*Article unchanged from e-bulletin.
**Blue type in article: changes from e-bulletin.

NS-ST DEAL

PAS: Start of operations. Second rail train.

OTHER REGIONAL ISSUES

PW: Annual meeting discusses intermodal.*

PW: Ethanol terminal expanding.*

PW: Auto comments at annual meeting.*

CONNECTICUT

ConnDOT: State rail plan drafting.*

HRRC: Applies for C&D permit at Shepaug.

MAINE

SLR: Intermodal down again.*

ST: Removes equipment from Baileyville.*

Eastport: Handling windmill blades.*

Eastport: Engineering study of rail to Perry.*

MASSACHUSETTS

MC/BCLR: BCLR renews Watuppa deal.**

CSXI: Resumes service Boston-South Kearney.*

CSXT/EOT: Liability negotiations continue.

ST/CSXT: Fish car too big for Highliner Foods, diverted to Wilmington Cold Storage.*

MC: New customer Capeway Terminal opens.

PAS: Ayer strikes deal on San Vel auto site.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire: Study passes on rail line buy.*

RHODE ISLAND

Provport: Hudson, Global operating biodiesel terminal, not doing refinery at this point.*

QDC/Seaview: More on Alterra’s planned biodiesel terminal.*

VERMONT

[No report.]

MARITIMES/QUÉBEC

WHRC: Update on operations. Gypsum suffering.*

Halifax: Stimulus $$ for Halterm’s second postPanamax berth, Richmond expansion.*

Melford: Stimulus for 344. Project moving ahead.*

Sydney: Dredging permits.*

Sydney: NSPI gives dredging $1 million.

Sydney/SCR: Xstrata will start coal mining in 2010.

Yarmouth: Applied for stimulus funding for short-sea shipping.*

Box on ferry subsidies.*

RAIL SHIPPERS/RECEIVERS

A cross-reference to companies mentioned here.

PEOPLE, POSITIONS, EVENTS

[No report.]

FROM THE PUBLISHER

Container terminal foolishness
At the Propeller Club of Belfast, I will reprise my theory that no new container terminal is needed. All invited, 21 May.

Vermont
I hope to catch up next issue.

- Chop Hardenbergh

Next issue 31 May.

NS-ST DEAL

The Norfolk Southern Railway (NS) and the Pan Am Railways (ST) created the Pan Am Southern Railway (PAS) to operate all of ST’s lines west of Ayer. This section covers that deal, approved by the STB on 10 March.

NS-ST: START OF OPERATION

13 May. PAS WILL NOT ISSUE AN NOTICE THAT IT HAS BEGUN OPERATION, at least not to the STB. It is not required. {e-mail to ANR&P from NS spokesperson Rudy Husband, and from attorney familiar with STB practice}

End of NS-ST section

With the start of PAS operations, this section ends. Most of PAS operations are handled by ST. As Mike McClellan of NS said [see 09#04B], “[ST] is the face of Pan Am Southern.”

A breath of fresh air

One of the officials long involved with ST noted recently that the NS participation in discussions brings a new and more reasonable tone. “Norfolk Southern is much more aware of media reports and public image,” she believed. “The NS participation in the joint venture [of Pan Am Southern] really helps.” {ANR&P discussion}

REGIONAL ISSUES

PW: INTERMODAL TRAFFIC*

29 April, Worcester. REASONS FOR SHRINKAGE AND REASONS FOR GROWTH in the railroad’s intermodal traffic were listed at the PW annual meeting here. Chair Bob Eder, President Scott Conti, and Vice-president Marketing Frank Rogers discussed the current and future traffic.

2008 numbers down 48%

The Annual Report noted container freight revenues dropped 44.8%. ‘The decrease in container freight revenues is the result of a 48.3% decline in traffic volume somewhat offset by an 8.6% increase in the average revenue received per container. Container traffic volume decreased by 19,567 containers to 20,938 in 2008 from 40,505 in 2007. During the second quarter of 2007 the Company began to experience a steady decrease in the volume of its container traffic which continued throughout 2008. Among other factors, rate increases imposed by western rail carriers in the United States resulted in steamship lines using "all water" routings to the East Coast for an increasingly larger portion of container traffic, thereby significantly reducing the volume of such traffic shipped cross-country by rail. In addition, the current economic downturn has added to the decline in container traffic.
volume. The Company is unable to predict if and when container traffic may significantly increase. The increase in the average revenue received per container is attributable to contractual rate adjustments based upon railroad industry cost indices as well as a change in the mix of containers handled.

The officials noted that the all-water route may predominate until East coast ports are filled, “then traffic may go back to the West coast.”

**“Horrible” traffic**

Eder called on one principal of Intransit Container Terminals attending the meeting, Norman Tasgal, to comment on the traffic at his facilities. Tasgal called the drop “horrible.” [Intransit did 65,000 containers in 2003, see 04#04A.]

The Panama Canal widening does not present the threat which some might think, said Tasgal. More traffic will go all-water, yes, but because the larger ships [see box] cannot call Boston, they will discharge in New York. Boxes for New England could then move on CSXI to the Worcester terminals.

**Possible sources of growth**

With the coming of Pan Am Southern [see above], ST will move NS intermodal traffic between Mechanicville and Ayer in haulage, for PAS [see 08#06A]. Rogers was asked whether, given the fact that domestic intermodal traffic has suffered much less than international intermodal traffic, PW saw any opportunity to shift its international intermodal terminals to domestic traffic. NS could compete directly with CSXT’s intermodal terminal in Worcester.

Rogers responded by noting that NS will have domestic terminals in Ayer and Mechanicville. [It could also locate a terminal in New Haven–see 08#12A Connecticut.] PW might try to load international containers received in Worcester with domestic freight to move back to the West coast. This would return the international box to the West coast for a trip back to Asia.

