April 14, 2014

The Tongue River Railroad Company, Inc. (TRRC) offers the following responses to the request for information dated March 13, 2014 regarding the Tongue River Railroad Project (Docket No. FD 30186). These answers are based on engineering that has been undertaken to date at a conceptual level:

1. *STB Request: Information regarding the construction duration for the Tongue River Alternative and Colstrip Alternative was presented in the October 16,2012 Revised Application and the December 17, 2012 Supplemental Application (respectively). Confirm that the construction durations for these alternatives are still valid and provide the anticipated construction duration for the remaining alternatives identified above. Indicate if the use of the variations listed above (Tongue River, Colstrip, Tongue River Road, Moon Creek, Decker, Ashland East Variation, Terminus 1 Variation) would affect the construction duration for the alternatives and, if so, provide the construction duration for the alternatives when paired with the variations.*[1]

   TRRC Response: The possible construction durations for each of the alternatives are provided below, given similar size and type of contractor work force assuming a construction season of eight months per year. In all likelihood, the construction durations could be reduced by increasing the contractor work force, which could be done if warranted by economic analysis and market conditions at the time the construction is undertaken. However, the following possible construction period durations are based on a roughly linear relationship between the amount of grading required to construct each alternative and the construction duration because the grading volumes will typically control the overall construction schedule:

   - Colstrip Alternative – 20 months over approximately 2.5 years
   - Tongue River Alternative – 24 months over approximately three years
   - Tongue River Road Alternative – 40 months over approximately five years (about twice as much grading would be required to construct the Tongue River Road Alternative compared to the Colstrip Alternative)
   - Moon Creek Alternative – 40 months over approximately five years (about twice as much grading would be required to construct the Moon Creek Alternative compared to the Colstrip Alternative)
   - Revised Decker Alternative – 48 months over approximately six years (about 2.5 times as much grading required to construct the Revised Decker Alternative compared to the Colstrip Alternative)
   - Ashland East Variation – Adds 16 months to the overall schedule over approximately two years (adds about 80% more grading to the Colstrip Alternative, and would similarly impact the above potential schedules for construction of the Tongue River, Tongue River Road, and Moon Creek Alternatives)

[1] As a clarification, the Revised Decker files were provided by OEA/ICF on September 25, 2013 rather than July 26, 2013 as indicated in the data request letter.

- Terminus 1 Variation – Adds six months over approximately ¾ of a year (adds about 30% more grading to the Colstrip Alternative and would similarly impact the schedule for construction of the Tongue River, Tongue River Road, and Moon Creek Alternatives)

Alternately, around the clock, year-round construction may be considered if project economics and market conditions dictate. Around the clock construction would be required for winter grading activities to prevent deep freeze from setting in to the embankment. This approach would significantly reduce construction duration for any alternative and avoid costly mobilization and demobilization of heavy equipment at the beginning and end of each construction season. For example, the Colstrip Alternative could be completed in approximately 16 consecutive months rather than 20 seasonal months over 2.5 years and the Revised Decker Alternative could be completed in approximately three years rather than six were winter construction to be utilized.

2. *STB Request: Identify the number and types of construction equipment TRRC anticipates using for the construction of the proposed rail line.*

   TRRC Response: TRRC will invite a group of qualified contractors to bid on the grading and drainage aspects of the project and each will likely have a different approach to constructing the project, including their proposed equipment fleet. However, all Contractors will likely utilize a fleet of excavators, scrapers, bulldozers, dump trucks, motor graders, compactors, and other miscellaneous equipment. Preliminary discussions with contractors familiar with projects of similar size and scope indicate a potential equipment fleet that could be used to construct any of the various alternatives within the durations described in the response to Question 1 above would be as follows:

No. of Units	Equipment Type
7	CAT 777 (100-ton haul trucks)
1	CAT 992 Front-end loader
1	CAT D10 dozer
1	CAT D9 dozer
2	CAT D8 dozers
3	CAT 14G motor graders
1	CAT 825 compactor
3	CAT 10,000 gal. water wagons
2	4,000 gal. water trucks
1	Smooth drum roller
3	CAT 637 scrapers
1	CAT 345 excavators
2	CAT 966 front-end loaders
2	Fuel trucks
6	Mechanics service trucks
3	Generator sets

