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RAIL SHIPPERS/RECEIVERS

A cross-reference to companies mentioned here.

PEOPLE, POSITIONS, EVENTS

Charlie Miller position eliminated. See Vermont.

FROM THE PUBLISHER

TIGER a surprise

As with the high-speed rail grants, I am surprised at how well New England did on the TIGER grants. The only DOT not to subscribe to my newsletter, ConnDOT, got shut out. A connection?

Chop Hardenbergh Next formal issue: 5 March.
TIGER GRANTS

17 February, Kansas City, Missouri. USDOT GAVE MONEY TO FOUR OF SIX NEW ENGLAND STATES, in the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) program. Secretary LaHood ‘announced funding for over 50 innovative, strategic transportation projects through the landmark competitive TIGER program.’

**Connecticut**

No award. The state had sought funding for all freight railroads [see 09#10B].

State Representative David McCluskey (D-West Hartford) expressed his extreme disappointment with the Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) after the U.S. Department of Transportation announced today that Connecticut would receive no funding from the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Act.

“ConnDOT submitted 23 requests totaling more than $630 million for various projects and did not receive one dime,” McCluskey said. “I’m dumbfounded. I can’t believe we didn’t receive even one of the awards.” [McCluskey press release 17.Feb.10]

**Maine: three port projects**

The TIGER $14 million covers the entire cost of projects in the three ports of Maine’s Three-Port Strategy. Funds will help the Port of Portland to upgrade the wharf and upland storage facility at the International Marine Terminal Facility; the Port of Searsport to invest in innovative new equipment, including a heavy-lift mobile harbor crane; and the Port of Eastport to invest in storage space and conveyor equipment [see 09#12A].

**Massachusetts: three awards**

- The Wachusetts extension of the MBTA past Fitchburg won $55 million. Federal funding was key, though the state had sought $65 million [see 09#12A].

- Revere Transit Facility & Streetscape $20 million

- Fast Track New Bedford $20 million. The Fast Track New Bedford project will reconstruct four deteriorated rail bridges. ‘All are more than 100 years old and can only accommodate train speeds of five miles per hour or less. The bridges were last rated in 1995 as having inadequate superstructures.

  ‘The bridge replacements are critical to moving freight from the waterfront area, which otherwise has to be moved by truck. Currently, 1300 carloads per year of PCB-contaminated dredge spoils are hauled from the New Bedford Harbor over the freight rail bridges [see 09#4B]. An additional 500 carloads of freight also depend on the bridges. Replacing the bridges will reduce fuel consumption and provide development opportunities in the waterfront area.’

The grant will also ‘build the Whale’s Tooth Station, an intermodal station adjacent to New Bedford’s busy waterfront. ...The Fast Track New Bedford project is an integral first step for the South Coast Rail which will address a long-standing lack of transit, and hence economic, access to Boston.’ [New Bedford application]

**Rhode Island: Quonset port work**

Quonset Development Corporation received $ 22,300,000 for the Quonset Wind Energy & Surface Transportation Project. The grant package submitted by QDC includes infrastructure improvements to roads, rail, piers and terminals in the Business Park.

Many of the proposed projects are designed to further support Quonset's role as a hub for the emerging wind
energy industry. Deepwater Wind is already on track to create regional off-shore wind farm manufacturing, staging and launching facility at the Business Park. {QDC newsletter}

The TIGER money Quonset was awarded represented about 50% of the $45.4 million QDC requested in its application. QDC Managing Director Steven King said construction work may begin within six months. {Chris Barrett in Providence Business News 17.Feb.10}

According to senior planner Katherine Trapani, USDOT funded only certain projects within the grant package. QPD does not ‘know for sure yet which projects we got, and probably won’t know until next week.’ {e-mail to ANR&P 18.Feb.10}

Vermont: road and trail
Burlington Waterfront North Project: $3,150,000

Other freight rail
‘Eleven national freight projects will help get freight off America’s highways and onto rail. This investment will make our roads safer, the air cleaner, reduce traffic congestion and decrease our reliance on foreign oil,’ the USDOT press release said.

For the Northeast, these include:

- $98 million toward a total project cost of $183 million for CSXT’s National Gateway intermodal improvements along three corridors

- $105 million toward a total project cost of $224 million for Norfolk Southern’s Crescent Corridor between New Jersey and the Gulf Coast.

The TIGER grant supports construction of two new intermodal facilities in Memphis, Tennessee and Birmingham, Alabama, both critical components of the full corridor plan. Construction of these new facilities includes pad and support tracks, trailer and container parking areas, lead tracks, and related ancillary buildings and features. {USDOT press release and backgrounder, except as noted}

Notable misses in addition to Connecticut
Maine. The proposal to purchase and rebuild the MMA trackage between Millinocket and Madawaska [see Maine].
Rhode Island. Providence $39.4 million [see 09#11A], for two new barge-mounted cranes, wind turbines, and solar panels.

Batting average
USDOT picked 45 projects to fund from about 1,400 requests for $60 billion made to the TIGER program, which has $1.5 billion to hand out.

Only 3.2% of the projects got funded. New England received 6 of the 45 projects, or 13%, though representing only 5% of the US population. {editor}

FERRY PORTLAND-YARMOUTH
15 February, Portland. MORE THAN ONE GROUP WANTS TO RESTART FERRY SERVICE between Portland and Yarmouth [see 10#01B]. One, Nova Scotia Cruises, is seeking a vessel like the Scotia Prince but larger, up to 700 cabins and more than 200 cars, trucks and buses. {Robert Cook in Mainebiz 16.Feb.10}
MAINE

MERR: TO AUGusta?*
8 February, Rockland. THE EXTENSION OF THE DOWNEASTER TO BRUNSWICK HELPS PASSENGER SERVICE TO AUGUSTA, said Gordon Page, MERR vice president and director of passenger operations. In a recent interview, he did not have an estimate on what it would cost to revive and refurbish the track between Brunswick and Augusta. “This won't happen immediately, and I expect Maine DOT will want to look at this closely. And at this point, by the time (railroad) service is upgraded, any number I give would be different....”

“It's always our interest to develop freight customers on that line.” {Meghan Malloy in Kennebec Journal 8.Feb.10}

MMA: ABANDONMENT*
5 February, DC. MMA FILED NOTICE THAT IT WOULD FILE FOR ABANDONMENT OF CERTAIN LINES between Millinocket and Madawaska. on or about 24 February.

