ConnRiver meetings: 4 on 2030 HSR vision.
Northeast Corridor: 11 states ask NEC study.
ST: Fink gives an update on the system.*
Harriman Safety Awards: No win for RRs. *
High-speed rail: CSXT says NYSDOT off track.*
CSXT/NYSDOT: Corrado HSR coordinator.*
PW: Connecticut Governor Jodi Rell expresses concern about two derailments in two months. **
MMA: ‘Old boys’ not to blame for lack of traffic.*
MMA: Next Task Force after bond referendum; mediation continues.**
MMA: STB postpones, awaits bond vote.
NEGS/ST: Transition talks. NEGS planning transload on White Mountain Branch.*
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REGIONAL

NEGS/ST: Transition talks. NEGS planning transload on White Mountain Branch.*

RHODE ISLAND

[No report.]

VERMONT

VAOT: Authority to sell state-owned lines amended.
NEGR: It & customer permitted to buy Fonda branch.
WACR: Granite move to begin soon.

MARITIMES/QUÉBEC

Sydney: Delay to await government funding.*

RAIL SHIPPERS/RECEIVERS

A cross-reference to companies mentioned here.

PEOPLE, POSITIONS, EVENTS

[No report.]

FROM THE PUBLISHER

NY, size of issue
We’ve begun covering New York–but gradually. With that comes an increase in pages; this issue has 14, two more than the past’s 12. Future issues will have even more.

Help needed
I still need free-lancers, particularly about NY. Contact me with any ideas, please!

- Chop Hardenbergh
- Next formal issue 18 June

REGIONAL ISSUES

CONNIVER MEETINGS

A SERIES OF PUBLIC INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS ON A 2030 VISION FOR HIGH SPEED, INTERCITY, AND REGIONAL RAIL SERVICE is scheduled by ConnDOT, MassDOT, and VAOT along two broad corridors:
1. New York City-New Haven-Hartford-Springfield-Boston, and

Four public informational meetings:
Wednesday, June 2 6pm. Pioneer Valley Planning Commission, 2nd Floor, 60 Congress Street, Springfield.
Thursday, June 3 6pm. Hartford Union Station, One Union Place, Hartford.
Thursday, June 10 6pm. Brattleboro Savings and Loan Bank, 221 Main Street, Brattleboro.
Consultant Wilbur Smith is assisting ConnDOT. {ANR&P discussion with ConnDOT's Mark Alexander 26.May.10}

REGION: NEC STUDY

20 May, Boston. THE NORTHEAST STATES ASKED THE FRA FOR A PLAN TO UPGRADE SERVICE ON THE NORTHEAST CORRIDOR. Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Delaware proposed a three-year, $18.8 million study of possible enhancements to both intercity rail service, such as Amtrak’s Acela Express, and local commuter rail systems that use portions of the Northeast Corridor track.

The federal government was asked for $15 million for the study; the states would pay the rest. {Bob Salsberg in AP}

Kit Morgan of NHDOT said the states not on the Northeast Corridor would still benefit from the improvement, so the three northern New England states supported it. {ANR&P discussion 21.May.10}

HARRIMAN SAFETY AWARDS*

18 May, DC. ONCE AGAIN, NO RAILROAD IN THE REGION WON A SAFETY AWARD. In 2004, Guilford won the gold for Group C, railroads under 4 million person-hours, and PW the bronze; in 2005 and 2006 Pan Am (formerly Guilford) won silver. Since then, covering the years 2006-2009, no railroad in the region has won. {AAR press releases}

ST: SYSTEM UPDATE*

15 May, Rockland, Maine. ST TOP OFFICIAL DAVID FINK GAVE AN UPDATE ON THE RAILROAD at the annual meeting of MRG/Downeast Rail here [compare to Ed Motte update in 10#04B].

New locomotives

Fink harkened back to Governor John Baldacci’s first inaugural address in 2003, just as Great Northern Paper shut down to MMA’s disappointment [see 03#01A]. “We are a hardscrabble people,” Baldacci said, and Fink riffed on that, saying, “Maine is a hardscrabble place to do railroading. We can't afford to buy new locomotives, and we never will.”

The ten SD-40s ST is buying from Kansas City Southern cost less than $100,000 each. The Waterville shop is renovating them; even with work, the cost is far less than buying one new, for $2.4 million. “I'm going to buy ten
more for our fleet.”

The old locomotives will go to the Conway Scenic, where according to Paul Hallett, an official with CSRX, one of them formerly led Maine Central's trains through Crawford Notch.

**Boxcars**

ST now owns 750 Plate F cars, but, said Fink, he would not invest in more without knowing that he would be moving more product, such as paper.

**Improvement programs**

Fink praised the purchase from International Paper of the Jay and Bucksport paper mills by the private company Verso Paper, because he can talk to the top officials at Verso, whereas IP was a huge company and did not pay that much attention to its Maine mills.

Recently, officials from Verso and ST gathered in a hotel in Lewiston to improve transportation of paper by rail, using the Kaizen process. “Bottom line, the transportation has never been better, and Verso is shipping more paper.”

ST did a similar process with SAPPI, using Six Sigma.

**Amtrak and ST track fees**

Amtrak pays ST 35 cents per car-mile to operate on ST track between Portland and the Massachusetts border. But ST pays Amtrak $1.35 per car-mile to operate over its track [Fink did not specify which stretch. ST operates over Amtrak between Springfield and Berlin]. “It's not fair.”

**Operation of the Downeaster**

Fink praised the relationship with Patricia Quinn, the director of NNEPRA. When passenger service operates over any freight railroad, “you are a guest in our home. Quinn came to us to understand how we work. She listened.”

Moreover, “She is very knowledgeable in getting funds.” When FRA Administrator Joe Szabo came to Maine to talk about the MMA situation in April [see 10#04A], he also visited, with Fink and Quinn, the proposed station sites in Freeport and Brunswick.

Like Quinn [see 10#04B Maine], Fink noted that the FRA was slow to disburse the funds it awarded. “FRA is a safety organization; it does not do grants. We are ready to go; I've got 100 furloughed workers ready to start working on track.” He expected the trackwork for the extension to Brunswick to start soon.

**Intermodal with NS/Mike McClellan**

Mike McClellan, NS vice-president for intermodal and automotive marketing, accompanied Fink to the MRG meeting, and spoke about access to New England. (Fink admitted, though: “We do more business with CSX than with NS; it's just a fact of life.”)

