Effect on Threatened and Endangered Species Effect on Parks, Forest Preserves, Refuges and Sanctuaries	None None None
Air Quality	Emissions from Construction + Idling Vehicles Effect on Air Quality Due to Construction (Fugitive Dust)	Negligible Negligible
Noise	Additional Receptors within the L <sub>dn</sub> 65 dBA Contour	None
Historic and Cultural Resources	NRHP-Eligible or Listed Historic Sites Affected NRHP-Eligible or Listed Archeological Sites Affected	None None
Energy	Changes in Fuel Consumption due to Construction Effect on Transportation of Energy Resources and Recyclable Commodities Overall Energy Efficiency Rail to Motor Carrier Diversions	Negligible None Improved None

SEA specifically invites comments on all aspects of this EA, including the scope and adequacy of the recommended mitigation. SEA will consider all comments received in response to the EA in making its final recommendations to the Board. Comments (an original and 10 copies) should be sent to: Vernon A. Williams, Secretary, Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street NW, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20423. The lower left-hand corner of the envelope should be marked: Attention: Dana White, Environmental Comments, Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub Nos. 1-7). Questions may also be directed to Ms. White at this address or by telephoning (888) 869-1997.

Date EA Made Available to the Public: **October 7, 1997**

Comment Due Date: **October 27, 1997**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Chapter 1 — DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

1.1	OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED RAIL LINE CONNECTION .....	1-1
1.1.1	Location and Description .....	1-1
1.1.2	Construction Requirements .....	1-4
1.1.3	Changes in Rail Traffic .....	1-4
1.2	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED CONNECTION .....	1-4
1.3	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION AND THE CONRAIL ACQUISITION TRANSACTION .....	1-5
1.4	SEA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS .....	1-6

### Chapter 2 — ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS CONSIDERED

2.1	NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE .....	2-1
2.2	BUILD ALTERNATIVES .....	2-1
2.3	SELECTION OF PROPOSED CONNECTION LOCATION .....	2-1

### Chapter 3 — EXISTING ENVIRONMENT

3.1	LAND USE .....	3-1
3.1.1	Current Land Use .....	3-1
3.1.2	Consistency with Local Plans .....	3-1
3.1.3	Prime Farmlands and Coastal Zones .....	3-3
3.2	SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE .....	3-3
3.3	TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY .....	3-4
3.3.1	Transportation Systems .....	3-4
3.3.2	Transport of Hazardous Materials .....	3-4
3.3.3	Hazardous Waste Sites .....	3-4
3.4	WATER RESOURCES .....	3-5
3.4.1	Wetlands .....	3-5
3.4.2	Surface Waters .....	3-5
3.5	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES .....	3-7
3.5.1	Vegetation .....	3-7
3.5.2	Wildlife .....	3-7
3.5.3	Threatened and Endangered Species .....	3-7
3.5.4	Parks, Forest Preserves, Refuges and Sanctuaries .....	3-8
3.6	AIR QUALITY .....	3-8
3.7	NOISE .....	3-8
3.8	CULTURAL RESOURCES .....	3-10
3.8.1	Archeological Resources .....	3-10
3.8.2	Historic Resources .....	3-10
3.9	ENERGY .....	3-10

### Chapter 4 — POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

4.1	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FROM THE PROPOSED	
-----	---	--

ACTION .....	4-1
4.1.1 Land Use .....	4-1
4.1.2 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice .....	4-2
4.1.3 Transportation and Safety .....	4-3
4.1.4 Water Resources .....	4-4
4.1.5 Biological Resources .....	4-4
4.1.6 Air Quality .....	4-5
4.1.7 Noise .....	4-6
4.1.8 Cultural Resources .....	4-7
4.1.9 Energy Resources .....	4-8
4.1.10 Cumulative Effects .....	4-8
4.2 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS .....	4-9
4.2.1 No-Action Alternative .....	4-9
4.2.2 Build Alternatives .....	4-9

**Chapter 5 — AGENCY COMMENTS AND MITIGATION**

5.1 SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS .....	5-1
5.2 AGENCY SUGGESTED MITIGATION .....	5-1
5.3 SEA RECOMMENDED MITIGATION .....	5-2
5.3.1 General Mitigation Measures .....	5-2
5.3.2 Specific Mitigation Measures .....	5-4
5.4 REQUEST FOR COMMENTS .....	5-4

**APPENDIX A**

CSX/NS CONSTRUCTION WAIVER APPLICATION  
DECISION 9 PRESS RELEASE  
STB DECISION 9

**APPENDIX B**

AGENCIES AND OTHER PARTIES CONSULTED  
AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

**APPENDIX C**

REFERENCES

**TABLES:**

Table 1. Racial Composition of Population ..... 3-3

**FIGURES:**

Figure 1. Project Location ..... 1-2  
Figure 2. Proposed Connection ..... 1-3  
Figure 3. Land Use ..... 3-2  
Figure 4. Water Resources ..... 3-6  
Figure 5. Noise Contours ..... 3-9



# **CHAPTER 1**

## **Description of the Proposed Action**

CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation Inc. (collectively CSX), Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Corporation (collectively NS), and Conrail Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation (collectively Conrail) have filed a joint Application with the Surface Transportation Board (the Board) seeking authorization for the acquisition of Conrail by CSX and NS. The fundamental objective of the proposed acquisition is to divide existing Conrail assets and operations between CSX and NS. As a result, certain Conrail facilities and operations would be assigned individually to either CSX or NS through operating agreements or other mechanisms, and certain other existing Conrail facilities would be shared or operated by both CSX and NS.

As a part of proposed transaction, CSX proposes to construct a rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio to permit traffic movements between the CSX and Conrail systems. The Board's Section on Environmental Analysis (SEA) has prepared this Environmental Assessment (EA) to determine whether construction of this connection would have any significant effects on the environment.

### **1.1 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED RAIL LINE CONNECTION**

#### **1.1.1 Location and Description**

The proposed connection between two existing Conrail rail lines is located in the Village of Crestline in Crawford County, Ohio, approximately 70 miles southeast of Toledo and 50 miles north-northeast of Columbus (see Figure 1). The proposed connection would be approximately 1,507 feet long and would be built entirely within existing railroad rights-of-way in the northwestern quadrant of the existing intersection of the east/west Conrail (single-track) and northeast/southwest Conrail (double-track) lines (see Figure 2). The proposed connection would be located at Milepost 75.77 on Conrail's northeast/southwest main line and Milepost 188.5 on Conrail's east/west main line.

The proposed construction project would be located north of the intersection of Thoman Street (SR 61) and Lincoln Avenue, and would pass under Thoman Street. The curvature of the proposed connection is 10 degrees. To accommodate the new connection, approximately 1,500 feet of the existing east/west Conrail single track would be relocated between 60 to 100 feet to the south to allow for clearance under the Thoman Street bridge. The relocation of this track would not require the acquisition of new property.

**Figure 1- Project Location**

**Figure 2 - Proposed Connection**

This connection would enable CSX to route less time-sensitive east/west traffic on the alternative Chicago-Cleveland Service Route linking Crestline, Ohio and Ft. Wayne, Indiana that CSX would operate if acquisition transaction is approved. This would permit use of CSX's parallel B&O line for high-speed traffic over its proposed Northeastern Gateway Service Route. Thus, the connection would allow the creation of an alternative east/west route on the CSX system for slower moving freight.