He also mentioned the possibility of intermodal traffic through the Bellows Falls tunnel between Canada and New England. [Such traffic was discussed when the Tunnel was enlarged–see 07#01B Regional.]{ANR&P coverage}

**PW: ETHANOL EXPANSION**

29 April, Worcester. THE ETHANOL TERMINAL IS EXPANDING THE PRODUCERS SERVED. At the PW annual meeting here, Chair Bob Eder, President Scott Conti, and Vice-president Marketing Frank Rogers explained the operation of the terminal in Providence, funded in part by PW, and operated by Motiva.
Transportation contract
Ethanol producers sell direct to end users in New England. The producer pays for the transportation to Providence, the terminalling by Motiva, and the delivery to the end user. Usually trucks carry the ethanol out of Motiva to New England destinations; infrequently it moves by barge.

To deliver by barge, PW must compete with the barge moves from the other two ethanol terminals near New England.

Producers
Through 2008, PW received ethanol from two producers in the Midwest, often in 80-car trains. In 2009, it will add a third producer, and possibly a fourth, in Canada. [One producer is Aventine—see 06#07B. A second, mentioned in the Annual Report, may be Cargill.]

Expansion
Producers would like to send 100-car trains to Providence. PW can switch in such trains to the Motiva terminal, with difficulty. Accepting 80-car unit trains is best done with space for 100 cars, the current design, the officials said. To best accept 100-car trains, the railroad needs 120 car spaces, and it is engaged in expanding the terminal to ‘the remainder of the South Providence Yard,’ the Annual Report said. [See box.]

While in the west, UP is giving much better rates to 100-car trains than to 80-car trains, here CSXT limits train length into Massachusetts because CSXT would have difficulty hauling the loaded train over the Berkshires.

PW can use the expanded access of Norfolk Southern into New England. Because of the Hoosac Tunnel [see 09#04B Regional], PAS can move the longer train more easily into Massachusetts, and then interchange with PW in Gardner. {ANR&P coverage}

SUING YOUR CUSTOMER
PW acquired the land under the Motiva terminal in 1982, when it bought Conrail properties in Rhode Island and Connecticut. PW in turn transferred the land to the City of Providence, retaining an easement for railroad purposes.

To build the Motiva terminal, PW had to move the company located next to the South Providence Yard, Coastal Recycling [our Directory # 489], off land on which it had encroached. That entailed winning a lawsuit; PW is now engaged in a second lawsuit, to clear the land for further expansion. Oral argument occurred the final week of April. {ANR&P coverage}

PW: AUTO TRAFFIC*
29 April, Worcester. PW’S HANDLING OF AUTO RACKS was discussed at the 165th PW annual meeting. The Annual Report noted that the railroad moved 1,043 carloads for February to December 2008, compared with 167 carloads in all of 2007. ‘Early [in March], the Company handled outbound vehicles delivered from Germany to Davisville via oceangoing vessel and destined for the West coast of the United States for the first time.’

NS interchange
While PW has interchanged with Class Is CSXT in Worcester, and CP via NECR through the Bellows Falls tunnel, PW has not yet interchanged auto traffic in Gardner with ST for forwarding to NS. Part of the problem: rail auto transportation contracts last three to five years [so that NORAD—see 08#02A—cannot quickly add new transportation contracts]. At this point, the auto rail traffic is moving as “spot business.” {ANR&P coverage}
CONNDOT: STATE RAIL PLAN

5 May. THE FIRST OF THREE PUBLIC OUTREACH MEETINGS on the state rail plan occurred in Norwich. ConnDOT plans a second in Norwalk on 19 May, and a third in West Haven on 2 June. The Connecticut Public Transportation Commission is hosting all three meetings.

Stakeholder meetings
The first meeting of stakeholders [see table] took place on 24 March. A second will happen in Newington on 9 June, followed by issuing of the draft State Rail Plan in July.

Substance
A powerpoint presentation from ConnDOT said the Plan would cover 2010 to 2014; USDOT will require a plan every five years. It showed the 11 chapters of the plan:

- Inventory, Review of all rail lines
- Passenger rail objectives
- Analysis of impacts
- Long-range rail investment program
- Public financing issues
- Rail infrastructure issues identified with stakeholders
- Intermodal connections
- Safety and security projects
- Evaluation of passenger rail performance
- Studies and reports on high-speed rail

ConnDOT said the Plan would cover 2010 to 2014; USDOT will require a plan every five years. It showed the 11 chapters of the plan:

HRRC: EXPANSION

13 May, Newtown. THE RAILROAD HAS REQUESTED A PERMIT FOR ITS TRANSFER FACILITY, in the locality of Hawleyville in the Town of Newtown.

History
In 2002, HRRC completed the Shepaug Bulk Transfer Facility [our Directory #680] here, adjacent to its long-time lumber transload [our Directory #681]. It operates as a wholly-owned subsidiary of the railroad.

In 2004, the facility began handling construction and demolition debris (C&D). Colin Pease, HRRC vice-president for special projects, said the railroad solicits C&D from surrounding non-rail-served facilities. It arrives already sorted, is dumped out of trucks onto a floor, and then loaded into waiting railcars.

Because of federal pre-emption, Shepaug did not need a state permit to operate up to now.

New federal law
In October 2008, the US Congress required all waste transfer facilities, even those already operating, to obtain a state permit.

Figure 1 Stakeholders and chapters of Connecticut State Rail Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Topic</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Freight Rails</th>
<th>Intercity Rails</th>
<th>Commuter Rail</th>
<th>Long-Range Invest Program</th>
<th>Public Financing Issues</th>
<th>Rail Infrastructure Issues</th>
<th>Intermodal Connections</th>
<th>Safety &amp; Security Projects</th>
<th>Evaluation of Performance</th>
<th>High-Speed Studies and Development Funding</th>
<th>Compliance Statement with 22101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Rail System Inventory</td>
<td>almost completed (status)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Rail Line Review</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 State Rail Service Objectives</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Rail Impacts Analysis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Env. Factors</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Long-Range Investment Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Public Financing Issues Statement</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Identification of Rail Infrastructure Issues</td>
<td>Asset Hmt Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Review/Optimization of Intermodal Connections</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Review of Safety &amp; Security Projects</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Performance Evaluation &amp; Improvement Strategies</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Compilation of High Speed Studies and Development Funding Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Compliance Statement with 22101</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
permit [see 08#10B Massachusetts]. Those grandfathered thus were given 180 days to obtain a permit from the state. [See box.]