3	Rock drills
15	Pickups

Cranes and delivery tractor trailers would also be needed to support bridge and large culvert construction

3. *STB Request: Provide the number of truck trips anticipated during construction. Include truck trips for all purposes, identified by trip type or purpose, if possible. At a minimum, indicate the number of light and heavy truck trips.*

TRRC Response: We assume that the above question is designed to allow for an estimate of construction-related emissions. In that regard, we provide below a summary of the above potential equipment and an estimate of the associated total hours of operation needed to construct the Colstrip Alternative because that information is more readily ascertainable than the number of truck trips. The equipment hours necessary to construct the other alternatives would be approximately linear in relationship to the degree of grading associated with each alternative. The summary of equipment hours to construct the Colstrip Alternative is as follows:

No. of Units	**Equipment Type**	**Total Operated Hours**
7	CAT 777 (100-ton haul trucks)	38,000
1	CAT 992 Front-end loader	5,500
1	CAT D10 dozer	5,500
1	CAT D9 dozer	5,500
2	CAT D8 dozers	7,000
3	CAT 14G motor graders	12,500
1	CAT 825 compactor	5,500
3	CAT 10,000 gal. water wagons	14,500
2	4,000 gal. water trucks	7,000
1	Smooth drum roller	5,500
3	CAT 637 scrapers	7,500
1	CAT 345 excavators	10,600
2	CAT 966 front-end loaders	10,600
2	Fuel trucks	20,000
6	Mechanics service trucks	13,000
3	Generator sets	8,000
3	Rock drills	8,000
15	Pickups	2,500

The ratios of grading compared to Colstrip are as follows:

- Tongue River = 1.35 times Colstrip
- Tongue River Road = 2.05 times Colstrip

- Moon Creek = 1.94 times Colstrip
- Revised Decker = 2.55 times Colstrip
- Ashland East Variation with Colstrip = 1.84 times Colstrip
- Terminus 1 Variation with Colstrip = 1.3 times Colstrip

4. *STB Request: Provide the number of supply train trips anticipated to occur over the finished portions of the line during construction.*

   TRRC Response: The Colstrip Alternative, at 42.1 miles, would require approximately seven rail trains each holding 64,000 linear feet of rail, 12 tie trains each holding 10,000 ties, and approximately 62 ballast trains each holding 5,000 tons of ballast.

   The other alternatives would require a roughly linear increase in trains based on route length. The approximate number of anticipated supply train trips for the other alternatives are as follows:
   - Tongue River = 83.1 miles = 14 rail trains, 22 tie trains, and 123 ballast trains
   - Tongue River Road = 83.1 miles = 14 rail trains, 22 tie trains, and 123 ballast trains
   - Moon Creek = 81.7 miles = 14 rail trains, 22 tie trains, and 121
   - Revised Decker = 51.0 miles = 9 rail trains, 14 tie trains, and 75 ballast trains
   - Ashland East Variation with Colstrip = 44.1 miles = eight rail trains, 12 tie trains, and 65 ballast trains
   - Terminus 1 Variation with Colstrip = 42.9 miles = eight rail trains, 12 tie trains, and 63 ballast trains

5. *STB Request: Identify the number of workers TRRC anticipates employing during construction. Detail the number of full- and part-time workers that would be employed during each year of construction and provide the number of employees that are anticipated during peak employment. Indicate how many months peak employment would be expected to last and the year of construction in which peak employment is anticipated to occur.*

TRRC Response: TRRC estimates that about 225 workers would be on site during peak construction. The approximate number of workers required for each major task (project management; civil/grading; track/signal/telecom) for each alternative and variation is reflected in the spreadsheet attached as Exhibit 1. That Exhibit is based on the same construction duration scenarios set forth in response to Question 1, above. The full contractor workforce shown on the Exhibit will be used until the grading, bridges, culverts and subballast/asphalt are substantially complete for the entire project. The partial force will be involved in clean-up work such as final fine grading, seeding, grade crossing approaches and such. The full track workforce will be involved in constructing the skeletonized track and installing turnouts. Once they are complete, the partial workforce will finish placing ballast in the track, surfacing the track to final line and grade, dressing the ballast, and de-stressing the rail.