### **1.1.2 Construction Requirements**

CSX estimates that the construction of the new rail line connection would require a labor force of approximately 25 people over a period of approximately 30 to 40 days. The construction would require minimal clearing of existing vegetation and grading. Minimal use of borrow material is anticipated; any needed borrow material would be obtained from local sources and hauled to the construction site by rail or truck. Various types of heavy equipment (such as bulldozers, roller/compactors, tie loaders, and rail installers) would be used during construction.

### **1.1.3 Changes in Rail Traffic**

The proposed connection would facilitate rail operations and traffic movements on the CSX and Conrail rail lines. CSX estimates that an average of 5.2 trains per day (primarily unit and intermodal trains with an average length of 6,200 feet) would operate over the new connection. Rail traffic on the existing rail lines served by the connection would change as follows:

- Traffic on the existing east/west Conrail line would increase from an average of 6.5 to 14.5 trains per day west of the intersection (Crestline to Bucyrus, Ohio segment).
- No CSX trains are projected to operate east of the intersection. This line would be allocated to NS. Approximately 6 NS trains per day would operate over the line segment.
- Traffic on the existing northeast/southwest Conrail line would increase from an average of 14.5 to 31.3 trains per day northeast of the intersection (Greenwich to Crestline, Ohio segment), and would decrease from an average of 28.3 to 26.5 trains per day southwest of the intersection (Crestline to Galion, Ohio segment).

## **1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED CONNECTION**

The purpose of the environmental review documented in this EA was to identify, analyze, and disclose the environmental issues and potential effects associated with the construction of the rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio. Based on the joint Application filed by CSX and NS, this connection would improve the service capabilities and operating efficiencies of each railroad. These efficiencies include enhanced single-line service, reduced travel times, and increased utilization of equipment.

This EA was prepared to determine whether the Board should approve construction of the connection before it decides on the merits of the entire acquisition transaction. If approved by the Board, this connection would be constructed before the Board's final decision on the CSX and NS Application to acquire Conrail. If the entire transaction is subsequently approved by the Board, CSX intends to begin operations on this connection immediately. If the Board does not approve the transaction, or approves it with conditions which preclude its use, operation of this connection would not be allowed.

### **1.3 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PROPOSED ACTION AND THE CONRAIL ACQUISITION TRANSACTION**

On April 10, 1997 CSX, NS, and Conrail filed their notice of intent to file an application seeking the Board's authorization for: (1) the acquisition by CSX and NS of control of Conrail, and (2) the division of Conrail's assets. On May 2, 1997 CSX and NS filed petitions seeking a waiver of the Board's regulations at 49 CFR 1180.4(c)(2)(vi) that provide that all "directly related applications, e.g., those seeking authority to construct or abandon rail lines,..." be filed at the same time. The waiver would allow CSX and NS to seek the Board's authority to construct and operate seven rail line connections (four for CSX and three for NS) prior to the Board's decision on the acquisition and division of Conrail.

The seven constructions are each relatively short connections between two rail carriers and have a total length under 4 miles. Most of the construction on these short segments would take place within existing rights-of-way. CSX and NS stated that these seven connections must be in place before the Board's decision on the primary application in order for them to provide efficient service in competition with each other. Without early authorization to construct these connections, CSX and NS contended, each railroad would be severely limited in its ability to serve important customers.

In Decision No. 9 (see Appendix A) served June 12, 1997, the Board granted CSX's and NS's petitions. The Board stated that it understood the railroads' desire to "be prepared to engage in effective, vigorous competition immediately following consummation of the [acquisition]." In granting the waiver, the Board noted that the railroads were proceeding at their own risk. If the Board were to deny the primary application, any resources expended by CSX and NS in building the connections would be of little benefit to them. Both the railroads and the Board recognized that no construction could occur until the Board completed its environmental review of each of the construction projects. Thus, the Board stated that it would consider the environmental aspects of these proposed constructions and the railroads' proposed operations over these lines together in deciding whether to approve the physical construction of each of these lines.

The operational implications of the Conrail acquisition as a whole, including operations over the roughly 4 miles of line included in the seven connection projects, will be examined in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) being prepared to assess the impacts of the entire acquisition transaction. The EIS will be available for a 45-day public review and comment period in late November 1997.

#### **1.4 SEA ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS**

SEA prepared this EA to ensure that the proposed action complies with the statutory requirements under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Board's environmental regulations, and other applicable rules and/or regulations. SEA is responsible for conducting the Board's NEPA environmental review.

The Board has adopted the former Interstate Commerce Commission's environmental regulations (49 CFR Part 1105), which govern the environmental review process and outline procedures for preparing environmental documents. Section 1105.6(b) of these regulations established the criteria that identify the types of actions for which an EA would be required. The construction of a rail line connection, like the one proposed in Crestline, is classified under the Board's regulations as normally requiring preparation of an EA. SEA reviewed the proposed rail line construction and determined that because the connection is not expected to result in significant environmental impacts, an EA should be prepared.

In preparing the EA, SEA identified issues and areas of potential environmental effect, analyzed the potential environmental effects of the proposed rail line construction project, reviewed agency comments, and developed mitigation measures to avoid or reduce anticipated effects on the environment. To assist it in conducting the NEPA environmental analysis and in preparing the EA, SEA selected and approved De Leuw, Cather & Company to act as the Board's independent third party consultant, in accordance with 49 CFR Part 1105.10(d). The independent third party consultant worked solely under the direction and supervision of SEA in conducting the environmental analyses related to the proposed construction. The Applicants provided funding for these activities.

SEA analyzed the Environmental Report and Operating Plan that accompanied the transaction Application, technical studies conducted by CSX's environmental consultants, and the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment for the Crestline connection. In addition, SEA conducted its own independent analysis of the proposed construction, which included verifying the projected rail operations; verifying and estimating future noise levels; estimating air emission increases; performing land use, habitat, surface water, and wetland surveys; assessing effects to biological resources; and performing archeological and historic resource surveys. In addition, SEA and/or its independent third party consultant consulted with CSX and its environmental consultants and visited the proposed rail line construction site to assess the potential effects on the environment.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **Alternative Actions Considered**

This chapter outlines the alternatives considered for the proposed connection.

#### **2.1 NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

In its environmental review, SEA considered a “no-action” alternative. Under this alternative, current operations would continue over existing CSX and Conrail rail lines. However, as outlined below, access between the two lines would be limited to existing connections, interchanges, or terminals. If the acquisition transaction were approved and no connection were built in Crestline, traffic would be routed via Greenwich and Deshler, where it would connect to the line linking Deshler and Lima, Ohio. At Lima, the traffic would connect to the Ft. Wayne line. According to CSX, this routing would cause slowing and congestion on the high-speed B&O line and would impair CSX’s service on the Lima-Crestline segment.

