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REGIONAL ISSUES

SLR: CONTRACT AWARDS

August. *THE RAILWAY AWARDED CONTRACTS FOR TRACKWORK* in three states. The text in bold & red show the winning bids.

**Continuously-welded rail**
Between mile 103.4 to 116.5 in New Hampshire and mile 1.35 to 4.25 in Vermont. Rail Cantech (Boucherville, Quebec) 475,866$, RailWorks Track Systems (Sewell, New Jersey) 476,950$, Atlas Railroad Construction (Eighty Four, Pennsylvania) 578,625$, GW Peoples (DC) 1,130,815$, RR Constructors (Paulsboro, New Jersey) 1,055,497$. [Cantech was disqualified as a Canadian company.]

**Ties**
Miles 63-96 in New Hampshire.
Rail Cantech 220,751$, Maine Track Maintenance (South Portland) 200,500$, Atlas 167,750$, G W Peoples (DC) 387,200$, WJ Riegel (Glenmont, NY) 365,000$, RR Constructors 226,750$.

**Surfacing**
Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont.
Rail Cantech 57,850$, RailWorks 75,998$, C & G Surfacing Specialists (Springfield, Massachusetts) 66,276$, Atlas 90,350$, G & W Peoples 153,975$, RR Constructors 103,325$. [C&G omitted mobilization costs.] {e-mails from Gérald Allard, chef entretien de la voie/chief maintenance of way GWIC 17-20.Aug.10; Dave Armstrong of DataFax project reports}

**PW: 2Q10**

13 August, Worcester. *CARLOAD TRAFFIC AGAIN JUMPED*, though not the 55% in 1Q10, according to the 10-Q filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission this day.

**Operating revenues**
Operating revenues increased $1.5 million, or 24.5%, to $7.6 million in the second quarter of 2010 from $6.1 million in the second quarter of 2009. This increase is the result of a $1.2 million (20.39%) increase in conventional freight revenues, a $117,000 (91.4%) increase in other freight-related revenues, and a $234,000 (184.3%) increase in other operating revenues, offset by a $13,971 (8.2%) decrease in container freight revenues.

**Conventional carloads up 25.4%**
The increase in conventional freight revenues is attributable to 25.4% increase in traffic volume, offset by a 8.3% decrease in the average revenue received per conventional carloading. The Company’s conventional carloadings increased by 2,047 to 10,110 in the second quarter of 2010 from 8,063 in 2009. The reasons for the increase in conventional traffic volume and decrease in average revenue per carloading are as previously discussed for the six months ended June 30, 2010.

[The discussion for the first six months stated: ‘This was driven by a modest recovery amongst base customers as well as new accounts, such as plastics transfer and distribution. Particular strength was seen in the shipments of ethanol, up 1,580 carloads and construction aggregates, up 778 carloads, destined primarily for the New York Metropolitan and Long Island markets. Automobile shipments increased during the period with a third manufacturer using the Company’s services [Ford-editor] as well as an increase in volume with an existing manufacturer. Coal shipments during the period were flat with the first six months of 2010.’]

‘The number of shipments of most commodities handled by the Company for the three-month period ended June
30, 2010 increased. This was the result of an overall improvement in economic conditions, coupled with particular strength in the shipment of ethanol, specifically export product destined for the European Union and construction aggregates for the New York Metropolitan and Long Island Markets. Additional infrastructure investments by one of the Company’s aggregate shippers combined with enhanced operational coordination between the Company and the destination rail carrier enabled an overall increase in shipments.

Containers down, but only 2%
The decrease in container freight revenues is the result of a 2% decline in traffic volume and a 10.5% decrease in the average revenue received per container. Container traffic volume decreased by 47 containers to 2,449 in the second quarter of 2010 from 2,402 in the second quarter of 2009....’

Other income
‘Other income decreased from $1.2 million in the second quarter of 2009 to $282,000 in the second quarter of 2010....June 2009 other income included $950,000 received for the settlement of certain legal proceedings and the granting of a permanent easement.’

Operating expenses
‘Operating expenses for the second quarter of 2010 increased by $801,000, or 10.59%, to $7.5 million from $6.7 million in the second quarter of 2009. The principal reasons for this overall increase were higher diesel fuel costs, in the amount of $258,000, increased traffic volume, higher maintenance charges and maintenance of way expenses as previously discussed.’

Cash flow
In 1Q10, the company drew down $1 million from its line of credit, putting cash and cash equivalents at $622,000. At the end of 2Q10, cash and cash equivalents came to $224,000. PW paid $388,000 in dividends during the first half of 2010. {text from SEC website}

MARINE HIGHWAY SELECTIONS*
11 August, DC. THE NORTHEAST FARED WELL IN THE FIRST ROUND OF AMERICA’S MARINE HIGHWAY SELECTIONS. USDOT Secretary Ray LaHood announced the selection, under the Marine Highway program of the Maritime Administration (MARAD), of eight ‘projects’ eligible for immediate funding, three in the northeast, and six ‘initiatives’ for possible later funding, three in the northeast. The 14 proposals were selected from among 35 applications submitted. {MARAD news release 11.Aug.10}

Though $7 million has been appropriated for America’s Marine Highways [see 10#05A], the designated projects and initiatives did not receive any immediate funding. “Applications are due the end of the month [August 27],” said MARAD spokesperson Cheron Victoria Wicker. “The money will be disbursed in the late fall.”

“A project is something that’s ready to go, that’s fully developed. An initiative is something that needs a little more development.” {ANR&P discussion 16. Aug.10}

Wicker declined to detail the total cost of any one project; all will cost far more than the available $7 million. ‘The grant contracts will be signed by September 30, after the applications have been reviewed and grantees selected and notified.

‘Designation as an "initiative" identifies applicants whose concepts are worthy of further development with the aim of becoming eligible for designation as "Projects".

‘The Department of Transportation would like to work with sponsors of these initiatives to help conduct some of the research and development, and market analysis to identify the feasibility, potential benefits and efficiencies they may offer.

‘Initiative sponsors are not now able to compete for Marine Highway Grants, but the Department of Transportation will work with those sponsors to identify resources to help in further viability studies.