It is anticipated that the construction and other workers would be employed by other entities under contract with TRRC, and thus in all or virtually all cases would not be TRRC employees. It is not possible to determine what ratio of those workers would be part-time, as this would be decided by the contractors. Peak employment would occur when grading construction and track/signal/telecom construction are taking place on site concurrently. The duration of this concurrent work is relatively short and varies by alternative.

6. *STB Request: Table 1 that accompanied the Applicant's May 3, 2013 response to OEA's information request identified preliminary bridge and culvert locations for a number of alternatives; however, the milepost locations for these features did not map correctly when input into the alternatives in GIS. Please provide a revised table of preliminary bridges and culverts and a corresponding GIS file mapping the locations of bridges and culverts for all alternatives and variations identified above.*

   TRRC Response: The table showing the list of structures based on conceptual engineering has been attached as Exhibit 2, along with a GIS KMZ file (part of that same Exhibit) showing the culvert locations.

7. *STB Request: The May 3, 2013 information request response indicates that culverts and bridges would comply with the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) and BNSF design criteria guidelines; however, the method used to generate the locations and sizes of the culverts and bridges along the alternatives is not clear. Provide a description of the hydrologic review and methods used to determine the locations and sizes of these structures.*

   TRRC Response: Pipe locations were determined by studying topographic maps and aerial imagery to determine stream crossings. Once a location was determined, the drainage area was delineated. Then, depending on the area, the Rational Method, Nassick Regression Equations, or USGS Regression Equations for the region were used to determine peak flows. The minimum pipe size used at any culvert location was 36 inches. Culverts 72 inches in diameter or less are anticipated to be corrugated metal pipes (CMP) and culverts larger than 72 inches in diameter are anticipated to be structural plate pipes (SPP). Hydraulic parameters associated with culverts were approximated using HY-8 software. Culverts were designed to meet BNSF hydraulic design criteria and AREMA structural design criteria. The required hydraulic BNSF criteria to be met with culvert design are:

   1. The 50-year water surface elevation will not come into contact with the crown of the culvert and
   2. The 100-year water surface elevation will not overtop the track subgrade elevation at the lowest point of cross section.

All culverts were initially sized based on 50-year discharges. An initial tailwater condition of 0.4 times the diameter of the pipe was used to calibrate the capacity of each pipe size to meet the 50-year criterion, where the upstream water surface elevation did not reach the crown of the pipe. In the event that the 100-year criteria could not be met with a single pipe, multiple pipes were evaluated.

8. *STB Request: Confirm that the AREMA design criteria for floodplain and floodway crossings meets the standards required for development in Federal Emergency Management Agency-designated floodplains and floodways for compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program.*

   TRRC Response: AREMA standards for floodplain and floodway crossings state that care must be taken to meet the local community adopted floodplain ordinances and requirements. The known requirements set forth by the Montana Department of Natural Resources (MTDNRC) and BNSF Hydraulic Design Criteria are more stringent than the requirements outlined in the NFIP. For instance, all bridge crossings over perennial and intermittent streams were sized such that the proposed bridge meets both BNSF Hydraulic Design Criteria and Montana Department of Natural Resources (MTDNRC) requirements of no more than 0.5-feet of increase in proposed water surface elevation for a 100-year event. This requirement was also defined in previous EIS Mitigation Measures #50 and #51. By NFIP standards, any stream that lies within a Zone A floodplain is allowed up to 1-foot of increase in water surface elevation. While there are Zone A floodplains within the project, only the lower five miles of the Tongue River near Miles City has a Zone AE floodplain with base flood elevations mapped as part of a detailed study for the National Flood Insurance Program. No potential alignments cross Tongue River near this location; however, the Tongue River and Tongue River Road alignments would impact a portion of the Zone AE floodplain with fill between Spotted Eagle Lake and Branum Lake in Miles City. No other streams within the limits of the alternative alignments are mapped with base flood elevations as part of the NFIP.

9. *STB Request: If available, provide any floodplain area estimates for stream crossings for the modeling used to determine preliminary culvert and bridge size and locations along each alternative. If available, provide a shapefile or geodatabase depicting these potential floodplain areas.*

   TRRC Response: Existing floodplain areas are not available since very little public mapping is available as described above in the response to Question 8. None of the floodplain extents were mapped as part of the conceptual design phase for alternatives analysis.