#### **2.2 BUILD ALTERNATIVES**

SEA considered other potential alternatives to the proposed rail line connection. An alternative alignment considered was also located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of the lines because only a connection in that quadrant would allow the efficiencies described above to be achieved. The alternative location would have crossed the east/west Ft. Wayne single track with a reverse curve, creating a diamond, and tied into the Ft. Wayne east/west line west of the new diamond. The alternative would have had a slower connection speed (15 mph), greater derailment potential than the proposed connection, and additional engineering, construction and maintenance requirements. Therefore, SEA concluded that this alternative alignment was not environmentally preferable.

#### **2.3 SELECTION OF PROPOSED CONNECTION LOCATION**

A 1,507-foot single-track connection in the northwestern quadrant at the existing intersection of east/west and southwest/northeast Conrail lines was selected as the optimal location and most direct routing for a new connection. This connection would allow CSX to route less time-sensitive east/west traffic on the Chicago-Cleveland Service Route linking Crestline, Ohio and Ft. Wayne, Indiana and use its parallel B&O line for high-speed traffic over its proposed Northeastern Gateway Service Route. The proposed connection also would reduce the engineering, construction, maintenance, and safety concerns associated with the installation of another diamond in the existing rail line area. The proposed connection would be built entirely within existing railroad right-of-way. Therefore, SEA concluded that there were no construction, operational, or environmental features

that would render another alignment of the proposed rail line connection more reasonable than the proposed location.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **Existing Environment**

This chapter provides an overview of the existing environment in the vicinity of the proposed construction.

#### **3.1 LAND USE**

##### **3.1.1 Current Land Use**

To identify current land uses and protected lands in the vicinity of the proposed construction, SEA reviewed local plans and maps, consulted with the appropriate federal, state and local agencies, and conducted field reviews at the proposed connection site. Land uses of concern include those sensitive to environmental changes, such as residential properties, commercial buildings, educational and medical facilities, and institutions. SEA also contacted the Bureau of Indian Affairs to obtain information on any federally recognized American Indian tribes or reservations within the project area.

The existing Conrail tracks intersect in an area of mixed railroad, residential, and commercial uses in downtown Crestline (See Figure 3). The nearest residence is located approximately 450 feet south of the proposed connection, just north of Brown Street near the western terminus of the proposed connection. Commercial and municipal buildings (fire and police) are located north and northwest of the proposed connection. A ground water monitoring well is located in the proposed project area between the existing track alignment and the Thoman Street overpass.

A Conrail switching yard is located approximately 1,200 feet west of the proposed construction site.

According to the National Geodetic Survey, one geodetic station marker may be located near the project area. The marker was not located during a site visit made by SEA's third-party consultant. None of the land for the proposed construction is within an American Indian reservation. According to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, there are no federally recognized American Indian tribes or reservations in Indiana.

##### **3.1.2 Consistency with Local Plans**

According to the Village of Crestline, Codes and Permits Department, the area surrounding the proposed construction site is zoned as general and local business, residential, and light and heavy industrial; railroad development is allowed in the area.

#### **Figure 3 - Land Use**

**3.1.3 Prime Farmlands and Coastal Zones**

The U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) maintains a national database of prime farmlands. SEA contacted the local NRCS office was contacted to determine whether prime farmland soils are located in the vicinity of the proposed project. According to the Soil Survey of Crawford County, none of the soils located within or adjacent to the construction site are classified as prime farmland soil.

Any proposed project which may affect land or water uses within a coastal zone designated pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451 *et seq.*), must be consistent with the state’s Coastal Zone Management Plan. Ohio does not have a federally recognized Coastal Zone Management program.

**3.2 SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

Based on the 1990 census, the population of Crawford County is 47,870; the population of the Village of Crestline is 4,938; and the population of the area in the vicinity of the proposed construction is 1,506. Approximately 4.9 percent of the residents in the vicinity of the proposed construction are minorities, compared to 3.9 percent of residents in the Village of Crestline and 1.2 percent in Crawford County. The racial composition of these areas is summarized in Table 1.

Census data indicate that the 1989 median family income for Crawford County was \$29,734 and \$27,889 in the Village of Crestline. In the vicinity of the proposed construction, median family income in 1989 was \$25,902. Approximately 10.2 percent of the residents in the vicinity of the proposed construction are low-income (below the federal poverty level), compared to 14.0 percent of residents of the Village of Crestline and 11.5 percent in Crawford County.

**Table 1  
RACIAL COMPOSITION OF POPULATION**

<b>Race</b>	<b>Crawford County</b>	<b>Village of Crestline</b>	<b>Area of Proposed Connection</b>
White	98.8%	96.1%	95.1%
Black	0.3%	2.3%	3.7%
Asian	0.3%	0.8%	0.3%
Hispanic (Any Race)	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%
American Indian	0.2%	0.4%	0.2%
Other	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**3.3 TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY**

**3.3.1 Transportation Systems**

SEA gathered information relating to the existing transportation system in the vicinity of the proposed construction during consultations with federal, state, and local agencies and field visits to the proposed connection site.

Two existing at-grade crossings are located outside the proposed construction area. The first is west of the western terminus of the proposed connection at Wiley Street. The second is located at Bucyrus Street, which is northeast of the terminus of the proposed connection. Currently both warning systems consist of bells, gates and lights. The proposed connection would not require the expansion of the existing at-grade crossings.

The proposed construction project would not require a new at-grade crossing or improvements to existing at-grade crossings. Access to the proposed construction area would be from Henry, Mansfield and Thoman Streets.

### **3.3.2 Transport of Hazardous Materials**

SEA reviewed CSX and Conrail operational data to determine whether the trains that would operate on the proposed connection are used to transport hazardous materials. Both Conrail lines are designated as Key Routes for the shipment of hazardous materials. A Key Route, as defined by the Inter-Industry Task Force, is a route where more than 10,000 carloads of hazardous materials are transported per year.

### **3.3.3 Hazardous Waste Sites**

SEA examined railroad records and government databases to determine whether there are known hazardous waste sites or reports of hazardous materials spills within 500 feet of the proposed construction site. The databases reviewed include: the National Priority List; the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information System; Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System—Treatment, Storage or Disposal sites; Emergency Response Notification System spill sites; the State Priority List; State Licensed Solid Waste Facilities; the State Inventory of Leaking Underground Storage Tanks; the State Inventory of Reported Spills; and the orphan, or unmappable, sites list.

No hazardous waste sites or other sites of environmental concern were identified as being located within 500 feet of the proposed rail line construction. The database revealed four orphan sites within the Crestline village limits. The limited address information available for these sites suggests they are not in the area of the proposed connection. Conrail reported a spill of paint (approximately 100 gallons) in the Crestline area on March 31, 1995. The spill was remediated in accordance with Conrail policy. No evidence of hazardous waste sites in the project area was observed during site visits by SEA's third-party consultant. A ground water monitoring well is located in the northwest quadrant of the Conrail diamond, approximately 15 feet west of the northeast/southwest Conrail rail line beneath the Thoman Street bridge. Additional information on this well was not available from the Village of Crestline or from Conrail.

### **3.4 WATER RESOURCES**

SEA identified water resources that could be adversely affected by the construction of the new rail connection. SEA also ascertained whether there were any designated wetlands or 100-year flood plains in the vicinity of the proposed construction.