Pease said because of the novelty of the statute, “no one had a clear sense” of how the permitting process would work. In filing with the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection, HRRC fit Shepaug into ConnDEP’s category of ‘volume reduction facility’. Pease emphasized that Shepaug does no sorting or processing of the C&D.

Possible expansion
Since the C&D started moving, Shepaug has done about 300-400 tons a day, Pease said. “We do no municipal solid waste. We have no interest in handling MSW, unless it is already in a container, or wrapped bails.”

Shepaug filed for a permit to handle 2,000 tons a day. “We did not want to limit ourselves,” Pease said. He foresees “expansion for soils...direct truck to rail. There’s clearly the potential, we want to make sure to have the permitted capacity.” {ANR&P discussion 13.May.09}

ConnDEP comment
DEP spokesman Dennis Schain said on 8 May the DEP will first have to render a preliminary decision on the project. “We'll be looking at environmental issues, wetlands, air quality, water quality.” Once the DEP issues its preliminary report, it will hold a public hearing if it receives a petition signed by 25 town residents.

Pease said HRRC will construct a building at the transfer station to enclose all its operations, cutting noise and containing any dust from the work, he said.

Truck traffic may increase on the tenth of a mile from I-84 to the facility location on Route 25. But putting the C&D on rail is far more environmentally sound than moving it by long-distance trucks.

First Selectman Joe Borst said the town will press the DEP to hold a public hearing on the project. “We want our say.” {Robert Miller in Newtown News Times 8.May.09}

STATUTORY LANGUAGE
Title VI of the ‘Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008’ covers the “Clean Railroads Act of 2008’ reads in part:

“(b) EXISTING FACILITIES.—
“(1) STATE LAWS AND STANDARDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Clean Railroads Act of 2008, a solid waste rail transfer facility operating as of such date of enactment shall comply with all Federal and State requirements pursuant to subsection (a) other than those provisions requiring permits.
“(2) PERMIT REQUIREMENTS.—
“(A) STATE NON-SITING PERMITS.—Any solid waste rail transfer facility operating as of the date of enactment of the Clean Railroads Act of 2008 that does not possess a permit required pursuant to subsection (a), other than a siting permit for the facility, as of the date of enactment of the Clean Railroads Act of 2008 shall not be required to possess any such permits in order to operate the facility—
“(i) if, within 180 days after such date of enactment, the solid waste rail transfer facility has submitted, in good faith, a complete application for all permits, except siting permits, required pursuant to subsection (a) to the appropriate permitting agency authorized to grant such permits; and
“(ii) until the permitting agency has either approved or denied the solid waste rail transfer facility’s application for each permit.

“(B) SITING PERMITS AND REQUIREMENTS.—A solid waste rail transfer facility operating as of the date of enactment of the Clean Railroads Act of 2008 that does not possess a State siting permit required pursuant to subsection (a) as of such date of enactment shall not be required to possess any permit to continue to operate or comply with any State land use requirements. The Governor of a State in which the facility is located, or his or her designee, may petition the Board to require the facility to apply for a land-use exemption pursuant to section 10909 of this chapter. The Board shall accept the petition, and the facility shall be required to have a Board-issued land-use exemption in order to continue to operate, pursuant to section 10909 of this chapter.” {Library of Congress website}
MAINE

SLR: INTERMODAL*

29 April, Auburn. **SLR INTERMODAL FOR 1Q 09 DROPPED.** Parent company Genesee & Wyoming reported 174 ‘carloads’ for January-March, below 1Q08's level of 259. [GWI press release]

This continues a steady decline; 4Q08 had 277 carloads. [See 09#01A.]

ST-BAILEYVILLE*

1 May, Baileyville. **ST MOVED ITS LOCOMOTIVE AND EQUIPMENT OUT**, as the Domtar pulp mill shut down. It ran the last loaded train on 29 April, with what Domtar spokesperson Scott Beal described as boxcars of pulp. {NERails e-list; Diana Graettinger in Bangor Daily News 30.Apr.09}

EASTPORT: NEW CARGO*

30 April. **STEVEDORES WILL DISCHARGE UP TO 104 GENERAL ELECTRIC BLADES** from Brazil, the first shipment of wind turbine components the port is receiving, said Chris Gardner, Eastport Port Authority director. “We think we are strategically well placed to handle many more such loads in the future.” Gardner said. He noted that the operator of the pier, Federal Marine Terminals, “has a good relationship with GE at other terminals.”

At least 20 blades are slated for a 40-turbine wind farm on Rollins Mountain in the northern Penobscot County towns of Lincoln, Lee, Burlington, and Winn, developed by Massachusetts-based First Wind. The rest of the blades will move by truck to industrial wind sites in Nova Scotia and Mansfield, Pennsylvania. {ANR&P discussion; Bangor Daily News cited by Mainebiz}

EASTPORT: RAIL STUDY*

27 April. **THE COUNTY WILL PAY FOR A STUDY OF EXTENDING RAIL TOWARD THE PORT**, said Chris Gardner, Eastport Port Authority director. The Washington County commissioners recently voted to take a leadership role and pursue funding for the engineering study via a grant from the federal Economic Development Administration. Gardner noted that EDA funding would require a 50% match. Even without the federal money, the County and the port would find the funds.

Gardner believed that by piggybacking the study on the already-begun Maine state rail plan [see 09#04A], the County can get the work done quickly and inexpensively. The port needs the study by November to apply for stimulus funds for the actual project. “We are working with MDOT to use the rail consultant [HNTB] to make an addendum” to the rail plan, and avoid the need to put the work out to bid.