‘The submitted applications totaled hundreds of millions of dollars in project costs.’ {Wicker e-mail to
An articulated barge for Portland-Boston?

New England Marine Highway Expansion Project will expand existing container-on-barge service between Portland, Boston, and Newark.

‘This will be accomplished by design and construction of an articulated tug and barge that rigidly connects the two vessels. This will provide more reliable service because it can operate in rougher weather than the traditional towed barges currently in use.’ [www.marad.dot.gov]

‘We applied for this designation to enable us to identify a new vessel for this service,’ wrote Maine Port Authority executive director John Henshaw. ‘A faster and more reliable vessel will attract additional customers to the service, particularly on the import side.

The existing container barge service out of Portland is operated by Columbia Coastal, but Henshaw said a new articulated barge could be operated by ‘the current operator or another operator.’ [Henshaw e-mail to ANR&P 16.Aug.10]

American Feeder Lines to New England?

The Gulf Atlantic Marine Highways proposal was developed by American Feeder Lines, a start-up container company which plans to establish container feeder and domestic freight service in support of the international container lines that serve the East and Gulf coasts. As the container lines put larger ships into service, especially with the planned opening of the Panama Canal’s new locks, a feeder system will complement the continuing drive toward greater efficiency.

Ports like Charleston and Galveston will play key roles in this effort. AFL will build ten state-of-the-art, environmentally-improved container ships in two U.S. shipyards for the start of the new system. [American Feeder Lines press release]

The American Feeder Lines website contains a map showing feeder roots to Portland and Boston as well as along the south Atlantic and Gulf ports, but American Feeder Lines analyst Ashleen O’Keeney explained that “All routes right now are speculative. They are ports and areas we could serve if we were up and running.” [ANR&P discussion 17.Aug.10]

American Feeder Lines does not own any vessels. It is merely proposing to build ten – five at the Akers Shipyard in Philadelphia and five at the Bay Shipbuilding yard in Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin – at a cost of $75 million each. [O’Keeney e-mail 17.Aug.10]

Other northeast projects

Trans-Hudson Rail Service will expand the current cross-harbor rail float service operated by the Port Authority’s New York New Jersey Railroad between Greenville Rail Terminal in Jersey City and Brooklyn ‘by placing a second barge in service following capacity improvements at the rail yard terminals at each end of the service.’ [www.marad.dot.gov]

Cross Sound Enhancements Project will improve ferry service between New London and Orient Point, Long Island.

Outside the region, container-on-barge operations between Hampton Roads, Virginia, and Richmond, Virginia, between Manatee, Florida, and Brownsville, Texas, and between Itawamba, Mississippi, and Mobile, Alabama were also given project designation, as was a cross-border passenger service between Detroit and Windsor.

Selected initiatives: three include the Atlantic Northeast

Hudson River Food Corridor Initiative will evaluate the feasibility of an alternative means of transporting fresh produce from upstate New York to New York City and Long Island. ‘Analysis will consider development of an intermodal option including utilizing refrigerated containers, a Marine Highway service and alternative energy sources to power the refrigeration during transport and storage.’ [www.marad.dot.gov]
New Jersey Marine Highway Initiative will assess the feasibility of short sea shipping within New Jersey and between New Jersey and ports in New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maryland, and Virginia. “This initiative can capitalize on existing container-on-barge and other surface transportation freight systems while exploring options to bring new services on line.” {www.marad.dot.gov}

New Bedford gets a nod
East Coast Marine Highway Initiative ‘proposes to develop a Marine Highway service utilizing a fleet of existing and new-build U.S. flag vessels to transport both domestic and international containers and trailers to destinations along the I-95 corridor in order to relieve vehicle congestion and truck traffic.” {www.marad.dot.gov} The service would operate between New Bedford, Massachusetts, Baltimore, Maryland, and Port Canaveral, Florida.

“This designation puts us on the playing field and keeps the project alive for the next fiscal year,” said Kristin Decas, executive director of the New Bedford Harbor Development Commission. “It makes us a player in the emerging marine highway network.” {ANR&P discussion 16.Aug.10}

NEW YORK

CSXT/D&H: TRACKAGE FEES
16 August, DC. **D&H MUST TELL NYA ITS TRACKAGE FEES.** At issue in the STB filing of CSXT and D&H for joint use of the line between New York City and Rouses Point: the New York and Atlantic’s request to know the amounts of fees.

The request
NYA, which became a participant to the application [see 10#06A], requested certain information from the applicants which they refused. On 28 June, NYA filed a motion to compel production of the information.

The STB ruled that D&H was required to produce ‘fees and charges that D&H currently pays to third parties for the exercise of its existing trackage rights over the Albany-Fresh Pond segment,’ that is, CSXT, Amtrak, Metro-North, and NYSDOT, the owners of the track between Albany and Fresh Pond.

The ruling
The Board noted that applicants were arguing that CSXT’s moving D&H traffic in haulage would save money, and therefore the amounts of fees was relevant to the argument.¹ D&H was required to produce this information, but not haulage or trackage fees for the rights it had on the NS line from Binghamton to Buffalo on the Southern Tier [see 10#07A]. This was ‘not relevant’, the Board ruled. {STB website, decisions page, Docket No. FD 35348 16.Aug.10}

PAS: AUTO/INTERMODAL*
3 August, Mechanicville. **SITE PREPARATION WORK HAS STARTED** for the new yard here. One observer reported ‘trees being ripped out followed by grading alongside the north side of the current main.’

NS spokesperson Rudy Husband wrote that while site work has begun, ‘We are still waiting on the construction

---

¹ The STB uses the rule that information must be produced if relevant to the case, and cited a Maine case for that: “The requirement of relevance means that the information might be able to affect the outcome of a proceeding.” Waterloo Ry.—Adverse Aband.—Lines of Bangor and Aroostook R.R. and Van Buren Bridge Co. In Aroostook Cnty., Me., AB 124 (Sub-No. 2), et al. (STB served Nov. 14, 2003). (The BAR estate in bankruptcy unsuccessfully sought to nullify its transfer of freight rights to CN to serve Madawaska.)
permit from the ACE.’ [See 10#06B.] {e-mail to ANR&P; D&H e-list}

No permit by 18 August
The Corps of Engineers has not yet issued the permit for work at the Mechanicville rail yard, said regional Corps official John Connell.

