

ONLY THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND CHAPTER 7 MITIGATION PORTIONS OF THE DOCUMENT APPEAR HERE.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ES.1 Introduction

On June 23, 1997, three major railroads (CSX, Norfolk Southern (NS), and Conrail)¹ applied to the Surface Transportation Board (Board) for authority for CSX and NS to acquire Conrail (Conrail Acquisition). Under the Application,² most of the Conrail assets would be divided between CSX and NS. However, some portions of Conrail (referred to as the Shared Assets) would be operated jointly by CSX, NS, and Conrail. Under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), the Board must consider the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Conrail Acquisition in making its decision in this case.

The three Applicants' rail systems encompass more than 44,000 miles of track in 24 states, the District of Columbia, and the Canadian Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Their rail systems pass through more than 1,000 counties, with a total population of more than 90 million people.

Combined, the Applicants handle more than 10 million rail cars a year. In addition to freight operations, Amtrak and 14 commuter agencies operate over tracks owned by one or more of the Applicants. Under the proposal, the existing CSX and NS systems would be expanded and would substitute two competing railroads for the existing Conrail system in the Northeast and upper Midwest.

The Board's Section of Environmental Analysis (SEA) has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to assess potential effects on the natural and human environment that could reasonably result from the proposed Conrail Acquisition if it is approved by the Board. This analysis considers potential environmental effects at several levels:

¹ CSX refers to CSX Corporation and CSX Transportation; Norfolk Southern refers to Norfolk Southern Corporation and Norfolk Southern Railway Company; Conrail refers to Conrail, Inc. and Consolidated Rail Corporation.

² "Application" refers to Surface Transportation Board Finance Docket No. 33388.

This analysis considers potential environmental effects at several levels:

- Broad system-wide environmental effects on the eastern United States.
- Regional environmental effects on several states.
- Local or site-specific effects on individual communities.

With this Draft EIS, SEA seeks to inform Federal, state, and local agencies and the general public about the potential environmental effects of the proposed Conrail Acquisition. SEA also describes in this Draft EIS its preliminary conclusions regarding these effects and those actions that SEA currently intends to recommend that the Board require of the Applicants to mitigate or alleviate potential significant environmental impacts.

Under the Council of Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA, the public has a 45-day period in which to review and comment on this Draft EIS. SEA invites all interested parties to provide comments that could further assist SEA's environmental review. SEA also seeks comments on the reasonableness and feasibility of proposed mitigation measures and suggestions regarding additional or alternate mitigation measures to address potential significant environmental impacts. (See Section ES.7 for information on how to file comments on the Draft EIS.)

ES.1.1 Overview of Potential Impacts and Preliminary Recommended Mitigation

Based on SEA's extensive analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed Conrail Acquisition, SEA presents the following preliminary conclusions in this Draft EIS:

- On a system-wide basis, SEA identified no significant environmental impacts, primarily due to the more efficient routes that would be created. Moreover, there would be some positive impacts on a system-wide basis such as reductions in fuel consumption, system-wide air pollutant emissions, and highway congestion.
- On a regional basis, SEA identified potentially significant environmental impacts for passenger rail safety and hazardous materials transport that appear to warrant mitigation.
- On a local or site-specific basis, SEA identified potentially significant environmental impacts that included such areas as freight rail operations, highway/rail at-grade crossing safety, traffic delay at highway/rail at-grade crossings, noise, cultural and historic resources, natural resources, and environmental justice issues. The following states could be affected by one or more of these potential environmental impacts: Alabama, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.
- SEA identified possible environmental mitigation measures that the Board could require of the Applicants to address potentially significant environmental impacts if the Board approves the

proposed Acquisition. (See Chapter 7 for a detailed list of SEA's preliminary recommended mitigation.)

- SEA encourages the Applicants and affected communities to work together to identify and reach agreement on alternate mitigation measures or approaches that could be more effective or more acceptable, but may be beyond the Board's authority to impose.

ES.1.2 Alternate Actions

SEA evaluates three alternative actions available to the Board in this Draft EIS:

No-Action Alternative – If the Board denies the Application, the proposed changes in ownership and rail operations would not be implemented and Conrail would continue to exist as the major rail carrier in the Northeast and upper Midwest. SEA has considered this alternative as the baseline scenario, to which SEA compared environmental changes to determine the potential environmental effects that could result from the proposed Conrail Acquisition.

Approval of the Proposed Acquisition – In evaluating this alternative, SEA considered the proposed changes in ownership and operations described in the Application, Operating Plans, and Environmental Report, submitted to the Board on June 23, 1997, as revised in the Errata and Supplemental Environmental Report filed with the Board on August 28, 1997. The Applicants have since provided, and continue to provide, additional operational and environmental information.

Approval of the Proposed Acquisition with Conditions – In considering this alternative, SEA evaluated the Applicants' proposal along with conditions that the Board could impose as part of any decision approving the proposed Conrail Acquisition. These conditions could include suggested modifications to the Applicants' Operating Plans that other parties have requested in Inconsistent and Responsive Applications to the Board, such as requests for trackage rights (the right of a railroad to operate trains over tracks owned by another railroad) and for modifications of the Shared Assets Areas. Conditions of approval could also include conditions requiring the Applicants to implement environmental mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate potential significant environmental impacts.

In considering whether to approve the transaction, the Board must weigh and balance the anticipated public benefits to the national transportation system, interstate commerce, and affected regions and communities against potential adverse effects. As part of that analysis, the Board considers the potential environmental effects, which include both beneficial and adverse impacts.

In its analysis, SEA has evaluated potential environmental impacts in the following issue areas:

- Safety.
- Transportation Systems.

- Energy.
- Air Quality.
- Noise.
- Cultural and Historical Resources.
- Hazardous Waste Sites.
- Natural Resources.
- Land Use and Socioeconomics related to changes in the physical environment.
- Environmental Justice.
- Cumulative Effects.

ES.2 Proposed Action

ES.2.1 Primary Application

The proposed Conrail Acquisition involves over 44,000 miles of track and numerous railroad-owned facilities throughout the eastern United States. The proposed Conrail Acquisition, with its division of Conrail's assets by CSX and NS, would result in two major railroad systems of roughly equal size and scope operating in the eastern United States. CSX currently operates approximately 18,500 route miles of rail lines in 19 states, the District of Columbia, and the Province of Ontario, Canada. The expanded CSX system resulting from this proposal would consist of approximately 23,200 route miles. NS currently operates approximately 14,300 route miles of rail line in 19 states and the Province of Ontario. The expanded NS system resulting from this proposal would be comprised of approximately 21,100 route miles. Conrail currently operates approximately 10,500 route miles of rail line in 13 states, the District of Columbia, and the Province of Quebec, Canada. Only 514 miles of track would remain in the Conrail system, if the proposed Conrail Acquisition is approved and implemented, and would be operated as Shared Assets Areas. The Shared Assets Areas are located in Northern New Jersey, Southern New Jersey/Philadelphia, and Detroit, Michigan. Figures ES-1 and ES-2 show the existing and proposed CSX, NS, and Conrail rail systems.

In 1996 and early 1997, CSX and NS each separately considered acquiring Conrail. On April 7, 1997, CSX and NS officially notified the Board of their intent to jointly acquire certain Conrail assets. Their joint Application, filed on June 23, 1997, included Operating Plans and an Environmental Report describing the physical and operational changes that would be associated with the proposed Acquisition and the potential environmental effects of those changes. The Applicants submitted corrected and supplemental information in the Errata and Supplemental

Environmental Report filed with the Board on August 28, 1997. The Applicants have since provided, and continue to provide, additional operational and environmental information.

The proposed Conrail Acquisition would result in some rerouting of rail traffic, increasing traffic for some rail line segments and rail yards, while decreasing traffic for others. The Applicants also anticipate attracting additional traffic away from highway truck shipments and onto the expanded CSX and NS rail systems. This would result in a decrease in long-haul truck traffic, although there could be increased local truck traffic in and around new and existing intermodal facilities. To accommodate these changes in traffic patterns, the Applicants plan various related rerouting and consolidation activities, including the abandonment of some rail lines, the construction of new rail line connections, and the construction or expansion of certain rail yards and intermodal facilities. Chapter 2 includes a more detailed description of the anticipated physical and operational changes expected to result from the proposed Conrail Acquisition.

ES.2.2 Related Actions and Seven Separate Connections

SEA has investigated 75 other actions proposed by the Applicants that could be reasonably related to the proposed Acquisition. Based on this review, SEA determined that three projects (two rail yard expansions and a bridge renovation) could potentially result in environmental impacts beyond the existing railroad right-of-way. These construction projects are discussed in appropriate issue and site-specific sections of Chapter 5. SEA determined that the remaining projects – minor actions with the potential for only small and temporary impacts – do not require further analysis.

At the request of CSX and NS, the Board has already considered proposals to construct seven new rail line connections, together totaling approximately four miles of new track. Specifically, CSX and NS asked the Board to consider these seven connections separately from, and prior to, the Board's decision on the proposed Conrail Acquisition. CSX and NS did this so they would be able to immediately provide efficient services in competition with one another if the Board approves the proposed Acquisition. CSX and NS assumed the risk that the Application may be denied and/or they would not be authorized to operate over one or more of the new connections.

On October 7, 1997, SEA issued separate Environmental Assessments addressing the potential construction impacts of each of these seven projects. In a decision issued November 25, 1997, the Board gave final approval, subject to certain environmental mitigation conditions, for the physical construction of these seven projects. However, no rail line operations can begin over the Seven Separate Connections until SEA completes its EIS process for the proposed Conrail Acquisition and then only if the Board approves the proposed Conrail Acquisition. The environmental impacts of the railroad operations over the Seven Separate Connections are assessed in this Draft EIS. For a detailed discussion of the Board's separate consideration of the physical construction of the Seven Separate Connections, and the specific environmental review process, see Board Decision No. 9 and Decision (in Sub Nos. 1-7) dated November 25, 1997, included in Appendix T.

ES.2.3 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Conrail Acquisition

According to CSX and NS, the purpose of the proposed Conrail Acquisition is to provide a more efficient rail transportation system in the eastern United States and to increase rail competition in the Northeast. CSX and NS state that there currently is a lack of competition in much of the commercial area now served by Conrail. They maintain that a well-managed rail network, configured in response to market forces, would increase competitive options for shippers, and yield substantial efficiencies and corresponding benefits to the shipping public.

Further, the Applicants claim that there is a benefit to the public when railroads spread their fixed costs over a broader traffic base, because the per-unit costs of shipping freight decline. Another public benefit cited by the Applicants is that the proposed Acquisition would result in a substantial reduction of costly and time-consuming rail traffic interchange that now slows operations as freight moves between the existing Conrail, CSX, and NS systems. The Applicants further state that the proposed Conrail Acquisition would also have environmental benefits, such as system-wide reductions in fuel consumption and air pollutant emissions.

ES.3 Role of the Board and SEA

The Board is an independent Federal regulatory agency with jurisdiction over certain surface transportation matters. In its review of proposed railroad mergers and acquisitions, the Board takes into account economic, competitive, and environmental considerations. The Board can either (1) approve a transaction as proposed, without conditions; (2) approve the transaction with conditions to offset or reduce the potential impacts including environmental impacts of the proposed transaction; or (3) disapprove the transaction (the no-action alternative).

The Board's authority to impose conditions is not limitless. Any conditions imposed, including environmental mitigation, must be directly related to the transaction before the Board for approval, must be reasonable, and must be supported by the record before the Board. The Board does not have authority to require mitigation of pre-existing environmental impacts, such as impacts resulting from existing railroad operations or land development in the vicinity of the railroads.

SEA is responsible for conducting the NEPA environmental review. SEA engages independent, third-party contractors to assist with its environmental analysis and with the preparation of its environmental documents.

ES.3.1 Review of the Merits of the Proposed Transaction

The Board is required by statute to approve and authorize a proposed rail acquisition when it finds that the transaction is consistent with the public interest, based on the economic and competitive merits. The Board has established a process for receiving comments and alternative proposals related to the economic and competitive merits of the proposed Conrail Acquisition. This process is separate from the environmental review process, which provides specific opportunities for the public to comment on the proposed Acquisition's potential environmental effects. However, the Board will consider both the economic and competitive issues, and the potential environmental effects in making its decision on the proposed Conrail Acquisition.

ES.3.2 Schedule

Following the 45-day public review and comment period, SEA will consider all the public comments submitted in response to this Draft EIS. SEA will then prepare the Final EIS, which will contain SEA's final recommendations to the Board regarding environmental conditions. SEA plans to publish the Final EIS prior to the Board's voting conference, which is scheduled for June 8, 1998. At the voting conference, the Board will announce whether it will grant or deny the Application, or grant it with appropriate conditions, including environmental mitigation conditions. The Board expects to issue a written decision by July 23, 1998. The Board's procedural schedule for the proposed Conrail Acquisition and the time frame for SEA's environmental review schedule are detailed in Table ES-1.

**Table ES-1
Board's Procedural Schedule**

DAY	ACTION	DATE
	Applicants filed Preliminary Environmental Report with SEA	May 16, 1997
Day 1	Applicants filed Application and Environmental Report	June 23, 1997
	Board issued Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Scoping Notice	July 7, 1997
	Public and government agencies filed comments on the Draft Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement	August 6, 1997
Day 60	Other applicants filed descriptions of Inconsistent and Responsive Applications	August 22, 1997
	Applicants filed Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessments for the Seven Separate Connections referenced in Decision No. 9	September 5, 1997
	SEA issued Final Scope of the Environmental Impact Statement	October 1, 1997
Day 100	Other applicants filed Responsive Environmental Reports and Verified Environmental Statements for any Inconsistent and Responsive Applications	October 1, 1997
	SEA issued Environmental Assessments for the Seven Separate Connections	October 7, 1997
Day 120	Other applicants filed Inconsistent and Responsive Applications	October 21, 1997
	SEA received comments on the Environmental Assessments for the Seven Separate Connections	October 27, 1997
	Board issued Decision requiring Applicants to file Safety Integration Plans	November 3, 1997
Day 150	Board issued Notice of Acceptance of the Inconsistent and Responsive Applications	November 20, 1997
	Board issued Decision allowing Seven Separate Connections to proceed	November 25, 1997
	Applicants filed Safety Integration Plans	December 3, 1997
	SEA to issue Draft Environmental Impact Statement to the public	December 12, 1997
Day 175	Responses to the Inconsistent and Responsive Applications and rebuttals in support of Primary Application filed with the Board	December 15, 1997

Table ES-1
Board's Procedural Schedule

DAY	ACTION	DATE
	EPA publishes <i>Federal Register</i> notice initiating 45-day comment period on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement	December 19, 1997
Day 205	Board to consider rebuttals supporting Inconsistent and Responsive Applications	January 21, 1998
	Public comments on Draft Environmental Impact Statement due to SEA	February 2, 1998
Day 245	All parties to submit briefs	March 2, 1998
	SEA to issue Final Environmental Impact Statement to the public and the Board	Late-May 1998
Day 346	Board to conduct oral argument	June 4, 1998
Day 350	Board to conduct Voting Conference	June 8, 1998
Day 395	Board to issue final written decision	July 23, 1998
	Administrative Appeals Filing Deadline	August 13, 1998

ES.4 Environmental Review Process

The Board's decision to grant or deny the proposed Conrail Acquisition is a Federal action requiring review under NEPA. Because of the magnitude of the proposed Acquisition and the potential for significant environmental impact, the Board has elected to prepare an EIS. In conducting this environmental review, the Board considers the requirements of NEPA, other related environmental laws and their implementing regulations, and the Board's own environmental rules. NEPA requires completion of this environmental review process before the Board can issue a final decision on this project.

In preparing this Draft EIS, SEA has considered any proposed changes in railroad activities that would meet or exceed the thresholds for environmental analysis set forth in the Board's regulations at 49 CFR 1105.7. For issue areas for which the Board's regulations do not specifically provide a threshold, SEA developed thresholds that it considers appropriate to the Acquisition-related activity. Generally, where, as a result of the proposed Acquisition, an affected area would experience an increase in rail traffic of at least 100 percent measured in annual gross ton miles, or an increase of at least eight trains per day (regardless of tonnage), SEA evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with the increase in rail traffic.

The various thresholds used by SEA are listed at the conclusion of this Executive Summary in Table ES-A. The activities that warrant environmental analysis, based on these thresholds, are described below.

ES.4.1 Railroad Activities Evaluated

This Draft EIS contains SEA's analysis of the potential system-wide, regional, and local environmental impacts of five types of activities associated with the proposed Conrail Acquisition. These are described below.