The notice, from attorney Jim Howard, stated that “The line sought to be abandoned will be available for subsidy or sale for continued rail use, if the Board decides to permit the abandonment, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations (49 U.S.C. 10904 and 49 CFR 1152.27).’

The notice also stated that a protest of the abandonment might be based on a feeder line application, if filed before the actual filing for abandonment.

MMA will provide an Environmental Assessment, normally done within 33 days of filing.

As well as various government entities and unions, the notice was served on 16 customers: Cavendish Agri Services of Presque Isle, Chandler Lake of Ashland, Columbia Forest Products of Presque Isle, Dead River of Presque Isle, Fraser Timber of Ashland, Huber Engineered Woods of Easton, Irving Forest Products of Saint John, Irving Woodlands of Ashland (2), JD Irving of St.Leonard New Brunswick, Lane Construction of Presque Isle, Louisiana Pacific of New Limerick, McCain of Easton, Maine Potato Growers of Presque Isle, Portage Wood Products of Portage, and Tater Meal of Presque Isle. {STB website, filings page, STB Docket No. 1043 (Sub-No. 1)}

Choices
As spelt out by President Bob Grindrod, the railroad may have three options [see 10#01B]: Someone may buy the line [but not the state, at least with a TIGER grant, see Regional]. Someone may subsidize the operation. Finally, the abandonment could proceed, and the tracks be lifted.

MMA: PLANS TO SAVE TRACKAGE*
10 February, Augusta. MDOT DESCRIBED ITS EFFORTS TO RETAIN THE MILLINOCKET-MADAWASKA LINES MMA has filed to abandon [see e-bulletin(e)]. A press release this day stated in part:

‘MaineDOT has retained an attorney who specializes in STB proceedings to represent the state’s interest. Today, the attorney filed a request for information with the railroad, in connection with the potential abandonment. The state is also working with Railroad Industries, Inc. (RII), a consulting firm that specializes in finding business solutions for continuing operations on distressed rail lines. Meanwhile, MaineDOT is continuing to negotiate with the MMA in an attempt to find a business solution that would allow continuation of uninterrupted service.’

Spokesperson Mark Latti said the attorney is Eric Hocky of Philadelphia’s Thorp Reed & Armstrong. {e-mail to ANR&P}

18 February, Augusta. A HEARING ON LEGISLATIVE BILLS will occur this day. According to the agenda, the Joint Transportation Committee will hear a report from MDOT on its efforts and the study by Gary Hunter of
Railroad Industries. It will then proceed to:

Public hearing, LD 1748. This bill, ‘An Act To Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue To Purchase and Upgrade Trackage of the Montreal, Maine and Atlantic Railway,’ was sponsored by Representative Charles Theriault (D, Madawaska) only recently, and introduced on 19 January.

Work session LD 1678. This bill, ‘Resolve, Directing the Department of Transportation To Review the Fiscal Impact on the State of the Closure of the Railroad Track between Madawaska and Millinocket,’ had a public hearing on 26 January [see 10#01B]. {legislative notice}

NEW HAMPSHIRE

NEW HAMPSHIRE: AVOID PAN AM*
5 February, Nashua. THE STATE SHOULD FOCUS ON SERVICE ONLY TO NASHUA, said an editorial this day in the Nashua Telegraph, given that it was the only New England state not to get any high-speed rail funding [see 10#01B Regional].

‘For their part, New Hampshire officials noted two common denominators among the successful states: sizable financial support from state governments and the backing of rail companies. “We have neither,” conceded Bill Boynton, the state’s transportation information officer, “and that’s apparently not a great combination.”

‘Undeterred, New Hampshire officials appear poised to reapply for the same $1.4 million planning grant when a second round of federal stimulus grants for rail – this time only $2.5 billion – becomes available after Oct. 1. Perhaps this time will be more successful.

‘But given Pan Am Railways’ refusal to cooperate...we believe state officials would be wiser to shift their focus to the less expensive Nashua-to-Lowell leg of the project.’ {editorial} [See Leishman proposal 09#01B.]

MBRX: NO VIOLATION
11 February, Concord. THE ETHICS PANEL DECLINED TO EXONERATE LEISHMAN COMPLETELY, when it took formal action on the complaint from Pan Am President David Fink (pere) [see 10#01B].

By a 6-1 margin, the committee endorsed a draft investigation that found ‘no substantial evidence’ Leishman had engaged in unethical conduct.

The committee recommended that Leishman sign a cautionary letter, to which Leishman agreed, that he must be more careful in the future in dealings with legislation and in negotiations with state officials on matters linked to his Milford-Bennington Railroad.

Pan Am not satisfied
Rob Culliford, Pan Am legal counsel, questioned the ethics committee’s authority and suggested Pan Am might appeal this decision in court. “We are still at the early stage of looking at that,” Culliford said.

Leishman wanted more
The committee declined to dismiss the accusations against Leishman. {Kevin Landrigan in Nashua Telegraph 12.Feb.10}

The MBRX owner requested in a letter to the panel that it dismiss Fink’s complaint ‘with prejudice...A "caution letter" directed toward me, while an informal remedy not involving any sanctions, does not remove the damage to my name and reputation arising from the Pam Am Railway/David Fink unfounded allegations. I would suggest it would be an unfair result to allow those false allegations (allegations that this Committee’s investigation has concluded fail to meet the relevant evidentiary standard) to bring about a dispositive letter that cautions not the authors of the unfounded allegations, but only me.’ {text from Leishman}
RHODE ISLAND

PW: NO CUSTOMER LOSS*

5 February, East Greenwich. PW WILL NOT LOSE TRAFFIC FROM THE STANLEY-BOSTITCH CLOSING of its Rhode Island nail making facility during April to October 2010. Company spokesperson Timothy Perra blamed finances for the reason.

The company will keep the nail production equipment in East Greenwich through the third quarter of this year, after which it will eventually distribute the equipment to its other nail production facilities. {Paul Edward Parker in Providence Journal website 8.Feb.10}

But the wire drawing will continue in East Greenwich.

History

In 2009, Stanley closed its nail production facility in New Britain [see 08#12A] and moved nail production to East Greenwich. To bring in nail wire, Stanley began using Dean Warehouse in Cumberland [see 09#11A with map] in January 2010.