The proposal

Gardner described the study as “purely engineering” of a rehab of the Y-shaped line: Calais to Baileyville, and Calais to Ayers Junction (which has rail) and Ayers to Perry (right-of-way, but no rail). This will be “a rail project for all of Washington County.” It will enable the marketing of the former Louisiana Pacific mill in Baileyville, the Domtar mill, and the port.

What about the L-P restrictions on the buyer of its Baileyville plant [see 09#01A]? “We believe the right business opportunity can overcome that,” said Gardner.

In Perry, the engineers will look at a new rail yard design which will permit easy truck to rail transload, and a freight village.

Why not to Eastport?

Building the rail past Perry, “it gets extremely expensive, that final seven miles.” Pan Am, and “Federal Marine’s marketing department and its operations people” see a transload in Perry as “a good compromise,” said Gardner.
At seven miles “the hook does not have to wait” to load a series of trucks moving directly from the pier to the transload, “in the proximity of Route 190.”

Customers?
Who will use the rail? Gardner acknowledged that “people want an up front guarantee” that Eastport will have a customer to use the new infrastructure. While he has no customer at this point, he argued that “if the state is serious about infrastructure, look where rail and port meet.” Maine can have the “deepest port in the continental United States, and a new rail structure.”

Gardner is seeking new cargo, and hopes that Federal Marine will help with a marketing study. Offering the near-dock rail will help.

Cost of the actual construction
An earlier study showed the line would cost $1 million per mile, but “the Mountain Division study shows less.” [The HNTB study of the Mountain Division said upgrading 50 miles of track to FRA Class 2 would cost $20 million, or $400,000 per mile. See 08#03A.]

“We are looking for stimulus funding,” said Gardner, and “working with MDOT to make a concerted request” not just for Eastport, but for the region. “We have had business opportunities we have lost for lack of rail.”

While the railroad has not yet committed funding, “Pan Am has been very active in these discussions” and he anticipates it will continue to do so.

The transload in Baileyville
MDOT had proposed funding a rail-truck transload located next to the Domtar mill [see 09#03B]. Gardner said that proposal was made “under a different model, when Domtar was the anchor. Then the port had stable base, and could grow other business at a slower rate.”

Now, he anticipates the money for Eastport in the bond package will be refocused more directly on the port infrastructure. {ANR&P discussion}
1800 hours on Monday will be available at 0800 Thursday; tendered Wednesday available 0500 Mondays, and tendered Friday available 0800 Monday.

‘The new service is consistent with CSXI's commitment to develop shorter-haul intermodal solutions serving markets near major East coast ports.’ {CSXI notice; ANR&P interview}

CSXT/EOT
13 May. **CSXT AND THE STATE CONTINUE TO NEGOTIATE ABOUT LIABILITY**, prior to the next step of their four-part sales agreement. In the first step, in October 2008 CSXT agreed to permit additional trains between Boston and Worcester.

In the second step, assuming that the two sides have solved the liability problem, in June 2009 CSXT will sell the state the lines to New Bedford and Fall River, as well as the Grand Junction and the Boston Terminal Running Track. In a third step, and not until 2012, the state will buy the line to Worcester. [See 08#10A.]

CSX would not comment on the specifics of the negotiations, the cost or timing of a sale, or whether the company would agree to take on some liability based on the government report. Spokesperson Robert Sullivan issued a statement saying talks are continuing. ‘While there are a number of issues involved in this process, everyone is engaged in arriving at a public-private sector solution that recognizes the value of passenger and freight rail transportation to the Commonwealth.’ {Connie Paige in Boston Globe 14.May.09}

CSXT/ST: FISH MOVE*
27 April, Wilmington. **WILMINGTON COLD STORAGE RECEIVED TWO REFRIGERATED RAILCARS** which were too big to fit inside the Highliner Foods [our Directory #38] building in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

**The move**
The seller on the West coast ships frozen fish by rail east, CSXT to ST. Two recent carloads [presumably Trinity Industries Trincool Plate F 17' high Trincool cars {company website}] were backed to the Highliner door which proved too low. ST then took the cars to Wilmington Cold Storage, where the fish was unloaded and drayed back to Highliner.

The seller was able to divert a third car to Everett directly on CSXT, to the Preferred Freezer Services facility [#212].

**Still very little traffic for Wilmington**
In the past, said Bob Ormond of Wilmington Cold Storage [#176], fish cars had moved BNSF-CSXT-ST directly to his facility on the MBTA New Hampshire route. But more than six years ago, ST raised its rates so high that the seller found the rail move direct on CSXT to Everett cheaper “by $700 or $800.” Wilmington Cold Storage formerly had 400 or 500 carloads a year, “a nice little business,” which went away almost entirely.

Now, Ormond said, railcar deliveries are “few and far between.” His facility is still doing business, but a sister company, Metro Freezer [our Directory #322] in Natick on CSXT closed “I would say three years ago.”

**Highliner rail traffic**
Paul Cavelli, who handles cold storage for Highliner, called the rail deliveries “a very slow process.” In the past year, the facility has received only ten to twelve cars. Others move to Everett whence the produce is trucked to Portsmouth. He has now added 18 inches to the door height, so he can accept the larger cars; the door was about 12 inches too low.

He’s handled rail deliveries for 37 years going back to Conrail at another facility in Boston; rail service has not improved over the years. For example, he received another, smaller car on 30 April; it was due on the 28th. “They said they’d deliver at 1100AM then 300PM, then finally 530PM.” His crew has to stay to unload the car, because “we have to turn off the car to bring it inside the building” to avoid the diesel exhaust. The crew has to unload the car “right away.” {ANR&P discussion 27.Apr.09 & 4.May.09}
**MC: NEW CUSTOMER**

13 May, Middleborough. The terminal is set up, said William Sullivan, who put it together for the owners, to do both outbound and inbound freight. “We have the Sekonnet Bridge” [the rail bridge to Aquidneck Island recently demolished—editor], he said, and the ability to load it into railcars. Sullivan promised more details, after the official opening next week. {ANR&P discussion}

It is located in Middleborough off Wareham Street (Route 28) on MC. Farther down the street lies a Pavestone manufacturing facility, reportedly to become one of the major users of Capeway.