Rail Line Segments. Rail line segments are the portions of rail lines that run between two terminals or junction points. CSX and NS each proposes to modify its operations over the expanded rail networks and to route traffic to meet customers' freight shipping needs. These modifications would result in rail traffic increases on some rail line segments and decreases on others. The anticipated changes in level of rail traffic on 119 rail line segments in the States of Alabama, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and Washington, D.C., would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. To evaluate the potential impacts on passenger rail safety resulting from the proposed Acquisition, SEA also analyzed all passenger rail lines that accommodate freight traffic that would experience a traffic increase of one or more freight trains per day. In addition, SEA evaluated potential safety impacts for all rail line segments with any increase in the transport of hazardous materials. Attachment ES-B of this Executive Summary shows a complete listing of all rail line segments, including those rail line segments that met the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis or additional thresholds SEA developed for this Draft EIS.

Constructions. SEA reviewed the proposed construction of 15 new rail line connections³ (four by CSX and 11 by NS) in the States of Illinois (5), Indiana (2), Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York (2), and Ohio (3) and 3 other facilities (one fueling facility at a rail yard in Ohio, one intermodal facility in Ohio, and a bridge rehabilitation in Delaware). New connections between existing rail lines would provide shorter, more direct routing between various origin and destination points over the expanded CSX and NS systems. One of the proposed CSX connections and five of the proposed NS connections would require the acquisition of additional right-of-way. SEA evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the construction of the 15 proposed new connections (not including the Seven Separate Connections) and considered site-specific alternatives to these proposed connections. SEA evaluated the potential environmental impacts of rail operations on all 22 proposed new rail line connections in this Draft EIS.

Intermodal Facilities. Intermodal facilities are areas where truck trailers and/or containers are transferred between trains and trucks or ships. Intermodal operations combine the local delivery capability of trucks with the long-haul efficiency of rail transport and ocean carriers. Local truck traffic would increase near the intermodal facility, while long-haul truck traffic would decrease on interstate and regional roadways. Proposed changes in activity at 23 intermodal facilities in the States of Georgia (2), Illinois (3), Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri (2), New Jersey (4), Ohio (2), Pennsylvania (5), and Tennessee meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. SEA assessed the environmental effects of increased operations at these intermodal facilities.

Rail Yards. The primary activity at rail yards is the switching and sorting of rail cars as trains are assembled and disassembled. Other activities include locomotive maintenance and fueling, and freight car inspection, cleaning, and repair. Rail yards vary in size from small support yards with just a few tracks to very large classification yards with dozens of tracks. SEA analyzed the proposed changes at rail yards that would result from the proposed Acquisition and determined that 15 rail yards in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana (2), Michigan, Missouri, New York, Ohio (4), Pennsylvania (2), and Tennessee would have activity increases that meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. This Draft EIS evaluates the potential environmental impacts of increased activities at these rail yards.

Abandonments. CSX and NS proposed to abandon one bridge in Ohio and three rail line segments (with a combined total of 58.2 route miles) in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio because operating and maintaining this bridge and these rail line segments would no longer be efficient. SEA evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with the abandonment of these assets.

ES.4.2 Conducting the Environmental Analysis

SEA's analysis of the potential environmental effects of the proposed Conrail Acquisition included seven primary components: data review and verification; analysis of potential environmental effects;

³ This does not include the Seven Separate Connections in the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

review of the No-Action Alternative; determination of significance; consideration of Inconsistent and Responsive Applications; evaluation of areas of special concern; and development of mitigation. Each of these components is described below.

Data Review and Verification. In preparing this document, SEA reviewed and verified information provided by the Applicants to identify changes from pre-Acquisition operations. SEA consulted with appropriate government agencies, including the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). In addition, SEA reviewed and verified the information provided by the Applicants and conducted independent environmental analyses, including over 170 site visits and field investigations. SEA also considered all the public comments received as of November 1, 1997.⁴

Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects. SEA analyzed those proposed railroad activities that would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis to determine the potential environmental effects. SEA considered those environmental issue areas that would have broad system-wide or regional implications (safety, transportation systems, energy, air quality, and cumulative effects) and issue areas that could have county, local, or site-specific effects (safety, traffic and transportation, energy, air quality, noise, cultural and historical resources, hazardous waste sites, natural resources, land use and socioeconomics directly related to physical changes in the environment, and environmental justice).

Consideration of the No-Action Alternative. SEA evaluated the No-Action alternative as the "base case" or "pre-Acquisition" scenario against which the proposed Acquisition-related changes are to be measured. The railroads' existing systems and operations would remain essentially unchanged, except for changes resulting from normal railroad business and market activity. None of the anticipated beneficial or adverse environmental impacts of the proposed Acquisition would occur.

Determination of Significance. For this Draft EIS, SEA developed criteria for determining the significance of impacts for each environmental issue area, based on applicable regulations, standards, and SEA's best professional judgment. SEA considered mitigation measures to address those potential environmental effects that would exceed these criteria.

Consideration of Inconsistent and Responsive Applications. SEA reviewed the potential environmental impacts resulting from actions proposed in the 15 Inconsistent and Responsive (IR) Applications that have been submitted to the Board. IR Applications are proposals by other parties requesting modifications or alternatives to the proposed Conrail Acquisition, such as requests for trackage rights.

IR Applicants were required to submit either a Verified Statement indicating that their proposal would not have significant environmental impacts, or a Responsive Environmental Report (RER) addressing environmental issues if their IR Applications included activities that would meet or

⁴ SEA will consider comments received after November 1, 1997 in preparing the Final EIS.

exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. SEA reviewed the Verified Statements and RERs and has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts that would result from the actions proposed in the IR Applications.

Evaluation of Areas of Special Concern. SEA conducted additional analyses and site visits to examine potential environmental impacts and public concerns in certain communities because of their unique circumstances. These communities include the following:

- Chicago, Illinois.
- West Cleveland Suburbs, Ohio.
- Cleveland, Ohio.
- Erie, Pennsylvania.
- Gary, East Chicago, Hammond, and Whiting, Indiana.
- Muncie, Indiana.
- Lafayette, Indiana.
- Newark, Delaware

Analysis of the Areas of Special Concern come at the end of the appropriate state sections in Chapter 5, "State Setting, Impacts, and Proposed Mitigation."

Development of Preliminary Mitigation Recommendations. Where potentially significant adverse environmental impacts were identified, SEA developed mitigation measures to offset or reduce those impacts. SEA also recommended mitigation to address environmental concerns in communities with unique circumstances where warranted. Preliminary system-wide, regional and site-specific mitigation measures are summarized in Section ES.6.2 of this Executive Summary.

ES.5 Public and Agency Outreach

As part of the environmental review process, SEA has conducted extensive public outreach activities to inform the public about the proposed Conrail Acquisition and to facilitate public participation. SEA consulted with Federal, state, and local agencies, and affected communities to gather and disseminate information about the proposal. In addition, in preparing the Draft EIS, SEA conducted consultations with government agencies. Details of these public and agency outreach and consultation efforts are included in Chapter 6.

ES.5.1 Public Scoping Process

SEA consulted with Federal, state and local agencies, and the public on the scope of its environmental analysis in this case. SEA distributed the draft scope to approximately 1,900 Federal, state, and local elected and agency officials and published a scoping notice and request for comments in the *Federal Register*. SEA also distributed a press release to almost 200 newspapers in the 24 affected states, and placed legal notices in 800 newspapers with the highest circulation for each of the potential affected counties.

SEA received more than 170 comments concerning the draft scope and considered all comments in developing the final scope of the EIS. This draft EIS reflects the final scope as published in the *Federal Register* on October 1, 1997 (*Federal Register*, Vol. 62, No. 190, p. 51,500).

ES.5.2 Agency Consultation and Public Information

In addition to the scoping activities, SEA consulted with several Federal agencies, including EPA and FRA, on applicable regulations, analysis methodologies, and mitigation approaches. SEA also consulted with dozens of local, regional, and state agencies, including local planning departments, Amtrak, commuter agencies, and departments of transportation. Appendix M lists the agency consultation contacts during preparation of this Draft EIS.

SEA also prepared and distributed a Fact Sheet (in English and Spanish) describing the proposed transaction to approximately 7,000 elected officials, agencies, and organizations for cities and counties potential affected by the proposed Acquisition. To further assist input from the public, SEA provided a toll-free environmental hotline ((888) 869-1997), established an Internet website (www.conrailmerger.com), and initiated media monitoring services that involved a weekly review of newspaper articles. SEA also conducted more than 170 site visits to assess local conditions and potential environmental impacts. Finally, SEA established a comprehensive database to record and maintain all comments received in writing, via telephone, or through the website. As of November 1, 1997, SEA has received from approximately 800 interested party comments that contain more than 1,600 separate environmental issues related to the proposed Conrail Acquisition.

ES.5.3 Draft EIS Distribution

EPA has published a notice of availability of the Draft EIS in the *Federal Register* in accordance with NEPA. In addition to the *Federal Register* notice, SEA has concurrently mailed the Draft EIS to more than 2,300 Federal, state, county, and local officials and agencies, Amtrak, commuter service agencies, and other interested parties. Notices of the availability of the Draft EIS have been sent to approximately 7,000 other interested parties. SEA has also distributed a press release to newspapers in the affected counties and has updated the website information about the availability of the Draft EIS and how to submit comments to SEA.

ES.5.4 Additional Public Outreach

To ensure that minority and low income communities that may have potentially disproportionate high and adverse impacts have full opportunity to participate in the review of the proposed Conrail Acquisition, SEA is conducting expanded outreach in 16 communities listed below. The expanded outreach includes providing additional notification to affected communities and neighborhoods, translating information materials into appropriate languages, and providing additional availability of the Draft EIS. Copies of the detailed public outreach plans for the following communities can be found in Appendix K:

- Illinois: Blue Island, Chicago, Danville, and Tilton.
- Indiana: Gary, Fort Wayne, and Lafayette.
- Maryland: Baltimore, Bladensburg, and Hyattsville (and surrounding areas in Prince George's County).
- Ohio: Ashtabula, Cleveland, Youngstown, and Toledo.
- Pennsylvania: Harrisburg.
- Washington, D.C.

ES.6 SEA's Preliminary Conclusions and Recommended Mitigation Measures

ES.6.1 SEA's Approach to Mitigation

As noted above, the Board has broad authority to impose mitigating conditions. However, as a government agency, the Board's authority is not limitless. Any environmental mitigation conditions must be: (1) reasonable, (2) directly related to the action proposed for approval, and (3) supported by the information developed during the environmental analysis.

It is the Board's policy to require mitigation only for those potential impacts that would result from a proposed merger or acquisition (e.g., the effects of changes in rail traffic). The Board does not impose mitigation to remedy pre-existing environmental impacts unless the Applicant and the

affected community reach agreement on how to fund any option to mitigate these pre-existing environmental impacts.

SEA believes that many of the potential environmental impacts identified in this Draft EIS could most effectively be resolved through mutually-acceptable agreements achieved following negotiations among the Applicants, the locally affected community, and the appropriate government agencies. These negotiated solutions may go beyond what the Board might otherwise be able to impose. Accordingly, SEA encourages these parties to review the analysis and mitigation presented in this Draft EIS and seek negotiated solutions to environmental concerns. SEA requests that the parties advise SEA as soon as possible regarding any agreements reached so that the agreements can be reflected in the Final EIS.

The Final EIS will contain SEA's final recommended system-wide, regional, and site-specific environmental mitigation conditions. The Board will then consider SEA's recommendations in deciding whether to approve the proposed Acquisition and, if so, whether to impose SEA's recommended mitigation as a condition to its approval.

ES.6.2. Summary of Potential Environmental Impacts and Preliminary Mitigation Recommendations

SEA's analysis of the proposed Conrail Acquisition includes system-wide, regional, local, and site-specific environmental impacts. System-wide and regional impacts, including safety, traffic and transportation, energy, and air quality, are described in Chapter 4, "System-wide Setting, Impacts, and Proposed Mitigation." Local or site-specific impacts are described in Chapter 5, "State Setting, Impacts, and Proposed Mitigation" and are organized by state. The following summary describes potential system-wide, regional and site-specific environmental impacts that SEA believes are significant and SEA's preliminary recommended mitigation. This section is organized by environmental issue area. The summary discusses the following issue areas:

- Safety, including freight operations, passenger operations, highway/rail at-grade crossings, hazardous materials transportation, and safety integration planning.
- Traffic and Transportation, including passenger rail capacity, highway/rail at-grade crossing traffic delay, roadway systems impacts, and navigation.
- Energy.
- Air Quality.
- Noise.
- Cultural and Historic Resources.
- Hazardous Materials and Waste Sites.

- Natural Resources.
- Land Use and Socioeconomics, including Native American lands.
- Environmental Justice.
- Cumulative Effects.

Safety

Safety is a paramount concern. SEA has evaluated safety-related impacts that could reasonably be expected to result from the proposed Conrail Acquisition in four specific issue areas: (1) freight rail operations, (2) passenger rail operations, (3) highway/rail at-grade crossings, and (4) hazardous materials transportation. For each of these issue areas, SEA analyzed potential adverse environmental impacts and considered whether any measures are warranted to mitigate those impacts. The potential impacts on safe rail operations resulting from the consolidation and integration of three separate railroad companies into two expanded railroads and the joint operations of the Shared Assets Areas are also discussed below under Safety Integration Planning. SEA's system-wide evaluation of the Application encompassed more than 1,000 rail line segments and approximately 400 rail yards and intermodal facilities, collectively handling over 100,000 rail cars per day.

Freight Rail Operations. SEA evaluated potential changes in the risk of freight train accidents for 54 rail line segments that would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis of an increase in eight or more trains per day. Based on this evaluation, SEA identified rail line segments with significant effects as possible candidates for mitigation measures. These rail segments include those segments where, if the proposed Acquisition were approved and implemented, an accident is predicted to occur more frequently than once every 100 years per mile of track. SEA determined that seven segments in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania would qualify for mitigation consideration. SEA intends to recommend that the Board require CSX and NS to conduct internal rail flaw inspections on these rail segments using the FRA's proposed rule for ton-mile based track inspections (49 CFR Part 213.237, Docket No. RST-90-1). The proposed rule would require railroads to complete internal rail flaw inspections on a rail segment at least once every 40 million gross ton-miles of rail traffic, or annually, if more frequent. FRA states that this interval is the maximum safe rail traffic volume interval between rail flaw inspections that would identify rail flaw defects before they deteriorate and contribute to a rail accident.

SEA also intends to recommend that CSX and NS be required to provide annual training programs on inspection requirements for the mechanical inspectors at the yards that dispatch trains over these seven rail line segments and for the track inspection force responsible for inspecting these rail lines.

On a system-wide basis, approximately 60 percent of the Applicants' rail line segments would have the same number of trains or fewer trains after the proposed Conrail Acquisition compared with current train traffic. The volume of cars switched in rail yards would decrease at over half of the yards. Overall, on a system-wide basis, the proposed Acquisition would result in a small increase

in the total operating train-miles and a small decrease in the number of rail cars handled at rail yards. This change would result in no measurable increase in the risk of freight accidents for the system. Based on available information and its independent analysis, SEA believes that the proposed Conrail Acquisition would not result in significant adverse system-wide safety effects from freight rail operations.

Passenger Rail Operations. SEA considered the impacts of Acquisition-related changes in freight train traffic on passenger rail line segments. SEA's analysis showed that freight traffic would increase on 108 rail line segments, comprising 4,359 miles, and remain the same or decrease on 89 rail segments, comprising 3,545 miles. SEA's analysis of rail line segments with an increase of one or more freight trains per day shows that nine rail segments (five CSX segments and four NS segments) would experience a significant increase in accident risk resulting from the proposed Acquisition. SEA determined that mitigation measures would be appropriate to reduce potential safety impacts on those rail segments expected to have a 25 percent increase in accident rate and a predicted likelihood of a passenger train/freight train accident more frequently than once every 150 years for the whole line segment.

SEA intends to recommend that the Board require CSX to establish passenger trains as "superior" trains on the five identified CSX rail segments in Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia, and Washington, D.C. That would mean that all trains moving in the same and opposite directions on the same track would be clear of the track at least 15 minutes before and 15 minutes after the expected arrival of a passenger train at any point. This requirement would not apply when a train is moving in the opposite direction away from a passenger train. SEA intends to recommend that the same mitigation measure be imposed on four NS lines in Indiana, Michigan, and New York. Because the increased traffic on the NS rail corridor from Porter, Indiana to Chicago, Illinois would result from potential Canadian Pacific trackage or haulage rights, SEA recommends that this mitigation measure be imposed for this corridor only if these trackage or haulage rights are granted by Board order or by agreement between the two railroads.

Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings. SEA evaluated potential train-vehicle accident risk at all highway/rail at-grade crossings on the 54 rail line segments expected to meet or exceed the Board's environmental analysis threshold of eight or more trains per day. Accordingly, SEA evaluated more than 2,000 crossings. To identify possible candidates for site-specific mitigation measures, SEA established two levels of increases in accident frequency likely to result in a significant impact. First, SEA considered mitigation for those highway/rail at-grade crossings that would have a predicted increase in accident frequency of one additional accident every 20 years. Second, for highway/rail at-grade crossings that already have a high predicted accident frequency based on current vehicle traffic and railroad operations, SEA determined that a smaller increase in accident frequency would provide a more conservative measure of significance. For these crossings, SEA considered mitigation if the accident frequency increased by one additional accident every 100 years. SEA considered a highway/rail at-grade crossing to have high predicted accident frequency if the crossing was within the top 50 crossings in the state for accident frequency or would experience one accident every seven years. SEA identified 118 highway/rail at-grade crossings in Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia that

meet this level of significance. SEA intends to recommend that the Board impose a condition requiring the Applicants to upgrade the crossing warning devices at these 118 crossings as follows:

- Upgrade crossings with existing passive warning devices to flashing lights.
- Upgrade crossings with existing flashing lights to gates and flashing lights.
- Upgrade crossings with existing gates and flashing lights to four-quadrant gates or gates with median barriers.

By upgrading the warning devices one level of protection at each of these 118 highway/rail at-grade crossings, the post Acquisition accident risk would be at or below the pre-Acquisition risk.

SEA believes that safety at highway/rail at-grade crossings could be improved if a mechanism were in place to notify the railroads of stopped vehicles and other obstructions that could create safety risks for motorists and train operations. Improved notification to the railroads would help ensure a prompt repair response and reduce the likelihood of accidents. Accordingly, SEA intends to recommend that the Board require the Applicants to install, at all public highway/rail at-grade crossings with active warning devices, signs that indicate (1) a toll-free telephone number for the public to report highway/rail at-grade crossing problems and (2) a unique crossing identification number.

Hazardous Materials Transportation. SEA evaluated all rail line segments expected to have an increase in the transport of hazardous materials. It should be noted that on November 24, 1997, CSX advised SEA that the hazardous materials transportation data it had provided may have been overstated by as much as 20 percent. As a result, the affected rail line segments and recommended mitigation in the Draft EIS may be different in the Final EIS. Based on its evaluation to date, SEA identified 65 rail line segments that would become key routes as a result of the proposed Acquisition (i.e., would increase to more than 10,000 cars of hazardous materials per year). These 65 rail line segments are in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

SEA intends to recommend that, before CSX and NS increase hazardous materials transportation on these rail segments or in these corridors, they be required to comply with the Association of American Railroads (AAR) key route guidelines (AAR Circular No. OT-55-B) and any more stringent key route requirements established by the operating railroad. These AAR guidelines include visual rail defect inspections at least twice per week, employee training in hazardous materials handling and equipment inspection, defective wheel bearing detectors at least every 40 miles of track, and other preventative measures. These AAR guidelines also include recommended operating procedures for key trains, which carry a certain number of hazardous materials tank cars, including a maximum operating speed of 50 mph and full train inspections by the train crew whenever a train is stopped by an emergency application of the train air brake.

SEA also identified 52 rail line segments where hazardous materials traffic would at least double and be greater than 20,000 cars per year. SEA has identified these routes as “Major Key Routes.” These rail line segments are located in Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Based on the information available to date, SEA intends to recommend that CSX and NS be required to prepare Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans for each emergency response organization along these key routes and “Major Key Routes” and implement a real time or desktop simulation emergency response drill with voluntary participation of local emergency response teams at least once every two years for each “Major Key Route.” SEA intends to further recommend that CSX and NS be required to provide a toll-free telephone number to emergency response personnel for each community along these key route and “Major Key Route” rail line segments. The toll-free number would provide direct access to dispatch centers where local response personnel could quickly obtain information about the contents and appropriate response procedures in the event of a train accident or hazardous materials release.

On a system-wide basis, due to the more efficient routes that would be created, the proposed Conrail Acquisition would result in the transportation of approximately one percent fewer rail car-miles of hazardous materials, which in turn should result in a very small decrease in hazardous materials releases due to derailments. In addition, the proposed expansion of single-line rail service, allowing grouping of rail cars for longer trips with fewer required car switching movements, would result in a four percent system-wide decrease in freight-car handling in rail yards. This decrease also is expected to result in an immeasurably small reduction in hazardous materials releases. Thus, overall, the proposed Acquisition should result in a slight safety improvement for rail transportation of hazardous materials and no significant system-wide adverse impacts related to hazardous materials transport.

SEA also examined hazardous materials handling practices for the rail yards and intermodal facilities that meet or exceed the Board’s environmental thresholds. SEA determined that the Applicants currently have procedures for hazardous materials handling and spill response at these facilities. Nevertheless, SEA intends to recommend that the Board require CSX and NS to establish a formal Failure Mode and Effects Analysis for reducing risk of spills both for storage and transport of hazardous materials at all rail yards and intermodal facilities.

Safety Integration Planning. Concerns have been raised by FRA and others regarding safety integration planning for combining the three Applicants – Conrail, CSX, and NS – into two expanded companies and for jointly operating the Shared Assets Areas. Responding to these concerns, the Board directed the Applicants to submit Safety Integration Plans by December 3, 1997. The Applicants’ Safety Integration Plans are included in Volume 2. SEA invites comments from FRA and the public on the adequacy of the Safety Integration Plans. SEA will develop any additional safety mitigation measures after reviewing the plans and the public comments. The Final EIS will include any final mitigation in this area.

Traffic and Transportation

Passenger Rail Service. SEA has determined that all of the rail line segments used by Amtrak have sufficient capacity to accommodate projected increased numbers of freight trains while also meeting contractual commitments to Amtrak. Therefore, SEA does not believe there would be any significant Acquisition-related impact on intercity passenger rail service. SEA has also evaluated the capability of any rail line with current commuter rail service and a projected increase in freight traffic of one or more trains per day to accommodate an increase of freight service without a disruption to the commuter service. Based on a review of the projected train traffic, number of tracks, and train signal control systems, SEA has concluded that there would be no significant potential system-wide, regional, or local capacity impacts to commuter rail service. Each of the rail line segments with commuter trains can accommodate the proposed Acquisition-related increase in freight traffic.

Traffic Delay at Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings. On the 119 rail line segments that would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis, SEA evaluated traffic delay at all highway/rail at-grade crossings with an Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count of 5,000 or more vehicles. Based on the information available and an evaluation of more than 300 crossings, it is SEA's preliminary determination is that the proposed Conrail Acquisition would result in a significant adverse impact on traffic delay at 38 highway/rail at-grade crossings located in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

To determine significant impacts, SEA established criteria for assessing vehicle delay based on (1) the increase in average delay per stopped vehicle or (2) the increase in average delay on a daily basis for all vehicles. For average delay per stopped vehicle at highway/rail at-grade crossings, SEA considered the environmental impact significant if the post-Acquisition increase in delay would be 30 seconds or more. For daily average delay for all vehicles, SEA considered the impact significant if the post-Acquisition traffic level of service at a highway/rail at-grade crossing would be at Level of Service⁵ (LOS) "E" or "F" regardless of the pre-Acquisition LOS, or would decline from a pre-Acquisition LOS of "C" or better to a post-Acquisition LOS of "D."

SEA intends to recommend that the Board require the Applicants to implement one of four approaches to address traffic delay impacts at these locations, as follows:

1. Improvements to track and train signal systems to allow increased train speed at eight locations in the States of Indiana, Maryland, and Ohio. Where appropriate, SEA also intends to recommend additional grade crossing warning device improvements to ensure that the trains would be operated safely at the increased speeds.
2. Separated grade crossings (constructing overpasses or underpasses) at five crossings located in the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky.

⁵ Level of Service (LOS) is a standard measure of traffic delay measured on a scale of "A" to "F." The LOS is defined by the Transportation Research Board's *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Third Edition, Updated 1994*. The letter grades represent traffic flow ranging from "A" (free flowing) to "F" (severely congested) as measured by the average delay experienced by all vehicles at the highway/rail at-grade crossing.

3. Rerouting of train traffic to an alternate route in Erie, Pennsylvania, and Lafayette, Indiana, to address 15 highway/rail at-grade crossings with significant traffic delay impacts.
4. Consultation with local officials and the state departments of transportation to determine the most appropriate measure to address traffic delay impacts at ten locations in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania where increased train speed is not feasible and Acquisition-related impacts do not appear to justify a grade separation.

Where separated grade crossings appear to be warranted by the Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts and the community agrees that a separated grade crossing is appropriate, SEA is also considering recommending that the Board require the Applicants to participate in mediation and binding arbitration with local and state officials, and assume the costs for such mediation and arbitration, to determine the appropriate allocation of funding for planning, construction, and land acquisition. SEA invites comments on such a negotiation-mediation-binding arbitration funding process.

Roadway System. The proposed Conrail Acquisition is expected to benefit the national and regional highway systems by reducing truck traffic on major state, regional, and U.S. highways. According to the Applicants, the diversion of freight from trucks on these major roadways to freight trains on the expanded CSX and NS systems would result in part from new or expanded intermodal facilities, including the use of intermodal facilities closer to markets. The proposed Acquisition also is expected to provide many shippers with more efficient direct long-haul rail service.

SEA evaluated the Acquisition-related increase of truck traffic to the three proposed rail line abandonments, which could result in rail-to-truck diversions. SEA also evaluated potential truck traffic impacts near 23 intermodal facilities located in the States of Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee, where the Acquisition-related increase in local truck activity is expected to meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. SEA considered the capacity of the anticipated truck routes and the planned increase in truck traffic. Based on this evaluation, SEA's preliminary conclusion is that the local road ways can adequately handle the increased truck traffic.

Navigation. SEA evaluated 13 movable bridges on 11 rail line segments where Acquisition-related increases in railroad traffic would meet or exceed the Boards' thresholds for environmental analysis. These bridges are located in the States of Indiana, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Washington, DC. Because the U.S. Coast Guard has jurisdiction over these moveable bridges and because ships have right-of-way over trains under Coast Guard regulations, SEA determined that there would be no system-wide or site-specific adverse impacts on navigation, including service to coastal and inland ports.

Energy

SEA evaluated the potential impact of the proposed Acquisition on the consumption of energy resources, primarily diesel fuel. SEA analyzed the Acquisition-related truck-to-rail diversions and

related increased train traffic and determined that the proposed Conrail Acquisition would result in a net annual reduction in fuel consumption of approximately 80 million gallons of diesel fuel.

SEA also considered the effect of the proposed Conrail Acquisition on the Transportation of energy resources and recyclable commodities. SEA does not anticipate substantial changes in the quantities of energy resources or recyclable commodities transported.

SEA also evaluated projected increases in vehicle delay at highway/rail at-grade crossings for adverse energy impacts. SEA determined that overall there would be no significant system-wide changes regarding energy use due to vehicle traffic delays at highway/rail at-grade crossings.

Air Quality

SEA evaluated air pollutant emissions on a county-wide basis for all rail line segments exceeding the Boards' thresholds for air quality analysis. For counties where pollutant emissions increases were projected to exceed the emissions thresholds SEA used, SEA conducted a "netting" analysis, totaling both emission increases and decreases in detail. All rail-related activities were evaluated and emissions decreases due to truck-to-rail diversions were taken into account. In counties where there were potentially significant net increases in emissions, SEA examined regional air quality issues and EPA-authorized nitrogen oxides (NO_x) emission waivers. Based on its analysis, SEA determined there would be no significant impact on air quality resulting from the proposed Conrail Acquisition. SEA intends to recommend, however, that the Board require CSX and NS to implement fugitive dust control measures at the 18 construction sites and the four abandonment salvage activity sites evaluated in this Draft EIS.

While the proposed Conrail Acquisition would reduce emissions for most air pollutants, SEA estimated that sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions would increase by about 520 tons per year. SEA considers this increase insignificant compared to the millions of tons of SO₂ emitted by stationary sources in the states affected by the proposed Conrail Acquisition.

Noise

SEA evaluated 71 rail line segments that would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for noise analysis. SEA examined impacts from train noise along rail line segments. Train horn noise is a deliberate action to enhance safety along the rail lines and is governed by FRA regulations. Safety is an overriding concern and train horn noise cannot be reduced or eliminated without jeopardizing safety at highway/rail at-grade crossings. FRA will be developing new regulations establishing a process for communities and railroads to receive FRA approval for alternatives to train horns, such as four-quadrant gates or paired one-way streets at highway/rail at-grade crossings. Until such regulations are in place, SEA does not believe it would be appropriate to recommend mitigation measures to reduce horn noise because of safety implications.

Mitigation measures may be appropriate, however, to alleviate Acquisition-related train noise engine and wheel noise impacts. SEA identified a total of seven rail line segments in Ohio and Michigan where the post-Acquisition engine and wheel noise levels would be above 70 decibels

(dBA) or higher and would increase five dBA or more above pre-Acquisition levels. SEA recommends that the Board require CSX and NS to consult with local communities along these seven rail line segments to identify appropriate measures (e.g., noise barriers, building sound insulation, and track lubrication) to reduce train engine and wheel noise impacts. SEA encourages the parties to reach agreement on the measures and the appropriate allocation of funding, and report back to SEA prior to SEA issuing the Final EIS. SEA invites the public to provide comments on what appropriate mitigation could be required in the event that the Applicants and communities cannot reach agreement.

Cultural and Historic Resources

SEA identified significant historic resources at two sites: Collinwood Intermodal Facility in Cleveland, Ohio, and the Toledo Pivot Bridge in Toledo, Ohio. SEA recommends that the Board require CSX to complete cultural and historic documentation (Historic American Building Survey (HABS)/Historic American Engineering Record(HAER) Level II) at the proposed Collinwood Intermodal Facility within 180 days of any Board decision approving the proposed Conrail Acquisition. SEA recommends that the Board require NS to complete cultural and historic resource documentation (HABS/HAER Level II) for the Toledo Pivot Bridge before initiating and construction or removal activities at that site.

SEA further recommends that the Board require CSX to maintain its interest in and take no steps to alter the 75th Street Interlocking Tower in Chicago, Illinois, until the completion of the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f) at that site. For the Shell Pot Bridge near Wilmington, Delaware, and the new rail line connection in Exermont, Illinois, the Board is still undertaking the historic preservation consultation process required by the Section 106 process. Therefore, SEA recommends that the Board prohibit NS or CSX from initiating any construction or modification at these sites until the Section 106 consultation process is complete.

Hazardous Materials and Waste Sites

SEA identified the existing hazardous waste sites within 500 feet of the Acquisition-related rail line construction activities or abandonment proposals in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio. The Applicants would have to comply with Federal and state statutes requiring investigation and remediation of these sites prior to or during construction. SEA does not intend to recommend any additional mitigation measures.

Natural Resources

SEA reviewed the potential impacts on water resources, wetlands, habitats, and threatened or endangered species for the Acquisition-related construction and abandonment projects. SEA has identified the potential presence of threatened or endangered species near the proposed new rail line construction in Vermilion, Ohio. SEA has identified no other potentially significant natural resource impacts. SEA recommends that the Board require NS, in consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, to conduct a survey to determine the potential presence of the endangered Indiana Bat.

Construction activities are also governed by other Federal and state statutes, such as Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act (permitting for construction in wetlands). These laws, which require the Applicants to acquire applicable permits, should assure the protection of natural resources in the vicinity of their proposed construction and abandonment projects. The Applicants also have established Best Management Practices for construction and abandonment activities. SEA has reviewed these practices and recommends that the Board require the Applicants to abide by them during any Acquisition-related construction or salvage activities. SEA believes the permitting requirements and this mitigation would effectively mitigate and potential significant adverse impacts on natural resources.

Land Use/Socioeconomics

SEA has evaluated potential impacts on existing land use plans, prime farmlands, Native American lands, Coastal Zone Management plans, and on socioeconomics resulting from physical changes to the environment from planned Acquisition-related construction and abandonment activities. SEA also examined the suitability of rights-of-way proposed for abandonment for alternative public use. Based on the available information, SEA has determined that there are no significant impacts on land use, socioeconomics, or Native American lands.

Environmental Justice

Although the President's directive on Environmental Justice in Executive Order 12898 of 1994 technically does not apply to independent agencies like the Board, SEA has evaluated the potential significant environmental impacts to determine if they could result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low income communities. SEA reviewed demographic information in the vicinity of all Acquisition-related activities that would meet or exceed the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis. SEA has concluded that there are 15 Acquisition-related activities that may result in a disproportionately high and adverse impact on minority or low income communities. There areas include the following:

- Blue Island, Chicago, Danville, and Tilton, Illinois.
- Gary, Fort Wayne, and Lafayette, Indiana.
- Baltimore, Bladensburg, and Hyattsville, Maryland.
- Ashtabula, Cleveland, Toledo, and Youngstown, Ohio.
- Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- Washington, D.C.

Accordingly, SEA has initiated additional comprehensive public information and outreach efforts to inform the communities adjacent to these activities of this Draft EIS and the opportunities for public review and comment. These efforts have included translation of information materials into Spanish and other languages and community notification through fliers, community newspapers, community centers, and radio announcements. Many of SEA's recommended mitigation measures would address potential significant environmental impacts in those low income and minority communities. SEA also recommends that the Applicants consult with affected minority and low income communities as soon as possible after SEA issues this Draft EIS to identify and reach agreement on implementation and funding allocation for additional mitigation measures to further offset the potential environmental justice impacts.