SEA consulted several data sources, including United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic maps, National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps produced by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood insurance maps, and NRCS soil survey maps, to identify existing water resources. Each site was also visited by SEA's third-party consultant for field reviews and data verification. Water resources within 500 feet of the centerline of the proposed construction site, as described above, were identified primarily from site inspections and the interpretation of hydrologic features delineated on USGS topographic maps. The other information sources were used to confirm and/or refine the locations and extent of these features.

#### **3.4.1 Wetlands**

A 4.0 acre man-made pond, classified by the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) as a palustrine unconsolidated bottom intermittently exposed excavated wetland (PUBGx), is located on the south side of the existing east/west Conrail single track, approximately 500 feet southwest of the proposed construction site. In addition, the NWI map indicates a small (less than one acre) palustrine, shrub/scrub wetland (PSS1F) approximately 150 feet north of the existing east/west Conrail rail line west of the proposed connection. The locations of these wetlands are shown on Figure 4.

#### **3.4.2 Surface Waters**

There are no surface waters in the proposed construction area. An unnamed tributary to Paramour Creek flows south of the existing east/west Conrail rail line and flows under the rail line at Wiley Street, west of the terminus of the proposed project area.

According to the FEMA map for the area, the proposed project area is located outside the 500-year flood plain in an area of minimal flooding.

**Figure 4 - Water Resources**

### **3.5 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

SEA identified biological resources that could be adversely affected by the construction of the proposed rail connection. SEA also investigated whether there were any parklands, forest preserves, refuges , or wildlife sanctuaries in the vicinity of the proposed construction.

SEA consulted several data sources to identify existing biological resources, including USGS 7.5-minute topographic maps, NRCS soil surveys, and USFWS lists of sensitive or threatened and endangered species. Each site also was visited by SEA's third-party consultant to evaluate habitats, identify the presence or potential occurrence of sensitive species, and to verify published data. Federal and state resource management agencies were consulted concerning the potential occurrence of sensitive plants and animals.

#### **3.5.1 Vegetation**

Construction associated with the proposed connection would occur within existing railroad right-of-way, which is generally a gravel-covered, industrially developed environment. The proposed construction area is surrounded by railroad facilities, commercial and industrial buildings, and residential properties. Vegetation west of the Conrail line and east of the Thoman Street overpass is generally composed of opportunistic species that include sparse, non-woody and woody plants (such as Queen Anne's lace, thistle, small box elder, grape, and fleabane) and lawns of the two commercial buildings that abut the right-of-way. North of the east/west Conrail line and west of Thoman Street, the vegetation consists of sparse, non-woody and woody plants toward the east and a wooded wetland to the west. Other plants noted in this area include locust, common mullein, and sumac.

#### **3.5.2 Wildlife**

Wildlife habitat found within and adjacent to the proposed connection site is limited to the wooded wetland, and urban/industrial areas described above. In general, the area of the proposed construction project offers poor wildlife habitat. Small mammals and birds acclimated to urban environments would be expected; the wooded wetland would be attractive to wildlife in this area of limited habitat. Aquatic species, particularly amphibians and invertebrates, would be expected in the wooded wetland. In the stream that crosses the Conrail line west of the proposed project and in the wetland south of the project, fish, amphibians, reptiles, and invertebrates are expected.

#### **3.5.3 Threatened and Endangered Species**

Of the federally listed threatened or endangered species known to occur in Ohio, only the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) is reported in Crawford County. Typically, this species winters in caves or abandoned mines; during the rest of the year its habitat includes wooded areas along or near small or medium-sized streams, where the species roosts in hollow trees, under bark of trees with exfoliating bark, or in man-made structures. The environment at and near the proposed Crestline construction site provides poor habitat for the Indiana bat. Further, the presence of this species in

the area of the construction site has not been documented, nor has it been reported in Crawford County.

#### **3.5.4 Parks, Forest Preserves, Refuges and Sanctuaries**

No parks, forests, preserves, refuges or sanctuaries are on or adjacent to the proposed construction site. Two city parks are located in Crestline; an unnamed park is located 2,000 feet southeast and Kelly Park is located 2,100 feet west of the proposed construction area. Commercial and residential areas are situated between these parks and the proposed connection site.

### **3.6 AIR QUALITY**

Crawford County, Ohio is currently categorized as being in attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Current sources of emissions in the project area include locomotives, vehicles, and industries.

During construction, ambient air quality in the vicinity of the proposed connection could be affected by fugitive dust. The State of Ohio regulates fugitive dust emissions under rule 3745-17-08 of the Ohio Administrative Code. This rule requires fugitive dust emission sources within the Village of Crestline to apply reasonably available control measures, such as the use of water or dust suppression chemicals, to prevent fugitive dust from becoming airborne.

### **3.7 NOISE**

SEA identified noise-sensitive land uses in the vicinity of the proposed construction site and measured existing noise levels resulting from operation of the existing Conrail and CSX rail lines.

The proposed connection is located in an area of Crestline that contains residential, commercial, industrial and municipal uses. The Board's regulations require the use of day-night sound level ( $L_{dn}$ ) measurements to characterize community noise; a standard of 65 decibels ( $L_{dn}$  65 dBA) is used to determine the extent of affected sensitive receptors. Operation of rail traffic on the existing rail lines results in a  $L_{dn}$  65 dBA noise contour (see Figure 5) which affects approximately six residences (homes and apartments) and a group residence facility (halfway house) in the vicinity of the proposed connection. Commercial and municipal buildings are within 500 feet of the proposed connection in a fully developed section of downtown Crestline.

**Figure 5 - Noise Contours**

### **3.8 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

To identify cultural (archeological or historic) resources in the area of the proposed construction, SEA reviewed CSX and Conrail records and historic valuation maps, examined soil surveys and topographic maps, reviewed the State's archives, conducted site visits, and consulted with the Ohio State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO).

#### **3.8.1 Archeological Resources**

There are no known archeological sites in the project area. Review of Ohio SHPO records indicated that no previously identified archeological sites were within the area that could be potentially affected by the proposed connection. Preliminary field investigation verified that the project area has been highly disturbed, and consultation with the SHPO determined that no archeological investigation of the site is warranted because it is highly unlikely that undisturbed sites would be identified within the project area.

#### **3.8.2 Historic Resources**

Three potentially historic structures are located near the proposed connection (see Figure 3):

- The Pennsylvania Railroad Switching Tower, located near the intersection of the two Conrail lines. This signal tower is the only known surviving structure associated with the once extensive Pennsylvania Railroad facilities in Crestline and it retains a good level of integrity.
- A single-span, rounded-arch stone bridge over a stream below Wiley Street that was built in 1866.
- Initial consultation with the SHPO indicated that the signal bridge west of the Pennsylvania Railroad Switching Tower may be historic; however, a plaque on the bridge bears a patent date of 1965.

The Pennsylvania Railroad Switching Tower and the stone bridge appear to be potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

### **3.9 ENERGY**

Current sources of energy consumption in the project area are associated with existing railroad operations and include locomotives and railroad maintenance equipment. The existing Conrail lines may be used to transport energy-producing commodities and recyclables.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **Potential Environmental Effects**

This chapter provides an overview of the potential environmental effects from the proposed rail line connection between the existing Conrail lines in Crestline, Ohio. This connection would involve the construction of a new rail line segment within existing railroad right-of-way to connect the existing rail lines. The current Conrail single-track line to the west of the intersection would be shifted southward to accommodate the proposed connection. As with any construction of new railroad tracks, the steps required to build a new connection include site preparation and grading, railbed preparation, ballast application, track installation, and systems (signals and communications) installation. Although the construction zone required would vary depending on site conditions, most work would be completed within 250 feet of the new rail line.