However, said regional Corps compliance officer Roy Loftfield, if the work now going on does not impinge wetlands or waterways, then no permit is needed. {ANR&P discussions 18.Aug.10}

Work is continuing
Contractors working for NS are clearing and grading the yard location, while a CP foreman is in charge of the work territory because CP owns the main line through the yard. {e-mail to ANR&P from observer Tim Stockwell 11.Aug.10}

CONNECTICUT

BRIDGEPORT: FERRY DISPUTE*
3 August. COASTLINE TERMINALS RECENTLY FILED SUIT AGAINST THE CITY ZONING BOARD for its denial of permission to the Bridgeport Port Jefferson Steamboat Company (BPJS) to move out of the city-owned terminal into new space on the east side of the harbor owned by Coastline Terminals of Connecticut [see 10#07A].

Besides claiming in Bridgeport Superior Court that ‘there is no substantial evidence in the record’ to support the denial, Coastline also claims in its suit that ‘at least one member of the defendant commission had a personal interest in the applications and was predisposed to vote against the applications.’ {Keila Torres in Connecticut Post 4.Aug.10}

More on ferry position: Move to New Haven?
BPJS has paid $152,400 per year for a 1.4-acre terminal, under a lease which expires within 12 months. To put that rent in perspective, Derecktor Shipyards currently pays the BPA $250,000 a year in rent that increases to $275,000 in 2013 for an approximately 23-acre shipyard with far less traffic and stress on City services.

The BPA [Bridgeport Port Authority] tried to negotiate purchase or a long-term lease of the terminal with the ferry company, but failed to reach agreement, Brian McAllister, head of BPJS, wrote recently.

‘[T]he approximately 1.5-acre property is totally inadequate, prevents growth in ferry ridership and causes agonizing traffic delays that discourage passengers from returning. Unfortunately, neither the BPA nor the downtown interests acknowledge this proven fact. They believe that the ferry will make downtown Bridgeport thrive. But less than 1% of our passengers go into downtown Bridgeport. The vast majority get on Route 95 and other roads bound for other destinations. The real benefit of the ferry is to take cars off the highways between Long Island and Connecticut. If the ferry could move to an adequate space on the East End, with faster loading and unloading of cars and easy access to Route 95, we should be able to take about 600,000 vehicles off the highways (as opposed to the significantly lesser number of cars we are currently taking as a result of the inadequacy of the Water Street Terminal)....

‘The BPA (with the support of the downtown business interests) is forcing us to look to alternatives, such as moving the ferry terminal to New Haven, or any other port where we would be welcomed.’ {onlyinBridgeport.com 4.Aug.10}
MAINE

AMTRAK/ST: CEREMONY*
2 August, Brunswick. TRACKWORK BEGAN for the Downeaster extension, following a ceremony attended by Joe Szabo, FRA chief. A rail train delivered 50 sticks of 1,650-foot continuously-welded rail, and ST sent its office car special [see photo in 10#07A]. Szabo told the crowd that Maine became the first state in the country to begin construction using the high-speed rail federal stimulus funding.

David Fink, ST president, said in 2011 ST workers will supply ballast stone from the ST quarry in Embden [see 07#08B], and insert new ties. Service will begin in autumn 2012 on the additional 28 miles of new track. {Tom Bell in Portland Press Herald 3.Aug.10}

What about the on-time performance guarantees?
The need to meet FRA requirements promulgated in June, stipulating how the host railroad will meet on-time performance standards, has held up other projects [see NECR in 10#07B].

Patricia Quinn, NNEPRA executive director, explained that NNEPRA had, when FRA promulgated the new requirements, “already sent in our agreement with Pan Am in final form. We [explained to FRA that] we have negotiated this, as part of a package with the new and existing service. To take that one segment,” and introduce different parameters about on-time performance would not be easy.

NNEPRA and FRA reached a deal. “If the on-term performance fell below 80% for three consecutive quarters,” NNEPRA would provide a work plan which showed the problems and how the agency would address them.

“We also had evidence that we do not have a history of poor on-time performance,” Quinn noted. “We usually work quickly to resolve” the situation, and “problems are not due to freight train interference.” This summer, for example, though the Downeaster has encountered delays, those are due to construction delays in Massachusetts, not “freight train interference.”

Why so long?
Quinn emphasized that the work included not just laying 28 miles of track, but also improving 36 grade crossings, and installing signals for the twice-daily service. Amtrak will be “running the service with the existing equipment pool.”

{ANR&P discussion 4.Aug.10}

MMA: OFA TERMS*
3 August. IF THE TERMS IMPOSED BY THE STB IN ITS DECISION ON THE OFFER OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE ARE TOO EXPENSIVE, Maine officials said, they might walk away from a deal to keep the railroad afloat. “This is about providing a cost-effective transportation alternative to those shippers up there,” said Nathan Moulton, MDOT rail manager. “Otherwise, it’s unusable. There’s no sense in spending this money if it’s going to be financially unfeasible.”

“Nothing good will come of it if the tracks come up,” said John Cashwell III, managing director of Portage Wood Products. Cashwell, who sits on the committee that is negotiating with the railroad, believes a deal will be struck. But the continuing uncertainty is unnerving for many people. {Brian MacQuarrie in Boston Globe 4.Aug.10}

MMA: TRACKAGE RIGHTS**
3 August, DC. THE STB REQUEST FOR COMMENTS ON TRACKAGE RIGHTS BROUGHT NINE MORE FILINGS this day. [See 10#07B for Seven Islands’.] See each filing for much more detail.

American Association of Railroads
“The AAR believes that a mandatory access condition imposed by the Board would be unlawful. The AAR believes
that such a condition (1) would be inconsistent with the statutory scheme, (2) would be inconsistent with a long-line of agency precedent, and (3) would add unnecessary complication to the abandonment and OFA processes.’

**Canadian Pacific Railway, Kansas City Southern**

‘As CP’s Comments demonstrate, the unambiguous language of 49 U.S.C.§ 10501, and longstanding court and agency precedent, make clear that the Board has no jurisdiction to grant trackage rights or any type of access over rail lines located in Canada.’ CP also argued that the Board had no authority to grant trackage rights.