Cumulative Effects

SEA has reviewed past, present, and planned projects and activities that could, when considered with potential impacts on the proposed Conrail Acquisition, result in significant system-wide or regional cumulative effects on air quality, safety, and transportation systems. Based on a review of past, present, and planned projects and activities and the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Conrail Acquisition, SEA's preliminary conclusion is that there are no significant cumulative effects in any of these issue areas.

Additional Mitigation

In addition to the recommended mitigation described above, SEA developed preliminary recommended general mitigation measures to address potential impacts at proposed locations for rail line construction and proposed abandonments. SEA also developed preliminary recommended mitigation measures to address issues in specific communities with unique circumstances. These additional mitigation measures, along with SEA's preliminary recommended system-wide, regional, and site-specific mitigation, are described in Chapter 7 of this Draft EIS.

ES.7 Comments on the Draft EIS

The public and any interested parties are encouraged to make comments on this Draft EIS. SEA will consider all comments in preparing the Final EIS, which will include SEA's final conclusion on potential significant impacts and SEA's final recommendation. All comments must be submitted within the 45-day comment period, which will close February 2, 1998. SEA specifically invites comments on the Safety Integration Plans, which are included in Volume 2 of this Draft EIS. When submitting comments on the Draft EIS, the recommended mitigation, and/or Safety Integration Plans, please be as specific as possible and substantiate your concerns and recommendations. To file your comments, please send one original and ten copies to:

Office of the Secretary
Case Control Unit
STB Finance Docket No. 33388
Surface Transportation Board
1925 K Street, NW

Executive Summary

Washington, D.C. 20423-0001

Please write the following in the lower left hand corner of the envelope:

Attention: Elaine K. Kaiser
Environmental Project Director
Environmental Filing

ATTACHMENTS

ES-A SEA's Thresholds for Environmental Analysis

ES-B Master Table of All Rail Line Segments

ES-C Q and A Fact Sheet

CHAPTER 7

SEA's Preliminary Recommended Environmental Mitigation

This chapter is divided into two sections. Section 7.1 provides background information to assist the public in responding to the mitigation measures recommended by SEA at this time. Section 7.2 lists the specific preliminary mitigation measures that SEA is currently recommending based on its independent environmental analysis, review of information available to date, and consideration of public comments received. These preliminary mitigation measures are grouped into six categories to facilitate public review. The six categories are:

1. System-Wide Mitigation.
2. Regional Mitigation.
3. Local or Site-Specific Mitigation.
4. Mitigation for Specific Communities with Unique Circumstances.⁶
5. General Mitigation for Proposed Constructions and Abandonments.
6. Site-Specific Mitigation for Proposed Constructions and Abandonments.

7.1 OVERVIEW OF SEA'S APPROACH TO MITIGATION

7.1.1 Background

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process for the proposed Conrail Acquisition will allow the Board to take the "hard look" at environmental consequences required for this complex and geographically far-reaching project. This environmental review process will assist the Board in making a decision to: (1) approve, (2) disapprove, or (3) approve the proposed Acquisition with conditions. The Board will make its decision only after it has considered all the public comments, the Draft EIS, and the Final EIS which will include SEA's final environmental recommendations.

⁶ This category includes communities that did not trigger any SEA environmental thresholds for significant environmental impacts, but nevertheless, appear to warrant mitigation because of their unique circumstances.

This Draft EIS describes the proposed 44,000 mile Conrail Acquisition, explains how SEA identified and analyzed potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, discusses the actual environmental impacts identified by SEA thus far, and presents possible ways to mitigate project-related environmental impacts. More specifically, Chapters 1 through 3 describe the proposed project, SEA's methodology for analyzing environmental impacts, and the types of mitigation measures that SEA considered. Chapters 4 and 5 discuss the potential system-wide, regional, and site-specific environmental impacts identified to date. Chapter 6 describes SEA's extensive public outreach and agency consultation process. The Appendices contain more detailed technical information and background materials.

The preliminary mitigation measures that SEA recommends in this Chapter are based on the results of SEA's extensive analysis as described in Chapters 1 through 6. In developing the proposed mitigation measures, SEA considered the proposed Acquisition on system-wide, regional, and local levels. The summary preliminary recommended mitigation table is presented in the text in the next section, while other tables appear at the end of this chapter.

On a system-wide basis, SEA's environmental analysis identified no significant system-wide environmental impacts as a result of the proposed Conrail Acquisition, assuming that the CSX, NS and Conrail systems can be safely integrated, as discussed below. Indeed, there would be some positive impacts on a system-wide basis such as reduced fuel use, reduced system-wide air emissions, reduced highway congestion, and a more efficient rail transportation system. Nevertheless, SEA has recommended a broad based system-wide mitigation measure to further enhance safety.

On the regional and local levels, SEA identified significant impacts that could result from the proposed Acquisition and could warrant mitigation. As a result, most of the recommended mitigation in this Draft EIS applies to regional and local environmental impacts.

7.1.2 Project Activities and Impacts

As previously explained, the proposed transaction covers over 44,000 miles of rail lines and related railroad facilities, covering the eastern part of the United States. As a result, the scope of this project is substantial. In reviewing this Draft EIS, it is important to understand the types of railroad activities associated with the project that could result in environmental impacts and, therefore, were analyzed by SEA in this document. These activities are changes in train traffic on rail lines, changes in activity at rail yards and intermodal facilities, and rail line abandonment and construction projects⁷, all of which would result from the proposed Acquisition. Potential environmental impacts

⁷ Potential environmental impacts of the physical construction of the Seven Separate Connections at issue in STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub Nos. 1-7) were covered in separate Environmental Assessments that were prepared by SEA prior to and separate from this Draft EIS. By a decision issued November 25, 1997, the Board approved, subject to certain environmental conditions, the physical construction of the seven connections totaling approximately four miles in the States of Indiana and Ohio. Proposed mitigation for the operational impacts associated with these projects is covered in Recommended Mitigation

associated with these types of activities can include safety, transportation including passenger service, air quality, noise, natural resources, land use including Native American concerns, historic and cultural resources, socioeconomic effects directly related to physical changes in the environment, and environmental justice.

SEA used the Board's thresholds for environmental analysis to determine which Acquisition-related activities to analyze for environmental impacts. These thresholds have proven during prior railroad merger and acquisition environmental reviews to be a conservative and practical means to focus on those activities and areas with potential for significant environmental impacts.

Surface Transportation Board's Thresholds for Environmental Analysis

Activity/Site	Air Quality Attainment Areas ^a	Air Quality Nonattainment Areas ^a	Noise
Rail Line Segments	Increase of 8 trains per day or 100% increase in annual gross ton miles.	Increase of 3 trains per day or 50% increase in annual gross ton miles.	Increase of 8 trains per day or 100% increase in annual gross ton miles.
Rail Yards	Increase of 100% in carload activity per day.	Increase of 20% in carload activity per day.	Increase of 100% in carload activity per day.
Intermodal Facilities	Increase of 50 trucks per day or 10% increase in average daily traffic volume on any affected road segment.	Increase of 50 trucks per day or 10% increase in average daily traffic volume on any affected road segment.	Increase of 50 trucks per day or 10% increase in average daily traffic volume on any affected road segment.

^a Attainment areas and non-attainment areas as defined by the Clean Air Act.

7.1.3 Scope of the Board's Conditioning Power

In assessing SEA's recommended mitigation, it is important to understand that the Board does not have unlimited authority to impose conditions. As a government agency, the Board can only impose conditions that are consistent with its statutory authority. Accordingly, any conditions the Board imposes must be directly related to the transaction it is licensing, must be reasonable, and must be supported by the record before the Board. Thus, the Board's practice consistently has been to mitigate only those impacts that result directly from the proposed action. The Board does not have authority to require mitigation of preexisting conditions, such as existing railroad operations or land development in the vicinity of the railroads.

As an alternative to the mitigation that the Board would unilaterally impose on CSX and NS, SEA strongly encourages the railroads and affected parties to negotiate mutually-acceptable agreements.

Nos. 47-49. Therefore, this Draft EIS only addresses proposed operations over these connections. For more details see Decision No. 9 and Decision (in Sub Nos. 1-7) dated November 25, 1997, included in Appendix T.

The Board could then impose compliance with the terms of any mutually-acceptable binding agreement as an environmental condition in any decision approving the proposed Acquisition.

7.1.4 Safety

Safety is of paramount importance to the Board. Accordingly, much of the recommended mitigation in this Draft EIS addresses the safety impacts associated with the proposed railroad operations. Additionally, in response to a request by the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), on November 3, 1997 the Board directed CSX, NS, and Conrail to submit detailed "Safety Integration Plans" explaining how they propose to ensure the safe integration of their separate systems. Because these plans were not due until December 3, 1997, the Draft EIS does not contain an analysis of these plans. To facilitate public review of this important issue, the complete Safety Integration Plans are included in Volume 2 of this Draft EIS. We encourage FRA and the public to review these plans carefully and comment on their sufficiency. Like all comments on the Draft EIS, any comments on the Safety Integration Plans must be submitted to SEA no later than the end of the 45-day comment period. SEA will fully consider these comments in preparing the Final EIS, which will contain SEA's final safety recommendations.

With respect to safety of hazardous materials transportation, CSX formally advised SEA by a letter dated November 24, 1997, that the data they previously provided regarding hazardous materials transportation may have overstated the amount of this traffic by 20 percent or more. (See Appendix B.) CSX plans to provide SEA with corrected data during the comment period for this Draft EIS. SEA will verify this data and conduct further analysis, as appropriate. Therefore, the mitigation recommendations here that address hazardous materials transportation may be modified in the Final EIS.

7.1.5 Traffic Delay at Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings

One of SEA's major concerns in this Draft EIS is the potential delay of vehicular traffic at highway/rail at-grade crossings. This delay relates to general type vehicles such as autos, trucks and buses as well as emergency response vehicles. SEA established criteria for assessing potentially significant impacts on traffic delay at highway/rail at-grade crossings based on (1) the increase in average delay per stopped vehicle or (2) the increase in average delay on a daily basis for all vehicles. For average delay per stopped vehicle at highway/rail at-grade crossings, SEA considered the environmental impact significant if the post-Acquisition increase in delay would be 30 seconds or more. For daily average delay for all vehicles, SEA considered the impact significant if the post-Acquisition traffic level of service at a highway/rail at-grade crossing would be at Level of Service⁸ (LOS) "E" or "F" regardless of the pre-Acquisition LOS, or would decline from a pre-Acquisition LOS of "C" or better to a post-Acquisition LOS of "D." SEA has preliminarily identified 38

⁸ Level of Service (LOS) is a standard measure of traffic delay measured on a scale of "A" to "F." The LOS is defined by the Transportation Research Board's Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Third Edition, Updated 1994. The letter grades represent traffic flow ranging from "A" (free flowing) to "F" (severely congested) as measured by the average delay experienced by all vehicles at the highway/rail at-grade crossing.

crossings in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania that would meet or exceed this level of significance. (See Table 7-7, "Preliminary Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Traffic Delay Mitigation.")

SEA has considered four mitigation strategies to address significant highway/rail at-grade crossing traffic delay impacts at these 38 highway/rail at-grade crossings: (1) increased train speeds consistent with safe operating practices, (2) possible diversion of train traffic to an alternate route, (3) separated grade crossings (constructing overpasses or underpasses), and (4) consultation to develop alternative mitigation.

(1) Increased Train Speed

Where local operating conditions allow for increased train speeds without compromising safety, increasing train speed generally reduces the time that a highway/rail at-grade crossing is blocked when a train passes. Where there is an ability to safely increase train speeds, this type of mitigation could offset any Acquisition-related increase in total traffic delay resulting from additional trains. Accordingly, for those crossings where potential traffic delay impacts would be significant, SEA first evaluated if increased train speed would be a feasible option for reducing or eliminating the traffic delay impacts. There are eight highway/rail at-grade crossings in the States of Indiana, Maryland, and Ohio where train track and signal conditions would permit safe operations at increased train speeds. (See Table 7-7.) At this time, SEA recommends that the Board impose on any decision approving the proposed Conrail Acquisition a condition requiring the acquiring railroad to implement the necessary physical and operating improvements to increase the operating train speeds in the vicinity of these eight highway/rail at-grade crossings. (See Recommended Mitigation No. 9.)

(2) Possible Diversion of Train Traffic to an Alternate Route

There are two locations where there are on-going relocation plans to divert train traffic to alternative routes. These communities are Erie, Pennsylvania and Lafayette, Indiana.

In Erie, Pennsylvania, SEA believes that existing plans developed by CSX and NS to reroute NS train traffic would effectively eliminate traffic delay impacts for five highway/rail at-grade crossings in downtown Erie that would otherwise be candidates for separated grade crossings. (See Table 7-7.) Specifically, SEA is reviewing the NS and CSX plan for NS to construct new tracks and reroute its operations to the CSX right-of-way through Erie, which has mostly separated grade crossings. (See Appendix S.) This rerouting would remove train traffic from the center of 19th Street in downtown Erie and eliminate highway/rail at-grade crossing traffic delay impacts at the five crossings. SEA's preliminary view is that this rerouting would be appropriate mitigation for the Acquisition-related traffic delay and safety impacts at these crossings as well as along the center of 19th Street. At this time, SEA requests that CSX and NS report to the Board by the close of the public comment period on this Draft EIS on the progress of plans to reroute this traffic and the schedule for implementing the plan.

In Lafayette, Indiana, SEA notes that CSX, NS, and the City of Lafayette are in the process of implementing a comprehensive program to relocate and consolidate rail lines through the City into a single rail corridor with separated grade crossings. This project, which has been planned for several years, would eliminate significant Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts at the ten highway/rail at-grade crossings in Tippecanoe County (Lafayette), Indiana. (See Table 7-7.) Therefore, at this time SEA requests that the State of Indiana, the City of Lafayette, and the Applicants jointly develop an "interim" plan to mitigate these Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts until the track relocation program can be fully implemented. SEA welcomes public comments from affected parties on possible "interim" measures to mitigate these traffic delay impacts.

(3) Separated Grade Crossings

Separated grade crossings generally improve safety and traffic flow at highway/rail at-grade crossings by eliminating traffic delay and any potential for train/vehicle accidents. SEA developed three criteria to identify the highway/rail at-grade crossings where a separated grade crossing appears warranted. SEA's preliminary determination is that a separated grade crossing may be warranted if each of the following criteria is met:

1. Acquisition-related train traffic would increase by at least eight trains per day.
2. Estimated post-Acquisition roadway traffic LOS would fall to an "E" or "F" because of increased post-Acquisition train traffic.
3. Sufficient increase in train speeds needed to mitigate Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts would not be feasible.

SEA believes these criteria identify the highway/rail at-grade crossings where there would be a significant increase in traffic delay resulting from the proposed Conrail Acquisition. At each of these highway/rail at-grade crossings, the projected Acquisition-related increase in train traffic would be at least eight trains per day, increased train speeds would not be feasible, and the resulting traffic LOS would be unacceptable ("E" or "F"). As a result, a separated grade crossing would appear to be warranted.

SEA originally identified ten highway/rail at-grade crossings in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky and Pennsylvania where it appears that Acquisition-related changes in train traffic would meet these criteria for separated grade crossings. (See Table 7-7.) However, because of plans to reroute train traffic in Erie, Pennsylvania, as discussed above, there are five remaining candidates for separated grade crossings in SEA's preliminary listing.

SEA notes that the Board generally does not determine where to locate a separated grade crossing and how the separated grade crossing is to be funded. These matters are typically determined through a comprehensive state or local highway planning process involving the state department of transportation (if the roadway is a state highway), the affected communities, and the railroad. The states have developed priority lists for separated grade crossings, based on traffic delay and safety factors. Each state has also established a percentage share of the construction cost for a separated grade crossing that is to be borne by the railroad. This percentage varies by state, but is typically five to ten percent. In some cases the railroads voluntarily agree to bear a higher share of the cost.

Based on the information available, however, SEA believes that a more far-reaching approach may be warranted for the five highway/rail at-grade crossings identified above. SEA believes it would be appropriate for the Applicants to provide more funding than railroads would ordinarily provide for these five preliminary candidates for separated grade crossings. It appears that the best possible way to reach agreement on a separated grade crossing and determine how to share costs would be to require the railroad to negotiate with the affected communities and the appropriate state or local agencies to determine what is appropriate, given the facts and circumstances of each particular highway/rail at-grade crossing.⁹ Therefore, SEA is proposing and inviting comments on a mediation and binding arbitration process to determine the funding allocation, which is described below.