When NS revived intermodal to Ayer with ST in 2000 [see 00#18 and 00#19] following clearance of the Freight Main for mixed doublestack and autorack traffic [for which NS paid—see 99#11] and the completion of the 1999 CSXT-NS split of Conrail, traffic totalled 1100 intermodal units a year. Now, it is running to 30,000 or 40,000 units [containers or trailers] per year. PAS is running four trains a day [one pair autos, one pair intermodal—see 10#04B box] and may soon add another pair.

After the capital improvement permitted trains to operate between Ayer and Albany in 6.5 hours, “business started to show up. We went from 6,000-foot trains to 10,000-foot trains.” McClellan attributed the increase to the decreased capacity in trucking, to the attraction of shippers to the “green thing” offered by railroads, and to the lower cost of intermodal. “If you can save $100 per move, and you move 10,000 truckloads a year, you save a million dollars.”

Work had yet to begin in Mechanicville for the intermodal and auto terminals. PAS is waiting on a permit. “Mechanicville is the lynchpin of the project.”
Waterville intermodal

Asked whether ST and NS might again operate intermodally to Maine [the experiment in Waterville was still running in 2003–see 03#09A], Fink said intermodal is operating in the state: containers are drayed from Ayer to, for example, Walmart's Lewiston distribution facility. “I hope we can restart Waterville.”

To get to Ayer, NS was willing to invest $150 million, Fink noted. “He needed it.” To return to Waterville, “maybe we will do it with Mike, maybe by ourselves, maybe with the other guy [presumably referring to CSXT.]” McClellan said, “we'll deal with Waterville when Mechanicville is up and running.”

Maine track speeds

But ST does not need faster track for its own purposes. “We can run on the branches 10 or 25, on the main line 25 or 10 [miles per hour] now. There's no need to go faster.” The key is operating safely.

A crew can move from Waterville up the Hinckley branch to Sappi at 10 miles per hour, and return.

The Mountain Division future

Fink referred to his father, David Andrew Fink, now 72. “We know where we can go to make money.” After acquiring the Boston & Maine in the 1980s, the new owners had no need for the Mountain Division. “The Maine Central used the Mountain Division to screw the B&M” out of traffic.

Now, “we want to run [railcars] on our line as much as possible,” so the traffic goes out of Maine via the B&M.

Use us or lose us

Referring to the MMA situation, Fink recalled that John Friedland, NS vice-president for strategic planning, said at NEARS in April that “if you do not use us, you will lose us.” [See 10#05A.]

One example: the Rockland branch, where the major shipper Dragon Cement went to barge. “Shippers like to use us as a wedge to get truck rates down, but if you don't use us,” the rail will disappear. {ANR&P coverage}

NEW YORK

CSXT: NY HIGH-SPEED RAIL

30 April, Albany. NYSDOT AND THE RAILROAD CONTINUED TO DISCUSS HOW FREIGHT AND HIGH-SPEED RAIL CAN CO-EXIST, said NYSDOT spokeswoman Deborah Rausch. She was responding to a report about a disagreement between the two parties on introducing high-speed rail between Buffalo and Albany.

Note on definition of high-speed rail

Based on comments below, CSXT appears to define high-speed as above 90 miles per hour, and requires a corridor separated by 30 feet from a freight corridor.

A NY State Senate report [see below] defines very-high-speed rail as 150-200 miles per hour; it also uses the
term ‘truly high-speed rail.’ {page 1-6}

**A chronology of events on high-speed rail**

2006 State Senate task force high-speed rail study.

2009 July - HSR pre-application for FRA class 6 track.

August - HSR final application also class 6

2009 autumn - NYSDOT and CSXT negotiate host railroad memorandum of understanding which helps get federal grants.

2010 28 January - FRA awards NYS $148 million for Empire West Corridor.

February - NYSDOT and CSXT begin to negotiate on host railroad agreement to be able to draw down FRA funds.

March - Renjel letter says NYSDOT officials are retreating on MOU.

April - HSR official Purdue resigns because of retreat. ‘No movement’ says insider.

April - Hoyt letter expresses concern about HSR funding deadline.

May - Anderson brings HSR issues to full daylight.

May 11 - Hoyt to meet with commissioner.

May 13 - Lahood appoints Rae to handle NY.

**Current freight and passenger operations**

Amtrak operates one line from New York City, which carries seven round trips each day as far as the Albany-Rensselaer depot. Two *Empire Service* round trips continue to Niagara Falls; the *Maple Leaf* operates through Niagara Falls to Toronto; and the *Lake Shore Limited* continues through Buffalo to Chicago. The *Adirondack* runs north from Schenectady to Montreal; the *Ethan Allen* runs north to Whitehall via Schenectady, and then to Rutland.

The trains apparently have little chance to run at top speed, because the host railroad is responsible for 76-82% of the delays, with freight train interference the most prevalent on the ECW. {2009 NYS State Rail Plan page 76}

**Track rating and traffic.** CSXT has a two-track main line (Track No.1, northmost, predominantly westbound traffic, Track No.2 southmost, predominantly eastbound) from Albany to Buffalo, FRA Class 4 (59 miles per hour freight, 79 miles per hour passenger).

Annually, the two tracks carry 103.44 million gross tons, equally east- and west-bound. [At 100 tons per car (which only roughly accounts for intermodal and autorack traffic), that translates to one million railcars a year. *Editor* {Railroad Accident Brief, Derailment of CSX Transportation Train No. Q39010, Oneida, New York, March 12, 2007, NTSB/RAB-08/05}]

According to the chart, CSXT operates 60 trains per day on the ECW.

**1. PLANNING FOR HSR**

**NYSDOT plans and comments on Empire Corridor West**

In autumn 2006, the New York State Senate Task Force on High-Speed Rail produced an assessment of the capacity of the corridor between Albany and Buffalo. It concluded: ‘In the Albany to Buffalo Corridor, increasing freight traffic, greater distances, and variable operating and track conditions are the major constraints. Over the long term, freight service and a quality passenger service cannot co-exist on the same tracks at speeds over 90 mph. Empire
Corridor rail service will not compete successfully with air travel for trips between Buffalo and New York City without a new dedicated passenger rail guideway.’ {Renjel letter}

According to the 2009 New York State Rail Plan, ‘[a] multi-year, three-phase, implementation plan is being developed to accomplish the necessary environmental, financial, and regulatory changes to increase freight and passenger train capacities and operating speeds by investing in a third mainline express track primarily within the corridor’s existing railroad rights of way.’ {page 93}