**MC comment**

Dan Wahle, who handles marketing for MC, wrote that the switch was installed the previous week to a brand-new siding. Business handled so far consists of several cars of finished steel. {e-mail to ANR&P 14.May.09}

**PAS: AUTO FACILITY WORK**

11 May, Ayer. NS, ST, AND AYER OFFICIALS HELD A “PRODUCTIVE MEETING” about the construction of the San Vel auto facility here [see 09#04B]. Ayer Selectman Jim Fay said Ayer and Littleton were concerned about the aquifer lying under the San Vel facility [subject of a consent decree in US District Court in 2003–see 09#02A and 03#08B–under which ST agreed to permit monitoring of the construction]. Fay and Ayer Town Administrator Shawn Suhoski, who also participated, said the railways agreed that “town water staff could participate in weekly construction meetings at the site.” The railways will also abide by the consent decree’s condition that the town have monitoring wells throughout the life of the terminal.

Fay added that the EPA is also monitoring the situation, and that the original plan for the terminal had 3,000 spaces. Now it will hold 810 cars. {ANR&P discussions 14.May.09}

**Spectacle Pond Water Association**

On 9 May, about 25 people attended the annual meeting of the Spectacle Pond Water Association, which looks after the health of the pond and the underlying aquifer. Attendees talked about the beginning of work on the San Vel facility. [ST itself had begun work on the facility in 2006–see 06#10B–but then stopped.]

“Industries rely heavily on our water product,” said Ayer Selectman Carolyn McCreary, citing local businesses such as Cains, Nasoya, Aquafina, Pepsi, and Nashoba Valley Medical Center. {Mary Arata in Nashoba Publishing website}

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**NH: STUDY RAIL LINE PURCHASE**

29 April, Concord. HB316, THE BILL TO CREATE A STUDY OF PURCHASING ALL RAIL LINES IN THE STATE, passed the Senate this day; it previously passed the House [see 09#04A]. {NH General Court website}

**RHODE ISLAND**

**PROVPORT: BIODIESEL TERMINAL**

30 April. HUDSON IS OPERATING A BIODIESEL TERMINAL, BUT NOT YET BUILDING A REFINERY, said Bob Cerio, project manager for Hudson. “It’s not the time for a production facility [see 07#01A], so many have closed in the past year,” he noted. “Massachusetts is certainly a potential market [see below]. Everyone has their
The Rhode Island Senate passed S0525 on 22 April expanding the 30 cents a gallon tax exemption from B100 to blended biodiesel. {General Assembly press release}

The Connecticut General Assembly is entertaining Raised Bill No. 1019, which would match the Massachusetts phase-in of biodiesel. It has passed the Committee on Energy and Technology, and the Committee on the Environment. {General Assembly website}

Terminalling
Hudson, which built five new heated and insulated tanks at the former Sunoco and Citgo terminals, operates the terminal for Global, which is “buying biodiesel from producers, and blending with heating and transportation fuels, in B2 (2% biodiesel), B5, B10, and B20,” said Cerio. It is selling to oil distribution companies. The B100 biodiesel comes in by truck from New Jersey; truck makes sense because it can make several stops. At this point Hudson is using a 28,000-gallon tank, but could change over one of its new tanks to throughput more biodiesel.

Suppliers and price
The producer, Innovation Fuels in Newark, New Jersey, is taking the tax credit of one dollar per gallon offered by the federal government on all biodiesel. It passes on the credit by reducing the cost to Hudson and others by 95 cents, explained Cerio, keeping five cents for itself “to run the tax credit through the books.”

Diesel arrives by ship from Canada, Venezuela, Russia, and New Jersey. “We get ultra low sulfur diesel from the United States, and sometimes Irving” in Canada. {ANR&P discussion}

QDC/SEAVIEW: BIODIESEL*
6 May, Weston, Connecticut. ALTERRA PLANS A CAUTIOUS EXPANSION of its facility at Quonset Point, said Dan Charleton, who is putting together the financing for the biodiesel terminal [see 09#04B].

The market
Charleton said he can assure investors that Alterra will not be crowded out, even as he knows of two other possible biodiesel facilities coming on line. Given the definite Massachusetts biodiesel requirement of 2% [see box] and possible Rhode Island1 and Connecticut2 requirements, the three states may require 2% of their total demand in 2010 of 2.2 billion gallons of diesel and home heating oil. He can calculate a demand of 2% of that, or 44 million gallons of biodiesel. He’s aiming to meet only one-tenth of that market. [See above for Hudson terminal biodiesel facility.]

Sources of funding
The project requires $7.5 million, made up of $0.5 million in working capital, $5 million of combined senior debt and equity, and $2 million of subordinated debt.

In April, the Rhode Island Economic Development Corporation decided to include biofuels as a category for its alternative energy loan fund, and Charleton sees that as a source of low-interest loan funds.

---

1 The Rhode Island Senate passed S0525 on 22 April expanding the 30 cents a gallon tax exemption from B100 to blended biodiesel. {General Assembly press release}

2 The Connecticut General Assembly is entertaining Raised Bill No. 1019, which would match the Massachusetts phase-in of biodiesel. It has passed the Committee on Energy and Technology, and the Committee on the Environment. {General Assembly website}
The facility
To become operational in 4Q09, Alterra plans to build three tanks. Charleton said at the outset, Alterra will receive both diesel and biodiesel by truck; it will blend onsite to the required mix of biodiesel. He envisions one tank of diesel, and two of B100 biodiesel.