SEA recommends that the Applicants consult with parties in the affected communities of (1) Calumet Park, Illinois (2 crossings); (2) Garrett, Indiana; (3) Hopkinsville, Kentucky; and (4) Madisonville, Kentucky regarding these five highway/rail at-grade crossings and the appropriate state and local agencies, beginning as soon as possible after the issuance of this Draft EIS. If these communities are interested in exploring options for separated grade crossings, SEA further recommends that the Applicants and communities pursue mediation, if needed, to facilitate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on respective shares of funding for separated grade

⁹ SEA understands that constructing a separated grade crossing requires coordination with local traffic planning departments, local approval and permitting agencies, and possible property acquisition. Therefore, it is not SEA's intent at this time to recommend that the Board require a separated grade crossing where the local community finds this approach undesirable or is unwilling to fund an appropriate share.

crossings. If the parties reach a mutually-acceptable agreement by the time SEA issues the Final EIS, SEA will recommend that the Board impose a condition in any decision approving this project requiring the Applicants to implement the terms of any such agreement.

In the event that a mutually-acceptable binding agreement is not reached by the time the Final EIS is issued, SEA's intent at this time is to recommend that the Board impose a binding arbitration condition in any decision approving the proposed Acquisition. This condition would require the Applicants to submit to binding arbitration, and assume the costs of such arbitration, with respect to the funding of separated grade crossings. In the Final EIS, SEA will provide a final list of locations where separated grade crossings would be warranted. As noted above, if any agreements are reached, SEA will recommend the Board require that the Applicants comply with the terms of any such agreement. For the communities on the final list where parties have not reached a negotiated agreement, SEA intends to recommend that the Board require the Applicants to participate in a binding arbitration process to determine the funding allocation for those communities on the final list.

SEA invites public comments on this mediation and binding arbitration process to ensure construction of separated grade crossings at appropriate locations where the communities want these crossings. Also, SEA welcomes public comments on SEA's preliminary list of locations where a separated grade crossing appears to be warranted.

(4) Consultation to Develop Alternative Mitigation

Based on the available information, SEA originally identified 20 highway/rail at-grade crossings in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania which appear to require mitigation but would not meet SEA's criteria for a separated grade crossing. In addition, local agreements or ordinances may preclude recommending increased train speeds without consultation with the affected communities. The traffic delays at ten of these highway/rail at-grade crossings would be mitigated by the implementation of the City of Lafayette's railroad relocation project discussed above.

Accordingly, for the remaining ten highway/rail at-grade crossings (see Table 7-7), SEA encourages the Applicants to meet with local officials and appropriate departments of transportation as soon as possible to negotiate traditional separated grade crossing agreements or identify other mutually-acceptable approaches to addressing Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts. SEA requests that the Applicants report to SEA on the results of these consultations by the close of the public comment period for this Draft EIS. SEA also welcomes comments from the affected communities on appropriate measures to address these traffic delay impacts. The highway/rail at-grade crossings where this consultation is recommended are shown in Table 7-7.

Public Comments — SEA's Approach to Traffic Delay Impacts

SEA emphasizes that these traffic delay mitigation recommendations are preliminary. SEA invites comments on the criteria for determining where a separated grade crossing would be warranted. Communities that SEA has identified in this Draft EIS as appropriate candidates for consultation

with the Applicants also can explain, in their comments to this Draft EIS, whether they favor construction of a separated grade crossing in the area and why they believe they meet the criteria for inclusion on this list. At the same time, the Applicants can submit comments. Based on its review of the comments and independent investigation, SEA will adopt final recommendations in the Final EIS to address potential traffic delay impacts.

7.1.6 Preliminary Nature of Mitigation

SEA emphasizes that the recommended mitigation measures in this Draft EIS are **preliminary**. SEA invites public comment on these proposed mitigation measures as well as alternative mitigation. In order for SEA to effectively assess the comments, it is critical that the public be specific regarding desired mitigation and provide specific reasons why the suggested mitigation would be appropriate. In addition, SEA requests that the railroads, communities, and other interested parties advise SEA of the status of any negotiations to address environmental concerns. If the parties execute a mutually-acceptable binding agreement, they should immediately advise SEA in writing.

Several of the preliminary mitigation measures that follow direct the Applicants to consult with local communities to develop mutually-acceptable mitigation before the Board issues a decision on the proposed Acquisition. Based on the results of these consultations, for the Final EIS SEA will modify these preliminary mitigation measures and the final list of communities as appropriate.

SEA will make its final recommendations for mitigation in the Final EIS after having the opportunity to consider all public comments on the Draft EIS, conduct further environmental analysis and agency consultations, and conduct additional site visits as appropriate. The Board will make its decision regarding this project and any conditions, including environmental conditions it might impose, based on its consideration of the public comments, the Draft EIS, and the Final EIS. In considering whether to approve the proposed Acquisition, the Board must weigh and balance the anticipated public benefits to the national transportation system, interstate commerce, and affected regions and communities against potential adverse effects. As part of that analysis, the Board considers the potential environmental effects, including both beneficial and adverse impacts.

7.2 RECOMMENDED PRELIMINARY MITIGATION MEASURES

Based on independent environmental analysis, consideration of the information available to date, and review of public comments, SEA's preliminary recommendation is that the Board impose, as conditions to any decision approving the proposed Conrail Acquisition, the following environmental mitigation measures. SEA has designed these preliminary measures to address potential Acquisition-related environmental impacts. They are presented below in six categories: (1) System-Wide Mitigation; (2) Regional Mitigation; (3) Local or Site-Specific Mitigation; (4) Mitigation for Specific Communities with Unique Circumstances; (5) General Mitigation for Proposed Constructions and Abandonments; and (6) Site-Specific Mitigation for Proposed Constructions and Abandonments. The tables included at the end of these recommended preliminary mitigation measures list the specific rail line segments and highway/rail at-grade crossings to which some of

the local or site-specific recommended mitigation measures apply. Table 7-1 below identifies the recommended mitigation measures for each state.

**Table 7-1
Preliminary Recommended Mitigation by State**

State	Preliminary Recommended Mitigation
Alabama	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
Connecticut	No significant impacts identified, and no mitigation recommended at this time with the exception of the System-Wide and General Mitigation Recommendations.
Delaware	Recommendations 13 and 25.
Florida	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C) and 5.
Georgia	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
Illinois	Recommendations 2B, 4 (A & B), 5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 24, 44, 45, 47, and 48.
Indiana	Recommendations 2A, 2B, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 7 (A & B), 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, 23, 26, 27, 46, 47, 48, and 49.
Kentucky	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 8, and 10.
Louisiana	Recommendations 4 (A & B) and 5.
Maryland	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 8, 9, and 19.
Massachusetts	No significant impacts identified, and no mitigation recommended at this time with the exception of the System-Wide and General Mitigation Recommendations.
Michigan	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 8, and 12.
Mississippi	Recommendations 4 (A & B) and 5.
Missouri	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C) and 5.
New Jersey	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
New York	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, and 8.
North Carolina	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
Ohio	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 7 (A & B), 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 42, 43 (A & B), 46, 47, 48, and 49.
Pennsylvania	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), 5, 7 (A & B), 8, 11, 19, and 22 (A, B & C).
Rhode Island	No significant impacts identified, and no mitigation recommended at this time with the exception of the System-Wide and General Mitigation Recommendations.
South Carolina	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
Tennessee	Recommendations 3 (A, B & C), 4 (A & B), and 5.
Virginia	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), 5, and 8.

**Table 7-1
Preliminary Recommended Mitigation by State**

State	Preliminary Recommended Mitigation
Washington, DC	Recommendations 2A, 3 (A, B & C), and 19.
West Virginia	No significant impacts identified, and no mitigation recommended at this time with the exception of the System-Wide and General Mitigation Recommendations.
System-wide or General Recommendations	Recommendations 1, 6, and 28-41.

Note that the site identification numbers that appear in the Tables 7-2 through 7-9 were developed to facilitate identification of specific rail line segments and railroad facilities such as rail yards, throughout the Draft EIS. In these segment identification numbers, “C” represents CSX, “N” represents Norfolk Southern, and “S” represents proposed Shared Assets Areas of CSX, NS, and Conrail as well as Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor (NEC) that would also be shared by CSX and NS. For example, the Washington, D.C. to Point of Rocks, Maryland rail line segment belongs to CSX and is designated as “C-003.”

7.2.1 Recommended System-wide Mitigation

Safety: Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings

1. For all highway/rail at-grade crossings with active warning device signals, including those in the Shared Assets Areas, CSX and NS shall provide prominently displayed instructions designating a toll-free telephone number and a unique highway/rail at-grade crossing identification number to report warning device malfunctions. NS and CSX shall provide 24-hour, seven-day-a-week staffing to respond to calls to the toll-free telephone number.

7.2.2 Recommended Regional Mitigation

Safety: Passenger Rail Operations

- 2(A). To enhance passenger rail safety, CSX and NS shall establish passenger trains as “superior” trains on passenger rail line segments as listed in Table 7-3, and as listed below:
 1. Washington, D.C. to Point of Rocks, Maryland (C-003).
 2. Savannah, Georgia to Jesup, Georgia (C-346).
 3. Weldon, North Carolina to Rocky Mount, North Carolina (C-334).
 4. Fredericksburg, Virginia to Potomac Yard, Virginia (C-101).

5. South Richmond, Virginia to Weldon, North Carolina (C-103).
6. Jackson, Michigan to Kalamazoo, Michigan (N-120).
7. West Detroit, Michigan to Jackson, Michigan (N-121).
8. Campbell Hall, New York to Port Jervis, New York (N-063).
9. Kalamazoo, Michigan to Porter, Indiana (N-497), should NS become responsible for train dispatching over this rail line segment.

By establishing these passenger trains as “superior,” trains moving in the same or opposite direction on the same track would be clear of the track at least 15 minutes before and 15 minutes after the expected arrival of a passenger train at any point. This requirement would not apply when any train is moving in the opposite direction away from a passenger train.

- 2(B). SEA’s preliminary recommendation is that this mitigation would also apply to the NS Chicago, Illinois to Porter, Indiana rail corridor if Canadian Pacific obtains trackage or haulage rights over these rail line segments.

Safety: Hazardous Materials Transportation

CSX recently advised SEA in a letter dated November 24, 1997 (see Appendix B) that the hazardous materials data that CSX provided SEA may overstate the post-Acquisition volume of hazardous materials transported along the rail line segments listed in Table 7-5. Accordingly, the number of rail line segments discussed in Recommended Mitigation Nos. 3 (A-C), 4 (A-B), and 5 below may change in the Final EIS.

- 3(A). Before increasing the number of rail cars carrying hazardous materials on 65 rail line segments that would become “Key Routes” as a result of the proposed Acquisition, CSX and NS shall comply with the Association of American Railroads (AAR) “Key Route” guidelines (“Recommended Railroad Operating Practices for Transportation of Hazardous Materials,” AAR Circular No. OT-55-B). In addition, NS and CSX shall prepare a Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan for each local emergency response organization along these rail line segments. Some of these rail line segments cross state lines. These rail line segments are listed in Table 7-5, and are located in the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

“Key Routes” are those routes that carry more than 10,000 hazardous materials rail cars per year. The AAR “Key Route” guidelines include measures for visual rail defect inspections at least twice per week, annual employee training in hazardous materials handling and equipment inspection, defective wheel bearing detectors at least every 40 miles of track, and other preventive measures.

- 3(B). Before increasing the number of rail cars carrying hazardous materials on any train, CSX and NS shall comply with the Association of American Railroads (AAR) "Key Train" guidelines ("Recommended Railroad Operating Practices for Transportation of Hazardous Materials," AAR Circular No. OT-55-B).

"Key Trains" are any trains with five or more tank car loads of chemicals classified as a Poison Inhalation Hazard (PIH) or a total of 20 rail cars with any combination of PIH, flammable gas, explosives, or environmentally sensitive chemicals. The AAR "Key Train" guidelines include measures for a maximum operating speed of 50 mph and full train inspections by the train crew whenever a train is stopped by an emergency application of the train air brake, or a reported defect by a trackside defective bearing detector.

- 3(C). If CSX or NS have more stringent requirements than the provisions of the AAR "Key Route" and "Key Train" guidelines, CSX and NS shall comply with their own requirements.

- 4(A). Before increasing the number of rail cars carrying hazardous materials on the 52 rail line segments that would be "Major Key Routes" as a result of the proposed Acquisition, CSX and NS shall prepare Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plans for each local emergency response organization along these rail line segments, which were identified in Table 7-6. A "Major Key Route" is defined by SEA as a route on which the hazardous materials rail car traffic would double and exceed a volume of 20,000 rail cars per year as a result of the proposed Acquisition. Some of these 52 rail line segments cross state lines. These rail line segments and corridors are located in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

- 4(B). CSX and NS shall implement a real time or desktop simulation emergency response drill with voluntary participation of local emergency response teams at least once every two years on each "Major Key Route."

5. CSX and NS shall provide toll-free telephone numbers to all emergency response organizations for each community located along the 65 rail line segments identified in Recommended Mitigation No. 3 (A-C) and the 52 rail line segments identified in Recommended Mitigation No. 4 (A-B). These telephone numbers shall provide 24-hour access to CSX and NS dispatch centers where local emergency response personnel could quickly obtain information regarding the transport of hazardous materials on a given train and appropriate emergency response procedures in the event of a train accident or hazardous materials release. This telephone number shall not be provided to the general public.

64. CSX and NS shall establish a formal Failure Mode and Effects Analysis (FMEA) program at CSX, NS, and Shared Assets Areas rail yards and intermodal facilities to address the sources and consequences of spills of both stored hazardous materials and hazardous materials in transportation. The purpose of the FMEA program is to reduce the risk of spills of hazardous

materials by identifying potential causes for such spills and eliminating them prior to any possible incident.

7.2.3 Recommended Local or Site-Specific Mitigation

Safety: Freight Rail Operations

- 7(A). To reduce the risk of train accidents and derailments, CSX and NS shall comply with the proposed requirement in FRA's proposed rule for "ton-mile based" inspections on the seven rail line segments that are listed below and in Table 7-2 in the States of Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. (See 49 CFR Part 213.237, Docket No. RST-90-1.) CSX and NS shall follow this standard until FRA promulgates a final rule on track defect inspection. Specifically, this proposed rule calls for railroads to conduct track inspections to detect rail flaws on a rail line segment at least once every 40 million gross ton-miles of rail traffic, or to inspect annually, whichever is more frequent. If FRA's final rule requires a different standard, then CSX and NS shall comply with the standard in the final rule.
- 7(B). CSX and NS shall train their mechanical inspectors annually at those locations (e.g., rail yards and initial terminals) that dispatch trains over these seven rail line segments. Also, CSX and NS shall train annually those track inspectors who are responsible for inspecting these seven rail line segments. These preliminary mitigation measures apply to the following rail line segments:
1. CP 501 to Indiana Harbor, Indiana (N-042).
 2. Berea to Greenwich, Ohio (C-061).
 3. Greenwich to Willard, Ohio (C-068).
 4. Willard to Fostoria, Ohio (C-075).
 5. Oak Harbor to Miami, Ohio (N-077).
 6. Miami to Airline, Ohio (N-086).
 7. Rutherford to Harrisburg, Pennsylvania (N-090).

Safety: Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings

85. CSX and NS shall upgrade warning devices at 118 highway/rail at-grade crossings in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia as listed and specified in Table 7-4.

Transportation: Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossing Delay

9. CSX and NS shall implement track improvements, train signals, and operating procedures that are necessary to increase train timetable speeds, consistent with safe operating practices, at a total of eight highway/rail at-grade crossings located in the States of Indiana, Maryland, and Ohio. Table 7-7 lists these crossings as well as SEA's proposed train speed increases.
10. CSX shall consult with appropriate authorities in the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Kentucky where five separated grade crossings may be warranted to mitigate Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts. Specifically, CSX shall consult with the following:
 - a. Cook County, the City of Calumet Park, the Illinois Department of Transportation, and other appropriate authorities and communities to address traffic delay at the Dixie Highway and Broadway-135th Street highway/rail at-grade crossings in Calumet Park, Illinois.
 - b. Dekalb County, the City of Garrett, the Indiana Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address traffic delay at the Randolph Street highway/rail at-grade crossing in Garrett, Indiana.
 - c. Christian County, the City of Hopkinsville, the Kentucky Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address traffic delay at the East 9th Street highway/rail at-grade crossing in Hopkinsville, Kentucky.
 - d. Hopkins County, the City of Madisonville, the Kentucky Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address traffic delay at the West Noel Avenue highway/rail at-grade crossing in Madisonville, Kentucky.

CSX shall meet as soon as possible after the issuance of this Draft EIS with these agencies and other appropriate parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the construction and funding allocation of separated grade crossing(s) at or near these locations, or other traffic delay improvements. SEA encourages the parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement that addresses all relevant matters related to implementing acceptable traffic delay mitigation. If a mutually-acceptable binding agreement has not been reached on the funding allocation of separated grade crossings or other improvements prior to issuing the Final EIS and the communities would like separated grade crossings constructed at these locations, SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX to participate in and assume the cost of binding arbitration to determine the funding allocation for separated grade crossings, or other appropriate mitigation at or near these locations.