KCS argued no authority existed for trackage rights in a foreign country.

**Huber Engineered Woods, Louisiana Pacific**

‘Because section 10903’s purpose is to protect rural communities, that provision permits the STB to impose trackage rights on MMA’s abandonment application. The importance of protecting rural communities is demonstrated by the plain language and legislative history of this section.’ (Huber)

L-P made similar arguments.

**Irving Forest Products**

‘Congress has put no restriction on the conditions that can be attached to an abandonment decision “other than that “they must be required by the public convenience and necessity.”’ *Consolidated Rail Corporation v Interstate Commerce Commission* 29 F.3rd 706, 706 (1994)’

**MMA**

‘As set forth in more detail below, MMA believes that the Board lacks any authority, whether pursuant to 49 U.S.C.
10903 or in connection with an OFA, to require any sort of forced access in this case. Furthermore, even assuming *arguendo* that Congress has given the Board general authority to impose forced access as a condition of an abandonment or an OFA, the Board clearly has not been given authority to impose any such access conditions over lines located in Canada. Finally, again assuming *arguendo* that the Board has been given general authority to impose forced access, as a matter of discretion and good transportation policy the Board should not involve itself in the numerous factual and commercial issues that would arise if the parties were unable to reach a negotiated solution.’

**MDOT**

The state did not indicate that the negotiations had reached a successful conclusion, though it had requested additional time to comment hoping for a success.

‘Because an OFA involves a forced sale, the Board may not want to impose such conditions in all abandonment cases. However, this is certainly not an ordinary abandonment. The proposed abandonment ...involves 233 miles...with over 20 active shippers moving over 9,000 carloads...’

**Twin Rivers/Fraser Paper**

‘As noted by Brian Sass and Arkon Home in their attached Verified Statements, access rights are necessary in this instance to (1) attract the investment needed to purchase and maintain the affected rail lines and other equipment; (2) allow affected shippers to maintain and potentially increase shipments, ensuring the financial stability of rail service to all the affected shippers and communities; and (3) ensure commercially reasonable and timely connections to Canada's rail system, especially in light of NAFTA and other North American trade policies; and (4) not reward an applicant for abandoning lines and discontinuing service by allowing them the right to dictate to other carriers and shippers the terms and conditions for access to the national rail system.

‘Twin Rivers and FTL also believe that the nature of the access rights is critical....Both in the attached Statements, as well as in other testimony before the Board in this matter, these companies have raised concerns over the efficiency and reliability of MMA.’ {STB website, filings page, STB Docket No. AB-1043 (Sub-No. 1)}

**Reply filings**

On 10 August [the due date, see 10#07B], nine parties filed ‘cross-replies’ to comments by others [see above article] on whether the STB has the authority to order MMA to relinquish trackage rights over the remaining lines following the abandonment and sale of the 233 miles. {STB website, filings page, Docket No. AB 1043(Sub No 1)}

[If the state and MMA reach an agreement, the STB may not need to reach a decision on awarding trackage rights. *Editor*]

**MMA: DEAL CLOSE?**

According to one source, MMA and the state are very close to announcing an agreement under which the state would purchase the 233 miles MMA proposes to abandon. Pending that announcement:

**TIGER II grant applications**

According to the MDOT website, the department has already filed two grants in the second round of Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery federal grants: one for ‘Aroostook Rail Preservation and Rehabilitation’ and one for ‘Aroostook Rail Preservation and Rehabilitation’. The website does not have, as of 22 August, the text of the applications.

**ST/FORE RIVER: DEMURRAGE**

5 August, DC. *FORE RIVER CONTINUED TO RESIST ST’S ATTEMPTS TO RECOVER DEMURRAGE*, an effort begun by ST in 2007 [see 08#07A]. In its reply filed with STB this day, Fore River stated: ‘In this case, STRC attempts to require Fore River to pay six figures in demurrage charges based on nothing more than ST’s conclusory allegation that Fore River is a consignee. ST remains undaunted in its pursuit of Fore River as a new profit center...
‘As argued in detail below, the Board should declare that Fore River, as a "middleman" caught between ST and the shipper, cannot be required to pay ST substantial sums to solve problems that it did not create.

‘Even if Fore River theoretically can be held liable for demurrage charges, the Board should declare that the demurrage charges in this case are unreasonable because they arise out of delay caused by STRC, as well as a glut of cars ordered by the shipper, not Fore River.’ {STB website, filings page, NOR 42108} [See New Hampshire for another shipper’s dispute with ST about demurrage.]

MASSACHUSETTS

MCER: NO TO TINY RAILROAD
16 August, Ware. THE TOWN OF WARE, MASSDOT, AND MASSDEC ALL OPPOSED THE EFFORT by ABC&D Recycling to create its own tiny, 773-foot railroad [see 10#07B and map in 10#03A].

Town of Ware
The Town, in a 366-page filing on 17 August, reiterated its objections [see 10#03B], including the fact that ABC&D did not reveal to the STB that it was turned down for a municipal solid waste facility site assignment by the Town, an decision it has appealed to the Massachusetts Court of Appeals.

Pre-condition for sale of facility: permitting
The Town newly revealed that ABC&D has actually failed [see 10#03A, new financing, new business plan]. ‘Since February 18,2010, ABC&D Recycling has ceded all operational duties, responsibilities and control of its facility to Valley Management Services, Inc. (a corporation controlled by [Chris] Berardi) pursuant to a Management Agreement dated February 18, 2010.

‘The Management Agreement is subject to termination at any time at the sole and exclusive discretion of Country Bank for Savings [which financed ABC&D]. The Notice of Exemption at issue has in fact been filed by Valley Management Services, Inc. the temporary interim manager of the business pending sale of the ABC&D Recycling, Inc. stock and the facility which it operates. In reality, the Notice of Exemption is being filed by [Chris Berardi], a potential purchaser of the business of ABC&D Recycling, Inc. which purchase is contingent upon ABC&D Recycling, Inc. obtaining approval to handle MSW.’

The Town filing contains documentation supporting these statements.