The biodiesel capacity helps, first because the producers often do not have significant storage space, and second because obtaining biodiesel will, he believes, be harder than obtaining the regular diesel.

Alterra will lease the property from QDC for thirty years, and pay $19,138/year to the Town of Kingston in lieu of taxes.

Eventually, said Charleton: “We will be building 5 tanks of 200,000 gallons each. The reasoning is that, in the most expanded scenario we will have the following use: On-road Diesel #2 – feedstock; ultra low sulfur diesel – feedstock; heating oil – feedstock; biodiesel B100 – feedstock; and spare capacity tank.”

Later expansion
Alterra believes during the first year it will throughput “eight to ten million gallons,” according to Charleton. By year three, he hopes to ramp up to 25 million gallons. This will require moving from truck to rail and marine delivery. For example, one producer is located on Lake Erie, and would prefer to deliver its B100 by ship.

QDC will assist with bringing in rail, and with a pipeline to the Alterra tanks, which helps considerably with Alterra’s capital needs. {ANR&P discussion}

---

QUEBEC/MARITIMES

WHRC: GYPSUM DOWN*
4 May, Windsor. AN UPDATE ON THE RAILWAY’S OPERATIONS came from Jim Taylor, the general manager.

Gypsum
The WHRC major move, gypsum from Mantua to Hantsport for Fundy Gypsum, will do perhaps 700,000 tonnes this year, he estimated, about half of earlier annual traffic [see 08#12A].

When the railway moves the cars with only one locomotive, as it has done recently, it moves 20 loaded gypsum cars from Mantua to Falmouth (about two miles west of Windsor) where it drops 10 and proceeds to Hantsport with the other 10; it cannot haul all 20 due to a grade. The locomotive returns to Falmouth and hauls the second 10 to Hantsport.

Taylor said “this tacks on about half an hour” to the operation.

CN service
WHRC also handles eight to 10 carloads a week [down from the 700 carloads a year of 2007–see 08#03B], moving them from the interchange with CN at Windsor Junction to the transload in Windsor [see 07#08B]. CN is scheduled to do the interchange twice a week, on Thursdays and Sundays. “It’s working,” said Taylor. “They’re close to being on their days.” {ANR&P discussion}

HALIFAX: GATEWAY PROJECTS*
30 April, Halifax. THE FEDERAL AND PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENTS ANNOUNCED TWO MAJOR INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS for the Port of Halifax.

Overall package
The federal and provincial governments made available a total package of $422 million for Nova Scotia; $136
million of that for shovel-ready infrastructure projects (half of this highway), $172 million to support the long-term objectives of the Atlantic Gateway, and the balance for community funding.

For provincial projects, the federal and provincial governments will each contribute up to half. {premier’s office press release}

Six Gateway projects
‘As mandated by the federal/provincial Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), the Atlantic Gateway Strategy will be released by Fall 2009, and will serve as the foundation for partners’ ongoing efforts to keep this vital trade and transportation system at the forefront of existing and emerging global commerce opportunities. The following infrastructure projects have been identified as priorities for funding, in support of the longer-term objectives of the Atlantic Gateway:

- Burnside Connector Phase 1 – $35 million (up to $17.5 million federal) highway project connecting Highway 102 and Highway 107 and a major industrial park and transshipment facility;
- Port of Halifax South Terminal Expansion – $35 million (up to $17.5 million federal) to accommodate the next generation of container ships;
- Port of Halifax, Richmond Terminals Multipurpose Gateway Extension – $73 million (up to $36.5 million federal) to upgrade and expand value-added cargo handling services;
- Truro High Speed Interchange – $9 million (up to $4.5 million federal) to upgrade the interchange ramps at a vital highway junction through which high volumes of Nova Scotian trade moves;
- Highway Upgrades on Route 344 – $15 million (up to $7.5 million federal) to support development and operation of the proposed Melford Container Terminal; and
- Business Development and Marketing Initiatives – $5 million (up to $2.5 million federal) to market Atlantic Gateway ports and other facilities.’ {Infrastructure Canada backgrounder}

Projects for the port
The port ‘had provided the Province of Nova Scotia and Government of Canada with a wide-range of infrastructure project options for consideration that covered all areas of the Port’s diverse business. This included rail service, containerized cargo, bulk cargo, breakbulk, roll-on/roll-off and cruise-related projects,’ according to an HPA press release. {HPA press release}

Halterm capacity increase
Michele Peveril, HPA spokesperson, supplied this background material on the two projects selected by the two governments:

‘Expansion of the South End Container Terminal (operated by Halterm Container Terminal Limited). This project would increase container handling capacity at the Port of Halifax by extending and deepening Pier C enabling simultaneous berthing of two full-sized post-Panamax vessels. The pier is currently capable of docking one post-Panamax ship and a smaller vessel at the same time, limiting operational flexibility and creating scheduling challenges when multiple shipping lines are calling at the terminal.

‘To create a second post-Panamax berth, the southern end of the pier must be extended by approximately 80m and the surrounding area must be dredged from a depth of 14.5m to a new depth of 16.0m. The extension would create a finger pier 80m wide which would support the crane rails and provide an operational area for cargo movement.

‘Improved cargo-handling efficiencies, particularly for truck operations through upgrade of the truck marshalling yard, would be created by increasing the terminal area by 4-6 acres and allowing for a reconfiguration and redevelopment of the approach road and gate complex to improve ingress and egress of truck traffic. Estimated project cost of $35 million.’ {HPA backgrounder}

More detail. Pier C has two berths, 41 (15.2 metres water depth) and 42 (13.7 metres) [HPA has numbered berths
from inland to ocean, with 42 the last berth [editor]. Pier C has cranes which can reach across a ship 22 boxes wide [Panamax vessels have widths of about 14 boxes—editor]; such a ship would need more water than berth 42 now provides, said Doug Rose, president of Halterm.