11. CSX and NS shall consult with appropriate state and local agencies as well as other appropriate parties to address potential traffic delay at the ten highway/rail at-grade crossing locations in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, where SEA's preliminary determination is that increased train speed may not be feasible to mitigate Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts, and the location does not meet SEA's criteria for a separated grade crossing. These locations are listed in Table 7-7 with the proposed mitigation listed as "Consultation." Specifically, CSX and NS shall meet with these agencies and other appropriate parties as soon

as possible to negotiate traditional separated grade crossing agreements or identify other mutually-acceptable approaches to address Acquisition-related traffic delay impacts. If a mutually-acceptable binding agreement has not been reached on the construction and funding of a separated grade crossing or other improvements prior to issuing the Final EIS, SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX and NS to participate in the implementation of appropriate traffic delay mitigation.

The highway/rail at-grade crossings in Erie, Pennsylvania, and those in Lafayette, Indiana, listed in Table 7-7 meet SEA's criteria for mitigation. However, SEA's specific Recommended Mitigation Nos. 22 and 23, respectively for these communities, are outlined below in the "Proposed Mitigation for Specific Communities with Unique Circumstances" section.

Noise

12. CSX and NS shall consult with affected local communities to address Acquisition-related train engine and wheel noise impacts on six rail line segments in Ohio, and one rail line segment in Michigan listed below and in Table 7-8:
 - a. Berea to Greenwich, Ohio (C-061).
 - b. Deshler to Toledo, Ohio (C-065).
 - c. Mayfield to Marcy, Ohio (C-072).
 - d. Quaker to Mayfield, Ohio (C-073).
 - e. Short to Berea, Ohio (C-074).
 - f. Oak Harbor to Bellevue, Ohio (N-079).
 - g. Carleton to Ecorse, Michigan (S-020).

Specifically, CSX and NS shall meet with the communities along these rail line segments to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement to implement measures to reduce the effects of engine and wheel noise for sensitive receptors experiencing noise levels above 70 decibels (dBA L_{dn}) and with an increase of 5 dBA or more. Appropriate measures could include noise barriers, sound insulation for buildings, or rail lubrication. If a mutually-acceptable binding agreement has not been reached prior to issuing the Final EIS, SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX and NS to implement noise control measures on these rail line segments.

Cultural and Historic Resources

13. NS shall undertake no construction or modification of the Shellpot Bridge near Wilmington, Delaware, until completion of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, as amended).
14. CSX shall undertake no construction or modification of a new rail line connection in Exermont, Illinois, until completion of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, as amended).
15. NS shall complete cultural and historic resource documentation (Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record Level II) for the Toledo Pivot Bridge before initiating any construction or removal activities at that site.
1612. CSX shall maintain its interest in and take no steps to alter the historic integrity of the 75th Street Interlocking Tower in Chicago, Illinois, until completion of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, as amended).
17. CSX shall complete cultural and historic resource documentation (Historic American Building Survey/Historic American Engineering Record) for the Lake Shore & Michigan Southern (New York Central) Shops District at the Collinwood rail yard in Cleveland, Ohio no later than 180 days following the effective date of any Board final written decision in this proceeding.

Natural Resources

18. Before initiating any construction of the proposed rail line connection in Vermilion, Ohio, NS, in consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, shall conduct a survey to determine the potential presence of the endangered Indiana bat. If this species is found to be present and potentially adversely impacted, NS shall proceed with applicable measures to comply with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.

Environmental Justice

19. CSX and NS shall consult with elected officials, appropriate local agencies, and community representatives to address Acquisition-related environmental impacts in the affected communities that SEA has identified in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. Table 7-9 lists these communities and the potential environmental impacts SEA has identified at this time.

SEA's Recommended Mitigation Nos. 1-18, and 28-41 would address potential significant environmental impacts for these communities, which may experience disproportionately high adverse effects as a result of the proposed Conrail Acquisition. Nevertheless, CSX and NS shall meet with these communities to identify and agree on any further appropriate measures to address the specific environmental impacts that may disproportionately impact these communities, or to develop other mitigation measures that might offset these disproportionate impacts. If the parties have not reached a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures to address environmental impacts resulting

from the proposed Acquisition prior to issuing the Final EIS, SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX and NS to implement appropriate mitigation measures.

7.2.4 Recommended Mitigation For Specific Communities With Unique Circumstances

Cleveland - Western Suburbs, Ohio

20. NS shall continue to consult with local and county government agencies, the Ohio Department of Transportation, elected representatives from the west Cleveland suburbs and the City of Cleveland, and other appropriate parties to address concerns about train traffic increases on the Cleveland to Vermilion rail line segment (Nickel Plate Line). Specifically, NS shall meet with these parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the construction and funding allocation of NS's preliminary alternative routing plan to balance train traffic on the Cleveland to Vermilion rail line segment and the Lakeshore Line through Berea, and associated improvements that include new rail line connections, possible grade separations, upgrading warning devices at some highway/rail at-grade crossings, and highway/rail at-grade crossing closures. The preliminary mitigation plan developed by NS was recently submitted to SEA. SEA invites public comments on appropriate alternative mitigation that the Board could require in the event that the parties cannot reach a mutually-acceptable binding agreement prior to issuing the Final EIS.

Cleveland, Ohio

21. CSX and NS shall jointly and/or separately continue to consult with the City of Cleveland, the City of East Cleveland, the Ohio Department of Transportation, and elected representatives for Cleveland and other appropriate parties to address concerns about train traffic increases on the CSX's Quaker to Mayfield and Mayfield to Marcy rail line segments and NS's Cleveland to White and Cleveland to Ashtabula rail line segments. Specifically, CSX and NS shall meet with these parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on train routing through Cleveland and mitigation measures for those routes that could experience potential significant environmental impacts. Such an agreement should address all relevant matters related to the implementation of a rerouting plan and/or environmental mitigation measures. SEA invites public comments on appropriate mitigation that the Board could require in the event that the parties cannot reach a mutually-acceptable binding agreement prior to issuing the Final EIS.

Erie, Pennsylvania

22(A). Pursuant to the CSX proposed plan in the Primary Application of June 23, 1997, CSX shall permit NS to operate on the proposed CSX right-of-way (currently owned by Conrail) through Erie, Pennsylvania.

22(B). As discussed in the proposed mitigation plan recently provided by NS to SEA, NS shall reroute its train traffic through Erie, Pennsylvania, from the 19th Street right-of-way to the CSX right-of-way, which has mostly separated grade crossings.

- 22(C). NS shall not increase train traffic by more than two trains per day on the NS right-of-way through Erie, Pennsylvania, until it completes the necessary agreements and physical improvements to reroute this NS traffic.

Also, CSX and NS shall negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement with appropriate parties that addresses all relevant matters related to the construction and rail operations necessary to accomplish this alternate routing plan. If the parties cannot reach a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the construction and funding of this plan prior to issuing the Final EIS, SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX and NS to construct and/or operate an alternate route for this area, or to develop other appropriate mitigation. SEA invites public comments on appropriate mitigation in the event an agreement cannot be reached.

Lafayette, Indiana

23. NS shall meet with the City of Lafayette, the Indiana Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to develop an interim agreement on a mitigation plan to address potential traffic delay at the ten highway/rail at-grade crossings listed in Table 7-7 until the City of Lafayette's planned comprehensive rail consolidation program can be implemented. This consolidation plan would relocate and consolidate rail lines into a single rail corridor with separated grade crossings. When completed, the consolidation project would eliminate traffic delay and safety issues at these ten highway/rail at-grade crossings. At this time, SEA invites public comments from the State of Indiana, the City of Lafayette, CSX and NS, and other appropriate parties on acceptable interim mitigation measures to address Acquisition-related traffic delay and safety impacts until implementation of the City of Lafayette's planned long-term track relocation project.

Chicago, Illinois

24. As described in CSX's permit applications to the City of Chicago, CSX shall implement the noise, traffic, and community mitigation measures for the proposed intermodal facility at 59th Street. CSX recently provided SEA with information on the proposed mitigation plan for this site that includes plans for CSX to construct a noise barrier and implement the community enhancement program described in the CSX permit applications for the 59th Street facility. CSX shall meet with the community to reach a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures prior to issuing the Final EIS. SEA invites public comments on appropriate alternative mitigation that the Board could require in the event the parties cannot reach a mutually-acceptable binding agreement. SEA may recommend that the Board, as a condition of the approval of the Application, direct CSX to implement appropriate mitigation measures for these potential environmental impacts.

Newark, Delaware

25. CSX shall consult with local agencies, the University of Delaware, the Delaware Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address potential safety concerns at the highway/rail at-grade crossings in Newark, Delaware. Specifically, CSX shall meet with these parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the implementation and funding allocation for measures to address safety concerns at these highway/rail at-grade crossings. Appropriate measures could include four-quadrant gates, pedestrian gates, pedestrian overpasses or underpasses, safety education, or other measures to address pedestrian safety. SEA invites public comments on appropriate mitigation that the Board could require in the event that a mutually-acceptable binding agreement cannot be reached prior to issuing the Final EIS.

Muncie, Indiana

26. NS shall consult with the City of Muncie, the Indiana Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address potential safety and traffic concerns at seven highway/rail at-grade crossings on the Alexandria to Muncie rail line segment (Kilgore, Nichols, Goodman, Hutchinson, Jackson, Celia, and Manning). NS recently provided SEA with a proposed plan to mitigate the potential environmental impacts that includes a plan to upgrade highway/rail at-grade crossing warning devices and to use current train traffic holding practices to avoid blocking highway/rail at-grade crossings. Specifically, NS shall meet with these parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the implementation of and funding allocation for measures to address safety and traffic concerns at these highway/rail at-grade crossings. SEA invites public comments on appropriate mitigation that the Board could require in the event a mutually-acceptable binding agreement cannot be reached prior to issuing the Final EIS.

East Chicago, Hammond, Gary, and Whiting, Indiana (Four City Consortium)

27. CSX and NS shall consult with representatives of the Four City Consortium, the Indiana Department of Transportation, and other appropriate parties to address potential traffic delay and safety concerns at the nine highway/rail at-grade crossings in these communities. Specifically, CSX and NS shall meet with these parties to negotiate a mutually-acceptable binding agreement on the implementation and funding allocation for measures to address traffic delay and safety concerns at these highway/rail at-grade crossings. SEA invites public comments on appropriate mitigation that the Board could require in the event that a mutually-acceptable binding agreement cannot be reached prior to issuing the Final EIS.

7.2.5 Recommended General Mitigation For Proposed Constructions and Abandonments

The following preliminary mitigation measures apply to all proposed construction and abandonment activities as appropriate in order to reduce or avoid potential environmental impacts.

- 2813. CSX and NS shall observe all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations regarding handling and disposal of any waste materials, including hazardous waste, encountered or generated during proposed construction or abandonment-related activities. In the case of a spill, CSX and NS shall implement appropriate emergency response procedures and remediation measures.
- 2914. CSX and NS shall transport all hazardous materials generated by any construction or abandonment-related activities in compliance with the U.S. Department of Transportation Hazardous Materials Regulations (49 CFR Parts 171 to 179).
- 3015. CSX and NS shall dispose of all materials that cannot be reused in accordance with state and local solid waste management regulations.
- 3116. CSX and NS shall restore any adjacent properties that are disturbed during right-of-way construction or abandonment-related activities to pre-construction or pre-abandonment conditions.
- 3217. CSX and NS shall use Best Management Practices to encourage regrowth in disturbed areas and to stabilize disturbed soils.
- 3318. CSX and NS shall use appropriate signs and barricades to control traffic disruptions during construction and abandonment-related activities at or near any grade crossings.
- 3419. CSX and NS shall restore roads disturbed during construction or abandonment-related activities to conditions as required by state and local jurisdictions.
- 3520. CSX and NS shall comply with all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations to control and minimize fugitive dust emissions created during construction or abandonment-related activities through the use of such control methods as water spraying, installation of wind barriers, and chemical treatment.
- 36. CSX and NS shall control temporary noise from construction or abandonment-related equipment through the use of work-hour controls and maintenance of muffler systems on machinery.
- 3721. If previously unknown archaeological remains are found during construction or abandonment-related activities, CSX and NS shall cease work in the area, and immediately contact and coordinate activities with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office.
- 3822. CSX and NS shall use appropriate technologies and Best Management Practices, such as silt screens and straw bale dikes, to minimize soil erosion, sedimentation, runoff, and surface instability during construction or abandonment-related activities. CSX and NS shall disturb the smallest area possible around any streams and tributaries and shall revegetate disturbed areas immediately following construction or abandonment-related activities.

3923. CSX and NS shall assure that all culverts are clear from debris to avoid potential flooding and stream flow alteration, in accordance with Federal, state, and local regulations.
40. CSX and NS shall obtain all necessary Federal, state and local permits for alteration of wetlands, ponds, lakes, streams or rivers, or if construction of abandonment-related activities would cause soil or other materials to wash into these water resources. Also, CSX and NS shall use appropriate techniques to minimize impacts to water bodies wetlands, and navigation.
41. CSX and NS shall obtain all necessary Federal, state and local permits for storm water discharge, including National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, during construction or abandonment-related activities.

7.2.6 Recommended Mitigation For Proposed Constructions and Abandonments at Specific Locations

Vermilion, Ohio

42. NS shall consult with appropriate local authorities and fully fund the cost of raising the elevation of Coen Road to minimize the adverse safety impacts that would be caused by the proposed construction of the Vermilion connection near the Village of Vermilion in Erie County, Ohio. If the proposed connection is constructed, the roadway should be elevated to create a level highway/rail crossing.

Oak Harbor, Ohio

- 43(A). NS shall consult with appropriate local authorities and fully fund the cost of raising the elevation of Toussaint-Portage Road to minimize the adverse safety impacts that would be caused by the proposed construction of the Oak Harbor rail line connection near the Village of Oak Harbor in Ottawa County, Ohio. If the proposed rail line connection is constructed, the roadway should be elevated to create level highway/rail crossings.
- 43(B). NS shall install a two-quadrant gate at their existing highway/rail at-grade crossing at Toussaint-Portage Road.

Tolono, Illinois: Tolono Construction

44. NS shall not disturb Daggy Street or the residential properties at this location during the construction at the Tolono Connection.

Paris to Danville Rail Line Segment, Illinois

45. CSX shall retain its interest in and take no steps to alter the historic integrity of the proposed abandonment of the rail line segment until completion of the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, as amended) has been

completed. In the event that potentially significant archaeological resources are discovered during the course of salvage activities, CSX shall cease work in the area and immediately contact and coordinate activities with the Illinois SHPO.

South Bend-Dillon Junction Rail Line Segment, Indiana

46. NS shall retain its interest in and take no steps to alter the historic integrity of the two bridges located at milepost SK 12.08 and SK 17.73 or archaeological site 12SJ8 until the Section 106 process of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f, as amended) has been completed. In the event that potentially significant archaeological resources are discovered during salvage activities, NS shall cease work in the area, and immediately contact and coordinate activities with the Indiana SHPO.

Seven Separate Connections¹⁰

SEA recommends the following mitigation measures to address rail operations over these seven separate rail line connections:

Crestline, Ohio (Sub No. 1); Willow Creek, Indiana (Sub No. 2); Greenwich, Ohio (Sub No. 3); Sidney, Ohio (Sub No. 4); Sidney, Illinois (Sub No. 5); Alexandria, Indiana (Sub No. 6); and Bucyrus, Ohio (Sub No. 7)

47. CSX and NS 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 potential incidents.
48. CSX and NS shall use only Environmental Protection Agency-approved herbicides and qualified contractors for application of right-of-way maintenance herbicides, and shall limit such applications to the extent necessary for rail operations.

Willow Creek, Indiana (Sub No. 2) and Greenwich, Ohio (Sub No. 3)

49. If wheel squeal occurs during rail operations over these connections, CSX shall use appropriate rail lubrication to minimize noise levels.

¹⁰ Potential environmental impacts of the physical construction of the Seven Separate Connections at issue in STB Finance Docket No. 33388 (Sub Nos. 1-7) were covered in separate Environmental Assessments that were prepared by SEA prior to and separate from this Draft EIS. By a decision issued November 25, 1997, the Board approved, subject to certain environmental conditions, the physical construction of the seven connections totaling approximately four miles in the States of Indiana and Ohio. Proposed mitigation for the operational impacts associated with these projects is covered in Recommended Mitigation Nos. 47-49. Therefore, this Draft EIS only addresses proposed operations over these connections. For more details see Decision No. 9 and Decision (in Sub Nos. 1-7) dated November 25, 1997, included in Appendix T.