A capacity study of the Empire Corridor from Rensselaer to Niagara Falls was begun in September 2008, the ‘Empire Corridor West Study’ (ECW Study) under the auspices of the State Senate Task Force on High-Speed Rail. According to the Rail Plan, the study would be completed in autumn 2009. {page 89} However, a NYSDOT official said it would become part of the environmental study effort, and is not yet ready for release. {ANR&P discussion 6.May.2010}

Commissioner Stanley Gee wrote in response to the 8 March letter from CSXT that design requirements for 110 miles per hour service would be part of the Environmental Impact Statement that the DOT has begun, and which is being paid for with some of the federal rail funding. {Eric Anderson in Albany Times Union 3.May.2010}

The 2009 State Rail Plan listed as a project proposed by NYSDOT ‘CP-169 to CP-431: Install Third main line track for 110 mph passenger train speed.  This initiative includes the construction of an express track where practical within existing railroad rights of way for...110 mph. Infrastructure includes track, signals, and structures necessary for operating speeds higher than existing 79 mph.’ Cost to be decided. {Appendix A page 21}

2. FUNDING TO PERHAPS BEGIN HSR

Federal funding
On 28 January, FRA awarded $151 million to New York [for comparison, all of New England received $195 million–see 10#01B], much less than what it applied for.

USDOT Secretary Ray LaHood said on 3 February at a breakfast sponsored by the Christian Science Monitor: “We based our decision on where the money could be well-spent and jump-start opportunities around the country. The money we gave to New York reflected what we thought about their application.”

He talked to Governor David Paterson and state officials and told them what they needed to do to receive larger sums in the future. “Unless a state or region has its act together, with (local) money, with a good plan that connects things, they’re not going to be in the high-speed rail business.” {Richard Dunham in Albany Times-Union 3.Feb.10}

The specific grants. On 28 January, NYSDOT received notice of $148 million in intercity federal stimulus for ECW, in five separate projects. Two will improve depots; the department also received $1 million for planning on the corridor. Two will improve specific track segments:

$54.50 million  Construct 11 miles of new third mainline track between Rochester and Batavia. According to the NYSDOT final application, ‘Specific improvements include: adding 11 miles of third mainline track to accommodate high-speed passenger service utilizing 136RE welded rail and concrete ties on a ballasted surface (47,500 feet). Eliminate sharp curves where determined practical and cost effective. Improve safety by upgrading the signal system, providing interlocking upgrades and PTC. Improve safety by rehabilitating existing bridges. Improve safety at at-grade crossings. Examine alignments on existing embankment designed to achieve 110 mph geometry where feasible with 25’ minimum and 30’ desirable track centers and maintain clearances to existing structures...’

‘The location for this project was selected partially because it appears there are feasible alternatives which can be constructed on existing right of way and roadbed and [do] not require the use public land. This existing ROW, which could accommodate a third track is generally utilized as maintenance of way access road.’ {NYSDOT final grant application 24.Aug.09}

$87.65 million  Design, construct and rehabilitate [ten miles of] a 2nd main line track between the Schenectady...
and Rensselaer stations and upgrade existing grade crossings and existing warning device systems. The first track was rated at FRA class 6 before the work, and both will be class 6 afterward, though average speed is only 51. (NYSDOT pre-application 10.July.09) [According to the NYSDOT Rail Plan map, CSXT owns this line. Only Amtrak is currently using it.]

**NYSDOT-CSXT memorandum of understanding**

In October 2009, an MOU was reached to cover the preparation of three documents for high-speed rail in New York, where the ECW is ‘a critical part of CSXT’s I-90 Corridor (Chicago-New York) and is CSXT’s highest-density freight corridor, which is essential to New York State’s economic vitality.’

The MOU was signed by NYSDOT Commissioner Stanley Gee, CSXT’s Steve Potter, and the FRA. [The document has a line for a signature from Amtrak, but according to Rich Slattery, senior principal, Policy Development & Support for Amtrak, Amtrak did not sign. {e-mail to ANR&P 19.May.10}]

The three documents. (1) Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement for high-speed rail while avoiding an adverse affect on CSXT; (2) Transportation Investment Plan for improved intercity passenger rail between Niagara Falls and New York City; and (3) definitive agreements covering the improvements identified by the TIP.

Separate corridor at 90+. ‘The Parties agree that the design standards used in the TIP for passenger trains operating on CSXT property at speeds higher than 90 mph between Buffalo and Hoffmans, NY [the point in western Schenectady where the CSXT freight line and the Amtrak line diverge, eastbound–editor] will require a separated and sealed corridor for passenger services constructed at least 30 feet offset from existing freight tracks unless otherwise mutually agreed between the parties. The Transportation Investment Plan and EIS will recognize this agreement, which will guide the development of infrastructure options.’ [This language is repeated verbatim in the
section saying CSXT will participate in the TIP process.] {text of MOU}

3. NYSDOT/CSXT DISAGREEMENT

Talks show disagreement
Talks [presumably working on a host railroad agreement to draw down the FRA funds—editor] between CSXT and NYSDOT unravelled in February. New York officials demanded train speeds of 110 miles per hour. The Department’s High-Speed Rail Project Manager Ann Purdue objected to this position, in vain.

On 13 April, Purdue resigned as of 30 April, only a year after she arrived from the Virginia Attorney General’s office. One DOT insider said the speed issue has “just poisoned the relationship between CSX and the state. There's been virtually no movement on anything since.” {Brendan Scott in New York Post 19.Apr.10}

CSX spokesman Bob Sullivan said 30 April that the right-of-way between Schenectady and Buffalo was wide enough in some parts to allow the [CSXT-requested] 30-foot separation. But "there would be some places when there probably would have to be some land acquisition." Those acquisitions likely would have to be paid for by New York state.

The New York Central Railroad once had four tracks on this line; two were removed as passenger service
waned.

**Separate corridor.** A separate passenger corridor might require the construction of new bridges and culverts, and elimination of crossings. “At speeds above (110 mph), ideally, you want to do away with crossings,” said Warren Flatau, FRA spokesperson. “There's an absolute prohibition at speeds of 125 mph or higher,” thus requiring as many as 200 new overpasses or advanced crossing gates to be built along the route.

The state is not clear about pursuing the separate corridor, though a publicly-owned rail line would give Amtrak more control over scheduling and train speeds and relieve congestion on the CSXT line. {Eric Anderson in Albany Times Union 3.May.2010}

**The nature of the dispute**
A source familiar with the situation on 13 May said CSXT and NYSDOT are discussing the FRA grants.

**Albany-Hoffmans grant.** Since CSXT does not operate on this CSXT-owned section, the dispute does not involve this section.