On 8 January, Brad Dean Junior said his warehouse started receiving gondolas of wire on the spur into the warehouse. PW drops six to ten cars at a time, and switches the warehouse, which can only hold two cars, twice a day.

On 10 February, Dean said Stanley told him it would continue to receive the gondolas, and to draw the steel out into thinner lengths for wire making. Stanley will then ship the thinner lengths to North Carolina for the final step in nail production.

Stanley assured Dean that it would continue to use his facility, Dean said.

Other Dean customers

Dean noted that the Mann Distribution proposal to move to one of his buildings in Cumberland [see 09#11A] was “pulled off the table.”

He has possibilities of using rail for wine from California and beer, with a backhaul of local micro breweries. for his warehouse in Walnut, California. {ANR&P discussion 8.Jan.10}

Warehouses full

Dean related that he has “no space left in any of the buildings.” As for rail, he considered receiving 100 centerbeam cars containing crane mats. Unfortunately, the spurs running into the former IGA warehouse are so laid out that he can’t get at both sides of the centerbeams when inside the building, so he had to turn the business away. {ANR&P discussion 10.Feb.10}

VERMONT

VAOT: REORGANIZATION

9 February, Montpelier. THE AGENCY PLEDGED TO ‘INCREASE PROJECT DELIVERIES’ in a statement released in early February concerning the Rail Section:

‘At this time the Agency has chosen to fill the rail planner position [most recently held by Charlie Miller] with a different type of employee. Therefore we will seek to hire support in our engineering and project delivery group.

‘We understand the importance of planning and the Agency has an entire division that is in charge of planning. They will assist in rail planning and take the lead on the 5-Year Rail Plan (they created the last one).
‘Other duties, including the Amtrak program, and regional and national affiliations, will be, for the time being, managed by the Rail Program Manager.

“We have listened to the concerns of the Vermont Rail Advisory Council and others [see Moore letter, below] regarding project delivery and are making moves to address those concerns and increase project deliveries.”

The staff of the Rail Program
Rail program manager Joe Flynn

Passenger rail and support team
(Responsible for Passenger Rail Liaisons, Vermont Rail Advisory Council, Vermont Operation Lifesaver)
Rail project coordinator Bob Atchinson (engineering tech)

Rail project development team
(Responsible for the development, scheduling, design and oversight of rail construction projects including rail/highway crossings and the management of engineering consultant and construction firms)
Rail project manager JB McCarthy
Rail project manager Mladen Gagulic
Rail project manager Doug Zorzi
Rail technician Kevin Clairmont

Property management team
(Responsible for the oversight of state-owned rail properties including rail trails and other related properties)
Property management specialist Larry Donna
Technician V David Gilderdale
Right of way agent Nicole Bettis
Administrative technician Joanne Fleurrey {text from Bob Atchinson}

VERMONT RAIL COUNCIL*
5 February, Montpelier. CHARLIE MOORE RESIGNED FROM THE RAIL COUNCIL IN PROTEST.

Governor Jim Douglas
Secretary David Dill
Scott Rogers, Joe Flynn & Rail Council Members
Pat Brennan – Chair House Transportation Committee
Dick Mazza – Chair Senate Transportation Committee
Mike Coates – Chairman Infrastructure Sub-Committee
Christopher Parker, Lee Kahn & members – Vermont Rail Action Network
Melinda Moulton

On Wednesday, February 3rd, during a meeting with Scott Rogers I informed him I would be resigning as member of the Vermont Rail Advisory Council and also as chairman of the Passenger Rail –Subcommittee. This was not an easy decision to make, on my part. The past 9 years serving on the rail council have been very rewarding, but I must be honest and tell you that they have also been frustrating.

Working with the members of the Rail Council, Passenger Rail-Subcommittee and the Vermont Rail Action Network has been a positive and a very good experience for me personally and for rail in general for the state of Vermont.

[Western corridor appropriation not spent]
I’m very, very pleased that the recent grant was approved for the Vermonter line, but I do regret that we were not successful in our grant application for the western corridor. Even though there may be another opportunity in the future, we need to examine very closely why this application was not approved. We need to look at our track record in utilizing our existing monies to get rail projects completed. I’m expressly making reference to the $30M Jeffords earmark for the western corridor. Why has this money not been spent after 7 years? What is the incentive for our Washington delegation to continue to secure funds if we are not going to spend the monies they have secured? This is unacceptable and someone needs to be held accountable. Not another dime of state, federal or taxpayer (my money) should be appropriated on rail until these existing
funds have been spent. Year after year we continue to hear that the funds are obligated, but to be frank, I’m tired of hearing that and seeing no action.

[Proposed study]
During my testimony over the years to both the house and senate transportation committees and also conversation with the Secretary of Transportation, I have asked if the state of Vermont can afford to be in the railroad business. With the slow economy and the budget deficit, I would say that the answer would be no. It is time for the legislature to get an answer to this question. This needs to be examined in detail, we have spent thousands on studies, and I would recommend that a study be done on this. The study must examine what being a owner of railroads is costing the taxpayers, what are the benefits to the taxpayers, what is the return on the taxpayers investment, what revenues has the state enjoyed, the lease between the state and the operator needs to be examined in detail, when does it expire, has it recently been extended, if so, who signed this and why was it extended? How can the state get out of this agreement if they did determine that being in the railroad business was no longer a benefit but a burden on the taxpayers?

I have truly enjoyed serving on the rail council and chairing the passenger rail sub-committee and I would like to thank Governor Douglas for allowing me to be associated with something that is very dear to my heart, but is very important to the future of Vermont. We have an opportunity to improve our railroads, get trucks off our highways and put people to work. It takes support from the top down for this to happen.

Sincerely,
Charlie Moore
St. Albans, Vermont 05478

[Charlie formerly served as regional vice-president, Atlantic lines of RailAmerica, which oversaw NECR.]

NECR: MORE ON HSR GRANT*
8 February. **NECR WILL HAVE SIGNIFICANT OPERATIONS GAINS FROM THE $50 MILLION TO IMPROVE ITS LINE** for better passenger service. NECR recognizes these benefits [see 09#09B Vermont], and is paying the 10% match. One source familiar with the grant [see 10#01B Regional] noted:

Fuel consumption. In the last several years, the railroad has invested significant funds in upgrading the track,¹ and removing slow orders. Nevertheless, some slow orders remain. Considerable fuel is expended to decelerate and then accelerate through the slow-ordered sections, and the savings from removing all slow orders will be significant.