Table 7-2
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Freight Safety Mitigation

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Description	Counties
IN	N-042	NS	CP 501 to Indiana Harbor, IN	Lake
OH	C-061	CSX	Berea to Greenwich, OH	Cuyahoga, Lorain, and Huron
	C-068	CSX	Greenwich to Willard, OH	Huron
	C-075	CSX	Willard to Fostoria, OH	Huron, Seneca
	N-077	NS	Oak Harbor to Miami, OH	Ottawa, Wood, and Lucas
	N-086	NS	Miami to Airline, OH	Lucas
PA	N-090	NS	Rutherford to Harrisburg, PA	Dauphin

**Table 7-3
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Passenger Safety Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Description	Passenger Service
DC MD	C-003	CSX	Washington, D.C. to Pt of Rocks, MD	MARC Amtrak
GA	C-346	CSX	Savannah to Jesup, GA	Amtrak
MI	N-120	NS	Jackson to Kalamazoo, MI	Amtrak
	N-121	NS	West Detroit to Jackson, MI	Amtrak
MI IN	N-497	Amtrak	Kalamazoo, MI to Porter, IN	Amtrak
NY	N-063	NS	Campbell Hall to Port Jervis, NY	NJ Transit Metro North Commuter Rail
NC	C-334	CSX	Weldon to Rocky Mount, NC	Amtrak
VA	C-101	CSX	Fredericksburg to Potomac Yard, VA	Amtrak VRE
VA NC	C-103	CSX	S. Richmond, VA to Weldon, NC	Amtrak

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
IL	479848P	N-045	Campbell Crossing/TR 450, Vermilion, Danville	Passive	Flashing Lights
IN	478188C	N-041	Notestine Rd., Allen, Graybill	Passive	Flashing Lights
	478216D	N-041	Estella Ave., Allen, Ft. Wayne	Flashing Lights	Gates
	478226J	N-041	Anthony Blvd., Allen, Ft. Wayne	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	478240E	N-044	Engle Rd., Allen, Ft. Wayne	Flashing Lights	Gates
	484246J	N-046	Washington St./CR 100 E., Carroll, Lockport	Passive	Flashing Lights

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
	484248X	N-046	Meridian Line, Carroll, Lockport	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484216S	N-046	Cedar St., Cass, Logansport	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484229T	N-046	18 th St., Cass, Logansport	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155419P	C-066	CR 9, Elkhart, Elkhart	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342470C	C-025	CR 100 N., Gibson, Princeton	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342473X	C-025	Spring St., Gibson, Princeton	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342481P	C-025	Mulberry St., Gibson, Princeton	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342493J	C-025	W. John St., Gibson, Princeton	Passive	Flashing Lights
	478270W	N-044	Briant St., Huntington, Huntington	Flashing Lights	Gates
	342413N	C-025	Hart St., Knox, Vincennes	Flashing Lights	Gates
	342416J	C-025	Perry St., Knox, Vincennes	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342417R	C-025	Buntin St., Knox, Vincennes	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342425H	C-025	S. 15 th St., Knox, Vincennes	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155391B	C-066	Seventh St., Kosciusko, Warsaw	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155392H	C-066	Huntington St., Kosciusko, Warsaw	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	155394W	C-066	Main/Syr-Web, Kosciusko Warsaw	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155395D	C-066	Oak St., Kosciusko, Warsaw	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155484V	C-066	CR 875 E, La Porte, Portage	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155496P	C-066	500W, La Porte, Portage	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155632M	C-027	Countyline Rd., Lake, Gary	Flashing Lights	Gates

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
	155633U	C-027	Hobart Rd., Lake, Gary	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155637W	C-027	Lake St., Lake, Gary	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	155645N	C-027	Clarke Rd., Lake, Gary	Flashing Lights	Gates
	474598M	N-040	CR 100 E., Madison, Anderson	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155465R	C-066	First Rd.-Smith, Marshall, Plymouth	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155476D	C-066	Thorn Rd., Marshall, Plymouth	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484209G	N-046	CR 250 W., Miami, Peru	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155372W	C-066	CR 500 W., Noble, Kendallville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155380N	C-066	900 W., Noble, Kendallville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155615W	C-066	CR 900 North, Porter, Between Chestertown and Valparaiso	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	484302N	N-045	8 th St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484303V	N-045	7 th St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484306R	N-045	Romig St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484308E	N-045	5 th St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
	484309L	N-045	4 th Street/US 231, Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Gates	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484311M	N-045	Smith St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	484323G	N-045	CR 172, Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484267C	N-046	CR 900 N., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484269R	N-046	CR 700 N., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484282E	N-046	CR 500 E., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Passive	Flashing Lights
	484291D	N-046	Greenbush St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484292K	N-046	18 th St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484293S	N-046	17 th & Salem Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Flashing Lights	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	484294Y	N-046	Union St., Tippecanoe, Lafayette	Gates	Complete Lafayette Bypass ^a
	342829D	C-025	Stacer Rd., Vanderburgh, Stacer	Passive	Flashing Lights
	342850J	C-025	Ohio St., Vanderburgh, Evansville	Flashing Lights	Gates
	478313M	N-044	Olive St., Wabash, Wabash	Passive	Flashing Lights
	478314U	N-044	Wolf Rd., Wabash, Wabash	Flashing Lights	Gates

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
KY	345246C	C-021	Duffey St., Christian, Hopkinsville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	345269J	C-021	E. 6 th St., Christian, Hopkinsville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	345318D	C-021	W. Moss Ave., Hopkins, Masisonville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155645N	C-021	W. Center St., Hopkins, Madisonville	Flashing Lights	Gates
	345331S	C-021	West Noel Ave., Hopkins, Madisonville	Flashing Lights	Grade Separation ^a
	345362R	C-021	W. Dixon St., Webster, Sebree	Flashing Lights	Gates
MD	469321F	N-091	Lappans Rd., Washington, St. James	Flashing Lights	Gates
	534883D	N-091	Reiff Church Rd., Washington, Mauginsville	Passive	Flashing Lights
	534887F	N-091	Shawley Dr., Washington, Mauginsville	Passive	Flashing Lights
MI	511027V	S-020	Pennsylvania Rd., Wayne, Taylor	Flashing Lights	Gates
NY	471825F	N-070	Loomis St., Chautauqua, Ripley	Passive	Flashing Lights
OH	532688W	C-062	Lafayette Rd., Allen,	Passive	Flashing Lights
	472012W	N-075	Walter Main Rd., Ashtabula, Geneva	Passive	Flashing Lights
	502682Y	C-064	Biddle Rd., Crawford, Galion	Passive	Flashing Lights
	481584W	N-071	Chatfield, Crawford, Chatfield	Passive	Flashing Lights
	142366F	C-066	Jackson St., Defiance, Defiance	Flashing Lights	Gates
	481490V	N-073	Berlin Station Rd., Delaware, Delaware	Passive	Flashing Lights
	481660M	N-085	Skadden/CR 42, Erie,	Passive	Flashing Lights

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
	518382H	C-071	Marsh Rd., Hardin	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155755Y	C-066	Main St., Henry, Deshler	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155760V	C-065	North St., Henry, Deshler	Passive	Flashing Lights
	518507F	C-061	Pitts Rd., Lorain, Wellington	Passive	Flashing Lights
	472284J	N-080	Kansas Ave., Lorain, Lorain	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	232122V	C-040	Conneau (State Line Rd.), Lucas, Alexis	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	518391G	C-071	Section St., Marion, La Rue	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	481546M	N-073	Galion-Marseilles, Marion, Marion	Passive	Flashing Lights
	481547U	N-073	Scott TWP Rd.-190, Marion, Marion	Passive	Flashing Lights
	518456X	C-067	Main St., Richland, Shelby	Flashing Lights	Gates
	518476J	C-067	Base Line Rd., Richland, Shelby	Passive	Flashing Lights
	473668W	N-079	Kilbourne, Sandusky Bellevue	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	473673T	N-079	CR 292, Sandusky, Bellevue	Passive	Flashing Lights
	473680D	N-079	CR 175, Sandusky, Bellevue	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	473726P	N-079	Unknown, Sandusky, Kingsway	Passive	Flashing Lights
	228774H	C-070	Main St., Seneca, Fostoria	Passive	Flashing Lights

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
	228780L	C-070	TWP 0180, Seneca, Fostoria	Passive	Flashing Lights
	142178R	C-075	Gillick Rd., Seneca, Tiffin	Passive	Flashing Lights
	142179X	C-075	Morrison Rd., Seneca, Tiffin	Passive	Flashing Lights
	503133H	N-082	Bradley-Brownlee, Trumbull, Farber	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	544729H	N-082	Warren Sharon Rd., Trumbull, Brookfield	Flashing Lights	Gates
	155789T	C-065	Range Line Rd., Wood, Bowling Green	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155794T	C-065	Kellogg Rd., Wood, Bowling Green	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155798S	C-065	Washington St., Wood, Tontogany	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155799Y	C-065	Tontogony Rd., Wood Tontogany	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155804T	C-065	Middletown Pike, Wood, Haskins	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155812K	C-065	Fire Point Rd., Wood, Perrysburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155814Y	C-065	Roachton Rd., Wood, Perrysburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155818B	C-065	Eckel Jct. Rd., Wood, Perrysburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155819H	C-065	Eckel Rd., Wood, Perrysburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155820C	C-065	Eckel Rd., Wood, Perrysburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155821J	C-065	W. Boundary St., Wood, Perrysburg	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	155838M	C-065	Ford Rd., Wood, Rossford	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155839U	C-065	Bates Rd., Wood, Rossford	Passive	Flashing Lights
	155840N	C-065	Schrack Rd., Wood, Rossford	Passive	Flashing Lights

**Table 7-4
Preliminary Recommended Highway/Rail
At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Safety Improvements**

State	FRA ID	Railroad Segment	Crossing Name, County, and City	Current Warning Device	Recommended Mitigation
PA	592290T	N-091	York Rd., Cumberland, Mechanicsburg	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	592295C	N-091	Criswall, Cumberland, Mechanicsburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	592320H	N-091	Mill, Cumberland, Mechanicsburg	Passive	Flashing Lights
	471901W	N-070	Peach St., Erie, Erie	Gates	Relocate to CSX corridor ^a
	471906F	N-070	Cherry St., Erie, Erie	Flashing Lights	Relocate to CSX corridor ^a
	471911C	N-070	Raspberry St., Erie, Erie	Flashing Lights	Relocate to CSX corridor ^a
	471940M	N-070	Lucas Rd., Erie, Erie	Passive	Flashing Lights
	535146X	N-091	Guilford Springs Rd., Franklin,	Passive	Flashing Lights
	535163N	N-091	Hayes Rd., Franklin	Passive	Flashing Lights
VA	468599F	N-091	SR 7, Clarke, Berryville	Gates	4-Quadrant Gates or Median Barriers
	468634S	N-091	Rockland Rd., Warren, Winchester	Flashing Lights	Gates

^a Recommendation from highway/rail at-grade crossing delay analysis.

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
Parkwood, Alabama — Thomasville, Georgia				
AL	C-270	CSX	Parkwood to Montgomery, AL	AL: Montgomery, Elmore, Autauga, Chilton, and Shelby

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
AL GA	C-380	CSX	Montgomery, AL to Thomasville, GA	GA: Thomas, Grady, Decatur, Seminole, and Early AL: Houston, Dale, Pike, and Montgomery
Parkwood, Alabama — Manchester, Georgia				
AL GA	C-376	CSX	Parkwood, AL to Lagrange, GA	AL: Jefferson, Shelby, Talladega, Clay, Randolph, and Chambers GA: Troup
GA	C-377	CSX	Lagrange to Manchester, GA	GA: Troup and Meriwether
Atlanta, Georgia — Flomaton, Alabama				
GA	C-355	CSX	Atlanta to Lagrange, GA	GA: Fulton, Coweta, and Troup
AL GA	C-356	CSX	Lagrange, GA to Montgomery, AL	AL: Chambers, Lee, Macon, and Montgomery GA: Troup
AL	C-271	CSX	Montgomery to Flomaton, AL	AL: Montgomery, Lowndes, Butler, Conecuh, and Escambia
FL	C-403	CSX	Winston to Plant City, FL	FL: Hillsborough
GA	C-347	CSX	Jesup to Waycross, GA	GA: Ware, Pierce, and Wayne
IN	C-693	CSX	Willow Creek to Ivanhoe, IN	IN: Porter and Lake
IN	N-041	NS	Butler to Fort Wayne, IN	IN: De Kalb and Allen
Latonia, Kentucky — Cartersville, Georgia				
KY	C-292	CSX	Latonia to Winchester, KY	KY: Clark, Bourbon, Harrison, Pendleton, and Kenton
KY	C-293	CSX	Winchester to Sinks, KY	KY: Clark, Madison, and Rockcastle
KY	C-294	CSX	Sinks to Corbin, KY	KY: Laurel and Whitley

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
KY TN GA	C-295	CSX	Corbin, KY to Cartersville, GA	KY: Whitley TN: Campbell Anderson, Knox, Blount, Monroe, McMinn, and Polk GA: Murray, Gordon, and Bartow
KY	C-617	CSX	N Hazard to Duane, KY	KY: Perry and Knott
MD DC	C-031	CSX	Alexandria Jct, MD to Washington, DC	MD: Prince George's DC: Washington, DC
MI	C-214	CSX	Detroit to Plymouth, MI	MI: Wayne
MO	N-478	NS	Moberly to CA Junction, MO	MO: Randolph, Charlton, Carroll, and Ray
Salisbury, North Carolina — New Line, Tennessee				
NC	N-360	NS	Salisbury to Asheville, NC	NC: Rowan, Iredell, Catawba, Burke, McDowell, and Buncombe
NC TN	N-361	NS	Asheville, NC to Leadvale, TN	NC: Buncombe and Madison TN: Cocke
TN	N-392	NS	Leadvale to New Line, TN	TN: Cocke and Jefferson
Hamlet, North Carolina — Fairfax, South Carolina				
NC SC	C-357	CSX	Hamlet, NC to Mcbee, SC	NC: Richmond SC: Marlboro and Chesterfield
SC	C-358	CSX	Mcbee to Columbia, SC	SC: Chesterfield, Kershaw, and Richland
SC	C-359	CSX	Columbia to Fairfax, SC	SC: Lexington, Orangeburg, Bamberg, and Allendale
NC SC	C-339	CSX	Pembroke, NC to Dillon, SC	NC: Robeson SC: Dillon
NJ	C-769	CSX	Trenton to Port Reading, NJ	NJ: Somerset, Mercer
NJ	S-211	Shared	Nave to N Bergen, NJ	NJ: Hudson

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
NY	C-052	CSX	CP Sycamore to Black Rock, NY	NY: Erie
NY	N-061	NS	Ebenezer Jct to Buffalo, NY	NY: Erie
Suffern — Buffalo, New York				
NY	N-062	NS	Suffern to Campbell Hall, NY	NJ: Bergen
NY	N-063	NS	Campbell Hall to Port Jervis, NY	NY: Orange
NY	N-245	NS	Port Jervis to Binghamton, NY	NY: Orange, Broome, Delaware, and Sullivan
NY	N-246	NS	Binghamton to Waverly, NY	NY: Broome and Tioga
NY	N-247	NS	Waverly to Corning, NY	NY: Tioga, Chemung, and Stuben
NY	N-065	NS	Corning to Buffalo, NY	NY: Stuben, Livingston, Wyoming, and Erie
Buffalo, New York — Bellevue, Ohio				
NY PA OH	N-070	NS	Buffalo, NY to Ashtabula, OH	NY: Erie and Chautauqua PA: Erie OH: Ashtabula
OH	N-075	NS	Ashtabula to Cleveland, OH	OH: Ashtabula, Lake, and Cuyahoga
OH	N-080	NS	Cleveland to Vermilion, OH	OH: Cuyahoga, Lorain, and Erie
OH	N-072	NS	Vermilion to Bellevue, OH	OH: Erie, Huron, and Sandusky
OH	N-079	NS	Bellevue to Oak Harbor, OH	OH: Sandusky and Ottawa
Quaker — Berea, Ohio				
OH	C-073	CSX	Quaker to Mayfield, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-072	CSX	Mayfield to Marcy, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-069	CSX	Marcy to Short, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-074	CSX	Short to Berea, OH	OH: Cuyahoga

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
Columbus — Toledo, Ohio				
OH	C-229	CSX	Columbus to Marion, OH	OH: Franklin, Delaware, and Marion
OH	C-070	CSX	Marion to Fostoria, OH	OH: Marion, Wyandot, and Seneca
OH	C-228	CSX	Fostoria to Toledo, OH	OH: Seneca and Wood
OH	C-695	CSX	CP Maumee to Oak, OH	OH: Wood and Lucas
Ashtabula, Ohio — Rochester, Pennsylvania				
OH	N-082	NS	Ashtabula to Youngstown, OH	OH: Trumbull, and Ashtabula
OH PA	N-095	NS	Youngstown, OH to Rochester, PA	OH: Mahoning PA: Beaver and Lawrence
OH PA	C-081	CSX	Youngstown, OH to New Castle, PA	OH: Mahoning PA: Lawrence
PA	C-766	CSX	West Falls to CP Newtown Jct, PA	PA: Philadelphia
PA	N-203	NS	Bethlehem to Allentown, PA	PA: Northhampton
PA	N-216	NS	Reading to Reading Belt Jct, PA	PA: Berks
Park Junction, Pennsylvania — Camden, New Jersey				
PA	S-232	Shared	Park Junction to Phila Frankford Jct., PA	PA: Philadelphia
PA NJ	S-233	Shared	Phila Frankford Jct., PA to Camden, NJ	PA: Philadelphia NJ: Camden
SC	C-341	CSX	Florence to Lane, SC	SC: Florence and Williamsburg
St. Stephens, South Carolina — Savannah, Georgia				
SC	C-343	CSX	St. Stephens to Ashley Junction, SC	SC: Berkeley
SC	C-344	CSX	Ashley Junction to Yemassee, SC	SC: Berkeley, Charleston, and Colleton