**Rochester to Batavia grant.** On this 11 miles, a train could not move off the CSXT main line, get up to 110, and then slow to return to the main line—at least not for any length. The dispute does not center on this section.

**Interpreting the MOU: entire corridor.** NYSDOT would like to construct separate parts of a 110 mile an hour corridor as money became available.

CSXT argues that because of signalling and other issues, the entire corridor must be separated and thus ‘sealed’ as the MOU language stated, before trains could operate at 110.

And the high-speed track must have 30-foot separation, according to CSXT: “Not 25 feet, 30 feet.”

Until the entire corridor is created, Amtrak could run at 90 on the new segments, “and on CSXT track” as well. {ANR&P discussion}

**The Renjel letter**
On 8 March CSX’s Louis Renjel, vice-president for strategic infrastructure initiatives [he is working on the CSXT move out of Beacon Park—see 10#02B] wrote to NYSDOT Commissioner Stanley Gee: ‘The MOU was critical to the State’s successful application for funding....

‘[but] NYSDOT is again advancing the concept of introducing high-speed passenger operations with CSX freight trains. CSX has been consistent in every communication with NYSDOT and the New York Congressional delegation in opposing this concept. Given the enormous volume of freight...introducing high speed passenger trains on or in an extremely close proximity to the freight network presents fundamentally unsafe conditions to the public and CSX employees....

‘Passenger trains that travel 110 miles per hour are fundamentally incompatible with the amount of freight on this line. From a public policy perspective, such an arrangement will absolutely force freight onto the highways and significantly diminish...benefits’ of freight rail.

‘Significant enhancements can be made to the existing passenger service between Albany and Buffalo....improvements could be made...to permit increases in maximum passenger speeds from 79 mph to 90 mph–as well as improving the reliability for passenger trains.’ {text of letter}

Gee, in his reply to Renjel, said that CSX "may have ... misinterpreted" the goals that the DOT established for high-speed rail. {Eric Anderson in Albany Times Union 3.May.2010}

**4. EFFORTS TO RESOLVE THE DISPUTE**

**NYSDOT may fail to draw down funds**
Assembly Member Sam Hoyt (D, Buffalo) on 19 April wrote Commissioner Gee to state in part that the Department has not completed certain requirements, including: ‘an agreement with our partners, such as CSX, completing a statement of work, project goals, and milestones, and turning in final budgets to the FRA deadline of September 1,
2010.’

He expressed concern about Purdue’s departure also, and third about ‘New York’s lack of a consolidated plan....New York State is poised to benefit from two mega-regions, one centered in New York City and another in Toronto.’

Hoyt called for the formation of a High-Speed Rail Authority, noting that two states which received a lot of funding, Florida and California, each had an authority. He asked for ‘[a] summary of all plans to implement high-speed rail in the state...separate from the material included in the State’s Rail Plan [which is inadequate–editor].’

Renjel’s letter also noted that Florida and California got a substantial amount of funding for ‘truly world-class high-speed rail’ which will ‘operate on dedicated, sealed, and separated’ corridors.

7 May, DC. **FRA’S RAE WILL WORK WITH NYSDOT AND CSXT TO RESOLVE DIFFERENCES** between CSXT and NYSDOT. The assignment resulted from a meeting convened by US Representative Louise Slaughter (D, western New York) at USDOT here. USDOT Secretary Ray LaHood said: “I promised Congresswoman Slaughter that FRA Deputy Administrator Karen Rae will work with the state and do whatever it takes to make high-speed rail happen for New York.” LaHood, Rae, Slaughter, USDOT Deputy Secretary John Porcari, FRA Administrator Joe Szabo, and officials from CSXT and NYSDOT attended the meeting.

Rae, until 2009 served as commissioner Policy & Planning at New York’s Department of Transportation. Slaughter “formed the Upstate Congressional Caucus” in 2009 with “bringing high-speed rail to the Empire Corridor our first priority,” she said. “Together we secured $4.6 million in funding through the appropriations process and today is one more milestone. High-speed rail in New York will be a reality.”

**Comment from an observer**

NYSDOT may want to keep the higher speed inside the existing right of way, said one source with knowledge of the situation. If the Department concedes that speeds over 90 need a separate right of way, advocates may ask, why limit the corridor to 110? Why not go to true high speed, 150 to 200?

Even at the 90 or 110 miles per hour, the price is "almost too big to worry about now." He'd heard a figure of $3 billion. The Department should do what it is apparently doing: create "a really good plan which outlines what you can do incrementally. Put the third track in some places, so you can go faster sooner."

A facilitator, which Rae could become, could wait for the completion of the capacity study, which will show the corridor and the possibilities in detail. She could then state, for the places where the existing right of way provides only, say, 22 feet: "Look, CSX, you need to suck it up and live with it."

In other places, where the right of way would only provide four feet, the facilitator could say to NYSDOT, "You're going to need to buy a bit of land."

Then the corridor would get built as the money became available, "In some places you'll go 110, in some places for awhile you won't."

14 May, DC. **US SENATOR KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND CALLED ON NYS TO APPOINT A NEW HIGH-SPEED RAIL COORDINATOR**, in a brief press release this day, to ‘make sure New York continues moving forward on developing high speed rail across the state and doesn’t miss out on any available federal funding.’

19 May, Albany. **MARIE CORRADO WAS APPOINTED HIGH-SPEED RAIL COORDINATOR** by NYSDOT Acting Commissioner Stanley Gee. “I have asked the Department’s Director of Major Projects, Marie A. Corrado, Esq, to oversee New York’s high speed rail program. The Office of Major Projects is charged with delivering the state’s most complex and important transportation projects.”

Organizationally, NYSDOT created teams to develop the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) high-speed rail project applications. To assure timely and successful delivery of the seven projects that received $151 million in ARRA funding, Acting Commissioner Gee supplemented the original teams with key engineering
and project management staff.

“Marie Corrado and the teams assembled to deliver the program share with me the commitment to making the expansion of high speed passenger rail service in New York State a reality. The benefits of high speed rail include job creation, opportunities for rail manufacturing and maintenance and service businesses, economic development, enhanced mobility, energy efficiency, and environmental sustainability, are vitally important for our state.” {NYSDOT press release}

CONNECTICUT

PW: DERAILMENT CONCERN**
13 May, Hartford. "TWO DERAILMENTS IN TWO MONTHS IS TOO TOO MANY," GOVERNOR JODI RELL SAID in an announcement this day, following a derailment in Lisbon on 12 May. In a nine-car train, three cars carrying latex overturned near the Quinebaug River; one had a minor leak. Five cars were carrying pellets. The sixth was an empty butane car. {NBC Connecticut affiliate} PW derailed ethanol cars on 11 March [see 10#05A Regional].