Second lawsuit
In the course of replying to the first ABC&D filing, the Town reviewed the filings in 2001, when ABC&D obtained its special permit for C&D.

‘A further review of those files in April of 2010, disclosed significant zoning violations associated with the Special Permit and that in fact, a Special Permit had not been granted. Town Counsel notified the Town of such finding and the Town shared that information with Mr. Patrick Hannon, the temporary interim management of ABC&D.

‘In response to such notification, the O’Riley Family Trust and ABC&D sued the Town of Ware on May 28,2010. That litigation, captioned as O’Riley Family Trust et al v. Town of Ware. Massachusetts, is currently pending in the Hampshire Superior Court, Civil Action Number 2010- 00115 (hereinafter “Pending Zoning Litigation”).’

MassDOT
Jamey Tesler, legal counsel for MassDOT, wrote on 16 August: ‘In particular, MassDOT believes that the freight rail business cannot grow in Massachusetts without the support and cooperation of the local communities in which
shippers locate. In this instance, MassDOT agrees with the Town of Ware that ABC&D’s true motivation in submitting this Notice is not to be a common carrier, but, rather, to obtain the protection of federal preemption for an intended municipal solid waste ("MSW") facility.

‘MassDOT does not believe either its policy objective, growing freight rail business throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, or the purpose of the applicable federal law is served through this attempt to circumvent local and state permitting. In particular, prior to the current permitting dispute with the Town of Ware as well as this Notice, ABC&D has demonstrated no interest in providing common carrier services in Massachusetts.’

**MassDEP**

James Colman, deputy assistant commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, wrote on 16 August: ‘In order to construct and operate a solid waste processing facility, ABCD first obtained a revised site assignment from the Town of Ware to operate a construction and demolition (C&D) waste processing facility on June 18, 2004. ABCD then filed a permit application with MassDEP to obtain a permit to construct the facility, which permit MassDEP issued on January 25, 2005.

‘Finally, on February 13, 2006, MassDEP issued a permit authorizing ABCD to operate a 750 tons per day C&D processing facility. Although ABCD indicated in its permit application that some processed C&D would be shipped out from the facility by rail, it did not indicate that it wished to provide common carrier service, too.

‘Since 2006, ABCD has been operating a C&D waste processing facility which sorts, grinds and crushes C&D waste at the site. ABCD uses electrically powered processing equipment including a shredder, a C&D residual grinder, and a trammel screen, along with a picking station, magnets and conveyor belts to sort, crush, and grind the C&D waste that is brought to the facility.

‘ABCD has been shipping loads of processed C&D from the facility by truck and rail. At no time during the past 4 ½ years of operation has ABCD ever indicated a desire or a plan to operate a railroad and provide common carrier service along with the C&D waste processing facility. And in its Notice, ABCD has not adequately shown that it can provide such service with locomotives, engineers and all the other activities necessary for providing common carrier service.’ [Indeed, MCER will provide the power and switching under contract to ABC&D, according to a statement by Pat Hannon of Valley Management Services, the rail manager, in March. [ANR&P discussion 10.Mar.10]]
Request for additional time
Leonard Singer, ABC&D counsel, filed with the Board on 20 August, in response to Ware’s request to reject the ABC&D Notice of Exemption, a request to have until 7 September to respond to Ware, and a suggestion that the effective date of the Exemption be postponed from 27 August to 27 September. {STB website, filings page, Finance Docket 35397}

MCER: NEW TRAFFIC*
19 August, South Barre. WILDWOOD RELOAD HAS TIES ARRIVING, AND ROAD SALT SOON. One source said the identity of the salt customer would be known in a week or two. More in a future issue.

MBTA/PW: MORE ON LOCO DEAL*
2 August. THE DEAL TO DO VEHICLE PREP FOR NEW MBTA LOCOMOTIVES is unique, wrote General Counsel Marie Angelini [see 10#07A]:

The prospect of furnishing services in the nature of pre-delivery inspection, preparation and support services for locomotives to be delivered to MBTA for use in commuter rail service, as well as providing warranty service to those units is novel for P&W, a freight operator. It provides an opportunity for P&W&W to utilize its manpower and repair and maintenance facilities in a novel and exciting way. We believe this is the first step in expanding our services and collaborative efforts, especially with MBTA, as its operations in Worcester County grow.

How the deal was landed
P&W believes numerous factors were at play in Motive Power’s decision to approach it, including its workforces' considerable skills on GE locomotives which comprise a substantial part of P&W's fleet, and P&W’s facilities and location in Worcester. Of course, P&W and Motive Power will have to enter into a contract before any work will be completed.’ {e-mail to ANR&P 2.Aug.10}

ST: NEW ENGLAND TRANSRAIL*
23 July, DC. THE STB ASKED FOR AN UPDATE ON THE STATUS OF NET’S PROPOSAL TO OPERATE A TINY RAILROAD in Wilmington and Woburn, since no party has filed on the petition since 2007:

‘In a petition for exemption filed December 5, 2005, New England Transrail, LLC, d/b/a Wilmington & Woburn Terminal Railway (NET or petitioner) sought authority from the Board to acquire 1,300 feet of existing track, construct 6,200 feet of new track, and operate as a rail carrier over the combined 7,500 feet of track on and adjacent to a parcel of land owned by the Olin Corporation and located in Wilmington and Woburn, Mass. In a decision served July 10, 2007 (July 2007 Decision), the Board found that, under its proposal, NET would, if authorized, become a rail carrier subject to the Board’s jurisdiction, and also addressed the extent to which NET’s planned activities relating to the handling of construction and demolition debris and municipal solid waste would come within the scope of the Board’s jurisdiction. The Board noted that before it could address whether to authorize NET’s proposal the parties would need to submit evidence on the transportation merits of the proposal, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would need to complete its remedial investigation and feasibility study and the Board would need to complete its own environmental review.

‘In July 2007, the State of Massachusetts, through its Department of Environmental Protection and Attorney General’s Office, filed a petition for reconsideration asking the Board to reconsider or clarify a portion of its ruling. NET filed a reply. In August 2007, NET filed supplemental information on the transportation merits of its proposal. Massachusetts and others filed replies.