Peveril said HPA’s board has considered the project for some time, and just recently agreed to expand and dredge berth 42 using its own funding; dredging of berth 41 is not now part of the project. The work will require environmental permitting.

Rose said the terminal had enough laydown area in its 73 acres to accommodate boxes coming off two large ships, and 8,000 feet of track; the track might require reconfiguring when traffic grew. Peveril said CN had given assurances it could rail out the additional quantities.

Does expanding the terminal make sense? Rose said Halterm is at only 30% of capacity. But, said Peveril, Halifax wants to be ready when the recession comes to an end and container traffic climbs.

Halterm and the other terminal, Fairview Cove operated by Ceres, total current traffic of half a million TEUs per year; Peveril said the two could handle a total of 1.5 million TEUs. {ANR&P discussions 1.May.09}

‘Richmond Terminals Multipurpose Gateway Expansion
This project will upgrade and expand the value added cargo handling services that can be conducted at Richmond Terminals. The facility would be expanded to enable roll on/roll off handling and enhanced heavy lift capabilities. Area 9D which is currently undeveloped would be upgraded to provide enhanced pier and marshalling capabilities. The Shed 9A facility would be redeveloped into a modern multi-purpose warehouse designed and subdivided to accommodate multiple cargo handling tenants. The activities carried out at Richmond Terminals will be value-added processing, transloading, and distribution, primarily for export.’ Estimated project cost of $73 million. {HPA backgrounder from Peveril}

More detail. “In terms of lands under the administration by the Halifax Port Authority, Richmond Terminals is the last significant block of property” that is underdeveloped and has great potential, HPA President Karen Oldfield said at a press conference 30 April. “There is so much potential there to go to some of our other lines of business,” referring to break-bulk, bulk and occasional cargo business from the offshore exploration industry.

The Richmond Terminals project would extend the berth and develop an area of just under seven acres of land, “so it is a significant addition at the port....This has been on the agenda for a while and we are quite happy with the opportunity to build that out.”

Timing
Details on cost-sharing for the Halterm and Richmond projects and when work will begin have not been determined. {Tom Peters in Halifax Herald 1.May.09}

Requirements
Federal financial support for these projects is conditional on their meeting all applicable federal eligibility requirements, including the completion of a full federal due diligence review, successful completion of any environmental assessments required under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Act, and signature of necessary contribution agreements for the projects. {Infrastructure Canada backgrounder}

MELFORD: ADDITIONAL FUNDING?*
30 April, Halifax. THE ATLANTIC GATEWAY INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING INCLUDED THIS:

• Highway Upgrades on Route 344 – $15 million (up to $7.5 million federal) to support development and operation of the proposed Melford Container Terminal.’ [See Halifax article.]

Richie Mann, vice-president marketing for the Melford International Terminal project [see 09#01A], said on 1 May
that Route 344 does not lie in the terminal’s proposed site. “All work on the terminal will be done by us.”

Route 344 “is in a state of disrepair,” and the governments have decided “to use Gateway funding” to improve it, which will “benefit residents of the area.” The highway work “will go ahead anyway,” though timing “may be affected by terminal work.”

Status of project
Mann said “we are still moving forward, working on aspects of project.” The group is “monitoring the global situation, to make sure we hit the market at the right time.” The land deals are “all finalized.” The project has complied with “all conditions of the environmental approval [see 08#10B], though some are in process.” The officials are moving ahead on the syndicate, marketing, and negotiating with the epc [engineering, planning, and construction] contractor. {ANR&P discussion 1.May.09}

SYDNEY: PER MIT APPROVALS**
28 April, Halifax. PROVINCIAL MINISTER OF THE ENVIRONMENT DAVID MORSE APPROVED the proposed Sydney Harbour Access Channel Deepening and Sydport Container Terminal, with conditions. ‘I am satisfied following a review of the information provided by Laurentian Energy Corporation, and through the government and public consultation as part of the environmental assessment, that any adverse effects or significant environmental effects of the undertaking can be adequately mitigated through compliance with the attached terms and conditions,’ Morse wrote.

Conditions
- Begin work within two years.
- Provide and implement a waste management plan as part of a broad environmental management plan. {text from Nova Scotia Environment}

Federal permitting still to come
Laurentian started the permitting process only with the federal government, said Jim Wooder, the point person for the project. But “when we moved the berth line we had to register with the province.” Both regulatory processes proceeded simultaneously, but the federal was far more complex, with federal Fisheries and Transport involved. The port permitting has “undergone several iterations” with the federal government, and considerable dialogue.

In mid-May, the federal government gave conditional approval to an environmental assessment for the dredging and container terminal projects.

No stimulus funds yet
Noting the announcements about Halifax, Wooder said that Sydney did not “expect to get out in front” on seeking stimulus funding for the dredging until permitting was in place. The stimulus funding for the road to Melford [see above] has a direct analogy in the funding for the Sydney dredging, which is “the road into Sydport.” {ANR&P discussion 4.May.09}

Moving ahead
On 14 May, Wooder referred to NSPI’s $1-million contribution [see below] as a validation of the dredging project, which he estimated could cost $30 million to $35 million when answers arrive to a request for proposals that is expected to go out in June. “This is our highway to the future,” he said. “We are hopeful that the Nova Scotia Power contribution helps everybody focus their attention on what we have to do to get the harbour dredged.” {Cape Breton Post 15.May.09}
SYDNEY: NEED FOR DREDGING
2 April, Halifax. **NSPI BACKS THE DREDGING**, said Gerald Weseen, the company’s general manager for communications and public affairs.

What if the province’s draft guidelines to govern emissions from electricity generation affect the burning of coal? [See 09#03A.] The guidelines will have a negligible effect in the near term on NSPI’s burning of coal, said Weseen.