10. *STB Request: Provide conceptual designs for bridges that would be constructed for each alternative and variation. Information provided should be sufficiently detailed to allow OEA to determine if bridge crossings would require in-water structures. If it is not possible to provide conceptual designs, describe the types of bridges anticipated to be built. For example, would*

bridge types include steel truss bridges, steel girder bridges, concrete tub-ballasted deck bridges, or another type of bridge? Identify which bridges would cross waterways using a clear-span design, and which bridges, if any, would require in-water structures.

TRRC Response: Generally, channels of the larger stream that are perennial or larger intermittent flows are to be spanned completely with no permanent in-water structures. It is possible that a temporary structure may be required to construct a bridge over the Tongue River. Bridge spans greater than 100 feet can be achieved with a deck-plate girder up to 200 feet, which spans the Tongue River channel for all of the alternatives except possibly the Revised Decker Alternative which appears to have a longer crossing due to skew angle and therefore could require a truss span, which would not be desirable due to long-term maintenance costs and initial construction costs. Shorter spans are planned to be pre-cast, pre-stressed concrete girders. See attached Exhibit 3, which reflects a concept for a Tongue River crossing that could apply for any of the alternatives other than the Revised Decker Alternative.

11. *STB Request: Indicate if the crossing of Interstate (I-94) for the Moon Creek Alternative would require I-94 to be raised as part of the railroad underpass design. Design files dated November 12, 2012 indicate that the grade of the railroad would be situated approximately 11 feet above the level of the roadway.*

    TRRC Response: The concept design assumes I-94 would be raised since the amount of grading required to raise the highway was less than that required to significantly modify the track alignment due to adjacent topography and proximity to Moon Creek.

12. *STB Request: Identify the number of set-out tracks and passing sidings that would be constructed for each alternative and variation. Provide the anticipated length and locations of set-out tracks and sidings. If available, provide GIS files for these features. Provide GIS files for the Colstrip Subdivision upgrade work that was described in the May 3, 2013 information request response. Include the locations where the 5 1/2-inch rail base would be relayed to a 6-inch base, where existing ties would be replaced, where the new 500-foot set-out track would be located, where the seven timber bridges would be repaired or replaced, and other signal and communication upgrade locations, if known at this time.*

    TRRC Response: Exact locations of set-out and siding tracks have not been determined as part of the current engineering effort, but will be located based on operational requirements, topography, and access. In general, the Colstrip Alternative would require three set-outs and one siding with two set-out tracks in the northern half of the alignment and the siding and third set-out track in the southern half of the alignment. The Tongue River, Tongue River Road, and Moon Creek Alternatives would require six set-out tracks and two sidings with two set-out tracks in each third of the alignment and the sidings in the northern and southern thirds of the alignment. The Ashland East and Terminus 1 Variations do not affect the number of set-out or

siding tracks described above. The Revised Decker Alternative would require four set-out tracks and two sidings with two set-out tracks and one siding in each half of the alignment.

Information related to the BNSF Colstrip Subdivision will be provided by BNSF under separate cover.

13. *STB Request: Provide the anticipated duration of the work required to upgrade the Colstrip Subdivision. Indicate if this work would occur when the Colstrip Alternative would be under construction.*

    TRRC Response: Information related to the BNSF Colstrip Subdivision will be provided by BNSF under separate cover.

14. *STB Request: Confirm that the cost of the Colstrip Alternative provided in the Supplement to Alternatives Screening Analysis - Evaluation of Additional Rail Alternatives under Consideration for Detailed Study dated April 30, 2013 includes upgrades to the Colstrip Subdivision. If not, provide the anticipated cost of the upgrades.*

    TRRC Response: Information related to the BNSF Colstrip Subdivision will be provided by BNSF under separate cover.

15. *STB Request: If available, provide conceptual design information for communications towers. For example, would they be freestanding or secured by guy-wires; would they consist of a single pole or steel-lattice structure; how tall would the towers be?*

    TRRC Response: Communication towers will be self-supported (no guy wires) steel lattice towers similar to that shown on the photo attached As Exhibit 4. Tower heights will vary based on topography, but for example, the Colstrip Alternative would require two 50' towers, one 80' tower and two 150' towers.

16. *STB Request: Indicate how the location of right-of-way fences would be determined. Describe how much of the right-of-way would be fenced.*

    TRRC Response: The right-of-way would be fenced continuously except at bridges, crossings, and cattle passes, where the fencing would turn in toward the track shoulder or tie into a cattle guard.