Crew costs. By operating consistently at 40 miles per hour (FRA Class 3), the railroad will use less crew time to move the train, and can operate more trains with the same number of crews.

Heavier cars. The improvement to the line required to move the **Vermonter** at 79 miles per hour (115-pound rail, some bridgework, some ties) will perforce enable NECR to operate 286,000-pound cars, up from the existing weight limit of 263,000 pounds. {ANR&P discussion}

Passenger ridership
The trackwork already completed by NECR has given the **Vermonter** more punctuality, so that even during the Great Recession the ridership has increased. As Charles Hunter, director, State Relations East for RailAmerica, noted on 1 February:

‘The **Vermonter**, along the NECR's route, handled 80,440 passengers in 2009. This is an increase of 3,060 passengers (4%) over 2008. This is at a time when most of Amtrak's trains were seeing a decrease in ridership. In 2009, the **Vermonter** carried about 79% of all Vermont Amtrak passengers.’ {e-mail to ANR&P 1.Feb.10}

---

¹ The Vermont application stated in 2007 NECR spent $1.3 million on capital improvements, and in 2008 it ‘more than doubled its investment in this corridor’. {VAOT website}
VRS: MIDDLEBURY SPUR

28 January, Montpelier.  **THE FHWA SIGNED THE RECORD OF DECISION, PERMITTING THE STAKEHOLDERS TO BEGIN.** FHWA supported the October 2008 federal environmental impact statement that selected a 3.3-mile rail spur route south and west from Omya’s Middlebury quarry to the Vermont Railway mainline [see 08#11B]. The spur would cross under Lower Foote Street and Route 7 (under a new vehicular bridge), then cross at grade level over Halladay Road before connecting to the mainline. The project also includes a 2,050-foot trestle that would bridge over the Otter Creek and Creek Road and a 2.2-acre loading facility allowing the potential for other Middlebury-area shippers to access the main rail line.

Next step

Joe Flynn, VAOT rail project manager, said the state will begin planning, but before it lays out any significant effort or funds, Omya and Vermont Railway need to secure financing. VAOT’s share, estimated at $8 million, involves highway-related work and will come out of the $30 million federal earmark of seven years ago [see Charlie Moore’s letter in other article].

No Act 250 to railroads

During the EIS process, some wondered whether the project is subject to Act 250, the state’s land use law. The 2008 environmental impact statement noted the project would be required to obtain a number of federal and state permits, including wetlands and storm water discharge. However, ‘Applicability of Act 250 has not been determined.’

The Record of Decision noted that the federal EIS found that because railroads are considered interstate commerce, ‘[t]hey are exempt from some (but not all) types of state and local regulation, either because of implied pre-emption under the Commerce Clause of the Constitution of the United States’ or because Congress has passed laws preempting state and local jurisdiction.

VAOT spokesperson John Zicconi said that based on the federal Court of Appeals 2005 case *Green Mountain RR Corp v State of Vermont*, 403 F.3rd 638 (2nd Circ), cited by the FHWA, the agency believes Act 250 does not have jurisdiction over the project because of federal law.
Need for Omya commitment

The Record of Decision responded to several commenters who noted that Omya had made no written guarantee to use the spur. The EIS addressed this, noting that both FHWA and VAOT shared the concern, and that Omya responded to the concern in a letter. From the EIS:

‘[The Omya letter stated in part:] Omya is committed to using rail whenever possible to transport its raw material and finished product....[A] firm commitment to using the rail and to removing truck traffic from Route 7 is critical to meeting the purpose and the need of the project. Before the project moves forward, FHWA will explore ways to secure Omya’s commitment to using rail.

‘However, Omya’s actual use of the proposed rail spur necessarily is dependent on future economic conditions so it is not appropriate to require an ironclad guarantee from Omya as to use of the proposed rail spur.’

The Record of Decision concluded: ‘FHWA and VAOT intend to obtain a sufficient and adequate commitment from Omya before committing public funding for final design, right-of-way acquisitions, and construction. The form of that commitment has not been determined.’

Omya comment

In a statement, Omya CEO Tony Colak repeated the company's intent to use the spur: ‘Once completed, the rail spur would provide alternative shipping methods for Omya and other businesses in Vermont. Use of the rail spur will allow Omya to eliminate the majority of its trucks from U.S. Route 7.’

Colak also said the company is working with the state and federal officials and Vermont Railway on finding ‘the optimal financing mechanism for this project.’

Previously, officials said the bulk of the cost could come in the form of a Federal Railroad Administration loan. The loan would be paid back through user fees paid by Omya and other users of the spur. {text of Record of Decision on VAOT website; Bruce Edwards in Rutland Herald 15.Feb.10}

VRS: GROUT MOVE TO START*

3 February, Montpelier. THE WACR MAY START MOVING GRANITE DOWN THE MOUNTAIN from the Rock of Ages quarry in early April, according to VRS President David Wulfson. Speaking at the Vermont Rail Council, he reported that Northeast Materials, the company handling the grout move [see 09#11B], is considering a contract to move 100,000 tons to the West coast.

More on the operation

A VRS source said the grout [the name for the chunks of granite remaining after quarrying–see 09#11B] will come down in two 10-car cuts each day to Montpelier Junction; this size permits WACR to use only a single locomotive. NECR will pick up the cars in either 20- or 40-car cuts and move them in regular manifest trains.

NECR will deliver the cars to CSXT in Palmer, whence they will move via Union Pacific to California for a coastline stabilization project. VRS has leased 150 to 180 cars for the grout. {coverage and ANR&P discussion by special correspondent Kevin Burkholder 3.Feb.10}

Northeast Materials

Ed Duggan, from Northeast Materials which is arranging the move, said the contract was not yet final and declined to confirm any details. {ANR&P discussion 8.Feb.10}

In December, Duggan said: “We are under lease with Rock of Ages to sell excess granite. Some will be crushed into paving material, others shipped out in large pieces for use for jetties along the coast, as far as New Orleans.

At that time, Northeast had “some quotes out on granite” purchases. He called the market “very competitive” with “many, many, suppliers. The bigger the job, the more competitive. The typical quarry does not have the rock sitting there.”