NSPI can meet the mandate, if enacted, by employing renewable energy power sources. “We definitely support the dredging,” he said. The coal coming through the harbour for the Point Aconi and Lingan power stations is low sulfur. As to whether NSPI would use any coal from the Donkin mine, he noted: “We are a ways away from seeing any results” from the mine. {ANR&P discussion}

NSPI adds funding
On 14 May, at the Sydney Ports Day, NSPI’s Mark Sidebottom, the director of fuels, energy and risk management, said dredging Sydney harbour would help the power corporation deliver coal to the area more efficiently, lowering its transportation costs, said. “It allows us to take the vessels we are using today and put more coal on them. That reduces the cost for importing the coal for us and allows us to pass along savings for our customers.”

The company will invest $1 million in the dredging. It receives from 1.5 million to 2 million tonnes of coal annually through the International Coal Piers in Sydney harbour which accounts for about 80% of the fuel used to produce electricity at the Point Aconi and Lingan generating stations.

These two power stations produce about 45% of the electricity used by Nova Scotians. The dredging project would deepen the shipping channel in Sydney harbour’s outer channel to a depth of about 17 metres below normal low tide. {Cape Breton Post 15.May.09}

SYDNEY/SCR: DONKIN UPDATE
7 May. **XSTRATA WILL NOT MINE COAL UNTIL 2010**, wrote Val Istomin, the general manager from Xstrata, the majority owner of the project. [See permitting approval 08#12B.]

‘The Donkin project is classified as being within the pre-feasibility stage of Project Approval. The final stage within the Donkin pre-feasibility process is what we call the Exploration Phase.

‘The detailed Exploration Phase entails using a continuous miner system to drive three underground roadways into the Donkin exploration licence area until sufficient technical information is gained. The required detailed technical information includes geology, geotechnical, hydrology, underground gas regime, coal seam mineability, and coal quality and marketability. This exploration phase is results-driven not time-driven but is estimated that it could take about two years to gain sufficient knowledge to make a decision.

During this Exploration Phase only approximately 350Kt per annum will be produced and obviously the construction of a new ~30-kilometer railway line to connect to the existing railway cannot be justified on such small tonnage over a couple of years. The Exploration Phase coal will be hauled on existing public roads to local (possibly NSPI) and export markets (over Sydney). This has been the publicly stated position since we commenced our studies and is detailed in the recently approved Environmental Assessment. If the Exploration results are positive and a modern longwall mine is proven to be economically viable, then as part of the mine development an approximately 30Km railway shall be constructed to haul 4-5 Mtpa over the 30 year mine life.

Planned production
‘The Donkin mine, annual production 4-5 Mt, was always planned to be primarily an export mine as the existing domestic market is essentially only NSPI with annual total coal usage of 3.5 Mtpa across all of its generators. NSPI purchases its coal from the world marketplace and strategically uses a number of suppliers so Donkin will only ever supply a % of NSPI’s total requirements

Dredging not needed
‘The Donkin project studies do not rely on the proposed Sydney harbour dredging to deliver product to export customers. Most of the current projected export market is the eastern US seaboard and existing channel and harbour
PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY TO BAY FERRIES

Yarmouth-New England
In January 2009, Nova Scotia’s government announced that its Industrial Expansion Fund will cover financial losses for Bay Ferries Ltd. on its Yarmouth-Maine service to allow the company to maintain the operation for the 2009 season. The total amount of assistance will depend on the financial results of the service, but will not exceed $12 million.

A joint federal-provincial study will examine the transportation needs in southwest Nova Scotia to determine long-term decisions about the Yarmouth to Maine service. The federal government has committed $1 million for the study. {provincial press release 22.Jan.09}

Saint John-Digby
In August 2008, Nova Scotia’s government announced that the Digby-Saint John ferry service will continue operating until 2011. The governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick will each contribute an additional $2 million and the government of Canada will invest $11.1 million to ensure the Digby-Saint John ferry service continues to run until 31 January 2011.

The two-year extension allows more time to investigate a possible long-term solution and look at the transportation requirements for the entire southwest Nova Scotia region.

The Digby-Saint John ferry service received $8

Ferries
The province is already subsidizing the ferries out of Yarmouth and Digby [see box]. Whiting said earlier the short-sea movement would utilize a different ship and different pier in Yarmouth [see 09#04B].

RE: YARMOUTH: STIMULUS FUNDING

1 May. THE PORT MAY ALSO RECEIVE SOME STIMULUS FUNDING, said Dave Whiting, the port manager, though it was not included in the announcement from the provincial government about Gateway funding [see Halifax]. Yarmouth submitted its application to Transport Canada only a week ago, for “the short-sea component.” The rules require one-third from Ottawa, one-third from Halifax, and one-third local match.

While the federal government did not have a specific date for announcing the funding, “it normally takes six weeks to two months,” Whiting noted. The announcement of provincial elections, now set for 9 June, will delay the decision process. {ANR&P discussion}

RAIL SHIPPERS

Alterra (Seaview, Rhode Island) Coming this year.
Capeway Terminal (MC, Massachusetts) Opening.
Coastal Recycling (PW, Regional) PW sues.
Fundy Gypsum (WHRC, Nova Scotia) Traffic down.
Highliner (ST, New Hampshire) Traffic diversion.
Intransit (PW, Regional) Traffic shrinking.
Maine Intermodal (SLR, Maine) Traffic shrinking.
Motiva (PW, Regional) Terminal expanding.
NORAD (PW, Regional) Traffic coming.
San Vel auto (PAS, Massachusetts) Work starts.
Shepaug Transfer (HRRC, Connecticut) Seeks permit.
Wilmington Cold (ST, Massachusetts) One-time move.
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*Atlantic Northeast Rails & Ports*, née *Maine RailWatch* (1994-1997) and later *Atlantic RailWatch* (1998-1999), is dedicated to the preservation and extension of the regional rail network. The editor believes that publishing news on railroads and ports spotlights needed action to preserve the rail network. The publication also imbues the region with a sense of an interdependent community, employing the network to move rail and port traffic. ‘No railroad is an island, entire onto itself.’