

## 7.0 ERRATA

This chapter presents changes and corrections to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS). The changes were either identified by the Section of Environmental Analysis in its ongoing environmental review or identified through agency and public comments to the DEIS and SDEIS.

### 6.1 Errata for the DEIS Executive Summary

Page ES-12 The second sentence under “Worker Health and Safety” should read as follows:  
“~~Construction and~~ Operation activities associated with the no-action alternative would likely cause greater impacts to worker health and safety, because ~~the construction activities would likely require more workers, and~~ injuries to workers during trucking operations are statistically greater.”

Page ES-20: The items in the list of meeting protocols that are preceded by the letters T, U, V, or W should be preceded by bullets instead of those letters.

#### Chapter 1

Page 1-6: Footnote 9, sentence 2 should read: “SEA generally prepares EAs for rail construction proposals that are relatively short in length and that are not likely to result in potentially significant environmental impacts, either as analyzed or with the addition of environmental mitigation.”

Page 1-11: First full paragraph, sentence 1 should read: “Because the quarry is not a facility related to rail transportation, the broad Federal preemption in 49 U.S.C. 10501(b) (discussed in more detail in Chapter ~~5~~ 4) would not apply to it and operations at the quarry would be subject to all applicable Federal, state, and local regulations.”

#### Chapter 2

Page 2-1: Second paragraph, sentence 2 should read: “An automated aggregate loading system would be used to load the rail cars at the loading track.”

Page 2-22: Public Health and Safety, first bullet should read: “Minor impacts from area roadway upgrades and construction from truck-to-rail loading facility, but impacts to area roadways would be longer in duration than impacts of the proposed rail line.”

Page 2-23: Worker Health and Safety, Alternative 2, last bullet should read: “No significant chance ~~or~~ of worker injuries or fatalities.”

Page 2-23: Worker Health and Safety, No-Action Alternative, the first bullet should be deleted.

Page 2-24: Groundwater Resources, Environmentally Preferable Alt., last bullet should read: “Proposed action preferable to no-action alternatives.”

Page 2-24: Surface Water Resources, No-Action, first bullet should read: “Greater surface water impacts than proposed action due to non-point source pollutants being carried as runoff to the local stream flow network.”

### **Chapter 3**

Page 3-50: Fourth paragraph, sentence 1 should read: “In a rural setting visual aesthetics are dominated by natural landforms and vegetation.”

Page 3-63: Table 3.11-2, last line of the table should include the following information: “Proposed route, None, 4.”

Page 3-67: Table 3-11-3, third to last line of the table, first box should read: “German-Alsatian Barn (Q) and House ® (R).”

Page 3-70: The two paragraphs above Table 3.12-2 should read as follows:

“Castroville (within 7 miles) and Hondo (within 8 miles) are the towns closest to the proposed project. There is a housing subdivision with a population of nearly 500 to the northwest of the community of Dunlay, near where the proposed rail line would connect with the UP rail line.<sup>48</sup> The community near Quihi, with a population of just over 50 people, is located within 1.5 miles of the proposed project. A rough estimate, based on 2000 census data, is that approximately 500 persons reside within 1 mile of the proposed route and alternative routes.

Table 3.12-2 presents 2000 minority population characteristics for Medina County, Texas and towns near the proposed project. Approximately 49 percent of Medina County’s 2000 population was minority, and 5 of the 36 census blocks within 1 mile of the proposed project area have a greater than 47.6 percent minority population (the Texas state average). The block group that would be affected by the proposed project has a 22.7 percent minority population.”

### **Chapter 4**

Page 4-2: Footnote 2, the last citation should be: “49 CFR 1105.4(d).”

Page 4-6: The second sentence under “Worker Health and Safety” should read as follows: “Construction and oOperation activities associated with the no-action alternative would likely cause greater impacts to worker health and safety, because ~~the construction activities would likely require more workers,~~ and injuries to workers during trucking operations are statistically greater.”

Page 4-16: Paragraph 3, last sentence should read: “However, in order to address the concerns raised by members of the public and TxDOT, SEA recommends that the following mitigation measures be imposed on any decision approving the proposed action proposed rail line construction and operation:”

Pages 4-16 to 4-17: The letters T, U, V, and W should be bullets.

Page 4-21: Paragraph 4, the beginning of last sentence should read: “Thus, the risk of to human health and safety from the operation of the no-action alternative on an annual basis would be:”

Page 4-22: Paragraph 3, Section 4.1.3, the first sentence should read: “In preparing this Draft EIS, SEA consulted with the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Texas Office of

Pipeline Safety (OPS), which orally indicated that pipeline owners are responsible for ensuring the safety of pipeline/rail crossings.”

Page 4-24: Paragraph 2 in Section 4.2.1, the first sentence should read: “Impacts to public health and safety from construction of the proposed rail line would primarily be from the emission of dust and criteria air pollutants (Total Particulate Matter (TPM), Particulate Matter less or equal to 10 microns (PM10), Nitrogen Oxides (NOX), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulphur Oxides (SOX), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), and Ammonia (NH4)) (as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s National Ambient Air Quality Standards, criteria air pollutants are the following: Carbon Monoxide; Lead; Nitrogen Dioxide; Particulate Matter; Ozone; and Sulfur Dioxides) that could be generated by heavy equipment during construction activities.”