**Table 7-5
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Key Route Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
SC GA	C-345	CSX	Yemassee, SC to Savannah, GA	SC: Colleton, Hampton and Jasper GA: Chatham
TN	N-399	NS	Bulls Gap to Frisco, TN	TN: Hamblen and Hawkins VA: Scott
TN	N-406	NS	Frisco to Kingsport, TN	TN: Sullivan
VA	N-315	NS	Alexandria to Manassas, VA	VA: Fairfax, Prince, and William
VA	N-432	NS	Poe ML to Petersburg, VA	VA: Petersburg City

**Table 7-6
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant
Emergency Response (Major Key Route) Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
Decatur, Alabama — New Orleans, Louisiana				
AL	C-267	CSX	Decatur to Black Creek, AL	AL: Morgan, Cullman, Blount, and Jefferson
AL	C-268	CSX	Black Creek to Birmingham, AL	AL: Jefferson
AL	C-269	CSX	Birmingham to Parkwood, AL	AL: Jefferson and Shelby
AL	C-270	CSX	Parkwood to Montgomery, AL	AL: Shelby, Chilton, Autauga, Elmore, and Montgomery
AL	C-271	CSX	Montgomery to Flomaton, AL	AL: Montgomery, Lowndes, Butler, Conecuh, and Escambia
AL	C-386	CSX	Flomaton to Mobile, AL	AL: Escambia, Baldwin, and Mobile
AL MS LA	C-387	CSX	Mobile, AL to New Orleans, LA	AL: Mobile MS: Jackson, Harrison and Hancock LA: Orleans and St. Bernard

**Table 7-6
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant
Emergency Response (Major Key Route) Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
GA	C-298	CSX	Manchester to Waycross, GA	GA: Meriwether, Talbot, Taylor, Macon, Dooley, Crisp, Wilcox, Turner, Ben Hill, Irwin, Coffee, Bacon, and Ware
Hamlet, North Carolina — Montgomery, Alabama				
NC	C-350	CSX	Hamlet to Monroe, NC	NC: Richmond, Anson, and Union
NC SC	C-351	CSX	Monroe, NC to Clinton, SC	NC: Union SC: Lancaster, Chester, Union, Newberry, and Laurens
SC	C-352	CSX	Clinton to Greenwood, SC	SC: Laurens and Greenwood
SC GA	C-353	CSX	Greenwood, SC to Athens, GA	SC: Greenwood and Abbeville GA: Elbert, Madison, and Clarke
GA	C-354	CSX	Athens to Atlanta, GA	GA: Clarke, Barrow, Gwinnett, De Kalb, and Fulton
GA	C-355	CSX	Atlanta to Lagrange, GA	GA: Fulton, Coweta, and Troup
GA AL	C-356	CSX	Lagrange, GA to Montgomery, AL	GA: Troup AL: Chambers, Lee, Macon, and Montgomery
GA AL	C-376	CSX	Lagrange, GA to Parkwood, AL	AL: Jefferson, Shelby, Talladega, Clay, Randolph, and Chambers GA: Troup
IN	C-025	CSX	Vincennes to Evansville, IN	IN: Knox, Gibson, and Vanderburgh
Butler, Indiana — Tilton, Illinois				
IN	N-041	NS	Butler to Fort Wayne, IN	IN: DeKalb and Allen
IN	N-044	NS	Fort Wayne to Peru, IN	IN: Miami, Wabash, Huntington, and Allen

**Table 7-6
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant
Emergency Response (Major Key Route) Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
IN	N-046	NS	Peru to Lafayette Junction, IN	IN: Tippecanoe, Carroll, Cass, and Miami
IN IL	N-045	NS	Lafayette Junction, IN to Tilton, IL	IN: Warren, Fountain, and Tippecanoe IL: Vermilion
Covington, Kentucky — Amqui, Tennessee				
KY	C-291	CSX	Covington to Latonia, KY	KY: Kenton
KY	C-287	CSX	Latonia to Anchorage, KY	KY: Kenton, Grant, Owen, Carroll, Henry, Oldham, and Jefferson
KY	C-288	CSX	Anchorage to Louisville, KY	KY: Jefferson
KY TN	C-289	CSX	Louisville, KY to Amqui, TN	KY: Jefferson, Bullitt, Hardin, Hart, Barren, Edmonson, Warren, and Simpson TN: Sumner and Davidson
Relay — Alexandria Junction, Maryland				
MD	C-037	CSX	Relay to Jessup, MD	MD: Anne Arundel
MD	C-034	CSX	Jessup to Alexandria Junction, MD	MD: Anne Arundel and Prince George's
MI OH	C-040	CSX	Carleton, MI to Toledo, OH	MI: Monroe OH: Lucas
OH	C-065	CSX	Toledo to Deshler, OH	OH: Lucas, Wood, and Henry
OH IN	C-066	CSX	Deshler, OH to Willow Creek, IN	OH: Henry and Defiance IN: Dekalb, Noble, Kosciusko, Elkhart, Marshall, St. Joseph, LaPorte, Porter, and Lake
IN	C-027	CSX	Willow Creek to Pine Junction, IN	IN: Lake and Porter
NJ	C-769	CSX	Trenton to Port Reading, NJ	NJ: Somerset and Mercer
NJ	S-211	Shared	Nave to N Bergen, NJ	NJ: Bergen

**Table 7-6
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant
Emergency Response (Major Key Route) Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Segment	County
NJ	S-032	Shared	PN to Bayway, NJ	NJ: Union and Essex
NY	C-052	CSX	CP Sycamore to Black Rock, NY	NY: Erie
Buffalo, New York — Vermilion, Ohio				
NY PA OH	N-070	NS	Buffalo FW, NY to Ashtabula, OH	NY: Erie and Chautauqua PA: Erie OH: Ashtabula
OH	N-075	NS	Ashtabula to Cleveland, OH	OH: Ashtabula, Lake, and Cuyahoga
OH	N-080	NS	Cleveland to Vermilion, OH	OH: Cuyahoga, Lorain, and Erie
Marion — Toledo, Ohio				
OH	C-070	CSX	Marion to Fostoria, OH	OH: Marion, Wyandot, and Seneca
OH	C-228	CSX	Fostoria to Toledo, OH	OH: Seneca and Wood
Quaker — Deshler, Ohio				
OH	C-073	CSX	Quaker to Mayfield, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-072	CSX	Mayfield to Marcy, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-069	CSX	Marcy to Short, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-074	CSX	Short to Berea, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
OH	C-061	CSX	Berea to Greenwich, OH	OH: Cuyahoga, Lorain, and Huron
OH	C-068	CSX	Greenwich to Willard, OH	OH: Huron
OH	C-075	CSX	Willard to Fostoria, OH	OH: Huron and Seneca
OH	C-206	CSX	Fostoria to Deshler, OH	OH: Seneca, Wood, and Henry
OH	C-695	CSX	CP Maumee to Oak, OH	OH: Wood and Lucas
OH	N-081	NS	White to Cleveland, OH	OH: Cuyahoga
PA	C-766	CSX	West Falls to CP Newtown Junction, PA	PA: Philadelphia
AL TN	C-373	CSX	Nashville, TN to Stevenson, AL	AL: Jackson TN: Davidson, Rutherford, Bedford, Coffee, and Franklin

**Table 7-7
Preliminary Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Traffic Delay Mitigation**

State	County, City	Segment and FRA Crossing ID		Crossing Name	Warning Device Type	LOS Change	Acquisition-Related Train Traffic Change			Recommended Mitigation
							Pre-	Post	Change	
IL	Cook, Calumet Park	C-010	163415H	Dixie Hwy.	Gates	D to E	17.0	32.9	15.9	Grade Separation
	Cook, Calumet Park	C-010	163416P	Broadway - 135 th St.	Gates	D to E	17.0	32.9	15.9	Grade Separation
	Cook, Evergreen Park	C-011	163433F	95 th St.	Gates	D to E	19.5	22.9	3.4	Consultation
IN	De Kalb, Garrett	C-066	155330K	Randolph Street	Gates	E to F	21.4	47.7	26.3	Grade Separation
	Madison, Alexandria	N-040	474600L	SR 9	Flashing lights	>30 sec. delay ^a	2.6	11.8	9.2	Consultation
	Madison, Alexandria	N-040	474601T	Harrison St.	Gates	>30 sec. delay ^a	2.6	11.8	9.2	Consultation
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484295F	Ferry St.	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484296M	Main St.	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484298B	Columbia St.	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484300A	South St., SR 26	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484301G	9 th St.	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass

**Table 7-7
Preliminary Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Traffic Delay Mitigation**

State	County, City	Segment and FRA Crossing ID		Crossing Name	Warning Device Type	LOS Change	Acquisition-Related Train Traffic Change			Recommended Mitigation
							Pre-	Post	Change	
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-045	484309L	4 th St., U.S. 231	Gates	C to D	23.6	41.0	17.4	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-046	484290W	Underwood St.	Flashing lights	B to D	18.4	40.2	21.8	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-046	484292K	18 th St.	Flashing lights	B to D	18.4	40.2	21.8	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-046	484293S	17 th & Salem St.	Flashing lights	B to D	18.4	40.2	21.8	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Tippecanoe, Lafayette	N-046	484294Y	Union St.	Gates	B to D	18.4	40.2	21.8	Complete Lafayette Bypass
	Vanderburgh, Evansville	C-025	342846U	W. Maryland St.	Flashing lights	C to D	22.3	30.8	8.5	Increase Train Speed from 25 to 30 mph
	Vanderburgh, Evansville	C-025	342848H	W. Franklin St.	Gates	C to D	22.3	30.8	8.5	Consultation
	Vanderburgh, Evansville	C-025	342850J	Ohio St.	Flashing lights	C to D	22.3	30.8	8.5	Consultation
KY	Christian, Hopkinsville	C-021	345267V	E. 9 th St.	Gates	D to E	23.4	32.7	9.3	Grade Separation
	Hopkins, Madisonville	C-021	345331S	W. Noel Ave.	Flashing lights	D to E	23.4	32.7	9.3	Grade Separation

**Table 7-7
Preliminary Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Traffic Delay Mitigation**

State	County, City	Segment and FRA Crossing ID		Crossing Name	Warning Device Type	LOS Change	Acquisition-Related Train Traffic			Recommended Mitigation
		Pre-	Post				Change			
MD	Baltimore City	C-032	140239X	Hollins Ferry Rd.	Flashing lights ^b	C to D	39.6	42.7	3.1	Increase Train Speed from 35 to 40 mph
	Prince George's, Hyattsville	C-030	140253T	Decatur St.	Flashing lights ^b	C to D	18.7	24.3	5.6	Increase Train Speed from 25 to 30 mph
	Prince George's, Bladensburg	C-030	140257V	Upshur St.	Flashing lights ^b	C to D	18.7	24.3	5.6	Increase Train Speed from 25 to 30 mph
	Prince George's, Cheverly	C-030	140258C	Annapolis Rd.	Gates	C to D	18.7	24.3	5.6	Increase Train Speed from 25 to 30 mph
OH	Butler, Hamilton	C-063	152407K	Vine St.	Gates	E to E	28.2	31.2	3.0	Consultation
	Cuyahoga, Brookpark	C-074	523971H	Hummel Rd.	Gates	B to D	13.4	47.3	33.9	Increase Train Speed from 35 to 40 mph
	Cuyahoga, Brookpark	C-074	523973W	Engle Rd.	Gates	B to D	13.4	47.3	33.9	Increase Train Speed from 35 to 40 mph
	Hamilton, Cincinnati	C-063	152346W	Winton Rd.	Flashing lights	E to E	28.2	31.2	3.0	Consultation
	Hamilton, Cincinnati	C-063	152347D	Mitchell Ave.	Flashing lights	E to F	28.2	31.2	3.0	Consultation
	Hamilton, Cincinnati	C-063	152355V	Township Ave.	Gates	E to E	28.2	31.2	3.0	Consultation

**Table 7-7
Preliminary Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossings That May Warrant Traffic Delay Mitigation**

State	County, City	Segment and FRA Crossing ID		Crossing Name	Warning Device Type	LOS Change	Acquisition-Related Train Traffic			Recommended Mitigation
							Pre-	Post	Change	
	Lorain, Wellington	C-061	518530A	Main St.	Gates	B to D	14.5	54.2	39.2	Increase Train Speed from 40 to 45 mph
PA	Erie, Erie	N-070	471901W	Peach St.	Gates	C to E	13.0	25.2	12.2	Reroute trains to CSX corridor
	Erie, Erie	N-070	471902D	Sassafras St.	Gates	D to E	13.0	25.2	12.2	Reroute trains to CSX corridor
	Erie, Erie	N-070	471906F	Cherry St.	Flashing lights	C to E	13.0	25.2	12.2	Reroute trains to CSX corridor
	Erie, Erie	N-070	471908U	Liberty St.	Flashing lights	C to E	13.0	25.2	12.2	Reroute trains to CSX corridor
	Erie, Erie	N-070	471911C	Raspberry St.	Flashing lights	C to E	13.0	25.2	12.2	Reroute trains to CSX corridor
	Westmoreland, W. Newton	C-033	145480R	Main St.	Flashing lights	C to D	27.7	32.8	5.1	Consultation

^a Significant traffic delay involves increased delay per stopped vehicle, which is not related to traffic level of service.

^b SEA intends to recommend that the Board require the Applicants to upgrade the crossing warning devices at these locations before increasing train speeds.

**Table 7-8
Preliminary Rail Line Segments That May Warrant Noise Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Description	Counties
OH	C-061	CSX	Berea to Greenwich, OH	Cuyahoga, Huron, and Lorain
	C-065	CSX	Deshler to Toledo, OH	Henry and Wood
	C-072	CSX	Mayfield to Marcy, OH	Cuyahoga
	C-073	CSX	Quaker to Mayfield, OH	Cuyahoga
	C-074	CSX	Short to Berea, OH	Cuyahoga
	N-079	NS	Oak Harbor to Bellevue, OH	Huron, Ottawa, and Sandusky
MI	S-020	Shared	Carleton to Ecorse, MI	Monroe and Wayne

**Table 7-9
Preliminary Communities That May Warrant Environmental Justice Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Description/Community	Potential Impacts
IL	C-010	CSX	Barr Yard to Blue Island Blue Island, IL	Noise ^a and Traffic Delay
IL	CM-2	CSX	59 th Street Chicago Intermodal Yard Chicago, IL	Traffic
IN	C-027	CSX	Willow Creek to Pine Jct. Gary, IN	Noise ^a , Hazardous Materials Transport, and Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossing Safety
	N-041	NS	Butler to Fort Wayne Fort Wayne, IN	Noise ^a , Hazardous Materials Transport, and Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossing Safety
IN IL	N-045	NS	Lafayette Junction to Tilton, IL Tilton, IL, Danville, IL, and Lafayette, IN	Noise ^a , Hazardous Materials Transport, and Highway/Rail At-Grade Crossing Safety

**Table 7-9
Preliminary Communities That May Warrant Environmental Justice Mitigation**

State	Site ID	Proposed Owner	Description/Community	Potential Impacts
MD DC	C-030	CSX	Alexandria Jct., MD to Benning Rd., DC Bladensburg, and Hyattsville, MD	Traffic Delay
MD	C-031	CSX	Alexandria Jct., MD to Washington, DC Bladensburg, MD and Washington, DC	Hazardous Materials Transport
MD	C-032	CSX	Baltimore to Relay Baltimore, MD	Traffic Delay
OH	C-072	CSX	Mayfield to Marcy Cleveland, OH	Noise and Hazardous Materials Transport
	C-073	CSX	Quaker to Mayfield Cleveland, OH	Noise and Hazardous Materials Transport
	N-075	NS	Cleveland to Ashtabula Ashtabula, OH and Cleveland, OH	Noise ^a and Hazardous Materials Transport
	N-081	NS	White to Cleveland Ashtabula, OH and Cleveland, OH	Noise ^a and Hazardous Materials Transport
	N-082	NS	Youngstown to Ashtabula Youngstown, OH Ashtabula, OH	Noise ^a and Hazardous Materials Transport
	N-086	NS	Miami to Airline Toledo, OH	Freight Rail Safety
PA	N-090	NS	Harrisburg to Rutherford Harrisburg, PA	Freight Rail Safety

^a SEA's noise analysis shows an Acquisition-related increase in noise levels in these communities, however the increase does not warrant mitigation at this time. However, because there are other potential significant environmental impacts in this community, noise effects have been included to consider potential cumulative effects.