‘Before the issues raised on reconsideration could be adjudicated, Congress enacted the Clean Railroads Act of
2008, Pub. L. No. 110-432, 122 Stat. 4848 (codified at 49 U.S.C. §§ 10501(c)(2), 10908-10910) (CRA) in October 2008. The CRA largely removed from the Board’s jurisdiction the regulation of solid waste rail transfer facilities such as the one planned by NET.[1] But NET’s proposal also includes plans to handle commodities not affected by the CRA, and the CRA did not change the Board’s jurisdiction over those aspects of the proposal. NET did not amend its petition to reflect passage of the CRA.

“As the law has changed since the Board’s July 2007 Decision and in an effort to update the progress of matters in this docket, the Board will require NET to file a status update no later than August 23, 2010. NET should inform the Board whether it plans to pursue its petition for exemption and of the status of any matters that will affect NET’s readiness to proceed. If NET still plans to pursue its petition for exemption, its status report should, in particular: (1) discuss the status of the EPA’s site investigation, (2) discuss whether NET still plans to transload solid waste at the proposed facility, and if so, (3) explain whether that transloading would be done in such a way as to render the facility a “solid waste transfer facility” under the CRA, 49 U.S.C. § 10908.’
ST/NS: ETHANOL COMING*
18 August, Revere. **THE EAST BOSTON BRANCH IS GETTING A FACELIFT**, according to observers. Over the past few weeks, crews from Atlas Construction of Middleboro have brushed out the entire branch down past the switch to the Global unloading rack [see map and photo].

Workers on site indicate that ST will come in to do the trackwork once they have finished, within a week or so.

The switch to the MBTA Rockport line must be placed, and some kind of crossing protection installed at Railroad Street. Also, the rail is severed at Railroad Street (aka Railroad Avenue). {e-mails to ANR&P from observer}

**Global comment**
Asked for information, Bernie Kelly of Global Partners in Waltham said on 16 August that he had no comment. “Wait for the announcement.” {ANR&P discussion}

NEW HAMPSHIRE

MBRX: UPDATE*
3 August, Milford. **UPDATE ON THE POSTURE OF THE EFFORT TO RESTORE RAIL SERVICE**.

**The lawsuit**
Leishman has filed suit requesting that the Court grant a preliminary injunction requiring ST to permit MBRX to operate, and to pay MBRX for lost income. ST’s answer is due 5 August.

**Schedule for preliminary injunction**
Leishman withdrew the request for an expedited hearing because his counsel was scheduled out of state. The judge then set the following dates: 28 July, refile motion for preliminary injunction; 14 days after filing, defendants objection due (Leishman refiled on 27 July, so objection due 10 August); then plaintiffs have 14 days to respond to the objection. Then a hearing will occur.

**FRA and NORAC notices**
Although ST continued to contend that the 2009 accident showed Leishman was operating unsafely, documents attached to Leishman’s motion for a preliminary injunction stated:

- The NORAC rules for shoving do not apply, since the control caboose met the requirements for a locomotive in terms of safety features.
- Les Fiorenzo, FRA administrator for Region One, wrote on 12 April the requirements for safe movement in the caboose. {1:10-cv-00264-PB Milford-Bennington Railroad Co., Inc. et al v. Pan Am Railways, Inc. et al}

  According to Leishman, following these communications in April, the STB’s mediation section asked ST to review its opinion on the question and resolve the matter quickly. That did not happen. {ANR&P discussion}

**NHDOT inaction**
New Hampshire Executive Councillor Debora Pignatelli, who represents the Milford area, wrote NHDOT Commissioner George Campbell, asking about his inaction. On 2 August, he responded:

‘It ain’t true- that we have done nothing.
This is VERY complicated and requires our lawyers to be very strategic. Our attorney- David Hilts and MBRR’s attorney have met or discussed this several times. This is a federal matter and the state has no jurisdiction because of federal preemption and interstate commerce cannot force Pan Am to allow Peter Leishman on their tracks- if I could we definitely would. MBRR is being mistreated.’ {text of e-mail}

**ST/MBRX: GOODBYE CUSTOMER**

4 August, Nashua. LAW WAREHOUSE AND LAW MOTOR FREIGHT STOPPED USING RAIL, according to ‘an email [President Brian Law] sent to the railroad, the Liquor Commission and to all our rail customers notifying them of this change.’

Demurrage and service problems
The e-mail follows:

‘Over the course of this year the Pan Am railroad has attempted to collect demurrage fees that we consider unfair, unjust and unwarranted. We have communicated to them that for more then a few years, their operation has never been able to reliably deliver cars on the day we were told they would arrive, often changing the expected arrival date multiple times and without advanced notice. In addition we provided data showing the high number of cars that arrived at our facility on Thursday or Friday evening and often a number of cars bunched together. We indicated that the unnecessary extra cost their service issues have created for us and our customers is well in excess of what they are attempting to recover.

‘Today we received a certified letter informing us that effective August 10, 2010 we will be required to post a security deposit before any car is placed for loading or unloading unless the unpaid demurrage is paid in full.

‘As a result of Pan Am railways continued unwillingness or inability to provide reasonable reliable service, their continued push for demurrage fees, and their lack of interest in mitigating these factors, we have elected to discontinue accepting rail cars. Please notify all of your supply points that we are no longer accepting rail cars.

‘For those cars that may be en-route, I encourage you to contact Mike Bostwick with the Pan Am Railways to make arrangements to spot these cars. As always, should these cars be spotted, we will unload them in a timely manner.

‘Please note - should the railroad spot these cars in such a way that it is not operationally feasible for us to unload them without incurring demurrage charges, we will not accept responsibility for any demurrage charged by the railroad....

‘Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Brian Law, president, Law Warehouses, Inc. Law Motor Freight, Inc. 27 Airport Road, Nashua, NH.’}

**Rio Tinto disappointed**

One customer of Law Warehouse was disappointed that it could no longer use Law Warehouse. It apparently had asked whether CN would assume the demurrage, resulting in the following e-mail to Law Warehouse:

‘Our company (Rio Tinto Alcan) through CN has advised me that we will not pay demurrage on railcars containing our metal units. As in your case, we have records regarding the movement of our freight and how long it has taken to get to the final destination (your facility). It hasn’t been pleasant! My disappointment through this whole process has been that we are going to lose a warehouse that provided us excellent service. You and your people have been great and it’s sad for me when we lose a relationship such as this. If Pan Am changes their philosophy, we will continue to ship via rail. However, based on correspondence I have received from Montreal there appears to be no chance.