Page 4-25: The last sentence of the first full paragraph should read: “Road construction activities, however, would result in greater impacts to local traffic because the disturbances to local roadways would be longer in duration and would disturb a larger area and impact a greater portion of the local road system.”

Page 4-27: Paragraph 2, the first sentence should read: “Impacts to worker health and safety from construction of the proposed rail line would be similar to the public health impacts discussed in Section 4.2, and would primarily be from exposure to criteria air pollutants (Total Particulate Matter (TPM), Particulate Matter less or equal to 10 microns (PM10), Nitrogen Oxides (NOX), Carbon Monoxide (CO), Sulphur Oxides (SOX), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs), and Ammonia (NH4)) (as defined by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s National Ambient Air Quality Standards, criteria air pollutants are the following: Carbon Monoxide; Lead; Nitrogen Dioxide; Particulate Matter; Ozone; and Sulfur Dioxides) that could be generated by construction activities.”

Page 4-28: Sentences 5 and 6 in the first full paragraph should be deleted.

Page 4-47: Second paragraph, first sentence should read: “However, in response to public comments regarding air-quality impacts, SEA has estimated the potential emissions from operations over the rail alternatives (including the proposed route, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3), as well as the no-action alternative, to assess in more detail the proposed project’s impacts on air quality.”

Page 4-49: The last sentence of the first full paragraph: “But construction activities would be longer in duration and would disturb a larger area” should be deleted.

Pages 4-56 to 4-66: Should be inserted. These pages appeared in their entirety as an attachment to the “Notice to the Parties” served by the Board in this proceeding on November 5, 2004.

Page 4-99: Section 4.15.3, first sentence should read: “In order to ensure that the provisions of the PA are fully implemented and complied with, SEA recommends that the Board impose the following condition on any decision approving the proposed action rail line construction and operation:”

Page 4-110: First full paragraph, first sentence should read: “The mobile source emissions of NOx, CO, PM10, and HC from local truck traffic, as well as the additive sum from local

truck traffic and the proposed action, are all below EPA's 10-ton and 100-ton per-year major emission thresholds for Title V permit applicability."

Page 4-117: Item 4, SEA's Preliminary Conclusion, first sentence should read: "The risks of accidents from proposed train operations would be unlikely, due to the limited amount of proposed rail operations (four trains per day – two round trips from the quarry to the UP rail line), the relatively short length of the proposed rail line (the proposed route would be seven miles in length, Alternative 1 would be nine miles in length, Alternative 2 would be approximately seven miles in length, and Alternative 3 would be 7.5 miles in length), the relatively low level of vehicular traffic, and the relatively slow speed of proposed train operations (25 miles per hour)."

## **Chapter 5**

Page 5-8: Mitigation Measure 36 should read: "During rail construction, Southwest Gulf Railroad Company shall promptly reseed the native grasses on the portion of the right-of-way that does not consist of the roadbed (tracks and ballast) or the ten-foot access area on either side of the roadbed."

## **Appendix A**

Photos were included to provide general background information of the proposed project area and not site specific photographic documentation. In response to comments received, indicating that some commenters regarded some of the photo captions to be offensive, the photo captions in Appendix A should be deleted.

## **Appendix C**

Table of Contents: Office of the Governor,, should be "Office of the Governor"

## **Appendix D**

Table of Contents: Median County Jude, Jim Barden should be "Medina County Judge, Jim Barden"

## **Appendix G**

Table of Contents: Pages 2 and 3 of the contents are identical. One of the pages should be deleted.

## **6.2 Errata for the SDEIS**

### **Chapter 2**

Page 2-15: The depicted boundary of the Weiblen property on Figure 2-2 is not accurate. The slight correction is depicted in the Figures included in Chapter 2 of this FEIS wherever the Weiblen property is depicted. This new boundary does not affect the conclusions and recommendations derived as a result of this environmental review.

### **Chapter 3**

Pages 3-47 and 3-48: The approximate number of individual properties that would be crossed by the Eastern Bypass Route, the MCEAA Medina Dam Alternative, and SGR's Modified Medina Dam Route are not accurate. The accurate number of properties would be 30, 20, and 24, respectively, and are presented in Table 2-17. Land Use of this FEIS.

## **Chapter 6**

Page 6-19: The last sentence of the paragraph before Table 6.2.3-1 should have a period at the end.

Page 6-35: The approximate number of individual properties that would be crossed by the Eastern Bypass Route, the MCEAA Medina Dam Alternative, and SGR's Modified Medina Dam Route are not accurate. The accurate number of properties would be 30, 20, and 24, respectively, and are presented in Table 2-17. Land Use of this FEIS.

## **Appendix B**

Title Page: Relevant Correspondent should be "Relevant Correspondence"