17. *STB Request: Provide cross-section diagrams for the typical maximum and minimum railroad rights-of- way that include elements and infrastructure expected to occur in each right-of-way. Provide a cross-section diagram for the right-of-way that includes the single-phase distribution line poles and an access road.*

TRRC Response: The maximum and minimum railroad right-of-way does not occur at locations where access roads and single-phase distribution line poles are located since support tracks are not logically located in areas of largest cuts or fills. In that way, the minimum and maximum railroad right-of-way exhibits, which TRRC provided as attachments to its May 3, 2013 responses to OEA's April 5, 2013 requests, are still valid. However, TRRC has attached as Exhibit 5 to this response a diagram of a typical section at a setout track, which would require an access road and in some cases, the single-phase distribution line. As indicated in TRRC's May 3, 2013 response to Question 3 of the April 5, 2013 data response, the single-phase distribution line is not a continuous feature and only serves specific locations where signal infrastructure is planned. As indicated in the previous TRRC response to Question 4 of that May 3, 2013 response, the access roads are not a continuous feature and only serve specific locations where signal infrastructure is planned or track turnouts are to be located.

18. *STB Request: Identify the anticipated source of ballast that would be used in construction.*

    TRRC Response: Pipestone Quarry near Whitehall, Montana, which is about 200 miles west of Billings.

19. *STB Request: Describe how ballast would be transported to the construction site by train. Would it be transported by maintenance-of-way trains and spread on skeletonized track? Alternatively, would it be transported by rail along the existing main line and then transported to the construction site by truck?*

    TRRC Response: Ballast would be transported to the site by work trains via connection to the existing rail network and be dumped in place on new skeletonized track constructed by a Track-Laying Machine.

20. *STB Request: Estimate the total volume of water that would be required for rail construction activities.*

    TRRC Response: Water will be required during construction to provide compaction of fill material and dust suppression. Assuming 5% moisture needs to be added to the fill material to achieve an optimum soil density of 120 lbs/CF and provide dust suppression during construction, 19.45 gallons of water needs to be added for every cubic yard of fill material, or 59.69 Acre-Feet of water per million cubic yards.

    As noted in the TRRC response to Question #11 of the STB Data Response dated April 5, 2013, water needed during construction for dust suppression, soil compaction and other construction activities is anticipated to be obtained through contractor-coordinated purchase of water rights access to Tongue River, Yellowstone River, water wells, or a combination thereof. In order to provide a comparison of water needed during construction for the various alternatives, three USGS gages were analyzed to determine the flow volume of water that can be expected in

Tongue River adjacent to the alternative alignments. The gages are located near Birney, MT (USGS gage #6307616), at the Brandenberg bridge north of Ashland, MT (USGS gage #6307830), and near Miles City, MT (USGS gage #6308500). The mean annual flow volume shown throughout the history of these three gages was averaged and it is estimated that the average annual flow volume of the Tongue River near the project location is 371,896 Acre-Ft/Year. Supporting information regarding these gages can be found at the USGS Web Site, http://mt.water.usgs.gov/projects/tongueriver. The flow volumes of these three locations were averaged as a reference for all alternatives under consideration due to their proximity to the study area.

The Colstrip Alternative has an estimated 17.7 million cubic yards (mmcy) of embankment, which per the above calculations would require (17.7 mmcy x 59.69 AF/mmcy) = 1,057 Acre-Ft of water for compaction and dust suppression. This represents 0.28% of the average annual volume of the Tongue River near the project.

The amount of water needed during construction is a function of the amount of fill required to construct the proposed rail line. The approximate amount of water required during construction is listed below for each alternative in million gallons (MMGallons) and as a percentage of annual flow of the Tongue River at Ashland/Otter Creek, Montana:

- Colstrip Alt. - (17.7 MMCY Fill), (1,057 Acre-Feet), 0.28% of Tongue River
- Tongue River Alt. - (22.9 MMCY Fill), (1,367 Acre-Feet), 0.37% of Tongue River
- Tongue River Road Alt. - (34.6 MMCY Fill), (2,065 Acre-Feet), 0.56% of Tongue River
- Moon Creek Alt. - (33.1 MMCY Fill), (1,976 Acre-Feet), 0.53% of Tongue River
- Revised Decker Alt. - (49.6 MMCY Fill), (2,961 Acre-Feet), 0.80% of Tongue River
- Ashland East Variation - (14.0 MMCY Additional Fill), (836 Additional Acre-Feet), 0.22% of Tongue River to be added to Colstrip, Tongue River, Tongue River Road, or Moon Creek Alternative quantities
- Terminus 1 Variation - (3.4 MMCY Additional Fill), (203 Additional Acre-Feet), 0.05% of Tongue River to be added to Colstrip, Tongue River, Tongue River Road, or Moon Creek Alternative quantities