‘We will ship via truck directly to the customer which is not pleasant from our standpoint as our plant was built for rail shipments. If as mentioned Pan Am changes their ways, please let me know immediately as we would start shipping via rail and again continue the relationship we have started. I believe once the metal units we have on hand
have been shipped from your facility, our warehousing needs will be ending.’

MBRXrail work for Law
Peter Leishman, the principal of MBRX, wrote on 20 August: ‘I know first-hand that Law was a very good rail customer (the largest on the Hillsboro Branch) and often received thousands of rail shipments a year from lumber, paper, sand, wines, etc. Often most of the railcars leaving Nashua for the Hillsboro Branch were for Law Warehouse. For nearly twenty years we have inspected, rehabilitated and several years ago extended their unloading track to accommodate ten or more rail cars at a time...They were a great customer.’ {communications via Peter Leishman}

NHN/CSRX: SILVER LAKE RR*
15, Madison. **UPDATE ON THE EXCURSION RAILROAD HERE.** In 2007 Neil Underwood began a local operation [see 07#01A] on the former B&M Conway Branch owned by NHDOT. The section lies between that owned by NHN and that owned by CSRX.

The excursion service uses a trackmobile between two home-made open passenger cars to operate over six miles of track. A former Dragon Cement Plymouth diesel is on display. {Ron Johnson in The 470 Aug.10}

RHODE ISLAND

PW: MORE FORDS**
11 August, Davisville. **NORTH ATLANTIC DISTRIBUTION SAID FORD WILL DELIVER TENS OF THOUSANDS OF VEHICLES INTO THE PORT OF DAVISVILLE.** At this point, NORAD already serves as one of the biggest auto import centers in the country, handling 175,000 cars and trucks each year, a number which will grow by one-third in 2010.

The new contract
NORAD does vehicle prep for some Fords which arrive by rail from factories in North America. Those reportedly were only overflow from the PAS terminal in Ayer [see 10#07A], but now NORAD has a definite contract, according to the announcement this day by the Quonset Development Corporation.

The initial agreement calls for NS, with PW and Seaview, to deliver auto racks containing 25,000 vehicles a year. NORAD will add 25 jobs to its current 250. NORAD could potentially distribute 75,000 Ford vehicles from Quonset Point each year. {Quonset News 12.Aug.10}

Possible Ford imports and exports
“Ford exports now out of New Jersey their new product to Europe. They also import into Baltimore the product that's made in Europe. Hopefully, long-term, we're looking at doing that at Davisville, along with the domestic product,” said Mike Miranda of NORAD. The import-export business would push the number of units passing through Davisville to more than 350,000, double the number that comes through the port currently.

Porsche
In another development, Miranda said he convinced Porsche to leave Baltimore and start bringing its cars from Europe into Davisville. {Bill Rappleye in turnto10.com 10.Aug.10}

Why use Davisville?
One source familiar with the region auto delivery system said reports had reached him of problems at the Ayer terminal. {ANR&P discussion 19.Aug.10}

Ford spokesperson Todd Nissen wrote: ‘We are using both the Ayer and Davisville sites. We and Norfolk
Southern determined we could gain efficiencies using both sites, plus the Davisville site is closer to some of our markets. I'm not aware if we have plans to use the Mechanicville site.” {e-mail to ANR&P 19.Aug.10}

Sample moves
Rail observers report autoracks continue to move to both Ayer and Davisville. [So the San-vel terminal is still handling vehicles. Editor] {Guilfordsightings e-list, PW e-list}

PROVIDENCE/DAVISVILLE
17 August, Providence. **THE PORT OF PROVIDENCE IS ADDING A LAYER OF CHEMICAL THREAT DETECTION** to its existing port security system, which surveys Narragansett Bay.

The chemical threat sensors, along with radar, geographic information system, and long-range video cameras, will be able to identify and track vessels from the harbor entrance at Newport to the Port of Providence. In the event of an incident or accident, emergency personnel in the region will be able to log on to the password-protected system to get the same information and data that the Coast Guard gets.

Using a $593,000 Department of Homeland Security grant, the City of Providence awarded the contract to Raytheon’s Integrated Defense System division in Portsmouth, Rhode Island which is using UK-based Smiths Detection as a subcontractor.

Smiths Detection’s FirstView software system will be added to Raytheon’s Athena array to help manage security data.

“This is a build-on to a system already in place,” said Smith Detections Vice President Jamie Edgar. “Providence has been increasing its capabilities over the years.” {discussion with ANR&P’s Ed Beem 18.Aug.10}

FirstView is already extensively deployed in the Boston area.

CWAs and TICs detected by ion mobility spectrometry
The Port of Providence already has Raytheon’s Athena command and control system in place to monitor traffic in Narragansett Bay. The new Smiths Detections Centurion II system will use ion mobility spectrometry sensors around the Bay to detect airborne chemical warfare agents such as tabun, sarin, and soman, plus toxic industrial chemicals such as chlorine, phosgene, and ammonia. {Smiths Detection website}

VERMONT

VRS: GROUT MOVE*
19 August, Florida. **WORKERS ARE UNLOADING THE GROUT-FILLED GONDOLAS** in Florida, said Ed Duggan of the Northeast Materials Group, which is handling the move of grout (granite waste) from the Rock of Ages quarry in Barre to Florida.

He attributed the holdup [see 10#07B] to construction of an access road: “They’ve resolved that now.” All the strings of railcars are now in Florida awaiting unloading. “As soon as we get cars back to Vermont,” they will be loaded again. {ANR&P discussion}

VERMONT ROAD SALT
23 August, Montpelier. **AMERICAN ROCK SALT AND CARGILL WERE AWARDED THE ROAD SALT BIDS** for the state. Dona Bosley, senior purchasing agent, renewed the Cargill contracts for six districts [see 09#09A] and bid three.