In conducting its analysis, SEA considered potential effects in the following environmental areas in accordance with the Board's environmental rules at 49 CFR Part 1105.7(e) and other applicable regulations:

- Land Use
- Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice
- Transportation and Safety
- Water Resources
- Biological Resources
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Cumulative Effects

#### **4.1 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS FROM THE PROPOSED ACTION**

##### **4.1.1 Land Use**

###### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

To assess land use effects, SEA consulted with local planning officials to establish whether the construction and operation of the proposed rail line connection were consistent with existing land uses and future land use plans. Determination as to whether a proposed rail line construction would affect any prime agricultural land was based on SEA's consultations with the NRCS. SEA conducted similar consultations with state Coastal Zone Management agency to assess whether the proposed construction would harm protected coastal areas. SEA also contacted the Bureau of Indian Affairs to obtain information on any federally-recognized American Indian tribes or reservations within the project area.

SEA considered land use effects to be adverse if any construction activities or subsequent operations would cause long-term changes that:

- Conflict with existing land uses in the area or future land use plans.
- Displace prime farmland from use for agricultural production.
- Conflict with an existing Coastal Zone Management Plan.
- Affect any American Indian reservation or tribal lands.

### **Potential Effects**

No adverse land use effects are expected from the construction of the proposed connection. It is compatible with surrounding land uses, complies with applicable zoning ordinances, and is consistent with community plans for the area. No prime farmland soils would be converted to railroad use as a result of the proposed connection. Construction activities would not disrupt a designated coastal zone. No known American Indian reservations or tribal lands would be affected.

### **4.1.2 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice**

#### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA analyzed the effects of the proposed construction on low-income and minority populations in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Executive Order 12898: “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.” SEA reviewed demographic and income data from the 1990 census to compare the population in the area of the proposed construction with that of the Village of Crestline and Crawford County.

An adverse environmental justice effect would occur if any significant adverse effects of the proposed construction fall disproportionately on low-income or minority populations.

### **Potential Effects**

SEA concluded that no environmental justice effects would result from the construction or operation of the proposed connection. There is not a substantial difference in the racial composition and economic status between the Village of Crestline or Crawford County as a whole and the area of the proposed connection. SEA does not expect construction of the proposed connection to result in any significant adverse effects to any residents, regardless of race or income. Therefore, minority or low-income communities would not be disproportionately affected by the proposed project.

### **4.1.3 Transportation and Safety**

#### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA examined the existing local and regional rail systems which could be affected by the proposed construction of the new rail line connection. Potential effects on the local and regional roadways were also evaluated. In evaluating potential safety effects, SEA assessed: (1) the need for new

grade crossings; (2) modifications at existing grade crossings; (3) the effect of the proposed connection on the transportation of hazardous materials; (4) the likelihood of encountering hazardous waste sites during construction; and (5) the likelihood of a hazardous material release during construction.

Effects are considered adverse if the construction or operation of the proposed connection would cause long-term disruptions to vehicular traffic, increase the potential for delays or accidents at grade crossings, increase the risk of transporting hazardous materials, or cause spills or release of hazardous materials during construction.

### **Potential Effects**

**Transportation Systems.** The proposed connection would improve rail access through Crestline and enhance the efficiency of CSX operations. No new at-grade crossings would result from the proposed connection. Other transportation effects would be limited to the increased use of public roads due to the transport of construction equipment. SEA expects this effect to be of short duration and unlikely to affect the long-term viability or life span of the roads. Short-term disruptions of local vehicular traffic could occur during the construction period.

**Transport of Hazardous Materials.** The transportation of hazardous materials is not expected to be affected by the proposed connection. Both of the current Conrail lines would remain Key Routes for shipment of hazardous materials. The manner of transporting hazardous materials would not change, and no increased risk of derailments or chemical releases is expected because of the new connection. The proposed alignment and associated switches would provide adequate safety margins for the proposed 30-mph train speed through the connection. CSX has policies to promote safe transportation of hazardous materials and procedures to deal with clean up and remediation, if an accident or spill occurs.

**Hazardous Waste Sites.** No known hazardous waste sites were identified as being located in the project area. The probability of a spill of hazardous or toxic materials during construction is small. In the unlikely event that a spill or contamination occurs, CSX has policies and procedures to deal with clean up and remediation. Overall, the proposed construction project is not expected to increase the probability or consequences of hazardous waste contamination in the project area.

#### **4.1.4 Water Resources**

##### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA assessed whether the following potential effects to water resources could result from construction and operation of the proposed connection:

- Alteration of creek embankments with rip rap, concrete, and other bank stabilization measures;
- Temporary or permanent loss of surface water area associated with the incidental deposition of fill;
- Downstream sediment deposition or water turbidity due to fill activities, dredging, and/or soil erosion from upland construction site areas;
- Direct or indirect destruction and/or degradation of aquatic, wetland, and riparian vegetation/habitat;
- Degradation of water quality through sediment loading or chemical/petroleum spills; and
- Alteration of water flow which could increase bank erosion or flooding, uproot or destroy vegetation, or affect fish and wildlife habitats.

Effects to water resources are considered adverse if there is substantial interference with drainage, adverse discharges (such as sediment or pollutants) or loss of wetlands or flood plains resulting from the construction or operation of the new rail line connection.

##### **Potential Effects**

SEA concluded that the proposed construction would not have adverse effects on surface water resources or wetlands. Alteration of river embankments or flows is not expected as a result of constructing the proposed connection. No flooding concerns are associated with the project area. Construction activities could potentially cause a temporary increase in sediment loads entering adjacent waterbodies. The wetlands within 500 feet of the proposed connection could be affected by runoff from the construction area. Construction specifications for the new connection would incorporate provisions for environmental protection (including appropriate measures for sediment and erosion control) as required by jurisdictional agencies and federal, state, and local permitting authorities.

#### **4.1.5 Biological Resources**

##### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA assessed whether the following potential effects to biological resources could result from construction and operation of the proposed connection:

- Loss or degradation of unique or important vegetative communities;
- Harm to or loss of rare, threatened, or endangered plant or animal species;

- Loss or degradation of areas designated as critical habitat;
- Loss or degradation of parks, forest preserves, wildlife sanctuaries or refuges;
- Alteration of movement or migration corridors for animals; and
- Loss of large numbers of local wildlife or their habitats.

Effects to biological resources are considered adverse if the proposed construction would result in the loss of important and/or critical vegetation or wildlife habitats, cause harm to threatened or endangered species, or the degradation of parklands, forest preserves, refuges or wildlife sanctuaries.

### **Potential Effects**

**Vegetation.** The proposed construction would occur entirely within the right-of-way in areas that have been previously disturbed. The proposed construction area is a degraded habitat, much of it covered in gravel, supporting only opportunistic species. The loss of this habitat would have little effect on the overall quality of the environment. The loss of vegetation within the construction area along the tracks would be permanent. The impacts to vegetation in other areas disturbed by the construction would be temporary and it is likely that opportunistic species would invade and reclaim these areas.