Who will pay?
Governor Rell today announced that the Federal Railroad Administration is investigating the recent train derailments in Lisbon and Willimantic. In addition, Governor Rell has directed the state Department of Transportation (DOT), the state Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and the Connecticut State Police to keep a record of all time and resources spent on responding to the derailments so that the state may be financially reimbursed for its efforts.

“Two derailments in two months is two too many. We are very fortunate that no one was hurt in either of these incidents and that they did not lead to any environmental disasters. But the larger question is what caused these derailments? We want to be sure that these privately-owned tracks are safe, that the trains are being operated ably and that proper maintenance is being conducted. We do not want to see a third derailment. Simply put, we want answers.”

“No Connecticut taxpayer money should be spent on the state's response to these derailments,” Governor Rell added. “From the extensive overtime to the clean up and remediation costs, we aim to recover every penny of taxpayer funds.” {Rell press release}

PW comment
Marie Angelini, PW general counsel, wrote on 17 May: ‘P&W has an impressive safety record [see Harriman article in Regional] and years of operations completed without a serious derailment. We move on from here, with the tracks restored to service yesterday.’ {e-mail to ANR&P}

25 May. FRA OFFICIALS MET WITH TOP PW OFFICIALS to discuss the situation. FRA Regional Administrator Les Fiorenzo declined to discuss the content of the meeting. {ANR&P discussion 25.May.10}

An 80-car ethanol train coming out of Canada was parked on the NECR; 40 cars were moved by PW down to New London, and then up the Norwich branch to Worcester on 26-27 May. {e-mail posts on PW list}
MAINE

MMA: OLD BOY NETWORK*
15 May, Chicago. **ED BURKHARDT SAID HIS FORMER RAILROAD DID VERY WELL,** addressing the contention of the NEARS conference ‘attendee with direct knowledge of the Maine shipping situation’ that MMA had hired “too many people from the old boy network at WC.” [See 10#04B.] Burkhardt listed himself, ‘one gentleman running the locomotive shop at Derby, and Bob Grindrod (president) and Joe McGonigle (VP Sales & Marketing).

‘Wisconsin Central was the most successful of the large regional railways, and was known for customer service, excellent car movement and transit time, and innovation. We won countless prizes, including placing first in the railway category for 13 straight years in the annual Distribution Magazine shipper poll of transportation operators. Bob and Joe held senior positions at WC, and were well immersed in this pro-customer culture.’

Plan for MMA
‘Our earliest plan for MMA was to try to replicate this success in Northern Maine. Initially we were very short of management talent, and it was necessary to recruit successful managers to MMA with railway experience. After CN took over WC [in 2001 -editor], some WC management people became available, and we were quick to recruit them. I just wish we could have recruited more, but some of the WCers were scared off by the bleak traffic picture faced by MMA from the outset [MMA began in January 2003 -editor].

‘Here’s the major difference. In my last year as CEO of WC, our revenues were $144,000 per mile. By Class I standards, that is low density, but we thrived under those conditions. Today, MMA ekes out a living at $40,000 per mile. The majority of WC customers were supportive and involved, responding well to our efforts to craft win/win solutions. In some cases, we found a rather different customer “personality” at MMA, with little consideration or understanding of our efforts to provide good service under conditions of rapidly declining volume. At the same time, the majority of MMA customers have responded well to our desire to work as partners through these difficult times.

‘The upshot is Bob and Joe have had to make many hard decisions, some of which haven’t earned them roses from our customers. But they have kept us alive, and they kept our customers in business, which is far better than our predecessor did. They now are closely involved in getting rid of the heavily loss-making 240 miles of our

---

**Industrial Port Development Opportunity**

**Mid-Coast Maine Location**

- 26 acre site with 32 foot depth of water (9.75m) alongside at low tide; 11 foot range of tide.
- 16 miles from Bangor/Brewer & I-95.
- Borders Pam-Am/ST rail system.
- Adjacent to Commercial Maritime District.
- Suitable for bulk, break-bulk, and project cargo; ship repair, terminal storage/distribution, and industrial fabrication.
- Recent marine survey available for review.
- Contact David Milan, Bucksport Economic Development Director, at (207)-469-7368.
system. This too is part of management. I’m proud of them, and would be only too happy to have additional WC veterans in our ranks.

‘....It’s rather disingenuous to blame the “WC old boy network” for the de-industrialization of Aroostook County and the establishment of 100,000-pound truck weight limits in Maine!’ {e-mail to ANR&P}

**MMA: NEXT STEPS**

20 May, Augusta. **THE AROOSTOOK RAIL TASK FORCE WILL MEET ON 9 JUNE**, the day after the bond referendum, somewhere in the County, said MDOT spokesperson Mark Latti.

The STB mediation
Commissioner Cole, who is heading both the task force and the STB-sponsored mediation with MMA, declined to provide any dates about the mediation, except to say that the department “continues to work through the process,” said Latti. {ANR&P discussion}

**MMA: EXTENSION OF TIME**

25 May, DC. **THE STB CREATED A NEW SCHEDULE AROUND THE BOND REFERENDUM**, in a decision issued this day. On 8 June Maine voters will decide whether to approve a bond for $7 million toward the state purchase of the Millinocket-Madawaska line.

Joint status report due
‘The Board understands that the parties may not be able to reach a final agreement concerning the sale of the lines without knowing the outcome of the June 8 referendum. Accordingly, MMA and the State are directed to submit a joint status report outlining their progress toward an agreement on the sale by June 17, 2010. If the parties have not reached an agreement or have not made substantial progress toward reaching an agreement by June 17, 2010, the Board will resume its consideration of the merits of this abandonment proceeding and prepare a final Board decision...

Hearing in near future
‘[If the parties have not reached agreement], it is expected that the Board will hold a hearing to gather testimony and to afford the Board members an opportunity to ask questions before reaching a decision on MMA’s application. Due to the time consumed by the mediation process and the need to schedule a hearing, to consider the testimony produced at it, and to produce a written decision, the Board does not anticipate that it would issue a decision on the merits of MMA’s application by July 9, 2010.’ {STB decisions page, Docket No. AB 1043 (Sub-No. 1)}

---

**MASSACHUSETTS**

**CSXT/MASSDOT: POSTPONEMENT**

21 May, Boston. **THE CLOSING ON THE PURCHASE BY MASSDOT OF THE CSXT LINES** in the South Coast, as well as the Grand Junction and South Boston, is delayed by several weeks, according to three different rail sources. According to the official plans, the closing should have happened on 14 May [see 10#05A]. {ANR&P discussions}

Reasons behind the delay
Jamey Tesler, MassDOT deputy secretary, said on 24 May that once the STB had granted the go-ahead for the transaction in early May [see 10#05A], the parties needed to do “a few last minute closeout steps. This is a
tremendous amount of work. We are imminently close.” He emphasized that the parties were encountering “no problems.”