For Northeast Materials, “transportation cost has been our downfall.” But if rail can get right into the quarry, transportation cost goes down. “We are putting monies into the upper part of the rail ourselves, paying VRS to do the work” most likely later winter and early spring.” {ANR&P discussion 17.Dec.09}
According to steelonthenet.com, thermal coal in 2007 sold for $55/tonne, and coking coal $94/ton. By July 2008, thermal coal was priced at $193/tonne, and coking coal at $122. In September 2009, coking coal had risen to $151, while thermal coal had dropped to $72/tonne. So which coal is more costly can vary widely. {website}

The company’s website states: ‘Construction: Granite's best qualities of strength and durability are now available for construction purposes at a price comparable to other heavy-duty materials. It is moisture resistant, thermally stable, and structurally sound, guaranteeing results far into the future. Raw granite can be used for levee construction, bank reinforcement, stream rehabilitation, and dredging placement with superior results. With thousands of tons available, delivery can be made by rail, barge, or truck, ensuring the material arrives on site on time.

‘Since 1885, Rock of Ages has quarried some of the world’s most sought-after granite for buildings, memorials, mausoleums, and precision products. As the raw granite material is removed from the rock face, cracks or breaks can occur, often preventing final use of the blocks. In the past, these raw granite blocks were discarded. However, in 2008 North East Materials Group saw an opportunity to bring to market these raw granite blocks. Though unsuitable for Rock of Ages’ purposes, the raw granite’s strength, durability, and aesthetic appeal is maintained. The end result is a quality product at an economical price. {website}

VAOT work
Trini Brassard, assistant director of VAOT operations, said on 3 February that “work has started on bridges and track” looking at what work is required, using both in-house staff and, for ultrasonic testing, a contractor on retainer. {ANR&P discussion}

**QUEBEC/MARITIMES**

**SYDNEY/SCR: NO COAL TRAFFIC**
10 February, Donkin. Xstrata announced it would switch to coking coal and would lighter it out of Donkin. Speaking to a packed audience at the fire hall here, Xstrata Coal Chief Development Officer Jeff Gerard said, “Xstrata Coal remains committed to the Donkin Coal Project and will continue to liaise with key stakeholders as we progress through the various internal and external approvals processes.”

No coal for NSPI
Xstrata and partner Erdene originally viewed Donkin’s coal for thermal use, possibly at Nova Scotia Power’s four coal plants. However, on 17 December 2009, Project Manager Val Istomin told a crowd of about 80 people in Donkin: “Until such time that we can move the coal that comes out as a result of this exploration work, we really shouldn't start it because obviously … we don't want to stockpile a million tonnes of coal.

NSPI, which stated in May 2009 it was hesitant to use Donkin coal as a test burn [see 09#05B], is facing stricter emission standards in 2010 [see 09#09A]. Istomin said NSPI would not buy the Donkin coal because, raw and unwashed at this stage, it will not meet the standards. {CBC cited by Ocean Resources On-line 18.Dec.09}

Bill No. 65 in the provincial legislative assembly to exempt NSPI from emissions requirements for four years, introduced by MLA Alfie MacLeod (Progressive-Conservative, Cape Breton West), died when the Assembly adjourned the day of introduction, 5 November 2009. {Assembly website}

**Switch to coking coal: impact**
Given the lack of a local market for thermal coal, said Istomin on 11 February, Xstrata decided to switch to coking coal, resulting in:

**Quantity produced.** Instead of the planned 5 million tonnes per year, coking coal production will run 2.75 million

---

2 According to steelonthenet.com, thermal coal in 2007 sold for $55/tonne, and coking coal $94/ton. By July 2008, thermal coal was priced at $193/tonne, and coking coal at $122. In September 2009, coking coal had risen to $151, while thermal coal had dropped to $72/tonne. So which coal is more costly can vary widely. {website}
tonnes per year.

Washing plant. Xstrata, after obtaining appropriate permits, will build a plant to wash the coal to remove some impurities. This will require, Istomin hoped, about 12 months and another $50 to $60 million.

Export. Instead of railing or trucking the coal to Sydney for export, Xstrata will build a barge terminal and plans to lighter the coal to colliers offshore Donkin. Barging is far more economical than using a pier. “There’s a potential impact of the pack ice for sometimes up to six weeks a year,” Istomin acknowledged.

While Xstrata did not want to proceed without a contract for the thermal coal, Istomin said Xstrata’s marketing department is confident it can sell the washed coking coal into the world market.

Impact on Sydney
The port had always hoped that outbound coal traffic [NSPI already imports Colombian coal through Sydney] would aid it. However, said Istomin, the thermal coal plans had “not built a business case around the dredging.” Xstrata was asked to join the Sydney Marine Group which supports the harbour dredging [see 10#01A], but “always declined. We planned” for ships which use the existing harbour depth.

Impact on SCR and CBNS
Peter Touesnard noted that Xstrata plans do not include CBNS. [See other article.]

Next steps
The coking coal project is far from a done deal, as proponents still need to conduct more feasibility studies and win environmental approvals. Erdene Resource Development Corporation, which holds a 25% stake in the project, will need to raise more money to continue to participate, according to Peter Akerley, president.

“Those hoops have to be passed through before we get to the point where we have a final production decision. Having said that, we have three years under our belt working with the province and the federal government. . . . So we have a very high level of comfort and confidence with moving forward. But there are still those milestones that have to be passed.” [ANR&P discussion with Istomin 11.Feb.10; Chris Lambie in Halifax Herald 12.Feb.10]

CBNS: CAPE BRETON SUBSIDY?*
11 February. DONKIN COAL WILL NOT HELP THE RAILWAY’S NEED FOR A SUBSIDY, as none of it will move by rail [see other article]. Peter Touesnard, vice-president Northeast region Rail America, said:

“Based on the radio reports I have heard, it sounds like they are going to be focused on offshore markets and barging coal to a ship and transloading to a ship, somewhere off the Donkin facility. . . .[I]n our ongoing conversations with the principals there, they are looking at various options trying to minimize the costs of transportation because of the facility is not rail-served today.