**Wildlife.** Wildlife such as birds and small mammals may frequent the proposed construction site, but it is not likely an important part of their habitat. Impacts to wildlife as a result of the proposed project are expected to be minimal.

**Threatened and Endangered Species.** One federally endangered species, the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) is listed by the USFWS as potential to Crawford County. Impacts to this species are unlikely since its primary habitat is not located in the project area. According to the Ohio DNR, there have been no reported sightings of the species in Crawford County.

**Parks, Forests Preserves, Refuges, and Sanctuaries.** No parks, forest preserves, refuges, or sanctuaries are located within 500 feet of the proposed connection. Construction of the connection would not affect the two local parks located within 1 mile of the proposed connection.

#### **4.1.6 Air Quality**

##### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

Potential air quality effects associated with construction of the proposed connection are primarily related to (1) effects associated with the operation of construction equipment and related vehicles, and (2) effects associated with fugitive dust generation.

SEA assessed whether the proposed construction would result in increased levels of pollutant emissions from the operation of construction equipment and vehicles. Air quality effects related to train operations over the CSX and Conrail line segments adjoining the connection, to the extent they meet the Board's thresholds for analysis, will be analyzed in the EIS being prepared for the entire acquisition transaction. SEA also evaluated the potential for air quality effects from fugitive dust

emissions. In general, the amount of fugitive dust generated by construction activities depends on the topography of the site, soil conditions, wind speeds, precipitation, and the types of roadways used to access the site.

Air quality effects are considered to be adverse if the proposed construction would lead to long-term increases in pollutant emissions or excessive fugitive dust emissions.

### **Potential Effects**

During construction of the proposed connection, the air quality in the vicinity could be affected by temporary increases in vehicle and fugitive dust emissions. Pollutant emissions from a small number of heavy equipment and construction vehicles would occur. Particulate matter, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO) and nitrogen oxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) result from combustion of diesel fuel. The emissions of these pollutants from construction operations generally would be minor and of short duration and would have insignificant effects on air quality. Emissions from the proposed construction project would not be sufficient to change Crawford County's attainment with the NAAQS. Increases in fugitive dust could occur due to grading and other earthwork necessary for rail bed preparation. Appropriate control measures, such as the use of water or dust suppression chemicals, would be implemented to minimize fugitive dust effects during construction.

#### **4.1.7 Noise**

##### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA evaluated the proposed rail line connection for effects from both short-term construction activities and long-term operations over the connection. SEA's approach for analyzing operational noise effects was to identify noise-sensitive land uses where changes in operation could result in noise exposure increases. Existing noise levels were measured and noise models were used to develop the current L<sub>dn</sub> 65 dBA noise contours. The future L<sub>dn</sub> 65 dBA noise contours resulting from operation of the connection were determined using the post-connection volumes on the main line and connection tracks. SEA then identified the number of noise-sensitive receptors (residences, schools, hospitals, and libraries) within these contours. Noise levels from rail traffic on the existing mainline tracks is generally greater than noise from operations over connections. Noise effects from the operation of the main line tracks will be analyzed in the EIS which addresses rail line segment effects for the entire acquisition transaction.

Noise effects were considered adverse if the connection would expand the L<sub>dn</sub> 65 dBA contours and affect a substantial number of new noise-sensitive receptors.

##### **Potential Effects**

Although most construction activities have the potential of causing intrusive noise at nearby noise-sensitive land uses, any noise effects during construction of the proposed connection would be for a limited duration and would not cause any permanent noise effects. Construction activities would

last for only a few months; most noise generated during that period would be similar to that caused by normal track maintenance.

Post-construction operations are projected to consist of 5.2 trains per day on the proposed connection. The noise from train operations on the main lines far exceed the noise expected to result from train operations over the connection. Proposed operations over the connection would have the effect of moving the  $L_{dn}$  65 dBA contour very slightly to the north, since the connection is just north of the existing rail line (see Figure 5). There are no additional sensitive receptors within the new  $L_{dn}$  65 dBA contour of the proposed connection, because it is within the existing noise contour of mainline track operations. In addition, since there are no new at-grade crossings associated with this connection, railroad operations over the connection would not generate additional horn noise which would affect nearby receptors.

The curvature of the proposed connection is approximately 10 degrees. The noise projection model includes wheel squeal for trains on tight-radius curves, and assumes that the tracks are lubricated, which is CSX's usual practice. These projections show that operations on the proposed connection track would only affect noise exposure at locations in close proximity to the connection. Therefore, no new noise-sensitive receptors would be affected by the construction or operation of the connection.

#### **4.1.8 Cultural Resources**

##### **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA consulted with the Indiana SHPO to identify potentially affected archeological and historic resources in the vicinity of the proposed construction. If National Register of Historic Places-eligible or listed resources or properties were present within the project area, SEA consulted with the SHPO to determine what effect, if any, the proposed construction would have on these resources.

Effects to archeological and historic resources are considered adverse if any National Register-eligible or listed resource would experience an Adverse Effect as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.9 as a result of the proposed rail line constructions or subsequent rail operations.

##### **Potential Effects**

Because two properties potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places are located within the project area, SEA consulted with the SHPO to determine what affect, if any, the proposed construction would have on these resources. The Ohio SHPO concluded that the proposed connection would not affect the historic significance of any of the these properties. No effects to archeological resources are expected because the area has been previously disturbed.

#### **4.1.9 Energy Resources**

## **Assessment Methods and Evaluation Criteria**

SEA assessed the effect of the proposed connection on energy consumption, the transportation of energy resources and recyclable commodities, and diversions of shipments from rail to trucks.

Energy effects are considered significant if the proposed action would result in a substantial increase in energy consumption, would adversely affect the transportation of energy resources or recyclable commodities, or would cause diversions from rail to motor carriers.

### **Potential Effects**

The operation of construction equipment would require the consumption of a small amount of energy (primarily diesel fuel) to operate motor or rail vehicles required to deliver construction materials to the site, prepare the site, and construct the connection. SEA considers this minimal consumption of energy resources insignificant.

The amount of energy resources and recyclable commodities that would be transported over the proposed connection is not known. However, the construction and operation of the proposed connection and the resulting improvement in operating efficiencies is expected to benefit the transportation of energy resources and recyclable commodities. The connection also would enhance system-wide freight transportation, thereby reducing energy consumption. Construction and operation of the proposed connection is not expected to result in diversions from rail to motor carrier.

#### **4.1.10 Cumulative Effects**

Based on a review of the transaction Application and the proposed Operating Plan supplied by CSX, no other rail construction projects are underway or planned in the vicinity of the proposed connection. Consultations with federal, state, and local agencies identified no other planned or on-going construction projects in the vicinity of the proposed connection. Therefore, the effects outline above represent the cumulative effects of the proposed construction project. The cumulative effects of the entire acquisition transaction, which could result from increased rail line segment, rail yard, and intermodal facility activity, abandonments, and other construction projects, will be addressed in the EIS.