Bosley rebid the three 2007 contracts held by American Rock Salt (districts 1, 4, and 6). Cargill won district 1 for one year, with an option to renew for two additional one-year terms; ARS won districts 4 and 6 with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Sifto</th>
<th>Cargill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$61.45</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>59.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$63.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>66.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$61.05</td>
<td>70.73</td>
<td>64.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the same terms. {text of contracts from website}

Other bids
International Salt, Morton, and Eastern Salt did not bid. {Figures from Dona Bosely, senior buyer, State of Vermont 23.Aug.10}

VERMONT ROAD SALT VENDORS 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Bennington</td>
<td>Cargill (ARS)</td>
<td>Location uncertain</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>58.85</td>
<td>57.70</td>
<td>50.79</td>
<td>49.80</td>
<td>46.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 N.Brattleboro</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>Rockingham/rail/Barrett #1141</td>
<td>10,565#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>61.48</td>
<td>54.95</td>
<td>48.63</td>
<td>46.84</td>
<td>43.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Rutland</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>Rutland/rail/Barrett #1136 or Wye location</td>
<td>12,784#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>62.43</td>
<td>56.06</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>47.81</td>
<td>44.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 White R.J.</td>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>WhiteR.J./rail/Barratt #1071</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61.76</td>
<td>49.77</td>
<td>44.07</td>
<td>41.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Essex J.</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>Burlington/rail/Barrett #1103</td>
<td>11,474#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>60.96</td>
<td>55.42</td>
<td>49.04</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>44.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Barre</td>
<td>ARS</td>
<td>Middlesex/rail/Dubois Const. #1056</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>61.05</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>55.54</td>
<td>48.89</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>41.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 St.Johnsbury</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>W.Milan NH #937 or WRJ #1071 or Ely/ rail/Barrett</td>
<td>10,918#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>64.18</td>
<td>58.88</td>
<td>51.11</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>46.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 St.Albans</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>W.Milan NH #937/Barrett</td>
<td>10,907#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>62.45</td>
<td>57.45</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>44.95</td>
<td>41.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Newport</td>
<td>Cargill</td>
<td>Location uncertain</td>
<td>15,048#</td>
<td>renewed</td>
<td>65.97</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td>51.30</td>
<td>46.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL: 106,906

# 2009 estimate.

QUEBEC/MARITIMES

WHRC: HARD TIMES*

12 August. BOTH GYPSUM AND GRAIN ARE DOWN, reported Bob Schmidt, president and CEO of Iron Road Railways, Inc. owner of WHRC. “Things are pretty much status quo. Gypsum started to drop in the fall of ‘06 mostly because of the housing situation in the U.S. and the lack of demand for wallboard. It [tonnage] reduced considerably last year and this year it is way below normal levels.”

The railway is “doing the best we can and hanging in there until times get better but when that happens who knows.”
Product decline
Schmidt said WHRC will haul approximately 100,000 tonnes to 150,000 tonnes of gypsum this year for USG Corporation from Miller’s Creek and Wentworth mines, near Windsor to Hantsport where it moves to wallboard plants along the Eastern seaboard. WHRC normally moves between 1.9 million tonnes and 2 million tones, said Jim Taylor, WHRC’s operations manager.

The gypsum decline has meant the layoff of WHRC workers. “We been working with the same crew for some time. We lay guys off and bring them back from time to time depending on demand,” Taylor said.

Grain going to Halifax?
WHRC also hauls grain and expects to carry about 30 carloads a month, Schmidt said. However, Co-Op Atlantic of New Minas has begun the construction of a new grain auger and reload facility at the CN marshalling area in Fairview yard in Halifax, and that will affect WHRC’s grain business, Schmidt said. {Discussions with ANR&P’s Tom Peters 12&13. August.10}

New grain facility
Louis Snyder, feed operations manager for Co-Op Atlantic, said preliminary work on the $100,000 grain project is now underway; the facility should be operational by the end of this year. Trucks will move the grain from Fairview to the mill in New Minas.

Co-Op Atlantic is the only full-fledged feed mill in the Annapolis Valley and with its small subsidiary moved about 250 to 260 carloads of grain annually over WHRC, he said.

However, with increased rail costs and unreliable delivery times, Co-Op Atlantic has informed WHRC that after 1 January 2011 it will no longer use the railway to haul its grain. {Discussions with ANR&P’s Tom Peters. 13.August.10}.

RAIL SHIPPERS

ABC&D (MCER, Massachusetts) STB filing.
Co-op Atlantic (WHRC, Nova Scotia) Stops rail.
Fore River Warehouse (ST, Maine). Lawsuit.
Global (ST, Massachusetts) New ethanol?
Law Warehouse (ST, New Hampshire) Stops rail.
New England Transrail (ST, Massachusetts) STB request.
NORAD (PW/SVT, Rhode Island) Ford contract.
Rock of Ages (VRS, Vermont) Grout resuming.

Described in this issue.
Our Directory of Rail Freight Facilities in New England has more information on the companies denoted with their directory number.

PEOPLE

The Surface Transportation Board recently appointed Farmrail System Inc. Chief Executive Officer George Betke as a short line and regional railroad representative on the National Grain Car Council (NGCC), according to the American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association (ASLRRA). Betke lives in Maine.

Gordon Fuller, executive vice president and chief operating officer of the Morristown and Erie railroads, including Maine Eastern, has retired. President Wes Weis has succeeded him.
EDITORIAL

GEORGE ‘NERO’ CAMPBELL

I hear a violin! And....there he is! New Hampshire Commissioner of Transportation George Campbell, in front of the State House dressed in a toga, playing while overlooking the burning of the state's freight rail system.

What's that he's singing while playing the fiddle? I recognize the tune, from *Porgy and Bess*:

Oh, I can do hardly nuttin’
*While Pan Am is screwing the state.*
I'm commissioner of transportatin’
But do nothing for rail freight.

I got no guts to confront,
That is plain to see,
Beer and rock go to truck, that's ok with me,
We’re the wimps without pride,
can’t fight Finks, on their side the STB!

Oh, I prefer to be fiddlin’
*While Pan Am is screwing the state.*
AAGs, they all say: keep mouth shut--only play!
Got no guts - go to truck - I just play!
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