“There would be a fairly large infrastructure cost to put that in place. That, combined with the fact that Nova Scotia Power has indicated they are not able to consume that coal because of their environmental restrictions, I would suggest it is unlikely we will have any volume from that facility (Donkin). Having said that, things change over time. I think the fact it (the mine) is going is very positive for the local economy and perhaps some spin-off businesses. We do serve a marine transload facility in Sydney (Provincial Energy Ventures) that could be easily used for a location to truck coal, let’s say from Donkin to the Sydney area and then loaded onto rail for points west of Sydney if there were market opportunities for that coal.”

What about a provincial subsidy?
The province has subsidized operations on the section of line between St. Peter’s and Sydney (the money losing section) [see 09#12B], which handled approximately 1,300 carloads in 2009. CBNS had about 10 regular customers in 2009 out of the Sydney area.
To keep that section self-sustainable, Touesnard uses a rule of thumb: a rail line needs about 10,000 carloads per 100 miles of rail to remain solvent, depending on the rail rate and the required infrastructure. “We are a long way from that (10,000 carloads) but having said that, with the port development activity in Sydney now that certainly holds some promise for creating substantially more than that volume if they were ever to be successful.”

On 10 February, Touesnard said, “We did have a meeting (with the province) and we got a little bit of homework from the meeting and we will have our homework completed shortly. We will be making a submission to the province in the very near future.

“Not getting into too many details” CBNS would be looking at “the same range” as the past subsidy for the St. Peter’s to Sydney section, which has been $2 million a year over five years. The railway would also like to see another five-year term.

**The rest of the line**
The section of line west of Port Hawkesbury, which connects to the CN mainline in Truro, is doing about 20,000 carloads a year. Because they have managed the business so well it is still “a positive ongoing concern.” {special correspondent Tom Peters of ANR&P discussions 10.Jan.10, 10&11.Feb.10}

**Crossing fees should be part of discussion**
In 2008, CBNS began to raise the fees landowners had to pay for private crossings, leading to an outcry along the line [08#07B].

On 28 January 2010, Nova Scotia Opposition Leader Stephen McNeil said any negotiations about continuing Rail America’s annual subsidy must also deal with a steep increase in lease and crossing fees for Cape Breton landowners along its tracks.

In May 2009, Touesnard said Rail America didn’t use the full subsidy allotment of $2 million per year. But the company doesn't anticipate being successful enough to get by without the subsidy until business picks up with a proposed container terminal at Sydney harbour and development of the Xstrata coal mine in Donkin. {Chris Hayes in the Cape Breton Post 28.Jan.10}

**BELLEDUNE: HANDLE AUTOS?**
4 February. THE PORT OF BELLEDUNE IS EXPANDING ITS INFRASTRUCTURE to improve its opportunities of becoming an entry port for automobiles from Mexico and China. Jenna Doucet, the port's marketing director, said the port is spending $67 million on dredging to deepen the water depth at the terminal from 11.5 metres to 13 metres and building a roll on/roll off/barge terminal.

Doucet said the port originally researched the feasibility of bringing vehicles into Atlantic Canada and Quebec from Mexico. “Those vehicles are not going by water right now and are moving by truck and rail. We looked at the space available in Belledune and the market in Atlantic Canada and Quebec and potentially the Toronto area and there is potential to develop a vehicle processing centre and a car movement operation in Belledune.”

**What about Halifax?**
CN, which serves the Port of Belledune, presently owns and operates the Autoport in Eastern Passage in the Port of Halifax. Doucet said Autoport is usually at capacity with an influx of European imports for North American markets. Autoport also handles North American-built vehicles arriving by truck and rail. Those vehicles are distributed to retailers in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador.3 Belledune wouldn't be competition for Autoport but more complimentary, she said.

On 8 February, CN spokesperson Mark Hallman said CN comment would be premature on whether or not Belledune would be a competitor of Autoport.

---

Autoport not at capacity
CN spokesperson Julie Senecal wrote in an email that Autoport is not at capacity and in fact has ‘spare capacity of 25% or more. With the completion of important infrastructure projects over the past several years, Autoport has the capability of taking on additional business.’
In 2007 CN announced it was spending $15 million on improvements at Autoport, including a new, $13 million dock to handle the larger car-carrying ships, and improved parking facilities.4
Senecal said Autoport handled 186,000 vehicles in 2008 and 156,000 in 2009. Of the 2009 totals approximately 82,000 vehicles were imports which arrived on 74 vessel calls. Approximately 74,000 vehicles made by North American manufacturers arrived by rail and truck, then were distributed throughout Nova Scotia. Oceanex Liner made 34 calls at Autoport to take vehicles to Newfoundland and Labrador.

Vehicles from China?
On a recent trade mission to China, Doucet reported, she and Rayburn Doucette, president and CEO of the Port of Belledune, met with automobile manufacturers BYD Auto (Build Your Dreams) and Beiqui Foton Motor Company.
BYD, formed in 1993 to make rechargeable batteries, manufacturers the E6 Electric car. BYD wants to be the world's number one car manufacturer by 2025.5 Beiqui Foton builds commercial vehicles such as trucks and buses and Ms. Doucet said “taking into consideration the growth of these companies they will come to Canada and the U.S. We wanted to let them know that we are here and what we have to offer at the port.”

Freight service planned
Even if the plan to handle imported vehicles doesn't happen, Belledune is negotiating with a Canadian line to establish a weekly freight service between Belledune and Argentia, expected to begin when the ro/ro+barge terminal is complete in 2011, Doucet said. She declined to disclose the name of the Canadian vessel owner. {Tom Peters, ANR&P special correspondent, discussions with Doucet 4.Feb.10; Senecal and Hallman e-mails 8.Feb.10}

SAINT JOHN: BAY STATE WORK*
PORT USERS HAVE COMPLETED TWO TRANS-SHIPMENT CONTRACTS for Massachusetts liquid natural gas (LNG) projects.

Northeast Gateway (Excelerate)
From the US Maritime Administration website: ‘Excelerate Energy filed an application on June 13, 2005 for a Deepwater Port terminal located in Massachusetts Bay, approximately 13 miles south-southeast of the city of Gloucester, MA and in federal waters approximately 270 feet in depth. On February 7, 2007, the Maritime Administrator signed the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port project. The favorable decision was contingent upon the applicant's commitment to employ U.S. mariners aboard its vessels servicing the Northeast Gateway LNG facility. On May 14, 2007, Maritime Administrator Sean T. Connaughton signed the license for Excelerate to own, operate and construct the Northeast Gateway Deepwater Port. Construction on the Deepwater Port commenced on May 27, 2007. Northeast Gateway received its first LNG cargo through the port system in May of 2008. In early 2009, Excelerate confirmed another delivery to the port to commission a newly-constructed Energy Bridge Regasification Vessel.’