## **4.2 POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

### **4.2.1 No-Action Alternative**

If the “no-action” alternative were implemented, the proposed rail line connection would not be constructed or operated. Therefore, the current land use and other existing environmental conditions would remain unchanged. However, if the related transaction is approved, the absence of this rail line connection could result in less efficient rail service. The capacity constraints, more circuitous routing of rail service, delays, and slower operating speeds that could result without the new

connection may cause additional fuel consumption and increase pollutant emissions from locomotives.

#### **4.2.2 Build Alternatives**

As discussed in Section 2.2, SEA identified no feasible “build” alternatives to the proposed rail line construction project. Therefore, the potential environmental effects of alternatives considered, but later rejected, were not evaluated.



## **CHAPTER 5**

### **Agency Comments and Mitigation**

This chapter summarizes comments received from federal, state and local agencies or officials about the proposed construction, and outlines SEA's recommended mitigation measures.

#### **5.1 SUMMARY OF AGENCY COMMENTS**

A list of federal, state and local agencies consulted in considering the potential environmental effects of the proposed connection is provided in Appendix B. These agencies also were contacted by the Applicant while preparing the Environmental Report which accompanied the transaction Application. Any agency responses received during the consultation process are included in Appendix B.

Agency comments regarding the proposed construction project are summarized below:

- The Ohio SHPO indicated that the two potentially historic structures in the vicinity of the project should be recorded on Ohio Historic Inventory Forms. In addition, the SHPO indicated that an archeological survey of the project area was not necessary.
- The National Geodetic Survey indicated that a geodetic survey marker may be affected by the project. The National Geodetic Survey requires notification 90 days prior to initiating any activity that may disturb the survey marker.
- The Federal Railroad Administration advised that no new grade crossings should be created by the project and any existing crossings should be upgraded to assure the project would not increase safety risks to citizens of Crestline.
- The NRCS indicated that the proposed project would not affect prime farmland soils.
- The Ohio DNR indicated that it was unaware of any rare species or endangered habitat in the area of the proposed project.

#### **5.2 AGENCY SUGGESTED MITIGATION**

The following mitigation measures were suggested for the proposed construction project by the various parties consulted in the process of preparing the EA:

- The National Geodetic Survey requests notification 90 days prior to start of construction if one of its survey markers would be disturbed or destroyed by the project.

- The FRA suggests that CSX work with local and state officials to ensure that safety concerns are addressed.

### **5.3 SEA RECOMMENDED MITIGATION**

SEA recommends that the Board impose the following mitigation measures in any decision approving construction of the proposed rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio.

#### **5.3.1 General Mitigation Measures**

##### **Land Use**

- CSX shall restore any adjacent properties that are disturbed during construction activities to their pre-construction conditions.

##### **Transportation and Safety**

- CSX shall use appropriate signs and barricades to control and minimize traffic disruptions during construction.
- CSX shall restore roads disturbed during construction to conditions as required by state or local jurisdictions.
- CSX shall observe all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding handling and disposal of any waste materials, including hazardous waste, encountered or generated during construction of the proposed rail line connection.
- CSX shall dispose of all materials that cannot be reused in accordance with state and local solid waste management regulations.
- CSX shall consult with the appropriate federal, state and local agencies if hazardous waste and/or materials are discovered at the site.
- CSX shall transport all hazardous materials in compliance with U.S. Department of Transportation Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Parts 171 to 180). CSX shall provide, upon request, local emergency management organizations with copies of all applicable Emergency Response Plans and participate in the training of local emergency staff (upon request) for coordinated responses to incidents. In the case of a hazardous material incident, CSX shall follow appropriate emergency response procedures contained in its Emergency Response Plans.

##### **Water Resources**

- CSX shall obtain all necessary federal, state, and local permits if construction activities require the alteration of wetlands, ponds, lakes, streams, or rivers, or if these activities would cause soil or other materials to wash into these water resources. CSX shall use appropriate techniques to minimize effects to water bodies and wetlands.

### **Biological Resources**

- CSX shall use Best Management Practices to control erosion, runoff, and surface instability during construction, including seeding, fiber mats, straw mulch, plastic liners, slope drains, and other erosion control devices. Once the tracks are constructed, CSX shall establish vegetation on the embankment slopes to provide permanent cover and prevent potential erosion. If erosion develops, CSX shall take steps to develop other appropriate erosion control procedures.
- CSX shall use only EPA-approved herbicides and qualified contractors for application of right-of-way maintenance herbicides, and shall limit such application to the extent necessary for rail operations.

### **Air Quality**

- CSX shall comply with all applicable federal, state, and local regulations regarding the control of fugitive dust. Fugitive dust emissions created during construction shall be minimized by using such control methods as water spraying, installation of wind barriers, and chemical treatment.

### **Noise**

- CSX shall control temporary noise from construction equipment through the use of work hour controls and maintenance of muffler systems on machinery.

### **Cultural Resources**

- If previously undiscovered archeological remains are found during construction, CSX shall cease work and immediately contact the SHPO to initiate the appropriate Section 106 process.

### **5.3.2 Specific Mitigation Measures**

In addition to the general mitigation measures identified above, SEA recommends that the Board impose the following specific mitigation measure in any decision approving the construction of the proposed rail line connection in Crestline, Ohio.

- CSX shall close the existing ground water monitoring well located within the project area if the well is affected by the project. The well shall be closed in accordance with local, state, and federal requirements.
- CSX shall consult with the National Geodetic Survey to locate any geodetic survey marker and, if necessary, assist in the relocation of the marker.

### **5.4 REQUEST FOR COMMENTS**

SEA specifically invites comments on all aspects of this EA, including the scope and adequacy of the recommended mitigation. SEA will consider all comments received in response to the EA in making its final recommendations to the Board. Comments (an original and 10 copies) should be sent to: Vernon A. Williams, Secretary, Surface Transportation Board, 1925 K Street NW, Suite 700, Washington, D.C. 20423. The lower left-hand corner of the envelope should be marked: Attention: Dana White, Environmental Comments, Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub Nos. 1-7). Questions may also be directed to Ms. White at this address or by telephoning (888) 869-1997.

Date EA Made Available to the Public: **October 7, 1997**

Comment Due Date: **October 27, 1997**

**APPENDIX A**  
**CSX/NS CONSTRUCTION WAIVER APPLICATION**  
**PRESS RELEASE FOR STB DECISION 9**  
**STB DECISION 9**



APPENDIX B  
**AGENCIES AND OTHER PARTIES CONSULTED**  
**AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE**

**Federal Agencies Consulted:**

Bureau of Indian Affairs—Eastern Area Office, Fairfax, Virginia  
Council on Environmental Quality, Washington, D.C.  
Federal Highway Administration, Washington, D.C.  
Federal Railroad Administration, Washington, D.C.  
National Forest Service—Eastern Region, Milwaukee, Wisconsin  
National Geodetic Survey, Silver Spring, Maryland  
National Park Service, Washington, D.C.  
National Park Service—Great Plains Office, Omaha, Nebraska  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—Buffalo District, Buffalo, New York  
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service—Ohio State  
Conservationist, Columbus, Ohio  
U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—Office of Federal Activities, Washington, D.C.  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—Region 5, Chicago, Illinois  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—Region 3, Fort Snelling, Minnesota  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—Ecological Services Field Office, Reynoldsburg, Ohio