Clearance work
For the second closing, covering the line to Worcester, the parties must provide clearance for full doublestack trains. That work is proceeding, Tesler said. “We have put out to bid one job, and bids have come back.”

The engine turning facility
Under the 2008 Definitive Agreement between MassDOT and CSXT, beginning in October 2008 the T was permitted to operate an additional 2.5 round trips per day, the ‘First Stage trains’. When MassDOT has made available to CSXT’s exclusive use ‘a locomotive turning and servicing facility located in central Massachusetts’, the T may operate one additional round-trip, the ‘Second Stage trains’. [See 08#12B.]

In March, the two parties were still, per CSXT spokesperson Bob Sullivan, ‘continuing to work on finding the best location for such a facility’ [see 10#02B]. By May Tesler reported that “given the relocation [of the facilities now at Beacon Park] is so far along, all energy is devoted to the relocation and bridge work.”

At this point, Tesler said, CSXT is running engines light to Beacon Park for servicing and turning. Since the relocation date is only two years away, the parties are not pursuing what was an “interim step,” permitting an additional commuter train in return for relocating the engine facility.

He understands that CSXT will place the engine turning facility, like all other Beacon Park facilities, at one of the three locations to which CSXT is relocating: Worcester, Westborough, or West Springfield. {ANR&P discussion 24.May.10}

CSX: RESISTANCE TO NEW YARD*
20 May, Worcester. WORCESTER WILL BE BETTER OFF WITH THE EXPANDED CSXI YARD, said Roberta Schaefer, president of the Worcester Regional Research Bureau, a private, non-profit organization that conducts independent, non-partisan research and analysis of public policy issues facing the greater Worcester region. “This is a wonderful project. Worcester needs more commuter rail” the quid pro quo for CSXI moving out of Beacon Park yard in Boston, for workers to commute into Worcester for employment as well as residents commuting to the Boston area.

The yard is an “expansion of the same use, an appropriate use,” she continued. “If Worcester becomes a distribution center as a result of the expanded intermodal offering, it will give an economic boost as well.” {ANR&P discussion}

Some doubt
During a forum sponsored by the Research Bureau on 18 May, Alan Ehrenhalt, who, as a journalist has studied the changing demographics of American cities, responded to a question about the advisability of the yard. Ehrenhalt, the director of information at the Pew Center on the States, called expanding the yard probably not a “great” idea for the city center, but he supported the deal because it would to get more commuter rail. {Bronislaus Kush in Worcester Telegram & Gazette 19.May.10}

Local resistance, a guest editorial
Excepted: ‘CSX has redesigned its access point to its freight yard on Grafton Street to create a more direct access to Interstate 290 and to keep its trucks from traveling on Grafton Street [see map in 10#02B]. The company is considering a mitigation account, which would fund improvement projects in abutting neighborhoods for years to come.

Per fee container. [At the request of the joint Council committee, it was requested that a mitigation fund be developed to address abutting neighborhood projects. It is expected that CSX will agree upon a fee per container, for each one shipped to and from the Worcester freight terminal, to provide the annual revenue for the mitigation
‘CSX had planned on closing Putnam Lane as part of its expansion. Now it’s been told it must leave Putnam Lane open, or build an alternative connection. But of six alternatives considered thus far, none has been accepted by city councilors or neighborhood residents. City councilors are right to insist that the company do all it can to protect the peace and safety of adjoining neighborhoods.

‘Yet it is becoming very apparent that some councilors view CSX as a powerful, billion-dollar company with deep pockets. These officials are willing to roll the dice to see just how much they can dig into those deep pockets. These councilors do not think there is any limit to their wish list, because they believe that CSX, having come this far, has no other options than Worcester.

‘City Councilor Philip Palmieri, who is second only to Mr. Murray in advocating for increased commuter rail to and from Worcester, was strategically pessimistic on whether negotiations with CSX will ever bear any fruit. “I don’t think CSX wants a deal,” he told me yesterday. Don’t panic. Phil means he is not yet finished squeezing the company on behalf of his district. We can only hope there is something left for the rest of the city when he is done.’

ST/FREIGHT OPERATIONS WILL BE AFFECTED BY A NEW GREEN LINE MAINTENANCE FACILITY. DOT Secretary Jeffrey Mullan, Mayor Joseph Curtatone, and Member of Congress Mike Capuano (D-8th) announced that after months of debate about the Green Line Extension Project, the City of Somerville and MassDOT agreed to locate the maintenance facility in the Inner Belt area known as Option L. This site makes possible the future redevelopment of the areas closest to the Green Line Extension corridor and the creation of long-term transportation connections between the Inner Belt and Brickbottom neighborhoods.

‘The construction of Yard 8 would remove all existing freight trackage within Yard 8 and the Wiley Track, a connecting track between the south end of Yard 8 and the Valley Tracks. Thus, this option would require some revisions to current freight operations by Pan Am Railways. However, based on on-going discussions with Pan Am Railways, none of this would preclude existing overall freight rail operations in the area.

‘Pan Am Railways’ freight trains reach Boston via the MBTA Lowell Line [it enters from the left of the map-editor]. Typically, there are about three to four round-trips per week for the local switching operation, which serves Somerville as well as Chelsea, Salem, and Peabody via other MBTA routes. In addition, the “sand and gravel unit train” to Boston Sand and Gravel in Charlestown makes another three to four round-trips a week. Most freight trains operate in the evening or night...

‘Currently, Pan Am Railways has two tracks in the yard: one through track and one storage track. Pan Am Railways’ freight trains coming down the MBTA Lowell Line pass through Yard 8, occasionally temporarily storing freight cars in the yard. If Yard 8 were dedicated to the Green Line, it would still be possible for Pan Am Railways to access the Boston area and to store freight cars in other nearby locations.