Neptune LNG (Suez LNG N.A.)
‘Neptune LNG LLC filed an application on February 15, 2005 for an LNG facility to be located in Massachusetts Bay, 10 miles south of Gloucester and 22 miles Northeast of Boston. On January 31, 2007, the Maritime Administrator signed a favorable Record of Decision for the Neptune project. The favorable Record of Decision

---

was contingent upon the applicant's commitment to employ U.S. mariners aboard its vessels servicing the Neptune facility. On March 26, 2007, the Maritime Administration issued a Deepwater Port License to Suez LNG to build, own, and operate an LNG receiving and regasification facility.

‘Current Status: On October 31, 2008, pipeline construction activities were completed for the 2008 calendar year. The second phase of construction is currently scheduled to end in September 2009 and the port is expected to be commissioned in March of 2010.’ {MARAD website}

**Saint John involvement**

Advanced Production and Loading (APL), a subsidiary of Norway-based BW Offshore, handled some products for the Northeast Gateway project through Saint John.

“Based on the Northeast Gateway experience and the bigger scope for the Neptune project, I forwarded Saint John as the preferred mobilization site” for Neptune, said Mogens Linnet Moller, mobilization manager for APL. “There were other alternatives in the Maritimes presented to the project,” but APL chose Saint John.

Irving Equipment provided heavy-lift and transportation services for the large monobuoys and suction anchors. Work was carried out at the Lower Cove Terminal from spring to autumn 2009. {Port Progress, SJPA newsletter 11.09}

**Why Saint John?**

Andrew Dixon, vice-president, marketing of the Saint John Port Authority, wrote this day that his port ‘has the advantage of having all of the required infrastructure and support services required to handle the requirements involved in staging project cargoes of this nature. Much of this is due to our heavy industrial base.

‘In addition, it allows the flexibility to move the final product to the construction area utilizing foreign-flag vessels that would not be able to operate between U.S. ports due to the Jones Act.’ {e-mail to ANR&P}

**SAINT JOHN: LONG WHARF**

2 February. *THE REDEVELOPMENT OF LONG WHARF INTO A SECOND CRUISE TERMINAL* is halted, following the decision of Fort Reliance [Fort Reliance is the family-owned, privately-held parent company for Irving Oil and various Irving Oil companies, including the JV Canaport LNG, and the Irving residential and commercial energy business, among others. {website}] not to build a major, LEED-compliant office building on the site.

In a press release today, Fort Reliance’s Blaine Higgs said only: “All opportunities have certain windows and during the time it has taken for us to get from our starting point to today the economic landscape has changed and the window on this project has unfortunately closed.” {Fort Reliance press release}

**The former plan**

Bill Eaton, SJPA spokesperson, said on 3 February that the City of Saint John, which owns the former site of the Lantic Sugar refinery between Lower Cove Terminal and Barrack Point Terminal, had planned to give the site to SJPA in return for SJPA’s turning over enough land (“the footprint”) for the Fort Reliance building.

Now, “Long Wharf will remain our secondary cruise facility and passengers will be greeted via the large tents we’ve used in the past.” {ANR&P discussion 3.Feb.10}

**Rails**

Andrew Dixon, vice-president, marketing of the Saint John Port Authority, wrote this day: ‘If Long Wharf is developed for cruise and the Fort Reliance project, it will not be rail served. Note that it has not been rail served with operational trackage for several years now.’ {e-mail to ANR&P 2.Feb.10}
OVERSEAS CONTAINER TRAFFIC RETURNS
According to the Global Port Tracker report released on 8 February by the National Retail Federation and Hackett Associates, import cargo volume at the nation’s major retail container ports will be 25% higher during the first half of 2010 compared with the same period a year ago.

January was estimated at 1.19 million TEUs, a 17% increase over January 2009, and February, traditionally the slowest month of the year, is forecast at 1.1 million TEUs, up 30% from the previous year. March is forecast at 1.18 million TEUs, up 23% as retailers begin to stock up for spring and summer, April at 1.25 million TEUs, up 27%, May at 1.3 million TEUs, up 26%, and June at 1.38 million TEUs, up 36%.

Hackett Associates founder Ben Hackett disagreed with economists who fear that the economy is in the middle of a W-shaped recovery where another dip could follow current signs of an upturn. “This forecast assumes that we are not in a double-dip recession and that a recovery is underway. Although 2009 saw decreased import activity levels, the forecast for 2010 points towards growth.” {NRF press release}

HALIFAX: CONTAINER EFFORT*
27 January. THE HALIFAX PORT AUTHORITY HAS ABOUT A THREE-YEAR WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY to attract an anticipated influx of new post-Panamax and super post-Panamax ships coming through the Suez Canal, before competitors like the Port of New York and New Jersey and Baltimore have the infrastructure in place to handle these larger vessels. The authority made the observation in its updated five-year business strategy plan, 'The Port of Halifax 2010 & beyond' posted on its website 25 January.

[As the box indicates, the long-awaited upswing in container imports has begun, affirming the decision of many ports to increase capacity. Editor]

Mercator Report
The port authority prepared its plan after commissioning Mercator International LLC, Logistics and Infrastructure Advisors to do a study entitled 'Containerized Cargo Strategic Review Summary Report, January 2010.'

Mercator’s study noted that despite excess liner capacity because of the Great Recession [North American containerized cargo has declined 20%, since 2007. See American Association of Port Authorities for port numbers], 326 new vessels of post-Panamax size (above 5,500 TEUs) and super-post Panamax (above 7,500 TEUs) were ordered prior to the recession and will be delivered through 2013.

Substituting these larger ships for the current smaller vessels will equate to cost savings, Mercator said.

Possible competition for Halifax
Per the business plan, only Halifax and Norfolk on the Eastern seaboard can handle these vessels now, with no restrictions. Mercator looked at six competing ports, and eliminated three due to water depth: Montreal, Boston, and Philadelphia [see Sydney plan to cooperate with Philadelphia because of depth in 10#01A.]