21. *STB Request: Describe the anticipated design for cattle passes. Identify how the location of cattle passes would be determined.*

TRRC Response: See attached Exhibit 6 for a typical cattle pass design. Cattle pass locations would be determined by agreements with landowners and based on topography. In general, areas where the proposed track is about 15 feet higher than the adjacent ground is preferred for cattle pass locations in order to avoid creating lower passes that can present drainage and cattle line-of-sight issues while minimizing crossing length.

22. *STB Request: In the January 11, 2013 Alternatives Screening Analysis, TRRC noted that BNSF is modeling locomotive emissions and fuel usage. Indicate when the modeling will be complete.*

If the modeling is complete, provide the results and comparative discussion identified in the screening analysis.

TRRC Response: Modeling of the many alternative and variation combinations for fuel consumption is complete. We anticipate the conversion of fuel consumption to emission estimates will be complete by the end of May 2014 and will provide the information to the STB at that time. .

23. *STB Request: Confirm that all staging areas would be located within the railroad right-of-way. If they would not be located in the right-of-way, identify where the staging areas would be located.*

    TRRC Response: It is currently anticipated that most, if not all, staging areas will be located within the railroad right-of-way. Although the exact locations of staging areas would be determined by the construction contractor, such areas would typically be somewhat level, preferably with public access.

24. *STB Request: Describe to what extent there would be activity, development, or disturbance outside of the daylight lines, but inside the right-of-way.*

    TRRC Response: It is possible that some minor disturbance beyond the daylight lines would occur during construction for temporary activities such as bridge material and crane staging, installation of erosion control, and seeding. Fire breaks would be maintained as shown in the typical section exhibits.

25. *STB Request: Identify the anticipated support facility locations for each alternative. Indicate if support facilities would be constructed in Ashland independent of the rail alternative licensed.*

    TRRC Response: It is anticipated that all alternatives would require a support facility near Ashland and expansion of one existing maintenance-of-way facility, which is addressed in the response to Question 26 below.

26. *STB Request: Identify the anticipated maintenance-of-way headquarters for each alternative. Indicate if maintenance-of-way headquarters in Forsyth would be constructed independent of the rail alternative licensed.*

    TRRC Response: The Colstrip Alternatives would require a small expansion of the existing maintenance-of-way facility in Forsyth, Montana. The Tongue River, Tongue River Road, and Moon Creek Alternatives would require a similar expansion of the existing maintenance-of-way facility in Miles City, Montana. The Revised Decker Alternative would require a similar expansion of the existing maintenance-of-way facility near Sheridan, Wyoming.

27. *STB Request: Does the preliminary design account for changes in weather extremes over the life of the proposed rail line (e.g. the effects on bridges, culverts, and roadbed from potential increases in the number, duration, and intensity of floods, or the effects of higher temperatures in the future on the rail), and if so, how?*

    TRRC Response: The preliminary design is based on discharges calculated for the current 50-year and 100-year rainfall events. This approach follows accepted design standards and guidelines based on historical and foreseeable conditions.

28. *STB Request: Are bank engineered structures such as rip-rap or bank armoring planned along the banks of the Tongue River below the T&Y dam or anywhere else along the Tongue River?*

    TRRC Response: TRRC has previously responded to this request by letter dated April 3, 2014.

29. *STB Request: Does TRRC anticipate nighttime construction or would construction be limited to daylight hours?*

    TRRC Response: TRRC does not at present anticipate the need for nighttime construction if grading occurs outside of winter months. However, as described in the response to Question 1, the option of working through the winter may be implemented based on economic or other factors requiring a more compressed construction schedule, which would require working around the clock during winter months, generally assumed to be November 1 through March 1.

Referenced KMZ files are available for viewing at tongueriverеis.com website under "environmental review process and documents".