**State Agencies Consulted:**

Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Department of Transportation, Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Historical Society (State Historic Preservation Officer), Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Office of Budget and Management—Ohio State Clearinghouse, Columbus, Ohio  
Ohio Rail Development Commission, Columbus, Ohio

**Local Agencies Consulted:**

Crawford County Commissioners, Bucyrus, Ohio  
Village of Crestline, Crestline, Ohio



## APPENDIX C REFERENCES

### **General:**

- CSX Transportation Inc. *Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment. Crestline, Ohio—New Connection.* September 1997.
- CSX Transportation Inc. and Norfolk Southern Railway Company. *Railroad Control Application: Finance Docket No. 33388. Volume 3—Operating Plan.* June 1997.
- CSX Transportation Inc. and Norfolk Southern Railway Company. *Railroad Control Application: Finance Docket No. 33388. Volume 6—Environmental Report.* June 1997.
- De Leuw, Cather and Company. *Conrail Acquisition Site Assessment Summary—Crestline, Ohio.* July 23, 1997.

### **Project Description and Construction Requirements:**

- CSX Transportation Inc., Engineering Department. Personal communications with Gray Chandler. July 25 and 28, 1997.
- Sverdrup, Inc. Personal communication with Sheila Hockel. July 30, 1997.

### **Land Use:**

- Conrail Consolidated Rail Corporation. Personal communication with Robert Humbert. July 24, 1997.
- Crawford County Courthouse. Personal communication with Carl Watt. May 30, 1997.
- Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission. Personal communication with G. Wilburn. May 30, 1997.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Geodetic Survey. Personal communication and correspondence from Edward McKay. May 23 and June 19, 1997.
- Ohio Historical Society. Correspondence from Martha Raymond. January 31, 1997.
- Ohio Rail Development Commission. Personal communication with Beth Wilson. May 30, 1997.
- Ohio State Clearinghouse. Personal communication with Linda Wise. May 22, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Forest Service—Region 9. Personal communication with Bill Rees. May 30, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Personal communication with Rod Yeoman. May 30, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Soil Survey of Crawford County, Ohio.* April 1979.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Federal Activities. Personal communication with Pat Haman. June 2, 1997.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 5, 1997. Personal communication with Mike McMullen. June 2, 1997.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Personal communication with Dave Stonefield. June 2, 1997.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Topographical Map—Crestline, Ohio Quadrangle. 1982.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Personal communication with Diane Rosen. May 27, 1997.

Village of Crestline, Ohio, Codes and Permits Department. Correspondence from James Gehrisch. May 9, 1997.

**Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice:**

Executive Order 12898. *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations*. Washington, D.C., 1994.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *1990 Census of Population and Housing, Summary Tape Files 1A and 3A*. Washington, D.C., May 1992.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *City & Data Book—Statistical Abstract Supplement*. 12th Edition. Washington, D.C., 1994.

U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Statistical Abstract of United States*. Washington, D.C., 1995.

**Transportation and Safety:**

Conrail Consolidated Rail Corporation. Personal communication Robert Humbert. July 24, 1997.

Conrail Consolidated Rail Corporation. Personal communication with Tom Pendergast. August 5, 1997.

CSX Transportation. Personal communication with Gray Chandler. May 23, 1997.

E Data Resources, Inc. *EDR-Radius Map with GeoCheck—Crestline, Ohio*. May 20, 1997.

Ohio Department of Transportation. Personal communication with J.P. Lawless. May 30, 1997.

Ohio Department of Transportation. *Average Daily Traffic Counts 1989-1992*.

Ohio Public Utilities Commission. Personal communication with Joseph Reinhardt. July 24, 1997.

U.S. Department of Transportation. Federal Railroad Administration. Personal communication with Rob Martin. May 30 and July 21, 1997.

U.S. Department of Transportation. Correspondence from Raphael Kedar. June 10, 1997.

**Water Resources:**

Federal Emergency Management Agency, National Flood Insurance Program. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Village of Crestline, Ohio, Crawford and Richland Counties, Panel 390091 0005 C, Community Panel No. 180202 0015B. July 1992.

Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Management Program. Personal communication with Don Povolny. March 3, 1997.

Richland County Regional Planning Commission. Personal communication with Bill Frasher. May 7, 1997.

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Buffalo District. Personal communication with Richard Leonard. June 2, 1997.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Soil Survey of Crawford County, Ohio*. April 1979.

U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory Map, Crestline, Ohio. April 1988.

U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Topographical Map—Crestline, Ohio Quadrangle. 1982.

**Biological Resources:**

- Ohio Department of Natural Resources. Personal communication with Jamie Best. May 30, 1997.
- Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife. Personal communication with Dave Swanson. August 5, 1997.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. *Soil Survey of Crawford County, Ohio*. April 1979.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory Map, Crestline, Ohio. April 1988.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 3. Personal communication with William Hartwig. May 30, 1997.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—Reynoldsburg, Ohio Field Office. Personal communication with Ken Multerer. May 30 and August 7, 1997.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service—Reynoldsburg, Ohio Ecological Service Field Office. Personal communication with Kent Kroonemeyer. June 2, 1997.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. *Threatened and Endangered Species of the State of Ohio*. May 10, 1995.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey. Topographical Map—Crestline, Ohio Quadrangle. 1982.

**Air Quality:**

- Ohio Administrative Code. Rule 3745-15-07. *Air Pollution Control Nuisance Regulations*.
- Ohio Administrative Code. Rule 3745-17-02. *Ambient Air Quality Standards*.
- Ohio Administrative Code. Rule 3745-17-08. *Fugitive Dust Rule*.
- U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. Volume 40, Part 81. *Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes*. Subpart C, Section 107—Attainment Status Designations, Porter County, Indiana.
- U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. Volume 40, Part 1105.7. *Surface Transportation Board, Procedures for Implementation of Environmental Laws*.
- U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Railroad Administration and Federal Highway Administration. *Guidebook for Planning to Alleviate Urban Railroad Problems, Volume 3, Appendix C*. Report RP-31. Washington, D.C., August 1974..
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. MOBILE 5b Emission Factor Model. 1997.

**Noise:**

U.S. Code of Federal Regulations. Volume 40, Part 1105.7. *Surface Transportation Board, Procedures for Implementation of Environmental Laws.*

Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. Correspondence and personal communications with Hugh Saurenman. May through August 1997.

**Cultural Resources:**

Crestline Historical Society. *A Pictorial History of Crestline, Ohio.* Crestline, Ohio, 1981.

GAI Consultants. Correspondence from Karen Orrence. August 12, 1997.

Myra L. Frank & Associates. Personal communications with Richard Starzak. September 5, 1997.

Ohio State Historical Society. Personal communication with Julie Quinlan. May 23, 1997.

Ohio State Historical Society. Personal communication with Franco Ruffini and David Snyder. July 18, 1997.

Sanborn Insurance Maps, Crestline, Ohio. 1901 and 1908.

Ohio State Historical Society. Personal communication with Dave Snyder. June 3, 1997.

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs. Personal communication with Terry Viridon. May 30, 1997.