That leaves Norfolk, Baltimore, and New York. Maryland has leased the Seagirt Terminal to Ports America Chesapeake, which has agreed to dredge the terminal to 50 feet to accommodate the larger ships. [See box in 10#01A.] New York will pose competition to Halifax to reach the US Midwest.

New York problems until 2019
The Mercator report has this:

Vessel depth and height requirements. ‘A typical 6000TEU ship has an expected laden draft of 12.5 meters in US East coast trades, and would need at least 0.7 meters of under-keel clearance thus requiring 13.2 meters of channel depth [43.3 feet] to operate without tidal restrictions.’ [According to other websites, a 7500TEU vessel needs 14.5 meters or 47.6 feet draft. Editor]

At the same TEU capacity, vessels vary in water draft and in air draft. According to the Corps study of the
Bayonne Bridge cited by Mercator, a 5500TEU vessel has a keel-to-masthead height of about 180 feet. A 7500TEU vessel has 200 feet.

New York water depth: no problem after 2011. ‘The Port of New York/New Jersey (PONYNJ) is viewed by ocean carriers to have water depth constraints. However, the current harbor deepening project of the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will mitigate most of those limitations, once it is completed in 2013. Moreover, the channel leading to the APM Terminals, Maher, and [Port Newark Container Terminal] terminals in Elizabeth and Newark will be dredged to 50’ MLW by 2011, while the Global Terminal in Bayonne is slated to have a similar channel depth by end-2010.’ [Most of the PONYNJ capacity, in other words–editor]

New York air draft: ok for post-Panamax. ‘However, for ships to access all of the container terminals in the PONYNJ, except for Global Terminal, they have to pass under the Bayonne Bridge. The air draft of this bridge is only 151 ft. (45.7 m) at mean high water (MHW) and it increases to 155.3 ft. (47.1 m) at mean low water (MLW). Once the Kill van Kull Channel is deepened to 50’ MLW, vessels with a maximum keel-to-masthead height of 196’ (59.4 m) can transit the Bridge at all times of the day, assuming minimums of 2 feet of under-keel clearance and 3 feet of above-mast clearance, and assuming drafts of exactly 48’ (14.5 m).’

Thus the average 7500TEU vessel cannot normally clear the Bayonne Bridge.

Air draft bars super-post-Panamax in New York until 2019. ‘The US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) conducted an analysis of the global containership fleet and concluded that an overwhelming majority of vessels with capacities in excess of 7000 TEU are not able to transit under the Bayonne Bridge, even at MLW. Consequently, USACE and PONYNJ are currently evaluating 4 alternative engineering solutions to replacing, or modify the existing bridge, but none of these solutions are expected to be operational before 2019. Therefore, given the air draft limitations of the Bayonne Bridge, the PONYNJ will have just one terminal capable of handling 7500+ TEU ships over the next ten years, which is Global Terminal (owned by GCT). This 98-acre facility has 6 cranes (of which 4 are PPX) and a linear berth of 545 meters, with an estimated capacity of 600,000 TEU/year. As 7500+ TEU ships have lengths in the range of 325-340 meters, Global effectively can presently handle only one PPX vessel at a time.’ {Bayonne Bridge Air Draft Analysis prepared for The Port Commerce Department, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, by the US Army Corps of Engineers 9.09 used by Mercator}

What about Sydney and Canso?
Neither the Mercator study, nor the HPA business strategy, mentioned the plans of two Nova Scotia competitors who intend to operate deepwater container terminals by 2012. The Sydney Marine Group proposes a terminal built on dredge materials [see 10#01A, at one point, supposedly operational in 2010, see 09#03A]. Melford International Terminal Inc. proposes one in the Strait of Canso, expected to be operational in 2012 [see 09#09B].

Need for two berths at each terminal
‘[D]ue to the inherent unpredictability of ocean navigation, container carriers are reluctant to utilize single-berth terminals.’ [Presumably, the ships cost so much per day that no carrier wants its ship waiting while stevedores finish working another ship at the berth. Editor] {Mercator}

Halifax is well equipped with three post-Panamax berths, two at the Fairview Cove terminal, operated by Cerescorp and one at its South End terminal operated by Halterm. Air draft may bar super-post-Panamax vessels at Ceres.

HPA has started a major expansion and dredging project at Halterm which will give it a second super post-Panamax berth. {Halifax Port Authority press release 26.Jan.10}

Halifax as alternative access
‘Currently there is a window of opportunity, which should last for the next 30 to 36 months, for Halifax to be highly competitive in securing new PPX/SPPX that are deployed in order to “roll–up” smaller and less economical vessel strings. This opportunity is driven by the fact that New York has relatively little PPX/SPPX terminal capacity, but
the Port Authority of NY/NJ is working to address this deficiency.

‘Therefore, Halifax is the only Atlantic Canadian gateway port that currently can handle traffic flows to/from Ontario, Quebec and the USA Midwest on new PPX/SPPX services that are expected to be deployed in the Transatlantic and Suez Asia. The port also has a number of options to cost-effectively expand its capacity for these classes of vessels. Thus Halifax represents Canada’s best existing and future resource to insure that Canadian import and export supply chains moving in Atlantic / Suez trade corridors on new PPX/SPPX services continue to flow over Canadian ports.’ {Mercator}

Key to plan
The key to making Halifax a bigger player is quick action, said port authority spokesperson Michele Peveril on 28 January. “If Halifax is able to bring in more lines, more services and secure them, we can build a critical mass of cargo.” She added it is important to do these things before New York gets a chance to complete its dredging and deal with the Bayonne Bridge and before Panama expands.

Halifax has to “get in front of lines and show them the advantages we have. We have to get them interested now when there is a true competitive advantage. We have to get them and keep them.”And keeping them means being able to offer lines a rates and fees package totally competitive with other ports, she concluded. {ANR&P’s Tom Peters discussion 28.Jan.10}

RAIL SHIPPERS

Dean Warehouse (PW Rhode Island) Keeps wire coils.
Deepwater Wind (SVRT, Rhode Island) TIGER grant.
Omya (VRS, Vermont) Middlebury spur given ok.
Rock of Ages (VRS, Vermont) Grout move to start?
Stanley-Bostitch (PW Rhode Island) Keeps rail transload.
Xstrata (SCR, Nova Scotia) No chance for rail.

Note: See MMA for the 16 customers who will lose service in Aroostook County.
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