‘Alternative routes exist within the MBTA system to support Pan Am Railways’ operations. There is no impact to CSX freight rail operations with this option. CSX freight trains could continue to operate as they do today with a Green Line maintenance facility at Yard 8. [The MBTA Fitchburg Line enters from the bottom left of the map. CSXT Grand Junction Branch from Beacon Park is shown curving into the Fitchburg line under the McGrath Highway (Route 28). Editor]

‘Option L would impact Pan Am Railways’ freight operations to the same degree as Yard 8. Both options would require the removal of the Wiley Track which connects the south end of Yard 8 to the Valley Tracks. Without the

ST/MBTA: MS WALKER*

17 May, Somerville. Planners looked at three options [see map]: Yard 8, Mirror H, and Option L.
Wiley Track, Yard 8 would be a two track stub end (single-ended) yard which would have little utility to Pan Am Railways’ operations.

‘M.S. Walker, a current freight customer of Pan Am Railways, is a business that would have to be relocated [sited left of the ‘Valley Track’ label on the map] to make room for the Green Line maintenance facility. Alternative routes exist within the MBTA system that could support Pan Am Railways’ service to other customers.’

**Freight impact of Mirror H option**

‘Mirror H would not impact existing freight railroad operations. Pan Am Railways’ operations through Yard 8 would remain as would the Wiley Track connection from Yard 8 to the Valley Tracks. Pan Am Railways’ operations would continue as they do today with this option.

‘There is no impact to CSX freight rail operations with this option. CSX freight trains could continue to operate as they do today with a Green Line maintenance facility at the Mirror H site. However, Mirror H would preclude the future North-South Rail Link project [unlike the other two options].’  


---

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**NHDOT: MANCHESTER-LAWRENCE**

May, Concord.  *THE WIDENING OF I-93 WILL NOT PRECLUDE REVIVING RAIL* on the Manchester-Lawrence line, according to the Supplemental Impact Statement:

**Potential Future Mass Transit Accommodations**

‘The 2005 Selected Alternative does not include rail service within the I-93 corridor, or along the former Manchester
and Lawrence Rail Line Corridor. However, the 2005 Selected Alternative will accommodate space for potential future mass transit opportunities between the MA/NH state line northerly to the Exit 5 Interchange. The potential rail line within the highway corridor could be a link in a future service between Lawrence, MA or Woburn, MA (and ultimately Boston, MA) to the south and the Manchester Airport and/or the City of Manchester, NH to the north. In addition, the proposed layout provides provisions, such as bridge replacements and continued grade separated crossings, to facilitate, and not preclude, the reestablishment of future rail service on the Manchester-Lawrence line.

‘NHDOT and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts are evaluating potential public transportation alternatives for the I-93 corridor as part of the separate I-93 Bi-State Transit Investment Study. While the transit service alternatives being evaluated by the Bi-State study would enhance mobility in the corridor, they would not divert sufficient vehicle trips from I-93 to eliminate the need to widen I-93 to four-lanes in each direction. For detailed information on the projected transit ridership levels supporting this conclusion, refer to the I-93 Transit Investment Study Ridership Memo provided in DSEIS Appendix A: Traffic Written Reevaluation/Technical Report.’

{New Hampshire Department of Transportation Interstate 93 Improvements [widening to four lanes each direction] (Salem to Manchester) Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Re-evaluation/Section 4(f) Evaluation Chapter 3: Alternatives, page 3-6}

NHDOT: HDR SELECTED**

21 May, Boston. **NHDOT CHOSE HDR TO NEGOTIATE A FEE DEAL FOR THE STATE RAIL PLAN.** Cambridge Systematics and Wilbur Smith were the other two firms on the short list. {ANR&P discussions with consultants} HDR and HNTB are doing the Massachusetts rail plan, and HNTB is doing the Maine rail plan. {Editor}

If the fee proposal is acceptable, they will be awarded a contract subject to Governor and Council approval. {e-mail to ANR&P from NHDOT’s Kit Morgan}

SLR: FRASER GORHAM SALE

25 May, Toronto. **FRASER SUBSIDIARY FRASER N.H. LLC WILL SELL SUBSTANTIALLY ALL OF ITS ASSETS TO AN INVESTMENT FUND** managed by Merchantbanc, LLC, of Manchester, New Hampshire. Financial terms of the transaction were not disclosed.

The Gorham paper mill, served by SLR, currently operates three paper machines and produced 80,000 tons of uncoated freesheet papers and 37,000 tons of towel products in 2009. The transaction is expected to close in late July and is subject to approval of the Ontario Superior Court of Justice (Commercial List) and the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Delaware. {Fraser press release}

Merchantbanc comment

According to its website, ‘MerchantBanc is a private investment firm that creates value for institutional and high net worth investors by purchasing and investing in entrepreneurial growth companies located throughout New England.’

Jeff Pollock, head of the firm, on 25 May said that it “invests in companies for growth. We see a good opportunity to make the mill sustainably profitable with NH energy sources.”

Pollock also sees “long-term niche opportunities in the paper industry which this mill can address successfully.” He said he was “very impressed with all the people there.”

As for rail use, he anticipated if revenues grew, shipping would also grow. But he had not directly looked at the rail transportation aspect. {ANR&P discussion}

Gorham mill energy

The Fraser website lists the 2009 energy sources as 75% fossil fuel, 1% purchased electricity, and 24% carbon neutral hydro-electricity. Fraser NH LLC already applied to the state Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Fund
for equipment which will ‘permit reuse hot air, hot water and condensate to reduce fossil fuel consumption.’ Cost $470,000. {New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission website, application not dated}

**ST/MBRX: NO PROGRESS**

20 May, Milford. **ST HAS THUS FAR REFUSED MEDIATION OR ARBITRATION** to resolve the dispute between it and MBRX. On 18 May, MBRX chief Peter Leishman wrote to ST counsel Rob Culliford: ‘During our last dispute, the STB suggested we use the Board's alternative dispute resolution processes of arbitration or mediation. See 49 CFR parts 1108 and 1109. The STB strongly urged us to explore these options.

‘I would be more than willing to move to binding arbitration to resolve our latest dispute.’

Track fee

Leishman also noted: ‘I found it interesting that [ST President David] Fink called it unfair that Amtrak is charging them $1.35 per mile [while paying ST only 35 cents per car-mile–see Regional]. They charge us $8.49 to go 3 miles or $2.83 per mile...and on top of that it is excepted track.’ {e-mails to ANR&P 18&20.May.10}

**NEGS/ST: THE TRANSITION**

20 May, Concord. **WE ARE IN TRANSITION MEETINGS**” with ST now, said NEGS President Peter Dearness. The date of the handover is not set.

Court settlement

Dearness said he could comment on the settlement of his lawsuit [to recover unpaid car fees–see 10#05A] in two weeks.

New transloads

Though NEGS will no longer serve customers on ST’s Concord tracks [ST has promised to provide five-day a week service to the Concord customers–see 10#05A], it retains the freight rights on NHDOT’s White Mountain Branch. Dearness hopes to expand his customer base there at two spots:

Canterbury yard. Here NEGS is “two-thirds through” installing a team track, and is acquiring a portable steel loading dock. Dearness expects to announce more “in a couple of weeks.”

Boyce yard. NEGS workers have cleared this yard, and depending on traffic need, will build a double-ended siding with a team track. {ANR&P discussion 20.May.10}

---

**VERMONT**

**NECR: STATE SALE**

21 May, Montpelier. **THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY PERMITTED THE SALE OF THE FONDA BRANCH** in the transportation bill this day.

Sec. 30. APPROVAL OF TRANSACTIONS REGARDING STATE-OWNED RAILROAD PROPERTY

Sale of part of Fonda branch to NECR

The state bought the former Lamoille railroad in 1973, from St.Johnsbury to Swanton Junction. The line from Swanton to St.Johnsbury was abandoned and became a trail [see 04#02B]. NECR continues to operate the Swanton Junction to Swanton section [see history of line in 02#01B] to serve the chip-loading operation at Shelburne Limestone [see
(a) The secretary of transportation, as agent for the state of Vermont, is authorized to sell to New England Central Railroad, Inc., for fair market value, a segment of the so-called Fonda Branch of the former Central Vermont Railway, Inc. in the town of Swanton, beginning at approximate mile post 37.86 and extending northerly a distance of approximately 1.26 miles to approximate mile post 139.12, which is the northerly abutment of the railroad bridge over the Missisquoi River.

Sale of part of Fonda branch to Shelburne Limestone
(b) The secretary, as agent for the state of Vermont, is authorized to sell to Shelburne Limestone Corporation, for fair market value, a segment of the so-called Fonda Branch of the former Central Vermont Railway, Inc. in the town of Swanton, beginning at approximate mile post 139.12, which is the northerly abutment of the railroad bridge over the Missisquoi River, and extending northerly a distance of approximately 0.58 miles to approximate mile post 139.70, which is the southwesterly line of U.S. Route 7. {H.784 from General Assembly website}

Shelburne Limestone use
Dennis Demers, the president of Shelburne, said on 25 May that when the state wanted to sell the line, he wanted to purchase it because it ran right through his property. “We are the ones using it and maintaining it.”

In addition to the chips, Shelburne has shipped out some railroad ballast and has also unloaded railcars there. We have ambitions to do more over time. {ANR&P discussion 25.May.10}

VAOT comment
Joe Flynn, the director of the rail program for VAOT, said on 25 May that in the autumn, the state, Shelburne, and NECR entered into a three-way industrial rail program under which Shelburne acquired a second siding at its facility. It can now load the chip train and access other rail cars at the same time.

The deal to sell the Swanton line emerged at this time. Flynn emphasized that the state has retained the right to operate regular train service through the Shelburne property should the Missisquoi rail trail ever revert to rail. {ANR&P discussion 25.May.10}

VAOT: AUTHORITY TO SELL
21 May, Montpelier. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AMENDED STATE AUTHORITY IN THE TRANSPORTATION BILL sent to the governor this day.

The underlined language is new:

* * * State-owned Railroad Property * * *
Sec. 36. 5 V.S.A. 3406(b) is amended to read:
(b) The secretary shall have authority, with the approval of the governor, to sell to any person or legal entity part or all of any parcel of state-owned railroad property or rights therein, provided that the terms of the sale are approved by the legislature or, in the event that the general assembly is not in session, by the joint fiscal committee subject to the following conditions:

1) the property is located more than 33 feet from the centerline of main line track (or former main line track), and the secretary determines that the property no longer is needed for railroad operating purposes or for railbanking under section 3408 of this title; and (2)(a) if the appraised value of the property is $100,000.00 or above, with the prior approval of the general assembly of the sale and its terms, or, in the event that the general assembly is not in session, with the prior approval of the joint transportation oversight committee; or (B) if the appraised value of the property is below $100,000.00, without further approval.

Sec. 37. 5 V.S.A. 3408 is amended to read:
3408. RAILBANKING; NOTIFICATION

08#04A].
(a) If the secretary finds that the continued operation of any state-owned railroad property is not economically feasible under present conditions, he or she may place the line in railbanked status after giving advance notice of such planned railbanking to the house and senate committees on transportation when the general assembly is in session, and when the general assembly is not in session, to the joint transportation oversight committee. The agency, on behalf of the state, shall continue to hold the right-of-way of a railbanked line for reactivation of railroad service or for other public purposes not inconsistent with future reactivation of railroad service. Such railbanking shall not be treated, for purposes of any law or rule of law, as an abandonment of the use of the rights-of-way for railroad purposes. \{H.784 from General Assembly website\}

WACR: GRANITE MOVE STARTING
24 May. THE FIRST GROUT WILL MOVE OUT OF VERMONT SOON, according to Ed Duggan, an official with Northeast Materials Group, which has contracted with the Rock of Ages quarry to market the waste granite (grout) \{see 10#02A\}. Northeast will move roughly 54,000 tons of grout for use as armor rock for the Herbert Hoover Dyke System in Lake Okeechobee, Florida. At 100 tons per car, that translates to 540 loaded cars, in ten-car trains twice a day, five days a week.

Representatives from Barre Town, Barre City, Berlin and Montpelier, as well as from the State of Vermont Rail Division, Central Vermont Economic Development

Corporation and Barre Area Development were all briefed 7 May by officials from Northeast Materials Group and Rock of Ages.

Duggan said the target date of end May may, like all targets, not be met. \{ANR&P discussion with Duggan 24.May.10; Montpelier Times-Argus 8.May.10\}

QUEBEC/MARITIMES

SYDNEY: MORE TIME*
14 May. SYDNEY MARINE GROUP’S REQUEST FOR FUNDS IS UNDER CONSIDERATION at senior government levels. Decision makers have indicated they require additional time to complete their due diligence, and on that basis SMG has successfully appealed to its preferred dredging contractor for an additional two weeks.

“We’re indebted to the contractor for this schedule concession,” said Jim Wooster, SMG chair. “They have accepted that all three levels of government are actively involved in the process and that everyone is acting in good faith.” \{SMG press release\} [See 10#05A.]

RAIL SHIPPERS

Fraser (SLR, New Hampshire) Fund buys mill.
MS Walker (ST, Massachusetts). Green removes.
Shelburne Limestone (NECR, Vermont) Buys line.
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